336. Also, petition of the Woodhaven Democratic Club, Inc., Woodhaven, Long Island, N. Y., Frank A. Visone, secretary, favoring the appropriation of additional funds for the purpose of extending the activities of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

337. Also, petition of the Hollis Post, No. 2247, Veterans of Foreign Wars, concerning the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

338. By Mr. STEFAN: Resolution of the Nebraska House of Representatives, memorializing Congress to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

339. Also, resolution of Nebraska House of Representatives, requesting Federal participation in interstate bridge projects across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

340. Also, resolution passed by the Nebraska House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress of the United States, favoring the speedy passage of a bill providing for a Federal old-age pension; to the Committee on Labor.

341. Also, resolution passed by the Nebraska State Senate, on January 14, 1935, regarding the payment of the adjusted-service certificates held by the veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

342. Also, resolution of the Nebraska House of Representatives, relating to payment of adjusted compensation to veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

343. Also, resolution adopted by the Farmers Holiday Association of Thurston County, Nebr., asking that with respect to crop-production loans, the cash payment for seed grain be superseded by payment in kind, bushel for bushel, with suitable number of bushels added to cover cost of handling; to the Committee on Agriculture.

344. Also, resolution of Nebraska House of Representatives, relating to a relief program for the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

345. Also, resolution adopted by the Farmers Holiday Association of Thurston County, Nebr., asking Congress to enact legislation to insure farmers cost of production of major products of farms, plus reasonable profit on what is used for domestic consumption, and that exportable products be sold on the world's best market; to the Committee on Agriculture.

346. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of General Edward Sigerfoos Post, No. 156, of the American Legion of America, and the Ladies Auxiliary of the General Edward Sigerfoos Post, No. 156, requesting Senator ROBERT J. BULKLEY, Senator VIC DONAHEY, Congressman FRANK L. KLOEB, Congressman-at-large CHARLES V. TRUAX, and Congressman-at-large STEPHEN M. YOUNG, and through them the entire Congress of the United States of America to appropriate the sum of $25,000 for the purpose of the erection of a building or some suitable memorial to the memory of Brig. Gen. Edward Sigerfoos within the limits of the village of Arcanum, Darke County, Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

347. Also, petition of German-American Citizens League of Ohio, requesting Representatives in Congress to use their good office and influence with the immigration authorities in order that the immigration problem be handled less harshly, favoring economic security, out-of-work benefit, old-age pensions, and a 30-hour work week; to the Committee on Labor.

348. Also, petition of Freedom Lodge, No. 153 (Ohio), Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of North America, by their corresponding representative, E. A. Luster, Zanesville, Ohio, requesting that 10-cent cigarettes be taxed $2.70 per thousand, while 15-cent and other higher priced cigarettes be taxed $3 per thousand; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

349. Also, petition of Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, Bellefontaine Division, No. 143, by their secretary, Edward Devine, requesting by their body consisting of 306 railway employees, exclusive of their families, Hon. CHARLES V. TRUAX, Member of Congress from the State of Ohio, to support to the fullest extent enactment of legislation to modify the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate commerce so as to permit the railroads to compete with unregulated forms of transportation as recommended by the Federal Coordinator and covered in the Pettengill bill (H. R. 8100) introduced at the last session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, Jan. 21, 1935)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, January 22, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] is absent in the Philippines on business of the Senate and that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] are necessarily absent. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS. I advise the Senate of the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], caused by illness; of the absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is detained on official business in Louisiana; and of the absence of the Senator from California [Mr. MCADOO], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator-elect from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] in connection with the Philippine Commission, they not having as yet returned.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

During the executive session the following legislative business was transacted by unanimous consent:

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of title 20, chapter 3, section 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] a

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Regent of the Smithsonian Institution, to fill the vacancy caused by the expiration of the term of service of Hon. David A. Reed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

Assembly Joint Resolution 1, relative to memorializing Congress to enact proposed legislation directing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates of sailors and soldiers of the World War

Whereas a period of depression exists in the State of California, throughout the United States, and the world; and

Whereas the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates of the sailors and soldiers of the World War, some of whom are in dire need owing to the present economic conditions, will alleviate suffering and increase tremendously the purchasing power of millions of the consuming public, distributed uniformly throughout the Nation, and lighten immeasurably the burden which States, counties, and cities are now required to carry for relief; and

Whereas the payment of such certificates will not create any additional debt, but will discharge and retire an acknowledged contract obligation of the Government; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is now definitely committed to a policy of spending large sums of money for the purposes of hastening recovery from the present economic crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California most respectfully urges and petitions the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the immediate payment, at face value, of the adjusted-service certificates; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and that such Senators and Members from California be urged to support such legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by a money institute, representing three cooperating churches of the community, held in Davison, Mich., under the auspices of the American Science Foundation, favoring enactment of legislation taking away from banks now organized and to be hereafter organized for private profit the privilege of issuing money, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate the memorial of Clair Pahl and several other members of the National Union for Social Justice, of Edgerton, Ohio, remonstrating against the ratification of the World Court protocols, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the United Irish Societies, an organization composed of officers of Irish Societies of Brooklyn and Long Island, N. Y., opposing the ratification of the World Court protocols, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Twentieth Kansas Infantry Association, assembled at Topeka, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the deportation of aliens as a means of alleviating the unemployment situation, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by members of the Caledonia-Mumford Lions Club, of Caledonia, N. Y., favoring prompt action by the Government to prevent the further spread of the Dutch elm disease as being a menace to the American elm, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Manufacturers Association, of Syracuse, N. Y., opposing the enactment of legislation providing a 6-hour day and a 5-day week for labor, with the same rate of pay per week as now obtains, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the National Institute of Arts and Letters, New York City, N. Y., favoring the prompt ratification of the pending copyright convention, so as to admit American producers of copyrightable property to the security of all the countries represented in the Berne Union, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by A. A. Harris Council, No. 66, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Amagansett, N. Y., favoring enactment of legislation requiring aliens seeking asylum in the United States to declare their intention of becoming citizens and to register with the proper Government official every 6 months, and at the end of 5 years and 6 months, if they have failed to become citizens, to be deported, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Rochester (N. Y.) Division, No. 149, Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, favoring enactment of legislation to modify the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the railroads to compete with unregulated forms of transportation, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a letter from Frank Cooper, judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York, Albany, N. Y., relative to and favoring the ratification of the World Court protocols, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a newspaper article from the Block papers of Monday, January 21, 1935, entitled "Join the World Court—Another Experiment", opposing the ratification of the World Court protocols, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 1175) to extend the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years; to authorize loans or renewals or extensions to mature not later than January 31, 1945; to empower the Corporation to buy railroad obligations, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in aid of railroad reorganization and in certain other circumstances; to empower the Corporation (a) to aid the mortgage situation generally by the purchase of nonassessable stock in mortgage-loan companies and similar financial institutions, and to authorize the sale of stock, capital notes, or debentures purchased by the Corporation; and (b) to purchase any portion of the assets of closed banks under certain conditions; to increase the authorized investments in preferred stock and capital notes of insurance companies, or loans thereon, from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000; to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Export-Import Banks of Washington, D. C., as agencies of the United States; and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 21) thereon.

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) to clarify the definition of disagreement in section 19, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 22) thereon.

SURVEY OF LAND AND WATER POLICIES AND PROJECTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 58) authorizing a survey of all land and water policies and projects of the various executive agencies and establishments of the Government, reported it with amendments, submitted a report (No. 23) thereon, and moved that the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 1374) authorizing the survey, location, and construction of a highway to connect the northwestern part of continental United States with British Columbia, Yukon Territory, and the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 1375) to amend the penal laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1376) authorizing the Secretary of War to convey Miller Field, Staten Island, N. Y., to the city of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1377) granting a pension to Maud King Priest; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 1378) authorizing the construction of a dam on the San Pedro River, Ariz.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

(By request.) A bill (S. 1379) to amend section 103 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the Canal Zone and section 542 of the Code of Civil Procedure for the Canal Zone;

(By request.) A bill (S. 1380) to regulate the defense of alibi in criminal cases;

(By request.) A bill (S. 1381) to amend the act approved February 13, 1925, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to further define the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of appeals and of the Supreme Court, and for other purposes";

(By request.) (A bill (S. 1382) to provide for the taking of depositions in criminal proceedings, and for other purposes; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 1383) to amend an act entitled "An act to make persons charged with crimes and offenses competent witnesses in United States and Territorial courts", approved March 16, 1878; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. FLETCHER introduced Senate bill 1384, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

A bill (S. 1385) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lindian J. Swaim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

A bill (S. 1386) for the relief of Duke E. Stubbs and Elizabeth S. Stubbs, husband and wife, both of McKinley Park, Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 1387) granting compensation to Philip R. Roby; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1388) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase the building in Boston, Mass., under lease for garage purposes to the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 1389) to amend section 7, title 1, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (Public, No. 10, 73d Cong., 48 Stat. 31 (1933), 7 U. S. C., art. 601 et seq., as amended by sec. 221 of the National Industrial Recovery Act, Public, No. 67, 73d Cong., 48 Stat. 210, 15 U. S. C., art. 607), so as to eliminate from said section as amended the limitation of time allowed to the Secretary of Agriculture for disposing of all cotton held by him, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 1390) for the relief of Harry L. Reaves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT, ETC.

Mr. FLETCHER. As in legislative session, and by unanimous consent, I introduce a bill to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, and so forth. I ask consent to have the bill, together with a brief digest of its provisions, printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1384) to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act, and to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act, and to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Farm Credit Act of 1935."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1016), is further amended by striking out of the third sentence the following: "and made for the purpose of reducing and refinancing an existing mortgage."

(b) Such section 32, as amended, is further amended by striking out the fifth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Loans may be made under this section for any of the purposes for which Federal land banks are authorized by law to make loans, and for the following additional purpose, and none other: Refinancing, either in connection with proceedings under chapter 8 of the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, as amended, or otherwise, any indebtedness, secured or unsecured, of the farmer, or which is secured by a lien on all or any part of the farm property accepted as security for the loan."

(c) Such section 32, as amended, is further amended by striking out the seventh sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "As used in this section, the term 'farmer' means any individual who is at the time, or shortly to become, bona fide engaged in farming operations, either personally or through an agent or tenant, or the principal part of whose income is derived from farming operations, and includes a personal representative of a deceased farmer."

(d) Such section 32, as amended, is further amended by striking out the eighth and ninth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Until February 1, 1940, the Land Bank Commissioner shall, in his name, make loans under this section on behalf of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, either in cash or in bonds of the Corporation at his election, or, at the option of the borrower, in consolidated farm-loan bonds; but no such loans shall be made by him after February 1, 1940, except for the purpose of refinancing loans previously made by him under this section. As much as may be necessary of the assets of the Corporation, including the bonds (and proceeds thereof) issued under section 4 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, may be used for the purposes of this section."

(e) Such section 32, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Any Federal land bank, when duly authorized by the Land Bank Commissioner and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, shall have the power to execute any instrument relating to any mortgage taken to secure a loan made or to be made under this section, or relating to any property included in any such mortgage, or relating to any property acquired by the Land Bank Commissioner and/or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. Any such instrument heretofore or hereafter executed on behalf of the Land Bank Commissioner and/or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation by a Federal land bank, through its duly authorized officers, shall be conclusively presumed to have been duly authorized by the Land Bank Commissioner and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation."

SEC. 3. The third sentence of paragraph "Twelfth" of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 771), is amended by striking out that portion of the sentence following the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "but in any case in which the Land Bank Commissioner finds that the amount of interest payable by such bank during any quarter subsequent to December 31, 1934, has been reduced by reason of the refinancing of bonds subsequent to June 30, 1934, the amount of the reduction so found shall be deducted from the amount payable to such bank for such quarter under this paragraph."

SEC. 4. The fourth sentence of section 24 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 913), is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the declaration and payment of any such dividend shall be subject to the approval of the Land Bank Commissioner."

SEC. 5. (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 202 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1031), is further amended by striking out that portion of the paragraph which follows the second semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and to discount for, or purchase from, any production credit association or bank for cooperatives organized under the Farm Credit Act of 1933, or any production credit association in which a production credit corporation organized under such act holds stock, with its endorsement, any note, draft, bill of exchange, debenture, or other such obligation presented by such association or bank, and to make loans and advances direct to any such association or bank secured by such collateral as may be approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration."

(b) Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of such section 202, as amended, is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "at such rates of commission as may be approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration."

(c) Subsection (d) of such section 202, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1034), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (a) of section 203 of the Federal Farm Loan Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 1041), is amended by striking out the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"*Provided*, That the aggregate amount of the outstanding debentures and similar obligations issued individually by any Federal intermediate credit bank, together with the amount of outstanding consolidated debentures issued for its benefit and account, shall not exceed 10 times the surplus and paid-in capital of such bank."

(b) Such section 203 (U. S. C., title 12, secs. 1041–1043) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Whenever it shall appear desirable to issue consolidated debentures of the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks and to sell them through a common selling agency, and the Federal intermediate credit banks shall, by resolutions, consent to the same, the banks may issue and sell said debentures subject to the provisions of this section and the provisions of section 21 of title I of this act, insofar as applicable. As used in this act, the term 'debentures' includes such consolidated debentures."

"(e) All debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks shall be lawful investments and may be accepted as security, for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States or of any officer or officers thereof."

SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 204 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1051), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any Federal intermediate credit bank may, with the approval of the Intermediate Credit Commissioner, from time to time establish rates of discount and interest which, except with the approval of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, shall not exceed by more than 1 percent per annum the rate borne by the last preceding issue of debentures which it issued or in which it participated. Any Federal intermediate credit bank may be required by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration to acquire, upon such terms as he may approve, loans and/or discounts of any other Federal intermediate credit bank."

SEC. 8. Section 208 of the Federal Farm Loan Act (U. S. C., title 12, secs. 1091–1094) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The executive departments, boards, commissions, and independent establishments of the Government, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Reserve banks are severally authorized, under such conditions as they may prescribe, to make available to any Federal intermediate credit bank, in confidence, upon the request of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, such reports, records, or other information as they may have available relating to the condition of any institution to which a Federal intermediate credit bank has made, or contemplates making, loans, or which it is using, or contemplates using, as a custodian of securities or other credit instruments or as a depositary."

SEC. 9. Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1141e), is further amended to read as follows:

"(2) The construction or acquisition by purchase or lease, or refinancing the cost of such construction or acquisition, of physical facilities."

SEC. 10. Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 7 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1141e), is further amended to read as follows:

"(1) No loan shall be made in an amount in excess of 60 percent of the appraised value of the security therefor."

SEC. 11. Subsection (a) of section 8 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1141f), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Loans to any cooperative association shall bear such rates of interest as the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration shall from time to time determine to be necessary for the needs of the lending agencies and shall by regulation prescribe (but in no case shall the rate of interest exceed 6 percent per annum on the unpaid principal): *Provided, however*, That the rate of interest on any loan made under the provisions of section 7 (a) (1) hereof, other than upon the security of commodities, shall conform as nearly as may be practicable to a rate of 1 percent in excess of the prevailing interest rate paid by production credit associations to the Federal intermediate credit bank of the land-bank district in which the principal business office of the borrower is located; and that the rate of interest on any loan made under the provisions of section 7 (a) (2) hereof shall conform as nearly as may be practicable to the prevailing rate on mortgage loans made to members of national farm-loan associations."

SEC. 12. Subsection (a) of section 15 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1141j), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) As used in this act, the term 'cooperative association' means any association in which farmers act together in processing, preparing for market, handling, and/or marketing the farm products of persons so engaged, and also means any association in which farmers act together in purchasing, testing, grading, processing, distributing and/or furnishing farm supplies and/or farm business services: *Provided, however*, That such associations are operated for the mutual benefit of the members thereof as such producers or purchasers and conform to one or both of the following requirements:

"First. That no member of the association is allowed more than one vote because of the amount of stock or membership capital he may own therein; and

"Second. That the association does not pay dividends on stock or membership capital in excess of 8 percent per annum.

"And in any case to the following:

"Third. That the association shall not deal in farm products, farm supplies, and farm business services with or for nonmembers in an amount greater in value than the total amount of such business transacted by it with or for members. All business transacted by any cooperative association for or on behalf of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof shall be disregarded in determining the volume of member and nonmember business transacted by such association."

SEC. 13. Section 34 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 34. Subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the chairman of its board of directors, the central bank is authorized: (a) To make loans to cooperative associations, as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, for any of the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in such act, as amended; (b) to make loans (by way of discount or otherwise) to banks for cooperatives organized under section 2 of this act; (c) to buy from, and sell to, any such bank or any Federal intermediate credit bank any note, draft, bill of exchange, debenture, or other obligation; and (d) to borrow from, and discount or rediscount paper with, any and all such banks."

SEC. 14. Section 41 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1134c) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 41. Subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Governor, the banks for cooperatives are authorized: (a) To make loans to cooperative associations as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, for any of the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in such act, as amended; (b) to make loans (by way of discount or otherwise) to any bank organized under this act; (c) to buy from, and sell to, any such bank or any Federal intermediate credit bank any note, draft, bill of exchange, debenture, or other obligation; and (d) to borrow from, and discount or rediscount paper with, any and all such banks."

SEC. 15. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 35 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1134k) is amended by striking out the period at the end and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that, in connection with any loan made on the security of commodities, the borrower shall be required to own, at the time the loan is made, only such amount of stock as may be prescribed by rules and regulations of the Governor."

(b) Subsection (a) of such section 35 is further amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Upon discharge of the loan, stock held by the borrowing association may be, and upon the concurrent or subsequent request of the borrowing association shall be, retired and canceled, and the association shall be paid therefor an amount equal to the amount paid for such stock or loaned to subscriber therefor, as the case may be, minus the pro rata impairment, if any, of capital and guaranty fund of the central bank, as determined by the chairman of the board of the central bank."

(c) Such section 35 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) In any case where the debt of a borrower to the central bank is in default, the bank may, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Governor, retire and cancel all or a part of the stock of the defaulting borrower at the fair book value thereof (not exceeding par), in total or partial liquidation of the debt, as the case may be."

SEC. 16. Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 12, sec. 1138f) is amended by inserting after the word "paid" in the first sentence thereof the following: "by any such bank, corporation, or association."

SEC. 17. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 30 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 is amended by striking out the words "2 years" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "4 years."

(b) The fourth sentence of subsection (b) of such section 30 is amended:

(1) By striking out the words "occurring more than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act"; and

(2) By striking out the words "a period of 2 years from the date of enactment of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "a period of 2 years from the date of the enactment of the Farm Credit Act of 1935."

SEC. 18. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 31 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 is amended by striking out the words "for 2 years from the date of the enactment of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "until May 13, 1937."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 31 is amended by striking out the words "such 2-year period" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the period of postponement."

SEC. 19. (a) If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The accompanying digest of Senate bill 1384 was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST OF AMENDMENTS CONTAINED IN PROPOSED FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1935

Section 1: Provides short title for the act.

Section 2: Amends section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act.

Paragraph (a), by eliminating the phrase "and made for the purpose of reducing and refinancing an existing mortgage", will authorize the Commissioner to make loans with maturities exceeding 13 years, where secured wholly by first or second liens on real property.

Paragraph (b) will authorize the Land Bank Commissioner to make loans for the purpose of financing the purchase of farm property, and the construction, alteration, etc., of farm buildings and other improvements.

Paragraph (c) will make the definition of the term "farmer" in the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 identical with the definition of that term in the Federal Farm Loan Act.

Paragraph (d) has three purposes: (1) To extend until February 1, 1940, the time within which loans can be made by the Land Bank Commissioner; (2) to remove the present $600,000,000 limitation on the amount of bonds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation which may be used in making such loans; and (3) to permit such loans to be made, at the option of the borrower, in consolidated farm-loan bonds.

Paragraph (e) will facilitate execution, by the Federal land banks, of releases and similar instruments affecting Land Bank Commissioner mortgages.

Section 3: Amends section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act.

Will reduce the amount of interest reimbursement payments which the Secretary of the Treasury is directed by law to make to each Federal land bank, by the amount of savings in interest payable by the bank for any quarter after December 31, 1934, resulting through the refunding of outstanding bonds accomplished subsequent to June 30, 1934.

Section 4: Amends section 24 of the Federal Farm Loan Act.

Will subject the payment of dividends by national farm-loan associations to the approval of the Land Bank Commissioner.

Section 5: Amends section 202 of the Federal Farm Loan Act.

Paragraph (a) will enlarge the authority of the Federal intermediate credit banks to include the discounting of paper for banks for cooperatives and the making of loans to such banks.

Paragraph (b) will authorize Federal intermediate credit banks to charge commissions for accepting drafts and bills of exchange.

Paragraph (c) will repeal subsection (d) of section 202, substituted provisions being embodied in section 7 of this bill.

Section 6: Amends section 203 of the Federal Farm Loan Act.

Paragraphs (a) and (b) will authorize the issuance of consolidated debentures by the Federal intermediate credit banks, and will make all Federal intermediate credit bank debentures legally acceptable as lawful investments and security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds held under the authority or control of officers of the United States.

Section 7: Amends section 204 of the Federal Farm Loan Act.

Provides that rates of discount and interest charged by any Federal intermediate credit bank shall be subject to approval by the Intermediate Credit Commissioner; and that, except with the approval of the Governor, the rates shall not exceed by more than 1 percent per annum the rate borne by the last preceding issue of debentures which the bank issued or in which it participated.

Section 8: Amends section 208 of the Federal Farm Loan Act.

Will authorize various Government departments, boards, commissions, independent establishments, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Reserve banks, upon request of the Governor, to furnish certain confidential information to any Federal intermediate credit bank.

Section 9: Amends section 7 of the Agricultural Marketing Act.

Will broaden the present authority of the Governor and the banks for cooperatives, with respect to the making of physical-facility loans to eligible farmers' cooperative associations, to include loans for physical facilities for all cooperative purposes.

Section 10: Amends section 7 of the Agricultural Marketing Act.

Will permit any physical-facility loan to be made in an amount not exceeding 60 percent of the appraised value of the security.

Section 11: Amends section 8 of the Agricultural Marketing Act.

Will enable the Governor to permit loans on the security of commodities to be made at rates of interest lower than 1 percent in excess of the discount rate of the Federal intermediate credit banks.

Section 12: Amends section 15 of the Agricultural Marketing Act.

Will clarify the definition of cooperative associations eligible to borrow from the Governor and from the banks for cooperatives; will broaden such definition to include cooperative associations in which farmers act together in furnishing farm business services; and will enable the Government and governmental agencies to use the facilities of large cooperative purchasing and marketing associations without jeopardizing their status under the Capper-Volstead Act and the Agricultural Marketing Act.

Sections 13 and 14: Amend sections 34 and 41 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933.

Will authorize each bank for cooperatives to borrow from and to buy, sell, or discount paper with any Federal intermediate credit bank and other banks for cooperatives.

Section 15: Amends sections 35 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933.

Paragraph (a) will authorize the Governor to except from the stock-ownership requirements of section 35 (a) borrowers from the banks for cooperatives whose loans are secured by commodities.

Paragraph (b) will authorize each bank for cooperatives to permit the retention of stock in the bank by borrowers who have discharged their loans.

Paragraph (c) will give each bank for cooperatives the authority to realize, in partial or total liquidation of indebtedness, upon the stock of such bank held by defaulting borrowers.

Section 16: Amends section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933.

Will make the present limitation on compensation which may be received by any officer or employee of a production credit corporation or association or bank for cooperatives, applicable only to the compensation paid by him by such institution, and thus will permit any such institution to participate in the payment of a salary in excess of $10,000 per annum to the general agent, who serves as a coordinating officer and is the joint employee of the four major district institutions.

Section 17: Amends section 30 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act.

Will extend until May 12, 1937, the time within which the land bank commissioner may make loans to joint-stock land banks for their orderly liquidation; will provide that no such loan shall be made unless the bank agrees that the required reduction to 5 percent in the rate of interest to be paid by its borrowers shall be effective on the next regular installment dates; and will provide that the required forbearance from foreclosure of mortgages for default in the payment of interest or principal shall extend for a period of 2 years from the effective date of this amendment.

Section 18: Amends section 31 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act.

Will extend for 2 years the period within which the land bank commissioner may make loans to any joint-stock land bank for the purpose of securing the postponement of the foreclosure of first mortgages during that period, except with the specific approval of the commissioner, and except in cases where the property covered by the mortgage is abandoned.

Section 19:

Contains the usual constitutional saving clause, and expressly reserves to Congress the right to alter, amend, or repeal the act.

WITHDRAWAL OF RECOGNITION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. BARBOUR submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States that the diplomatic recognition by the Government of the United States of America of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should be withdrawn.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LONG

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator HUEY P. LONG, of Louisiana, over the network of the National Broadcasting Co., of Washington, D. C., on January 19 last.

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

OUR GROWING CALAMITY

Ladies and gentlemen, the only means by which any practical relief may be given to the people is in taking the money with which to give such relief from the big fortunes at the top. The common people haven't anything worth having; and when you put a tax that falls on them for the purpose of unemployment relief or for old-age pensions, or for anything else, you are giving nobody any relief, because you are taxing the same people who have nothing, on the pretense that you are going to give it back to them. And as a matter of fact, it all never does get back, but much of it would remain in the hands of these Washington bureaucrats and politicians.

Now, we have been clamoring for a number of relief measures. Among them was the old-age pension. We did not propose any unreasonably high old-age pension as some other plans have suggested, but we did propose that every person who reached the age of 60 should receive something around from $30 to $40 per month. We excluded from the list all people who owned $10,000 worth of property or who earned as much as $1,000 per year.

Now, along comes Mr. Roosevelt and says that he is for the old-age pension of $30 a month, but he says that it shall be paid by the States. And he says up until January 1, 1940, this $30 a month may be paid by the States to those who are over 70 years of age and after that time to those who are 65 years of age. Then he says that before they can get the $30 a month that the State government has got to put up one-half of the $30, and then it shall be paid only to those who are needy. And then he says that in order to get the money for the part the Federal Government is going to put up, that they will put a tax on all payrolls, so that the money would be taken from the very source and class to whom it is intended it would be paid.

What the Roosevelt pronouncement for old-age pensions means is that he would scuttle it inside and out. In other words, he will proceed to show how unreasonable, how impossible an old-age pension system can be, and how much harm can be done by trying to bring it about.

His plan contemplates that the Federal Government will contribute $125,000,000 for old-age pensions throughout the United States. That is not a drop in the bucket. It will take three and a half billion dollars to pay an old-age pension to all people who are 60 years of age; and unless the United States Government puts up all of the three and one-half billion dollars, you will not have any old age pension system that is worth anything.

Now, the only way you can get three and one-half billion dollars is by taxing the billionaires and multimillionaires, and nobody else, because if you tax the poor wage earner, who is barely making a living now, you will do more harm than good in trying to build up an old-age pension system. All the worthy movements that have been advocated throughout the United States are always praised by Mr. Roosevelt, who prescribes, in order to carry them into effect, a remedy that means you try to pull yourself up by your own bootstraps.

He admits that most of the people of America are impoverished because the rich people have all the money. He says they ought not allow them to have it all, but in the next breath he gives out a statement that the big rich must not be taxed very much, and that is as far as we ever get with him.

He rode into the President's office on the platform of redistributing wealth. He has done no such thing and has made no effort to do any such thing since he has been there. There is only one relief that can come to the American people that is of any value whatever, and that is to redistribute wealth by limiting the size of the big men's fortunes and guaranteeing that, beginning at the bottom, every family will have a living and the comforts of life. We can pass laws today providing for education, for old-age pensions, for unemployment insurance, for doles, public buildings, and anything else that we could think of, and still none of them would be worth anything unless we provided the money for them. And the money cannot be provided for them without these things doing twice as much harm as they do good unless that money is scraped off the big piles at the top and spread among the people at the bottom, who have nothing.

Any man with a thimbleful of sense who would be trying to help the poor people today by taxing the poor people so as to give the money back to them, ought to be bored for the hollow horn. Now, Mr. Roosevelt has better sense than that, but he is faced with a proposition. He has made the promise to the people that he will tear down these big fortunes by putting some reasonable limit on them, and he has further promised to build up the little man from the bottom. But he feels he doesn't dare keep that promise; he doesn't dare to keep that promise, and so, what is he doing? He makes every kind of move showing he is for this and for that; that he wants to appropriate a little money—so much for this and so much for that—but when you wind up, you find what he actually does is, that if there is any tax that can be levied on the poor people to give these things back to the poor people, that then he prescribes that kind of cure that never has cured or will cure.

The big interests realize Roosevelt's plan would not cost them anything, which is the same as saying it will be no relief to the poor. Here is the proof of that admission from the financial page of the New York Times of January 18, 1935:

"The action of the stock markets yesterday indicated that Wall Street was not alarmed by the President's message to Congress on social-security legislation. The financial community had been hopeful that the plan would not be so ambitious as to retard recovery. By its freedom from liquidation, when the message appeared on the news tickers, the market indicated that Wall Street did not feel that the plan would increase taxation unduly, since it would be largely self-sustaining."

What Wall Street is saying by this dispatch is that the big men of Wall Street were a little bit apprehensive for fear Roosevelt would provide some relief or social legislation that would cost them something, but they are glad to see whatever he does will be self-sustaining. That is, the poor people who get relief will pay for it. In other words, the poor people will be allowed to help the poor people, a poor wage-earner will be allowed to help his aged father or mother and take away a little more from his wife and children. "Ain't" that grand? Yet Wall Street says they are much pleased with it because it means they will not be touched for the necessary money to cure the ills of our people.

Now, our conditions today are much more deplorable than they were in Hoover's depression. The Roosevelt depression is just a double dose of the Hoover depression. In 1929 we started out with the public debt under Hoover of $16,931,000,000, and we wound up under Hoover with his depression showing a public debt of $19,487,000,000, or an increase of two and a half billion dollars, practically all of which increase under Hoover, however, was covered by loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for which it had adequate security and collateral, and so, in fact, there was scarcely any such thing as an increase in the public debt under Hoover as compared to Roosevelt.

So we started in, in 1933, with the Roosevelt depression, starting from the Hoover national debt figure of $19,487,000,000. Now, when we got to December 31, 1934, the national deficit had been raised by the Roosevelt depression to $28,478,000,000, or an increase of approximately $9,000,000,000, and most of it is just that much more debt, good and simple.

Now, how much good has been done with it? Has it cured unemployment? Get ready to laugh, if crying will do it. I will give you some unemployment figures that will shed the light as it ought to be. Here they are as they exist today:

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Half the people in America are unemployed today. Industrial unemployment:

American Federation of Labor—1934—November 10,659,000

Farm unemployment:

Figure farm unemployment on the basis that 1929 was a normal year. That year the farm population was 30,257,000 and earned $11,941,000,000, or $394 to every farm person—that much in Hoover's first depression year. In 1933 the farm population increased by 2½ million to 32,509,000 persons who earned for the whole year $6,256,000,000 less $271,000,000 given by the Government, or the sum of $184 to the person, or 46 percent as much per farm person as under Hoover's first depression year. So the only thing that we can say is that the farm labor of 1933, as compared to the farm labor of 1929, was 54 percent unemployed so far as earnings go, and that is all that counts in unemployment figures. Figuring that 40 percent of the farm population does not work, that leaves us to figures that 19,620,000 persons are normally employed on the farm, and if we take 54 percent of them as unemployed, which they are on the basis of 1929 earnings compared to 1933 earnings, we add to the unemployed list farm laborers numbering 10,594,800

Making the unemployed total 21,253,000

Knowing that one employed person may be the breadwinner of anywhere from 1½ to 5 persons, this figure of 21,253,000 unemployed persons presents a total unemployment picture of nearly half the American people. It is about equally balanced, one-half unemployed to industry and one-half to agriculture. This does not even include the professional man as unemployed. The lawyer, doctor, accountant, architect, dentist, grocer, baker, and candlestickmaker, who cannot make a living because the people have nothing to spend with them, are not even listed as unemployed, though if the proper thing were done they would increase the list another 2,000,000,000 unemployed.

The figure of 10,659,000 unemployed in the industrial class would be materially increased if we included as a percentage of unemployment those working part time, some down to as low as 1 day per week.

Note also that even those who are employed earn a wage which is 43 percent below a fair standard of living. (See American Federation of Labor bulletin of Jan. 12, 1935.)

So you see from the Government's own figures that the estimate of one-half of all our people as unemployed does not near tell the whole story.

It would be very interesting if you would just take a look to see how well the people who are employed are getting along. I have here the monthly survey of business of the American Federation of Labor dated January 12, 1935. It says this:

"Comparing 1934 with 1933, according to the records, we have—

"1. Average yearly wage: The worker's average yearly wage has increased 6.7 percent in these industries, while the price of food rose 11.3 percent and prices of clothing and house furnishings rose 15.3 percent. Clearly, the average employed worker's standard of living was lower in 1934 than 1933, although his average yearly income rose from $1,029 to $1,099 in 1934.

"2. The average worker's income of nearly $1,099 in 1934 is below the minimum necessary to support a family of five in health and decency by $813, or 43 percent."

In other words, according to these accredited figures, those so fortunate as to be employed are living 43 percent below a reasonable standard of living at the end of the year 1934 under Roosevelt's depression.

So we sum up our condition:

We compare the Roosevelt depression with the Hoover depression and we find the Roosevelt depression debt is $9,000,000,000 more than the Hoover depression debt; the unemployment under Roosevelt has eclipsed everything Hoover ever heard about, and approximates more than one-half the whole population of America; the wage earner of today is living further below the standard of a fair living than ever before in the history of the country; the wealth of the country is more in the hands of the big interests and the big men than it has ever been, and the common people and masses in general have less than they ever had; two-thirds of all of the money in the banks is owned by one-one hundred and fiftieth of the people, according to the figures furnished by the Government bureau itself; there are 5,000,000 more people on the dole than there were last year, and another 5,000,000 people trying to get on the dole.

We have the same promises from Mr. Roosevelt now that we had before he was elected, with the exception he says you must not pass any such law as will put them into effect in actual fact.

The only difference in Roosevelt before election and now is that Roosevelt now says he is still for them, but that you must not do anything about them. The only difference between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hoover is that things are much worse in every degree under Mr. Roosevelt than ever under Mr. Hoover; and you could tell what Mr. Hoover meant to do, or rather meant not to do, whereas understanding what Mr. Roosevelt means to do compared to what he does do is difficult.

There is only one way to save our people; only one way to save America. How? Pull down wealth from the top and spread wealth at the bottom; free people of these debts they owe; God told just exactly how to do it all.

Many other countries have been in the shape that America is in now; many fell and vanished like Rome and Greece, but some cared for their people and were saved.

There was once a country in exactly the same shape as America is today. God's prophet was there and applied the laws as God had prescribed them. If you would just recognize that God is still alive, that His law still lives, America would not grope today. Here is the written record of that country that was in the same fix as America is today. Here is what they did under the command of God's prophet. Hear me, I read from the Bible, Nehemiah, chapter 5:

"And there was a great cry of the people and of their wives against their brethren the Jews.

"For there were that said, We, our sons, and our daughters, are many: therefore we take up corn for them, that we may eat, and live.'

"Some also there were that said, We have mortgaged our lands, vineyards, and houses, that we might buy corn, because of the dearth.

"There were also that said, We have borrowed money for the king's tribute, and that upon our lands and vineyards.

"Yet now our flesh is as the flesh of our brethren, our children as their children; and, lo, we bring into bondage our sons and our daughters to be servants, and some of our daughters are brought into bondage already: neither is it in our power to redeem them; for other men have our lands and vineyards.

"And I was very angry when I heard their cry and these words.

"Then I consulted with myself, and I rebuked the nobles, and the rulers, and said unto them, Ye exact usury, every one of his brother. And I set a great assembly against them.

"And I said unto them, We after our ability have redeemed our brethren the Jews, which were sold unto the heathen; and will ye even sell your brethren? or shall they be sold unto us? Then held they their peace, and found nothing to answer.

"Also, I said, it is not good that ye do: ought ye not to walk in the fear of our God because of the reproach of the heathen our enemies?

"I likewise, and my brethren, and my servants, might exact of them money and corn; I pray you, let us leave off this usury.

"Restore, I pray you, to them, even this day, their lands, their vineyards, their oliveyards, and their houses, also the hundredth part of the money, and of the corn, the wine, and the oil, that ye exact of them.

"Then said they, We will restore them, and will require nothing of them; so will we do as thou sayest. Then I called the priests, and took an oath of them, that they should do according to this promise.

"Also I shook my lap, and said, So God shake out every man from his house, and from his labor, that performeth not this promise, even thus be he shaken out, and emptied. And all the congregation said, Amen, and praised the Lord. And the people did according to this promise."

Hear me, people of America, God's laws live today. Keep them and none suffer; disregard them and we go the way of the missing. His word said that. Here is what He said:

"The profit of the earth is for all." Ecclesiastes: chapter 5, verse 9.

"And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a jubile unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family." Leviticus: chapter 25, verse 10.

"At the end of every 7 years thou shalt make a release. * * * Every creditor that lendeth ought unto his neighbor shall release it; he shall not exact it of his * * * brother; because it is called the Lord's release." Deuteronomy: Chapter 15, verses 1 and 2.

Maybe you do not believe the Bible; maybe you do not accept God as your Supreme Lawgiver. God help you if you do not; but if you do not, then all I ask of you is to believe the simple problems of arithmetic, the tables of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. If you believe them, you will know that we cannot tolerate this condition of a handful of people owning nearly all and all owning nearly nothing. In a land of plenty there is no need to starve unless we allow greed to starve us to please the vanity of someone else.

I can read you what Theodore Roosevelt, Daniel Webster, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Ralph Waldo Emerson, all other great Americans said. Their beliefs might be stated in the following lines of Emerson:

"Give no bounties: make equal laws: secure life and prosperity and you need not give alms."

Or maybe these words of Theodore Roosevelt would be proof:

"We must pay equal attention to the distribution of prosperity. The only prosperity worth having is that which affects the mass of people."

It was the poet Horace who warned that Rome would fall in the days of Augustus Caesar. He expressed the line:

"Penniless and great plenty."

So are our American people today. Too much to eat, to wear, or to live in; too much, and yet we are penniless and starve.

Here are the words of Pope Pius in his encyclical letter of May 18, 1932, which I, a Baptist, caused to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Hear these words:

"From greed arises mutual distrust that casts a blight on all human dealings; from greed arises hateful envy which makes a man consider the advantages of another as losses to himself; from greed arises narrow individualism which orders and subordinates everything to its own advantage without taking account of others, on the contrary, cruelly trampling under foot all rights of others. Hence the disorder and inequality from which arises the accumulation of the wealth of nations in the hands of a small group of individuals who manipulate the market of the world at their own caprice, to the immense harm of the masses, as we showed last year in our encyclical letter."

I call and ask you now to organize a share-our-wealth society in your community now. Don't delay. If you want to know more about it, write to me in Washington. If you want a copy of this speech, write to me for it. Help in our plan. What is it? I state it to you again:

We propose to limit the size of all big fortunes to not more than three to four million dollars and to throw the balance in the United States Treasury; we will impose taxes every year to keep down these fortunes and to also limit the amount which any one may earn to $1,000,000 per year, and to limit the amount any one can inherit to $1,000,000 in a lifetime, throwing all surpluses into the United States Treasury.

Then from the immense money thus acquired we will guarantee to every family a home and the comforts of a home, including such conveniences as automobile and radio; we will guarantee education to every child and youth through college and vocational training, based upon the ability of the student and not upon the ability of the child's parents to pay the costs; we would pay flat and outright to all people over 60 years of age, a pension sufficient for their life and comfort; we would shorten the hours of work to 30 hours per week, maybe less, and to 11 months per year, maybe less; and thus share our work at living wages and to those for whom we fail to find work we would pay insurance until we do find it; we would pay the soldiers' bonus and give a sufficient supply of money to carry on our work and business.

All this can be done with ease only if we will say to the rich, "None shall be too rich!"

Won't you help in this work? Is not humanity worth the effort? How much do we need it? I will tell you.

Hear me now read you a report from our newspapers. It reads:

"BABE DYING, MOTHER WALKS STREET IN HUNT FOR AID—BRAVES BITTER COLD WHEN CHILD GROWS WORSE; FINDS NO RELIEF AT WELFARE STATION, IS TOLD TO GO TO HOSPITAL, WALKS IN VAIN

"By United Press

"CHICAGO, January 16.—It was bitterly cold. Frail Mrs. Ella Martindale huddled with her four children close to an insufficient stove. The baby, 5 months old, wailed fitfully in fever under blankets on the floor.

"All awaited return of Murrian Martindale, the father, who promised when he left for his shift as a cab driver that 'I'll bring something to eat, some way.'

"The baby's cries grew more frequent but weaker. She refused the warm water offered as a substitute for milk. Paroxysms purpled her tiny face and the older children, from 3 to 12, whimpered in sympathy and fear. Mrs. Martindale paced the floor, wrung her hands.

"A strangling cough wrecked the infant girl. The mother acted in desperation. Whirling blankets around the baby and a ragged coat around her own shoulders, she ordered the oldest girl to watch the other children. She raced from the room, carrying the sick child.

"At an infant welfare station two blocks away she sobbed out her troubles. The women on duty were sorry, but no doctor would be present for hours. They advised her to go to St. Joseph's Hospital.

"Mrs. Martindale had no car fare but she went. She walked—six blocks—with the thermometer at 16 above zero. She stumbled on the steps into the hospital.

"'My baby,' she sobbed to a nurse, 'she's sick.' The nurse peered into the blankets, then took the little bundle.

"'She's dead', she said."

Good night, my friends. I thank you!

SOME PROBLEMS BEFORE CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DUFFY

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered at Washington, D. C., January 18, 1935, by Senator F. RYAN DUFFY, of Wisconsin, on the subject Some Problems Before Congress. It is a very thoughtful address and I think will prove of interest to the Senate.

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

SOME PROBLEMS BEFORE CONGRESS

I welcome the opportunity given by the Columbia Broadcasting System to discuss with the people of this country some problems that are up for decision before the Seventy-fourth Congress. I think the Columbia Broadcasting System is rendering a splendid service to our people by furnishing their facilities to representatives of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in the discussion of the important problems of the day.

Right now, perhaps the most important subject under discussion, certainly in the Senate, is the question of the World Court.

Many of our people do not have a clear idea of just what is involved in this question.

At the close of the World War, when the terrific cost of that war both in lives and in treasure had been seared deep into the souls of the people of the world, it became evident that some movement should be attempted that would lessen the probability of wars in the future; and so an international agreement was signed by practically all of the leading nations of the world, setting up a Permanent Court of International Justice. The fundamental idea seemed to be sound, that if some tribunal could be established whereby disputes between nations might be settled, it would make for peace in the world, because every dispute between nations—no matter how trivial it might seem to be—is a potential cause of war; and the countries of the world are now so close together—due to the development of transportation and communication in all their forms—that a war between two nations is very likely to involve many other nations in that dispute.

The treaty that is now before the Senate is really in three divisions, or protocols, but they are being discussed, and should be regarded, together. The question cannot be considered a partisan one. Republican Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover advocated our adherence to the Court, as does President Roosevelt. Both political parties in their national conventions in 1932 incorporated in their platforms, planks favoring adherence by the United States to the Court. The Democratic platform was brief. It said: "We advocate adherence to the World Court with the appending reservations." The Republican plank, which was more lengthy, was, however, very definite, and a part of same is as follows: "The acceptance by America of membership in the World Court has been approved by three Republican Presidents, and we commend this attitude of supporting in this form the settlement of international disputes by the rule of law."

There must be, of course, a two-thirds vote in the Senate in favor of the ratification of any treaty, and where there is determined opposition, a two-thirds vote is always somewhat difficult to obtain. Although a majority of the Senate at the last Congress favored the ratification of the St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty, yet it failed at that time because there was not a favorable vote of two-thirds. The World Court Treaty has vigorous opposition, and yet I believe from the present outlook that the treaty will pass the Senate. The original agreement for creating the Court was ratified by 49 countries. The second protocol contains amendments to the original agreement which was prepared largely so as to meet the conditions laid down by the United States Senate in its reservations and has been ratified by 46 of the principal nations of the world. I should perhaps at this point invite your attention to the fact that when the United States Senate gave its advice and consent to the original treaty on January 27, 1926, it incorporated certain reservations which, in turn had to be agreed to by the various other nations. Four of the reservations were agreed to outright, and it is really because of the fifth reservation that the matter now again comes before the Senate.

Let me read to you the resolution that now is before the Senate—"That the Senate advise and consent to the adherence by the United States to the said three protocols * * * with the clear understanding of the United States that the Permanent Court of International Justice shall not, over an objection by the United States, entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States has, or claims, an interest."

There is no question in my mind that much of the opposition to the World Court today is due to the willingness with which European nations have repudiated their obligations to this country. Many of our people feel that, where solemn obligations seem to rest so lightly on the shoulders of nations owing us money, we should keep away from any agreement with them whatsoever.

While I recognize the force of the argument, and while I feel that in many cases the repudiation by European governments of their debts to this country are absolutely indefensible, yet I feel that this Government will be better protected, and in a better position, by agreeing to the ratification than if we refuse to do so. The only obligation that this Government is under if we ratify, is that we shall bear our proportionate share of the expense of operating the Court, and the few thousand dollars involved will be of no moment in a discussion of this question. The important point, as I see it, is if we ratify the treaty that the Court could not, over our objection, entertain any request for an advisory opinion upon any question the United States has, or claims, an interest; while if we are not a member of the Court such an advisory opinion could be rendered; and while there is always the question of how such an opinion could be enforced, yet it seems to me to be far better for us to be in a position to stop the Court from even entertaining such a dispute, rather than standing off on the sidelines, and perhaps have such an opinion crystallize the public sentiment of the world against us.

President Roosevelt sent a message to the Congress on last Wednesday, asking the Senate to ratify the treaty. I agree quite thoroughly with the statement of the President in that message, in which he says: "The sovereignty of the United States will be in no way diminished or jeopardized by such action. At this period in international relationships, when every act is of moment to the future of world peace, the United States has an opportunity once more to throw its weight into the scale in favor of peace."

Disputes between individuals can usually be settled by an appeal to the courts. Disputes between groups of individuals constituting our States in the Union can thus be settled. It should be recalled that in the early history of this country there were at times disputes between the States which became so severe there was possibility of a resort to force, and so it was very fortunate indeed that we had a tribunal in this country which could pass judgment impartially upon such disputes. Nations are only enlarged groups of people, and any means that can be devised whereby disputes between groups of individuals organized into separate nations may be settled, is certainly a long step toward peace.

I do not think that even the most enthusiastic advocates of the World Court believe that it will prevent all wars in the future, but many of us do believe that the Court already has, and in the future will be able to settle disputes between nations, which, if not so settled, might bring on an armed conflict.

If there is one proposition upon which practically all of our people are united, it is that our Nation may continue at peace with the world. The cost and the horrors of the last war have not been—and should not be—forgotten. We can no longer hide our heads in the sand and say that we will live only unto ourselves and will not be concerned with the rest of the world, because we know, if we are honest with ourselves, that any great conflagration between the larger nations of the world might easily involve us. The World Court, properly functioning, and having greater prestige in the eyes of the world by reason of our being a member thereof, will make possible a lessening of the armaments of the nations of the world, and thereby lift a very considerable burden from the backs of the overburdened taxpayers of the world.

I, personally, do not believe that the ratification of the World Court Treaty will be taking us into the League of Nations by the front door, or back door, or down the chimney. If I believed this to be the case I certainly would not vote for adherence to the Court. In addition, if after we make this sincere effort toward world peace, we should feel it advisable for us to withdraw from the Court, we can readily do so without delay. It does seem to me that a ratification of the treaty will not only be a sincere effort on our part to assist in bringing peace to the world, but it will, likewise, place us in a position to more adequately protect the interests of this country.

As my time is very limited this morning, let us discuss one or two of our domestic problems. The first bill that was introduced into the Senate at this session was a bill which I prepared to extend the operation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. It is now known as bill S. 57.

I regard the operation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation as one of the most important and essential parts of the recovery program. Even in the days of the so-called "stock-market prosperity" near the latter part of the year 1929, the ranks of our unemployed were being rapidly augmented month after month, and of course after the October crash, the numbers of unemployed rapidly increased. One of the groups that suffered most is perhaps one of the most important elements that go to make up the citizenship of this country. I refer to the small home owners—those frugal, hard-working, American men and women—who laid aside a little of their income and pay checks each month so they could have a modest little home of their own. This class of people did not have the money to buy a home outright, and so they bought on time. They bought on land contracts or placed mortgages against their property. As long as their employment continued they were gradually paying up the debts on these homes, but when suddenly, without warning, they lost their jobs, they could no longer pay the taxes or the interest on their mortgages or land contracts. When President Roosevelt came into office he found a veritable avalanche of foreclosures in all parts of the country. And so the Home Owners' Loan Corporation law was passed to assist these good citizens in their distress, and I think they have done a wonderful job. We authorized them to issue bonds to the extent of $3,000,000,000, but we now find that the applications were so many that this sum was insufficient; and so my bill authorizes this corporation to issue an additional $1,000,000,000 in bonds, and this will enable the corporation to take care of the large number of people who have applied for help, but whose applications were delayed for one reason or another in reaching the legal department, or who may have struggled on until their small cash resources were gone—trying to avoid asking the Government for help, but finally found it was necessary to do so.

I am not one of those who likes to see the Government enter into competition with private business. If the private financial institutions of this country could or would take care of these people who have not yet received Government assistance in this respect, I would not ask for the extension, but I am advised by people in the mortgage-loan business from various parts of the country that at present there is practically no chance for such assistance. Let me call your attention to this fact—while the Government will become obligated for the additional billion dollars of bonds that are issued, on the other side of the ledger the Government will have first-mortgage security upon property valued greatly in excess of that amount. It is not like an outright expenditure because the Government will have excellent security for every dollar it has to put up in further carrying out this great humane program.

Several other bills similar to mine have been introduced, and I believe that there is an excellent chance for such proposed legislation to be enacted into law. I believe we have just time enough left to comment upon the message of the President, which he sent to the Congress yesterday. You perhaps have noted from the newspapers of last evening or this morning, that he recommends legislation for unemployment compensation, old-age benefits, Federal aid to dependent children, in support of existing mother-pension systems, and additional aid to public-health agencies. Bills have been and will be introduced to carry out

these recommendations. It seems almost certain that the President's recommendations will be carried out. The important point to mention in this respect is the statement of the President in his message, as follows: "It is overwhelmingly important to avoid any danger of permanently discrediting the sound and necessary policy of Federal legislation for economic security by attempting to apply it on too ambitious a scale before actual experience has provided guidance for the permanent discussion of such efforts." This shows that the President is pursuing a safe and sane course, and is not being influenced by either the ultraconservatives or the ultraradicals.

THE WORLD COURT

The Senate resumed the consideration of Executive A (71st Cong., 3d sess.), protocols concerning adherence of the United States to the Court of International Justice, the pending question being the amendment of Mr. VANDENBERG to the resolution of adherence as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in the course of his characteristically able argument on the subject of the accession of the United States to the Permanent Court of International Justice, remarked:

> Mr. President, the great achievement in government may be said to be the impartial administration of justice. Property rights and personal liberty alike wait upon the success of this achievement. Contentment among the people, the progress and prosperity of a people, are advanced and assured in proportion to the progress made in the full realization of this achievement.

Mr. President, no better words could be uttered on this subject, and they afford me a point of departure, if not a text. I think I might go further than the statement of the distinguished Senator, in that justice is the only justification of government; that justice is the reason for the existence of government; and that justice is the soul of the progress of civilization. We take pride in our governments only in the degree that we succeed by means of them in arriving at and executing justice. The proposition here, Mr. President, is to extend the great principles of adjudication by tribunals of justice beyond the borders of domestic life and national operations into the great, wide realm of international affairs. The same high motives that induce us to erect tribunals of domestic justice move us now to support the resolution of adherence by the United States to the first tribunal in history erected in the interest of international justice.

The Permanent Court of International Justice is proposed by the nations of the earth, I think not less now than 50 in number, and is maintained by them in the interest of extending to the nations of the earth, to their disputes and controversies, the great principles which have justified the existence of the governments themselves. It is a singular commentary, Mr. President, after ages of so-called "civilization" and the existence of almost innumerable governments, each of them dedicated to and existing by reason of their aspiration for and capacity for the administration of justice within themselves, that the world should have waited until the present age, the last 14 years, to devise and set forward a tribunal dedicated to precisely the same principle that has justified the existence of the governments themselves, the principle merely being extended to operate amongst the several nations.

We propose in international affairs to substitute, not by way of arbitration but by way of a court of justice, reason, and righteousness for force and willfulness and war. I am sure there is not a man within this Chamber and very few on the earth who would refuse favorable entertainment of a proposal so justified in the experience of nations within their own domain and so justified by the principles which are native to the breasts of all human beings, civilized and uncivilized. We propose that justice shall preside over the nations of civilization even as it presides over the peoples within those nations.

I take it, therefore, Mr. President, that we have no controversy here, nothing whatever to overcome by way of predilection or argument against the vital and dynamic principle underlying the proposition presented in the Permanent Court of International Justice and put forward in the resolution of our accession.

The Court has now been in existence nearly 14 years. It has succeeded in maintaining itself and commanding a certain degree of respect throughout the earth for these 14 years. Those years have been years of unusual trouble and almost, I sometimes fear, actual insuperable difficulty. So far from decreasing in respect or regard, year by year throughout the period, it has continued to operate and to command the respect of the world and the adherence of 50 nations of the earth, including all the greater nations.

Not only so, but in the progress of the Court in these 14 years, submitted as it has been to the trials of exceedingly troublous times, every President of the United States from the day of its institution to the present hour has commended it to the Senate of the United States and to the American people. Moreover, with the Court in operation, with the objections put forward as they have been put forward here, each of the great political parties—and our country is still governed by means of two great political parties—has proposed the adherence of the United States to the World Court and each has won elections with that proposal in its platform.

The party now in power won its election by a majority of 7,000,000 votes with the pledge of its faith in behalf of the adherence of the United States to the Permanent Court of International Justice. The Republican Party, under the leadership of President Hoover, at that time their candidate, pledged its faith likewise and won an election, as I recall, by a majority of about 8,000,000 votes. While I would not undertake to stress too much this particular point, I think I am safe in saying that the policy, the principle, and the great idea presented by the Permanent Court of International Justice has been approved as very few propositions have ever been approved in our land, not only by both parties, but by immense majorities of the American people.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to invite attention to the fact that in the last Democratic convention I was a member of the resolutions committee which drafted the resolution which was presented to the convention, but the resolution was presented because there was a fight over the World Court coming in the resolutions committee. It was expressly considered, and the only way we could get the resolution adopted was to have it embrace the appending reservations. What were those appending reservations? The appending reservations are not in the resolution as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. BAILEY. I shall come to that, but I remind the Senator that at this stage of my remarks I was speaking of the approval of the principles and the ideas and the consummation rather than the details. However, I promise the Senator that before I shall take my seat I shall undertake to go into those details.

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

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. In connection with the remarks just made by the Senator from Montana, I think it is easily demonstrable that the reservations referred to by the Senator from Montana are the five reservations to which the signatories have agreed.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

I may observe, in passing from these introductory remarks, just the one fact that President Woodrow Wilson did more than any other President of our country to bring forth this noble conception; that President Harding approved it in specific language; that President Coolidge approved it; that President Hoover approved it; that President Franklin D. Roosevelt approves it. I may go further and say that in principle, by definite statements, President McKinley approved it as far back as 35 years ago. After him, President Theodore Roosevelt approved the principle. I add to that the statement that the political parties of the United States, the two greater parties, have approved it, and, rather remarkable to say, each of them has been placed in power upon platforms approving it.

I add to that that practically 50 nations of the earth have approved it, and continued to approve it after giving their adherence to the Court itself. Strange to say, however, the one country whose President brought the conception into definite form, the one country whose political parties have submitted the question to the people, the one country in which the proposal has received, so far as it can receive, the approval of the people in at least two great elections, the one country in which this great principle and consummation of extending the domestic standards of justice to the nations of the earth, and substituting the reason and the righteousness of tribunals for force and willfulness and war, should make the greatest appeal—the one great country that remains aloof is, strange to say, the United States of America.

Only the Senate of the United States has stood between our country and this great consummation. If there has been delay, and if there is delay, if there has been apparent defeat—not ultimate defeat—it is due to the fact that this Chamber has stood in the way of the consummation.

Now we come once again to consider it, no longer an experiment, tried by 14 troubled years, approved by 50 nations of the earth, with a line of its decisions and its actions and some conception of its character before us. I think, Mr. President, it is time that the Senate of the United States, which has delayed this consummation so long, should take very grave thought as to its attitude.

I propose now to go into some rather elementary considerations, because I have observed from the press and from some portions of the discussion here that there is somewhat of misapprehension and misunderstanding of the character of this tribunal.

What is this Permanent Court of International Justice? It is nothing more nor less than a tribunal of judges dedicated to truth and to justice. The very statement of that fact should disarm all reasonable men. Here we in the United States are used to courts. We rely upon the courts. They are, in a very great sense, the source of the life of the American people. They mean more to commerce than any legislation of which we can conceive. They mean more to order than all the armies we could employ. Courts of justice, at any rate, are not strange and new things in America, that Americans should recoil from the prospect of erecting one that will extend the great principle of national life and domestic well-being to the great realm of international relationships.

This Court consists of 11 judges and 4 deputy judges, and they are chosen by the nations that adhere to the Court and its jurisdiction. The Court is supported by those nations.

What is the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice? The jurisdiction is set out in article 36 of the statute of the Court, and I propose to read it into the RECORD.

The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it—

There is mutuality—

which the parties refer to it—

That is, the parties to the cases—

and all matters specially provided for in treaties and conventions in force.

The members of the League of Nations and the states mentioned in the annex to the Covenant may, either when signing or ratifying the protocol to which the present statute is adjoined, or at a later moment, declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other member or state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all or any of the classes of legal disputes concerning—

(a) The interpretation of a treaty.

(b) Any question of international law.

(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation.

(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The declaration referred to above may be made unconditionally—

That is, the declaration as to recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction—

The declaration referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain members or States, or for a certain time.

In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

There is the statement in the unchangeable statute—for the statute is unchangeable under the special protocol which is proposed here, save by the consent of all the nations adhering to the Court. So here is the statement of the jurisdiction; and on the very face of it the jurisdiction relates wholly and exclusively, specially and particularly, to international controversies and questions; and insofar as it might relate to other questions in the general statement of the first paragraph of article 36, it cannot possibly take jurisdiction save by the reference to it of the parties in interest. That is voluntary; and as for the compulsory features of the jurisdiction, it is specifically provided with reference to the particular items of the jurisdiction that no nation may be compelled to the jurisdiction save by means of a specific stipulation voluntarily entered into by the nation itself.

What could be fairer than that? What could be more prudent than that? Are we to argue here that there is something special about the United States of America that we cannot afford to adhere to a court which will take no jurisdiction save by and with our consent? If we take that position, Mr. President, we shall be simply taking the position that there are no circumstances under which we are willing to submit our cause in a controversy to a tribunal of justice.

I have heard a good deal said here about Americanism. If that attitude be Americanism, then it might be pleaded in the courts of the world as evidence that we are not a civilized people. The only alternative to accepting that voluntary jurisdiction is the alternative of sitting back here upon our shores with a strange conceit that we alone are capable of deciding disputes between ourselves and others and that the other nations must either whip us in battle or we whip them.

To reject the character of jurisdiction outlined here is to reject the principle of justice in international relations; and to reject the principle of justice in international relations is to reject the principle of justice altogether, because justice is not a national affair.

Justice is universal. It rests in the heart of every man. The prophet of the nineteenth century, Thomas Carlyle, remarked as far back as 1835 that justice was the one universal instinct that could surely be found in the heart of every man; that even though one should go to the heart of the wilderness of Africa, and find himself in the midst of a benighted tribe, there would be no difficulty there in discovering the universal instinct for justice.

So I make my argument here that justice is a universal aspiration; it is a universal necessity; and the nation that undertakes to defeat justice in the universe, or in the international realm, fights against the stars that fought against Sisera.

Mr. President, so much for the jurisdiction. Now, with respect to the advisory opinions, I wish to get that into the RECORD.

Mr. President, it is contended in the Senate that the advisory opinions open up the doors to doubt, in that they probably enlarge the jurisdiction of the Court.

I read the new article 65, chapter IV:

Questions upon which the advisory opinion of the Court is asked shall be laid before the Court by means of a written request, signed either by the president of the Assembly or the president of the Council of the League of Nations, or by the secretary-general of the League under instructions from the Assembly of, or, the Council.

The request shall contain an exact statement of the question upon which an opinion is required, and shall be accompanied by all documents likely to throw light upon the question.

I concede that the article is general and is in no aspect of it specific. I concede that there is possibility—I believe I would go so far for the purposes of the argument as to agree that economic and political questions might be presented under article 65 touching the advisory opinion. But, Mr. President, what is an advisory opinion? It is without force, save the force of advice, which one may accept or reject as he will upon its value. There is a very great distance between

an opinion of a court or a decree of a court or a judgment of a court and an advisory opinion of a court. It could have in the mind of the nations involved nothing more nor less than the quality of light, and not remotely the quality of force.

On that point, however, Mr. President, I believe I will digress just a little, returning to the resolution which is proposed in the Senate, in order to show that even with respect to advisory opinions not one of them may be entertained touching any questions in which we are involved or have an interest over the objection of the United States of America.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LOGAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator would not say "involved"?

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to read the resolution itself, and I will let it stand, and then we can undertake to interpret it:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring), That the Senate advise and consent to the adherence by the United States to the said three protocols, the one of date December 16, 1920, and the other two each of date September 14, 1929 (without accepting or agreeing to the optional clause for compulsory jurisdiction), with the clear understanding of the United States that the Permanent Court of International Justice shall not, over an objection by the United States, entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States has or claims an interest.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho raised an objection to my use of the word "involved." The resolution speaks for itself. If we object on the ground that we have or claim an interest, that ends the matter; and if it is our view that we are involved, our objection will be an estoppel under this resolution, and we would be the judges of that; and if we were not the judges of that, our doors are wide open under two sections, one the right of absolute withdrawal and the other the right of withdrawal without prejudice.

So, Mr. President, with a great deal of respect for my distinguished friend from Idaho, whose judgment and eloquence and nobility of character I honor as highly as any human being could, I think I am justified, in the light of the resolution and the exposition that I have given, in the statement that our resolution of accession, upon which we are to pass, gives us the power of preventing action upon an advisory opinion on any matter in which we have or claim to have an interest, in using the word "involved" as I have; and, to be sure, if we have an interest, we would be involved, or if we should be involved within our conception, we would interpret that as interest, and that would be our interest and justify the objection, which would be an absolute estoppel upon the action of the Court.

Mr. President, again, What is the power of this Court? I believe that question would go almost to the heart of a good deal of the argument I have heard in the Senate. I have heard Senators speak here as if this Court would be some sort of supreme power over the United States of America; that this Court could interfere with our affairs; that this Court could determine our foreign policy; that this would be a supercourt imposed upon the great fabric of the American Government. There is nothing in that. This Court has only the power of jurisdiction which we may choose to give it to start with. And it has also only the power to enforce its judgment that lies within the moral realm of truth.

To put the matter in perfectly plain language—there are no marshals in this Court; there are no sheriffs in this Court; there is no power of execution of judgment in this Court. The controversy is voluntarily submitted to it. It resolves the controversy as only the Court may. The opinion is stated to the world, and its validity and its force rest only upon the moral power of truth. I do not minimize that power. That is a greater power than the sheriffs have, and that is a greater power than our domestic courts have. Probably the supreme power in the world is the power of truth.

Is the United States of America afraid of the power of truth? Are Senators of the United States disposed to cringe before the prospect of the moral power of the universe? I cannot believe it. I cannot entertain the thought.

I think I shall make a little departure here to say that the Man of Galilee, to whom the ages have looked and ever will look, upon being questioned by the presiding officer of the Roman court, Pontius Pilate—"Are you a King?" said, "My kingdom is the kingdom of truth." And that was the only kingdom existing then that exists today. It is the only kingdom that mortal men cannot resist. It is the only kingdom that armies cannot cope with. It is the only kingdom that survives all the vicissitudes of life, that resists the puny attacks of mortal men. So I do not intend to minimize this great moral power of the Court, but on the other hand I rejoice that we are reaching a stage in the progress of man when that moral power may be invoked in definite form, and may preside over the nations of the earth and the multitudes of their populations.

It was Matthew Arnold who said years ago on the question of the Deity and of his faith that—

There is an eternal making for righteousness.

There is an eternal making for righteousness. It cannot make for righteousness by means of force and of war. Certainly not save at the cost of the destruction of men and of civilizations, as all of us can bear witness from recent experience. But it does make for righteousness by means of the reason in the brain of men and the instinct in their hearts for justice.

That is the only power the Court has—that is all the power the Court has. So far as I am concerned, I would be ashamed before the people who sent me here and of the civilization which I represent in the Commonwealth of North Carolina if ever I should give to any man the slightest intimation that I had reason to recoil from or to seek to evade the force of the moral power of the kingdom of truth. So much for that phase of the matter.

I am coming now to the objections that have been put forward in particular with regard to the adoption of this resolution at the present time.

The first objection of which I will speak is the objection that our adherence to the World Court will affect or in some degree impair the historic American policy, especially with reference to other nations. I shall overlook the statements made here on the floor about oil companies running the courts, running that Court. I think men who put forward arguments of that sort get credit for only one thing, and that is the capacity to portray themselves in perfect character, from which nothing can be taken and to which nothing can be added, and I give them credit for perfection in self-portraiture.

But what is the historic American policy with regard to other nations? I realize, Mr. President, that to answer that question would invite me to go into a long discussion, but I am going to resolve it into a brief generality. We have faithfully sought to avoid responsibilities in the Old World, though not absolutely. We have entered into the nine-power pact and five-power treaty, and I raise no quarrel about that, and I think with fair accuracy I may say that we have undertaken to avoid responsibilities among the nations of the Old World and all manner of their controversies.

Over here we have assumed a larger responsibility, especially with respect to Central and South America, than any nation on the earth ever undertook to assume with respect to other nations, save perhaps the recent policy of the kingdom of Japan with respect to the Far East. If I had anything to say on that subject I would say that Japan in the Far East is emulating the example of the United States in the southern half of the New World.

If I have stated, Mr. President, fairly well in general terms what our foreign policy has been, I wish to raise the question, How could our adherence to this Court affect that foreign policy? There are those who say that the adherence to the Court would immediately involve us in the political questions that arise continuously in Europe.

Mr. President, how would our adherence to a tribunal of justice involve us in any question whatsoever save the question to which we are a party and to which we submit? Do we assume because we agree to help maintain an international court, because we agree that we may accept its jurisdiction at

our will, that, therefore, we participate in its decisions and are responsible for its policies? I cannot see how it follows. The Court, in my conception, will be a thing apart, as courts must be. The fact that we have a vote in the election of judges or that an American may sit on the bench of the Court, as two Americans have sat, cannot affect the United States in the remotest degree in respect to the opinions or the decisions of the Court.

I make an analogy which, I will agree, is not perfect. I vote for the judges of the supreme court in the State of North Carolina, but I am not responsible for their decisions. North Carolina assists in the election of a President and participates in the election of Senators who have their respective shares in the appointment of judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, but the people of North Carolina are not involved and cannot be involved by way of any responsibility whatsoever for the actions of the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States. I fear that the impression has gotten abroad that by some means when we adhere to the jurisdiction of the Court under the reservations, the voluntary aspect of which I have described, we become responsible for its decisions. We do not even have to accept its decisions with respect to ourselves, and certainly we are obligated to give to its decisions with respect to other nations only that support which the moral law demands in the hearts of men.

So I see nothing in the argument that adherence to the Court, even in contemplation that it may pass upon economic and political questions, would tend in the remotest degree to involve us or make us in any degree responsible for advisory opinions or actions or decisions of a great court of international justice passing upon controversies which probably could not be settled otherwise save by willfulness or might or force. The idea that that adherence would involve us is not supported by any conception of courts of justice in any nation. It is not supported by any facts or any statute or any action of the Permanent Court of International Justice itself. So I think, Mr. President, we may dispose of that. I will, however, add one more word.

I hear the general talk of Americanism. We have a favorite way in America of using a word or slogan without rhyme or reason, and Americanism is one of those words. What is Americanism? It would be a subject of discussion all to itself; but Americanism never has been the rejection of justice.

Woodrow Wilson was an American, and out of his brain sprang this great conception. Theodore Roosevelt was an American, and probably a more typical American than any of the modern famous men; and yet he put forward this conception. Warren Harding was an American; the American people made him President, and he supported the World Court. Calvin Coolidge was an American, and he supported the World Court. Herbert Hoover is an American, and he supported the World Court in his Presidency. And Franklin Roosevelt is an American. The man who takes it upon himself to draw the line of Americanism in this controversy likewise takes upon himself the burden of showing wherein he is an American and all the Presidents of the United States from 1899 to the present hour are not such Americans as he is. I mention that just in passing.

Now, Mr. President, I come next to the argument that to adhere to the World Court is to join or to become a member or to become involved with the League of Nations. I think that is put forward with the utmost seriousness and commands our most respectful and grave consideration. No one could have put it forward better than the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho, and I am going to read a little of his language:

> Here is a tribunal of which we are a member—

I disagree with the Senator from Idaho; we are not a member of it; but—

> Here is a tribunal of which we are a member—a tribunal having advisory jurisdiction upon which the League may call when it chooses for an opinion. Where does this power of advisory jurisdiction come from? Does it come from the statute of the Court? Certainly not. It comes from the League of Nations.

Insofar as the United States of America is concerned, insofar as the Court takes jurisdiction with reference to us, its power comes from us. We are not in the League of Nations. It gets no power save that which we give it. I think that clears it of any suspicion or imputation that the jurisdiction of the Court relative to us could possibly associate us with the League of Nations. The League of Nations is in the nature of a collection of other nations under a covenant which we have not signed, to which we are not a party. There is a definite way to become a member of it. If they create a court and we give accession to the jurisdiction of the Court, the League of Nations has no power over the decisions of the Court. So far as the jurisdiction is concerned only we ourselves can accept or reject the jurisdiction respecting us at our will and not the will of any other nation whatsoever.

Again the Senator from Idaho said:

> This tribunal was created by the League, its members are elected by the League, paid by the League, and pensioned by the League.

We will pay our part in the maintenance of the Court. I do not get the word "pensioned." As I understand the expenses of the Court, the maintenance is drawn from the nations which adhere, and if it happens that 50 of the nations are in the League of Nations, one may argue that that means the League is paying the expenses, but it is getting the expenses from the respective countries.

> It is a tribunal designed in the first instance to be and actually has been created as a department of the League.

Mr. President, that is an interpretation put upon it by the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I will agree that it is called forth in the Covenant of the League, but I deny that it is a part of or is dependent upon the League. It is not a part of anything, no more than the Supreme Court of the United States is a part of the Congress which wrote the Constitution. The Court proceeds out of the matrix in which it is conceived and molded. It takes its character as a court, and maintaining that character it must forever stand apart from all else. Where could we find a better illustration than this which we have here? Here is the great Supreme Court of the United States, no part of the Congress, no part of the States, no part of the Presidency, separate and alone, guarding peace and justice in America. It would do justly by an alien as readily as by a citizen.

The Permanent Court of International Justice is intended precisely and has so far conducted itself regardless of its origin—it had to originate somewhere—as an independent judicial tribunal dedicated to the settlement of controversies between contending nations under the standards, not of accommodation or of politics but of justice. That is why it makes its great appeal to me.

I read on:

> It is a tribunal dependent for its continued existence upon the continued existence of the League.

I am sure the Senator from Idaho believes that, but I believe quite differently. The League might dissolve tomorrow, but the aspiration of mankind, the desire of enlightened nations to avoid the rule of force and willfulness of war, to find the rule of truth and righteousness and peace, would disturb the heart of man until he found another international tribunal. I think, Mr. President, that the League may go, and I hold no brief for the League, but mankind will never let go its hopes of justice duly administered in international affairs. Once now that 50 nations of the earth have seized upon the achievement, mankind will never again let go its hopes of guiding nations and civilizations under the judicial process and take the unspeakable risk of the sword and the cannon and the gas and all the inconceivably horrible things by means of which stupid governments have for ages sought so vainly to settle the disputes and controversies between contending nations.

If I may say so, nothing is better established on the earth today than that nations are incapable, of their own will, of settling their disputes. War is no remedy. I question

whether in all the history of men there has ever been a settlement by means of war in which the price paid for the war was not a thousand times more than the value of the cause that was won.

Mr. President, I think this great conception came forth from the brain of Woodrow Wilson as he, with that historian-statesman's eye, beheld the wreck and ruin of settlement by war—came forth in order that mankind might at last realize, upon the ruins wrought by the rule of nations red in tooth and claw, the ancient way established by the God of Hosts when He set up for mankind the standards of righteousness.

Again the Senator from Idaho said:

Is it fair to say to the American people that in becoming a member of this important department of the League we are not in the League and a part of the League—a part of the machinery of the entire organization?

I assert to my distinguished and honest friend the senior Senator from Idaho it is perfectly fair. I say it with utmost respect. I would say it to my little 6-year-old girl, and fathers do not deceive their little children. I would say it to my constituents. I say it here. I would not say to the American people that in becoming a member of the Court we become a member of the League of Nations.

We do not become a member of the Court in the first place. By adherence to its jurisdiction we do not become a member of the Court. I take it that the members of the Court in the ordinary conception are the judges. They are the members of the Supreme Court of the United States. I have heard lawyers described in the United States as "members of the court", and they are officers of the court. As such officers their foremost duty is to minister to the demands of justice.

How do we make ourselves or conceive ourselves as members of the Court merely because we agree at our own will to submit a controversy to it? I do not think it follows. I cannot make the connection.

If we desire to maintain the Court of this tribunal after we have joined it, must we not maintain the League in order to maintain the Court?

I quote that from the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I do not think it follows. I just now said that the League might disappear, but never I hope will the tribunal of international justice disappear. I can conceive of a time when such tribunal may be rejected and denounced by reason of national feeling. But even so, if we should strike one down, the Senator from Idaho himself would be the first to lead the way to create another to take its place. He has said no less in his address here. If he had not said it, I would have known it anyway. I would not hear his foremost enemy say to the contrary.

So much, Mr. President, for that objection. The other objection is that by adhering to the Court we may become involved in European questions.

I quote again from the distinguished Senator's address:

Again, Mr. President, let us suppose that when the German-Austrian Treaty came before it we were a member of the Court; suppose that we had become a member in 1926, what would have been the situation? Here was a tribunal of which we were a member which was dealing with a question which was purely European in character, which did not concern us in the slightest, which was purely European in its import and in its effect; we would not have entered into a discussion of the matter of our own voluntary action; but as a member of the Court, a member of the tribunal, the League calls upon us for an advisory opinion.

Imagine that—the League calling upon the United States for an advisory opinion!

And we join with the other members of the Court in passing upon a purely political European question. If we would not be acting under the auspices, under the direction, and under the influence of the League, I do not know what would bring us under the influence of the League.

There was the Senator's conception. I differ utterly from him in my conception. He speaks of us as a member of the Court and a member of the tribunal. We are not members. He speaks of the League calling upon us for an advisory opinion. It calls upon the Court, not upon us. He speaks of our joining with the other members of the Court. We do not join.

Assume that there is a member from the United States of America, as there is now a member. Are we responsible for his decisions? Assume that this resolution of adherence shall pass, and we have a vote, and we cast that vote, and the man for whom we cast it is elected. Do we join the Court? Do we join the League? Why, no. We vote for a judge. And it is of the very essence of jurisprudence and of justice that the judge, when elected, must be indifferent to his electors. He ministers in the temple of justice. His attachment would not be to the United States. He would not be a representative of the United States. His attachment is to justice and to truth.

The Great Word said to all men—said most of all to judges, by the Almighty—

What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

That is all that we can require, all that any nation can require, all that the mighty Father Himself could require of any judge anywhere, international or local.

So, Mr. President, I cannot see wherein our adherence under this resolution could possibly make us in any degree responsible for the adjudications or actions or advices of the Court. We help maintain it, and we help maintain the Supreme Court of the United States. We help elect its judges, and we help elect judges throughout America. But courts are courts, and they serve but one master; they have but one source of validity; they have but one justification for their existence; and that is truth—in other words, justice.

I will pass by the remark made here, speaking of Earl Grey, that he went home after he had visited America and wrote a letter to the London Times, saying, "Let them"—that means America—"come in with their reservations; we will construe their reservations." That was a strange thing for Lord Grey to say. He was a very noble man. He enjoyed the love and esteem of the British people as few of its statesmen have ever enjoyed the love and esteem of a great people. I cannot account for it. When the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] says that Lord Grey said it, I am sure that he did say it. I raise no question about that; and, accepting the statement that he did say that they would construe our reservations, very well. We also would construe them. Upon any act that would seem to us unjust or unfair we have the right, inherent and of our own will and arbitrarily, to withdraw from the Court. I do not hesitate to say that should the Permanent Court of International Justice undertake to tell us what we meant, we would still have the capacity to tell them what we meant, and our word would be the last word. So that gives me no trouble.

There was an objection on the ground that the Court cannot be trusted; that it is human. It is true that it is human, and that is true of the Supreme Court of the United States; but it can be trusted. The argument of the fallibility of men gets us nowhere. The whole treasure of government is in earthen vessels. We are not going to turn from the adherence to a great tribunal of international justice simply because men elect it and men preside over it. That is the best we can do. We cannot call gods or demigods to help us on earth; and men have done quite well, Mr. President.

We stand here under the shadow of a great court, on whose altar fires have burned the lamps of justice for nearly a century and a half. Cynical men have said about the Supreme Court that it was made up of mortal men. I saw a statement the other day that one of the Justices had said that the members of the Court were human, but some were more human than others; and, you know, Mr. Dooley said, away back yonder in the last 5 years of the nineteenth century, that he did not know whether or not the Constitution followed the flag, but he understood that the Supreme Court followed the election returns.

Mr. President, I want to dwell on that. That statement found lodgment in the brain of practically all the American reading public. We rolled it under our tongues as a sweet and humorous morsel; but it did not impair in one one-

hundredth of 1 degree the universal respect in which the Supreme Court of the United States is held.

I am glad courts are human. If they were not human, I do not know from what source I would obtain justice, for they judge me remembering that they are as I am; and I do not care that they are fallible. I question whether life itself would be very greatly worth while in an infallible universe.

So, Mr. President, I conclude this portion of my argument with the simple statement that there is nothing whatever in the argument that the Court is made up of men, is human, and is therefore fallible. On that argument we would never have anything. We would not even have a Congress of the United States or a President.

I come now to my conclusion, Mr. President. I have presented no arguments for the Court except by way of answering other arguments, but the argument may be very simply stated.

In the world, as it is now constituted and has been constituted ever since record was made of the activities of men, there are controversies between kingdoms and peoples and tribes. These controversies must be settled in one of two ways—either by willfulness and force or by reason and righteousness.

Choose ye this day whom ye will serve.

As for the constitution of the Court, it must be international in character. We cannot constitute it. No man, no nation, ought to be judge in its own cause. We have a concert of 50 nations which has constituted it. We cannot build another. We cannot destroy it. If we are actuated by the reason and the righteousness which prompts us to set up indifferent tribunals for the trial of controversies between our nationals at home, then why should we hesitate to give adherence to an international tribunal indifferent in character, so far as the nations are concerned, for the settlement of international controversies and questions?

Mr. President, I began my remarks with a word or two on the subject of justice. I think I may safely say that the distinction between the natural creation of the brutes and the beasts and the civilized creation of human beings lies in that one word "justice."

Out yonder in the winter day the sparrow has no law and no court. If the hawk is stronger that he, the hawk prevails. The sparrow becomes a meal for the hawk.

Yonder in the wilderness the rabbit has nothing to protect him save his cunning; no army and no power, no court of justice, and no refuge save his speed and the instinctive capacity for deceit. If they fail him when he is young, he is food for the hound; and when they inevitably fail him in his age he is food for the fox.

So all the way through the whole realm of nature we have the rule of force and the consequence of blood and of suffering.

They call that the "survival of the fittest." The great German philosopher, Nietzsche, put forward that doctrine for men and nations in his philosophy in the early years of the present century, proclaiming to the German people the exaltation of the superman and telling them to be hard and to be strong and to rely upon hardness and to rely upon their strongness. If I had to explain the plunging of a noble people into a great war, if I had to explain many things going on over there of which I would prefer not to speak, if I should have to explain the substitution of persecution for a great and noble culture which produced the noblest literature and most perfect music of the generation that lies behind us; if I should have to explain those things, I would explain them in the fact that Nietzsche succeeded in injecting the virus of the barbaric spirit of nature in the blood of a great and noble people, with consequences which horrify mankind—which I often fear will wreck civilization.

But the instinct for justice in the breasts of men creates governments, protects the weak, takes care of the children, lays a helpful hand upon the stooping shoulder of the aged. It negatives the ruthless rule of nature.

I speak not only of justice in commerce, justice in courts between men and the law, between men and men, but of this modern aspiration for social justice. They are all one. It is that justice which lies at the root of the tree of civilization itself.

Shall we deny it here? Why is it that we who abhor the cruelty of nature in the wilderness do not abhor it between nation and nation? Why is it that we denounce the brute who beats the woman and sustain an international situation in which the greatest brute can destroy the humblest nation? Why is it that we exalt justice here as the soul of our civilization and deny justice in all the vast international relations? It cannot be answered.

So, Mr. President, I shall cast my vote for this resolution, and in casting it shall remember in the years that remain that when an opportunity was presented I sought to make one contribution to the moral structure of civilization.

During the course of Mr. BAILEY's speech,

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. In line with what the Senator is now suggesting, I desire to call attention to a statement made by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] the other day when he undertook to say that the Court was controlled by the political interests of the judges. To quote him exactly, he said:

I just know politics that well that I can tell the Senator now how they voted, and if I make a mistake I would almost be willing to say I am making a very serious blunder.

Then he undertook to mention how each judge voted, by reason of his nationality, and he mentioned Great Britain and Czechoslovakia and Russia as having voted for the majority opinion. Czechoslovakia had no judge in the Court at the time; neither did Russia—that was mentioned by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]—and Great Britain voted for the minority opinion. So the Senator from Louisiana not only made a blunder but, indeed, according to his own admission, a very serious blunder.

I desire now to put in the RECORD how the judges voted, so far as their nationality is concerned, on the customs-union advisory opinion involving Germany and Austria. The judges who voted for the minority opinion were from Japan, Holland, Great Britain, United States, Belgium, Germany, and China; those who voted for the majority opinion were from Spain, Italy, Cuba, France, Salvador, Rumania, Poland, and Colombia.

I wanted to make that correction and call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to the fact that he did make a serious blunder in his guess, in the event he ever comes back to get the information.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, let that come in at the conclusion of my speech, if it is agreeable to the Senator; and I think it also should go in the RECORD that if the Senator from Kentucky thinks he can correct the blunders of the Senator from Louisiana, I quickly confess that I am quite incapable of it. [Laughter.]

After the conclusion of Mr. BAILEY's speech,

Mr. McNARY. 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	Burke	Dieterich	Keyes
Ashurst	Byrd	Donahey	King
Austin	Byrnes	Duffy	La Follette
Bachman	Capper	Fletcher	Lewis
Bailey	Caraway	Frazier	Logan
Bankhead	Carey	Gerry	Lonergan
Barbour	Clark	Glass	McCarran
Barkley	Connally	Gore	McGill
Bilbo	Coolidge	Guffey	McNary
Black	Copeland	Hale	Maloney
Bone	Costigan	Harrison	Metcalf
Borah	Couzens	Hastings	Minton
Brown	Cutting	Hatch	Moore
Bulkley	Davis	Hayden	Murphy
Bulow	Dickinson	Johnson	Murray

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

Mr. LEWIS. I beg to reannounce the reasons for the absence of the Senators whose names I gave this morning as being absent from the Senate, and ask that the announcement I then made stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a matter that I think is of public interest in view of the fact that it involves the public-school system of our country.

I think it was in August of 1933 that an effort was made by the authority of the National Industrial Recovery Board to put a text on N. R. A. in the public schools. That met with very serious opposition. Only a few days since I found that an effort is being made, in my judgment, to interest the National Education Association in another type of political propaganda which I believe should be frowned upon.

I have a letter from the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C., dated December 18, 1934, as follows:

Hon. L. J. DICKINSON,
Algona, Iowa.

DEAR SENATOR DICKINSON: You will be interested in the attached study of the Tennessee Valley project which is reprinted from the Journal of the National Education Association for December. This will be used in thousands of schools. If you wish additional copies we will be glad to supply them.

Very cordially yours,

JOY ELMER MORGAN, *Editor.*

Upon examination of this article, I find that it is an article written by Walter E. Myer, editor of the American Observer, under title "The Tennessee Valley Looks to the Future." This article is written, of course, purely from the standpoint of the interest of those wanting to make everything look rosy in behalf of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

When the appropriation for T. V. A. comes before this body for approval I shall bend every effort to obtain adoption of a special prohibition that no moneys expended by T. V. A., either out of its borrowed funds or from direct apropriation, shall be used in secret propaganda either in the American school system or in any other manner.

Recently I was astounded to discover the broadcast manner by which the doctrines proposed by this association are being spread in this underhanded manner, the same as we found the public utilities were doing only a few years since.

I feel sure that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who does not happen to be in the Chamber just now, and who, more than any other person, is responsible for the existence of the Tennessee Valley Authority, will join me in the suppression of such a pernicious practice. Certainly he will object to practices by the Tennessee Valley Authority which he has so vehemently denounced when carried on by utilities. I am sure he will agree with me that the commission of a sin by the utilities cannot justify the same sort of activities by a Federal agency.

I am sure that none of those in this Chamber who, like myself, voted for T. V. A. contemplated such activities by that corporation any more than we realized the threat toward socialistic activities and competition with business which the administration of T. V. A. has manifested.

Every American school teacher, every American parent, every American taxpayer, will be gravely concerned to learn the latest attempt to prostitute our public-school system for the purpose of spreading the propaganda of a public-ownership doctrine by writers secretly subsidized out of Federal moneys to prepare public-ownership "study units" published by the Journal of the National Education Association and distributed to the school teachers of the country.

We have in this article by Mr. Myer a detailed description of what it is expected will be done under the Tennessee Valley Authority, but we find that this article was prepared by Mr. Myer at the instance and request of those in the Authority. We have this on the admission of Dr. Joy Elmer Morgan, editor of the Journal. Dr. Morgan was asked, before publication, according to Herbert Corey, in the current issue of the New Outlook: "How much are you going to pay the correspondent for writing it?" "I do not know", Dr. Morgan replied, "the T. V. A. is taking care of that. It will be a matter of bargaining between the correspondent and the Authority."

Thus is revealed an agency of the Federal Government engaging in a propaganda trick that amounts to a public fraud—a deception as black as any charged against its public-utility opponents. T. V. A. has employed a writer of reputation to prepare an article purely for propaganda purposes, pleasingly painting its arguments, and has paid this man to place the article within the covers of the Journal of the National Education Association as a bona fide, unbiased study of a great Federal experiment. The deception lies in the fact that the readers of this article—and it has been reprinted for classroom use, large quantities having been purchased for free distribution by T. V. A.—are forced to assume that the writer has written freely from his own observations. It is my understanding that over 50,000 copies of this article have already been printed and that the Tennessee Valley Authority has purchased 25,000 of them. The guileless reader never suspects that he is a victim of a public-ownership propaganda scheme.

I do not want to commit myself as a public-ownership advocate or as a private-ownership advocate; what I am trying to touch upon is the fact that the public-school systems of the United States ought not to be used to spread propaganda for or against either type of ownership of public utilities.

Equally culpable is the management of the Journal of the National Education Association, which would submit supinely to such a prostitution of the name and prestige of its organization to further the cause of an alien political doctrine.

One wonders what official pressures were brought to bear upon Dr. Morgan that he was willing to participate in a governmentally financed conspiracy to proselyte the Nation's school children.

Other pertinent questions include:

How much money did Walter E. Myer receive from T. V. A. for writing this article?

With whom did he collaborate on the propaganda staff of T. V. A. and to what extent was his copy censored and rewritten by the propagandists for this Government agency?

Let us turn to the article itself.

We read:

"They (utility companies) seek to influence public opinion insofar as it relates to the regulation of utility rates. * * * They carry their influence to the schools and secure the adoption of textbooks which are favorable to utility companies and the elimination from other textbooks of statements they consider harmful." This from a piece of propaganda performing the same kind of mendacious dissembling!

I hold no brief for the utilities companies. Unquestionably some of them may have been mismanaged, and some of them well deserve the castigations that they have received. My own record is clear on that point. But this statement implies that each and every public utility commonly engages in the most pernicious types of propaganda—a statement that cannot be demonstrated and that is obviously false.

The irony is, of course, that such a self-righteous accusation should be contained in a similar attempt to influence the schools.

Such, however, is a minor issue. I take more serious objection to the whole fatuous tone of utopian star-gazing, with which the impressionable youth of this country is given this story in a magazine whose supposed purpose is to mold the child mind. To have been fair, the views of realists on public ownership should have had equal space.

Such an activity on the part of an agency of the Federal Government would be reprehensible and against public policy, even if the statements contained therein were wholly true and undebatable facts. Inasmuch as the real sponsors for this article remain hidden, and accept no responsibility for the

opinions expressed therein, it must be assumed that the officials responsible for it did not dare openly to espouse the opinions set forth.

Our children are told how opposition to T. V. A. is to be anticipated and discounted in advance as a natural reaction, not of patriots but of exploiters of the masses, of selfish and disgruntled business interests:

The T. V. A. must expect active hostility at times from business groups who feel themselves adversely affected by its operations. If, as is clearly possible, the dominance of the private power companies in the utility field is seriously challenged by the T. V. A., the companies may throw their great influence into the scales against the practice of governmental competition. Other industrial interests will have their grievances. If the T. V. A. maintains its purpose to encourage industries which contribute to the public good and to discourage those which do not, it would be fatuous to suppose that it will not step on the toes of a good many very powerful business men. It would be equally fatuous to suppose that they will not strike back.

Mark how the propagandists have anticipated the time when T. V. A.'s failures begin to arouse inevitable skepticism:

The test (of T. V. A.) will come when the novelty of the idea wears off and when the absence of quick and tangible results of T. V. A. efforts may try the public patience. It is not enough that the people tolerate the Authority. They must follow its guidance actively if its purposes are to be achieved. Are we on the verge of an "authoritarian state"?

The so-called "yardstick" idea again is used without qualification, with no explanation of how Federal taxpayers' moneys contribute to T. V. A. low rates. In fact, the entire article is a biased hypocritical statement of T. V. A. views offering no opportunity to consider the problem with the critical detachment necessary to true scholarship.

In a personal message to the school teachers of the country, Dr. Joy Elmer Morgan "explains", without explaining, this remarkable document. On the last page of this article I find this statement from Dr. Morgan, editor of this journal:

Cannot the curriculum be so arranged that every student will be studying some current activity, so that his powers of observance and analysis will be trained to look upon the passing scene? Such questions as these were in the editor's mind, when the plan was made to work out in cooperation with the Tennessee Valley Authority, the story of what is being done in that great watershed. By a piece of good fortune, arrangement was made for Walter E. Myer, editor of the American Observer, and a gifted writer and student, to prepare the story. Try it on your classes. Perhaps it will help young people to realize that America has a great future if it wills to have such a future.

I am curious to know if this is just the beginning of such propaganda activities by T. V. A., or how long has this sort of thing been going on?

This special feature in the 15 pages preceding provides specific and abundant teaching material for a study unit based on one of the most significant developments now taking place in the United States. It can be used to vitalize the teaching of many school subjects. It will turn teachers' attention to a study of their own communities—their resources and needs. Perhaps most important is the emphasis this special feature makes on the idea of planning and that a new and better civilization can and is being created in the Tennessee Valley, which is possible in other sections of our country. The potential public usefulness of the entire Tennessee Valley "enters the wide fields of flood control, soil erosion, afforestation, elimination from agricultural use of marginal lands, and distribution and diversification of industry." The implications of all this for education and classroom teachers are far-reaching.

Mr. President, as a matter of fact, there is a noble purpose in the Tennesse Valley Authority. No one objects to having those beautiful hills manicured and the valleys landscaped; the only question is, How far is it the responsibility of the Federal Government or the American taxpayer to foot the bill?

I also find that they have extended their activities into other avenues. Only last night I was looking through the Public Works Administration allocations. I find that they have allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority $1,000,000, which is being used as capital stock for an equipment corporation, and that equipment corporation is selling to the inhabitants of certain areas electrical appliances on the installment plan, to be paid for at their will.

There are other phases of that development down there which I think ought to have the attention of the country. They are calling in people from all over the area, largely women, who are supposed to be students. They are to take instruction from teachers in the use of electrical equipment for a certain number of weeks or months and then they are to go out and spread the gospel as to the additional uses that people can make of electric appliances. So the Government furnishes the teachers to instruct others how to use the appliances, sells them the appliances on time, and trusts to the Lord that they will be able to pay for them some time; but I do not know how they are going to increase their income. Of course, if they can get enough income from relief allowances, and so forth, so as to pay for this equipment, the Tennessee Valley Authority will not lose any money.

I am not interested, Mr. President, in whether or not we continue only private ownership of public utilities or private and public ownership of public utilities, but I am interested in seeing that the public-school system of this country shall not be subjected to undue influence on the part of either side by means of the type of propaganda they want put out in order to further their own interests.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS. I reannounce the absences, for the reasons then stated, of certain Senators as announced by me this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE WORLD COURT

The Senate resumed the consideration of Executive A (71st Cong., 3d sess.), protocols concerning adherence of the United States to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the pending question being the amendment of Mr. VANDENBERG to the resolution of adherence as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, it is manifest that the Senate is approaching the time when debate upon the general proposition will be exhausted. I have spent most of the day going about the Senate Chamber trying to ascertain who desires to speak and who is ready to speak. When the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] concluded his remarks a few moments ago it appeared there was no one who desires to address the Senate.

In view of the situation, I wish to address to my friends of the opposition to the pending resolution a suggestion that they give consideration to a proposal, which I shall not undertake to make definite at this time, for the Senate to proceed to vote on the issues which are before the Senate. I realize that this is a very stormy day and that a number of Senators, who were anxious to be present before the proposed resolution and reservations are disposed of, are necessarily absent. Senators will all agree that the debate has proceeded in a somewhat leisurely fashion. There has been no effort on the part of anyone to block a conclusion

nor delay it. On the other hand, there has been no attempt to press to a conclusion.

In view of all the circumstances, it is my feeling that the Senate should proceed to vote tomorrow or at least the day after tomorrow. I merely make this statement now in the hope that Senators who are interested in the subject may give it consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas is quite right. The debate has proceeded in regular and fairly leisurely fashion. It ought to continue, if it is to be continued, as a debate. There is no question on that score at all. I could not at the moment agree, and the Senator will pardon me for the suggestion, to fixing a specific time to vote tomorrow or the following day. I know there are several Senators who desire to speak, and, as usual in cases of this kind, generally they want to speak "tomorrow." They are not prepared at the moment to proceed, and the difficulty arises from that as much as from any other reason.

There are some things that can be said this afternoon and some things that perhaps ought to be said. I am ready to present a particular article or brief which was furnished me this morning by a very learned gentleman and which under the rule I cannot insert in the RECORD because of its length. It is not lengthy in fact, but it exceeds what the rule will permit to be inserted in the RECORD. I was not aware of that rule until it was called to my attention this morning.

If there is no objection upon the part of the Senator from Arkansas, I shall endeavor to take up with him tomorrow what may be possible in reference to an agreement upon a vote, but saying to him now that I am hoping that on mature consideration by him he may not endeavor definitely to fix that vote until some time in the following week. However, I shall be glad to talk with the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. I appreciate the spirit in which the Senator approaches the question, but I should like to point out to him that since the debate began we have had the habit of adjourning very early in the day in order to get some Senator ready to proceed "tomorrow." Now we find ourselves at an impasse. I know of only two or three Senators who have indicated that they might speak. The subject has been before the Senate for so long a time that it seems to me the Senator from California should go with me in an effort to bring it to a conclusion. Of course, I am not insisting now upon a vote.

Mr. JOHNSON. I quite agree with the Senator. This matter ought to be voted up or voted down. The only problem is to give fair opportunity to all those who wish to speak upon the subject and not unduly delay it.

Mr. ROBINSON. We have been doing that, and we are doing it again today, with no one ready to speak.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator knows the Senate far better than I do, and he realizes the difficulties we are encountering whenever the debate is in progress here.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; but I wish to say to the Senator from California, in view of the statement I made in the beginning, that I have been busying myself today trying to find out who wants to speak and who is going to speak, that I do not propose to proceed in that way any further. Senators who wish to discuss the subject ought to come here and be ready to take part in the discussion. Otherwise it will be necessary for the Senate to attempt to reach a conclusion without the assistance of their suggestions.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, a gentleman who is very learned in the law, who has had not only some personal experience at Geneva but a great deal of personal experience at home, this morning sent me a manuscript upon the subject of whether or not we should join the World Court.

I may say in explanation of his position that he was a very strong advocate of a world court, not this one, perhaps, but that he was in thorough accord with those Americans who during the long years have sought by judicial interpretation and judicial decision to solve controversies which might exist among the nations of the earth. That will be observed from the beginning of what he has to say.

I read this for the reason I indicated a moment ago, that under the interpretation of the rule, as I understand it, a document of this length, perhaps a few pages in length, would not be permitted insertion in the RECORD.

This article is by Mr. Herbert Wright. Mr. Wright is in the department of politics and government, international law and relations in the Catholic University of America, in this city. Here he presents his views.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Appreciating the statement the Senator has made that he is reading it because it cannot be printed in the RECORD, if the Senator would like to have it printed in the RECORD, I should be glad to ask unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that the matter to which he refers be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON. I quite appreciate that suggestion, and I should avail myself of it, if it were not for the fear on my part that few of our Senators would look at it unless it is thus presented.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator desires to read it, of course, he has a perfect right to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state for the benefit of Senators that the rule to which reference has been made is one enunciated by the Joint Committee on Printing and cannot be abrogated by any action of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is the absolute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the absolute rule.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is what I was told this morning.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not concede that at all.

Mr. JOHNSON. I should think the Senate could abrogate its own rule.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senate is the creator of the Committee on Printing, and, having complete authority over the Committee on Printing, it can suspend its rules or suspend any rule and print anything it wishes to print. I do not wish to subscribe to the legal doctrine that a committee can, for its own procedure, adopt a rule by which the Senate is unalterably bound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state further that this matter has been called to his attention by the parliamentary clerk. The statute authorizes the Joint Committee on Printing to make such rules, and abrogation of the rule is not a matter of unanimous consent by the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the Senate has complete control of its records. But if the rule is authorized by statute, it would be controlling.

Mr. JOHNSON. The only question in that regard might be because it is a joint committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Any question regarding it will be solved by reading the article.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator stated in the beginning the position or employment of Mr. Wright, the author of the article he is about to read. Will he state it again for my benefit?

Mr. JOHNSON. He is in the department of politics and government, international law and relations of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON. I read:

The suggestion of a permanent court of international justice is not new.

I may not agree with all that is said here, but I am delighted always to have the considered conclusions of any gentleman of standing and repute and anyone learned in the law. The Senator from Arkansas may not agree with some of the conclusions he has reached.

Mr. ROBINSON. I probably shall not.

Mr. JOHNSON. I read:

SHALL THE UNITED STATES JOIN THE WORLD COURT?

By Herbert Wright

The suggestion of a permanent court of international justice is not new. It originated in the proposal of the United States to the First Hague Conference of 1899. In the Second Hague Con-

ference of 1907, at the insistence of the United States, the project was worked out and agreed upon in its essential features, except the method of selecting the judges. A solution of the latter question seemed impossible because of an apparent irreconcilability of the political doctrine of the equality of states with that of the hegemony of the more powerful states. This practical difficulty was overcome by the advisory committee of jurists, which met at The Hague in the summer of 1920 at the invitation of the League of Nations, and it was their plan that formed the basis of the statute of the Court finally adopted by the League. Manifestly, then, the presumption is in favor of the United States supporting the Court, for both self-respect and self-interest require that the United States should stand by its own policy. We cannot decently urge the creation of such a court as this upon the rest of the world through a long series of years and then repudiate the Court when they consent to it, unless we offer some adequate reason for apparently such an absolute change of front.

Moreover, since the project for a permanent court of international justice drafted by the advisory committee of jurists and their accompanying recommendations represents the combined thought of the best legal minds of the world as applied to the problem of world peace, to a consideration of which many of them have given a lifetime, it would seem that no more practical way to peace between nations could humanly be devised.

It must be remembered, however, that the Advisory Committee did not consider the establishment of a World Court as an independent proposition, but as an instrument of the League of Nations, by whose invitation they met. Consequently the project which they elaborated was naturally linked up with the League. It must also be borne in mind that the original project of this Advisory Committee and their recommendations were not adopted verbatim by the League, which, on the contrary, made substantial changes and additions to the project and paid but scant attention to the accompanying recommendations. The present Court, therefore, is not precisely the court proposed by the Advisory Committee, a fortiori, not the court envisaged by the Hague Conferences. Hence there are fundamental objections to the very nature of the Court.

There are now before the Senate, awaiting its advice and consent, three instruments concerning the Permanent Court of International Justice:

1. The protocol of signature of the statute of December 16, 1920.
2. The protocol of accession of the United States of September 14, 1929.
3. The protocol of revision of the statute of September 14, 1929.

Let us examine these, objectively, to see if there are any fundamental reasons why the United States Senate should not advise and consent to these three instruments.

1. THE PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE

The United States should not adhere to the protocol of signature of the statute if the United States is opposed to entering the League of Nations, and the Court is an integral part of the League.

That the Court is an integral part of the League seems evident from a number of considerations. In the first place, it is a fact that the protocol of signature of its statute was framed under the direction of the League, for members of the League, is signed only by members of the League, and is open for signature by nonmembers of the League only on terms approved by the Council of the League.

Most of these facts require no proof. They need only to be stated to be admitted. The protocol itself admits that it "has been drawn up in accordance with the decision taken by the Assembly of the League of Nations on December 13, 1920." And the decision referred to was taken after the Assembly had deliberated on the report and recommendations of the Advisory Committee of Jurists established by the Council. Moreover, the protocol specifically states that "The members of the League of Nations, through the undersigned, duly authorized, declare their acceptance of the adjoined statute." It is true that it also declares that the protocol "shall remain open for signature by the members of the League of Nations and by the states mentioned in the annex to the Covenant of the League." But that the latter are referred to only as prospective members of the League and not at all as nonmembers is evidenced by the fact that the annex to the Covenant does not include Afghanistan, Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Irish Free State, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Turkey, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and a few Arabian and Indian states, although a number of these were subsequently admitted to the League. Article 35 of the statute provides that the Council shall lay down "the conditions under which the Court shall be open to other states." This the Council did in a resolution of May 17, 1922, which provides "that such state shall previously have deposited with the registrar of the Court a declaration by which it accepts the jurisdiction of the Court, in accordance with the Covenant of the League of Nations", and with the terms provided for in the rules of procedure of the Court, and "undertakes * * * not to resort to war against a state complying" with the decisions of the Court. By this same resolution the Council "reserves the right to rescind or amend this resolution."

But the allegation is made that these facts relate simply to the historical genesis of the Court and not to the juridical relationship between the Court and the League. Let us therefore examine the statute itself.

The statute provides (art. 1) that the Court is established "in accordance with article 14 of the Covenant." Article 14 of the Covenant provides that—

The Council shall formulate and submit to the members of the League for adoption plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. The Court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it. The Court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly."

This is the only juridical basis for the advisory jurisdiction of the Court. The judges, therefore, sit and render decisions by the authority of the Covenant. They are, moreover, bound to expound and defend the Covenant as the fundamental law of the society of nations, above all other international law, customary or written, for by article 20 of the Covenant—

"The members of the League severally agree that this Covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings inter se which are inconsistent with the terms thereof."

The statute provides (art. 4) that "the members of the Court shall be elected by the Assembly and by the Council." Articles 5 to 12 and 14 give the details of this electoral procedure.

The statute provides (art. 26) that the technical assessors in labor cases shall be chosen from a list "composed of two persons nominated by each member of the League of Nations and an equivalent number nominated by the governing body of the Labor Office."

The statute provides (art. 27) that the technical assessors in transit and communications cases shall be chosen from a list "composed of two persons nominated by each member of the League of Nations."

The statute provides (art. 32) that the salaries, allowances, and indemnities of judges shall "be determined by the Assembly of the League of Nations upon the proposal of the Council." The same article also provides that the Council shall decide the salary of the registrar and that the Assembly on the proposal of the Council decides "the conditions under which retiring pensions may be given to the personnel of the Court."

The statute provides (art. 33) that "the expenses of the Court shall be borne by the League of Nations" as "decided by the Assembly upon the proposal of the Council."

The statute provides (art. 34) that "only states or members of the League of Nations can be parties in cases before the Court."

The statute provides (art. 35) that "the conditions under which the Court shall be open to other states shall * * * be laid down by the Council, but in no case shall such provisions place the parties in a position of inequality before the Court." These conditions, as a matter of fact, have been laid down by the Council resolution of May 17, 1922, the principal provisions of which have been set forth above.

The statute provides (art. 36) by implication that only "members of the League of Nations and the states mentioned in the annex to the Covenant" may sign the optional clause for compulsory jurisdiction, for it makes no reference to any procedure whatsoever for signature of this optional clause by nonmember states, even upon conditions laid down by the Council.

The statute provides (art. 37) that when a treaty refers to "a tribunal to be instituted by the League of Nations the Court will be such tribunal."

The statute provides (art. 40) that the registrar shall "also notify the members of the League of Nations" of the application of a state to bring a case before the Court. The purpose of this provision appears to be to give such members of the League of Nations which are not actual parties to the case an opportunity to intervene if they consider themselves interested parties. But why should such notification be limited exclusively to the members of the League if the Court is not an integral part of the League?

These provisions of the statute itself seem to show conclusively that the Court is not only an integral part of the League but a very important part. And this nexus, as proclaimed in the very terms of the statute itself, could be corroborated further by the statements of many distinguished individuals engaged in League activities. If it had been intended to have the Court absolutely independent of the League, the term "adherents to this statute" could very easily have been substituted for the term "members of the League" and similar adjustments and substitutions made in other relevant portions of the statute.

"Joining the Court" therefore would be but a step into the League itself. It should not be necessary here to give reasons why the United States should not join the League. The United States Senate has placed itself unmistakably on record against such a step, both by rejecting the Treaty of Versailles and by consenting to the ratification of separate treaties of peace with the Central Powers. Moreover, the political conventions of both major parties in the United States since that time have consistently maintained the same attitude.

But let us examine the text of the Covenant itself for the fundamental reasons for this attitude. The treaties of Paris, of which the Covenant is part I, were essentially treaties of peace forced upon defeated nations by victorious nations, based upon Germany's sole responsibility for the World War and not based upon broad principles of justice. The arbitrary dismemberment of Germany, Austria, and Hungary, the unjust seizure of their colonies, and the exacting of intolerable and impossible reparations could only be executed by the establishment of an armed alliance to maintain the status quo of the peace treaties.

Such an armed alliance is provided by the Covenant. In the first place, the defeated nations were debarred from original membership, which was limited (art. 1) to those signatories mentioned in the first part of the annex to the Covenant. Secondly, it was to be a closed alliance. Although a second group of nations, mentioned in the second part of the annex, were to be allowed to become members of the League, admission to the score or more not there mentioned was to be only upon the agreement of two-thirds of the Assembly, provided that each such prospective member "give effective guaranties of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations and shall accept such regulations as may prescribed by the League in regard to its military, naval, and air forces and armaments." No such conditions are exacted of the original members or of any states mentioned in the annex.

This closed alliance was intended to control the world, for article 3 provides that "the Assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter * * * affecting the peace of the world", and article 4 gives the same power to the Council, a small group controlled by the principal Allied and Associated Powers. Moreover, this control of the world is to be on the basis of the status quo of the peace terms, for by article 10 "the members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League", and by article 11 "any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations." Should a member of the League violate the Covenant, the other members, by article 16, "undertake immediately to subject it to * * * the prevention of all financial, commercial, of personal intercourse between the nationals of the Covenant-breaking state and the nationals of any other state, whether a member of the League or not." The same article also provides for military and economic sanctions against a Covenant-breaking state. In the event of a dispute between a member of the League and a nonmember, the latter is invited by article 17 to accept the obligations of the League for the purposes of such dispute, with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council. If it refuses the invitation and resorts to war, the sanctions of article 16 will apply.

Under article 22, the seizure of the colonies of the defeated nations in the World War is cloaked under a system of "mandates", allegedly "a sacred trust of civilization"—

Just recall those words in the light of what we have seen of late—the "mandates" given as "a sacred trust of civilization." Then says this author—

but realistically interpreted by most of the mandatory states as outright acquisitions, to be exploited for their exclusive benefit.

Let me digress for just an instant concerning the mandated islands in the Pacific Ocean. This sacrosanct organization at Geneva, which means "the peace of the world", gave as a sacred trust for civilization the Marshall and the Caroline and the adjoining islands in the Pacific under a mandate to Japan. Japan stands now facing the world, saying she intends to hold those mandated islands in perpetuity; and the League of Nations, investigating, hints and insinuates that Japan has fortified those islands so that she might use them for warlike instead of for peaceful purposes; and all the world apparently, and particularly the League of Nations, accepts practically without demur Japan's attitude in regard to the mandated islands in the Pacific. "A sacred trust of civilization" they constitute now!

The articles of the Covenant quoted above prove conclusively that the League is a closed and armed alliance to maintain the status quo of the so-called "peace" treaties, the joining of which by the United States would mean that the United States would be obliged to assist in perpetuating the iniquities and injustices of those treaties and thus become embroiled in every quarrel of Europe.

2. THE PROTOCOL OF ACCESSION

The United States should not adhere to the protocol of accession because it does not comply entirely with the terms of Senate Resolution 5 of January 27, 1926, advising and consenting to the adherence of the United States to the protocol of signature. This resolution contains certain reservations and understandings which are "made a part and condition of this resolution." The protocol of accession of 1929, however, does not include these as a part of the instrument, but accepts the adherence of the United States "subject to the five reservations formulated by the United States in the resolution" of 1926, without including the text even of these reservations, much less that of the understandings which also formed a part of the Senate resolution. Article 1 of the Protocol of Accession declares that the signatories "accept the special conditions attached by the United States in the five reservations mentioned above", but only "upon the terms and conditions set out in the following articles."

But the following articles make no specific mention of reservations 1 and 3. It may be alleged, however, that they are included by implication from the passage quoted above. Let us see how far this is true. Reservation 1 provides that the adherence of the United States "shall not be taken to involve any legal relation on the part of the United States to the League of Nations or the assumption of any obligations by the United States under the Treaty of Versailles." From what has been said above concerning the juridical relation between the Court and the League, it is difficult to see how the adherence of the United States to the Court could fail to involve a "legal relation to the League or the assumption" of obligations under the Treaty of Versailles, unless the other signatories of the protocol of signatures divorced the Court from the League, which they failed to do. Reservation 3 provides that "the United States will pay a fair share of the expenses of the Court as determined and appropriated from time to time by the Congress of the United States." In the absence of any specific mention of the terms upon which this is accepted, it may be presumed that the apportionment of the expenses of the Court, including the share of the United States, will be decided by the Assembly in accordance with article 33 of the statute.

The protocol of accession in article 2 accepts almost verbatim reservation 2, concerning the participation of the United States in the election of the judges.

The protocol of accession in article 8 accepts the first part of reservation 4, concerning the power of withdrawal of the United States at any time, but adds that if two-thirds of the other signatories desire to withdraw their acceptance of the protocol of accession, it "shall be considered as ceasing to be in force." In other words, the protocol of accession is to be regarded as a treaty between the United States on the one side and all the other signatories on the other, instead of being regarded as an individual accession like those of the other signatories. If two-thirds of the other signatories desire to kick the United States out of the Court, they may do so, but no other signatory may be kicked out of the Court with the United States vote or without.

The protocol of accession in article 3 accepts almost verbatim the second part of reservation 4, concerning the amending of the statute, and in article 4 accepts the first part of reservation 5, concerning publicity and hearings for advisory opinions.

The protocol of accession does not comply with the second part of reservation 5, which provides that the Court shall not, "without the consent of the United States, entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States has or claims an interest." Article 5 of the protocol of accession provides that "with regard to requesting an advisory opinion * * * there shall be attributed to an objection of the United States the same force and effect as attaches to a vote against asking for the opinion given by a member of the League of Nations in the Council or in the Assembly." If the members of the League desire an advisory opinion and the United States is not prepared to forego its objection, the exercise of the powers of withdrawal * * * will follow naturally. In other words, Senate reservation 5 asks for an absolute veto on advisory opinions, while article 5 of the protocol of accession provides for a veto or withdrawal. The signatories misconstrued this reservation of the Senate to be merely a request for equality with the members of the League, but the terms of the Senate reservation are unmistakably clear. The Senate wished an absolute veto on advisory opinions. There are a number of questions which the United States does not desire to have submitted to the Court for advisory opinion without its consent. It is impossible to enumerate all, but mention might be made of immigration, tariffs, relations between debtor and creditor, relation between reparations and war debts, and other political, domestic, or purely American questions. Hence it is not sufficient to allow the United States to object and, if overruled, to withdraw. Withdrawal under such circumstances is bound to injure the reputation and prestige of the United States in spite of the fact that by article 5 it is to follow "without any imputation of unfriendliness or unwillingness to cooperate generally for peace and good will." Simply saying so does not make it so.

Moreover, who is to decide whether the United States has or claims an interest in a proposed advisory opinion? Is it the Executive alone? This question was put to Prof. Philip C. Jessup, who accompanied Mr. Root to Geneva when the Root-Hurst formula was adopted, at the annual meeting of the American Society of International Law on April 24, 1931, to which he replied by making a distinction between disputes to which the United States is a party and disputes to which the United States is not a party. In the former case, "arrangements for that submission must be by and with the advice and consent of the Senate", he admits. In the second case, "if the United States is not a party to a dispute, but there is a question in which we have an interest, and it is proposed to request an advisory opinion regarding that question, I should think it might be quite possible to say that that was within the discretion of the Executive." It is precisely this second group of questions, in which the United States has an interest but is not a party, that Senate reservation 5 was designed to cover. By new article 68 of the protocol of revision the Court will apply to advisory opinions the same provisions of the statute as those which apply to contentious cases to the extent to which it recognizes them to be applicable. This certainly means that advisory opinions will very closely approximate judgments in contentious cases and that their effect upon the United States as precedents will be just as potent and far-reaching as that of judgments. Is the Senate prepared to delegate this power of control to the Executive?

The protocol of accession does not comply with the first paragraph after Senate reservation 5, providing that the signature of the United States to the protocol of signature will not be affixed until the other signatories shall have indicated, through an exchange of notes, their acceptance of the foregoing reservations and understandings as a part and a condition of adherence by the

United States. The protocol of accession is virtually a treaty between the United States on the one side and all the signatories on the other, and not an acceptance by bilateral exchange of notes.

The protocol of accession makes no reference to the second resolution of the Senate resolution of 1926, providing that recourse to the Court for the settlement of differences between the United States and any other State or States can be had only by agreement thereto through general and special treaties concluded between the parties in dispute. This is the resolution by which the Senate retains control of the cases to be submitted to the Court by the United States. Does the Senate wish to relinquish this control?

The protocol of accession makes no mention of the third resolution of the Senate resolution of 1926, providing that adherence is not to be so construed as to require the United States to depart from its traditional policy of * * * entangling itself in the political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state nor to imply a relinquishment by the United States of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions. This is evidently aimed at insuring the judicial character of the Court and preventing it from exercising political functions. Does the Senate wish to abandon this part of its original resolution of 1926?

3. THE PROTOCOL OF REVISION

The United States should not adhere to the protocol of revision of the statute for the following reasons:

The new text of article 4 of the statute adds a provision to the effect that—

"The conditions under which a state which has accepted the statute of the Court but is not a member of the League of Nations may participate in electing the members of the Court shall, in the absence of a special agreement, be laid down by the Assembly on the proposal of the Council."

Why should the Assembly have the power to decide how states accepting the statute of the Court without membership in the League should participate in the election of the judges? There are many members of the League who have not accepted the statute of the Court. On the other hand, there may conceivably be states accepting the statute of the Court without wishing to be members of the League, who would be debarred from participation in deciding the conditions for others such. If the United States should, by accepting the three instruments now before the Senate, enter such category, it would not thereafter have the right to participate in deciding the conditions for others such.

The new text of article 32 of the statute repeats the provision of the old text that "salaries, allowances, and indemnities [of judges] shall be fixed by the Assembly of the League of Nations on the proposal of the Council." Why shouldn't they be fixed by the signatories of the statute alone? Why shouldn't the United States, if the present protocols are accepted, have the right to participate in such matters?

The new text of article 35 of the statute repeats the provision of the old text that the Court shall be open "also to states mentioned in the annex to the Covenant" and that "the conditions under which the Court shall be open to other states shall * * * be laid down by the Council." This has already been commented on above.

The new text of article 40 of the statute repeats the provision of the old text that the registrar shall notify "the members of the League of Nations" of the application of a state to bring a case before the Court. This likewise has been commented on above.

The new articles 65–68 refer to procedure in advisory opinions and are designed, first, to include in the statute provisions for jurisdiction in advisory opinions, which is now based exclusively upon article 14 of the Covenant, and secondly, to make the procedure in advisory opinions approximate as far as possible that in contentious cases. The substance of these articles, so far as they may be applicable to the United States under Senate Resolution 5, has been commented on above and requires no further comment here.

THE MORAL ARGUMENT

The arguments thus far advanced have been based upon an examination of the three documents now before the Senate. Advocates of the acceptance of these three instruments, as reported by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of January 17, 1935, are wont to minimize the effect of such acceptance by saying that "the United States does not have to submit a case to the World Court, if it is disinclined to do so" and that "the principal value of American membership in the World Court is the moral support given by the United States to a movement to settle disputes by judicial means, instead of by violence." These two contentions involve peculiar, not to mention naive, if not downright hypocritical and absolutely untrue, inferences. If the United States does not intend to submit cases which may arise to the Court, what need is there to join? What need to stultify ourselves by saying, in effect: "This is an innocuous and meaningless step, but nevertheless we take it." Ah, but it is necessary in order to show our moral support of a movement to settle disputes by judicial means, instead of by violence. In other words, the implication is that by failing to take the step, the United States disapproves of the peaceful method of settling disputes and approves of violence.

But let us look at the record. The United States is a signatory of convention I, for the pacific settlement of international disputes, of the First Hague Conference (1899) and the Second Hague Conference (1907). It had the first case before a tribunal operating under that convention, the case of the Pious Fund of the Californians against Mexico, and it had the last case to be decided by a tribunal under that convention, the case of the Island of Palmas or Miangas against the Netherlands, besides several cases in between these (the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Case against Great Britain, the Orinoco Steamship Co. Case against Venezuela, and the Norwegian Shipping Claims Case).

Furthermore, the United States has, by treaties for the advancement of peace and treaties of conciliation with the following 38 nations, provided permanent commissions of inquiry: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia. These commissions of inquiry at the present time are available and ready to investigate any fact which may be a source of belligerent activity between any of these nations and the United States.

Moreover, the United States is in the process of concluding or has concluded successful arbitrations with Germany on mixed claims, with Panama on claims, with Spain on claims, with Mexico on claims, with Sweden on claims, and with Canada within the past month on the *I'm Alone* claims.

Here is an enviable record which challenges comparison with that of any State. Will the addition of the contemplated step, which is alleged to be otherwise meaningless, add anything material to this record?

CONCLUSION

The arguments given above have demonstrated the following points:

1. That the United States should not join the League of Nations.
2. That the United States should not join the Court if it is an integral part of the League of Nations.
3. That the Court is an integral part of the League of Nations.
4. That the three protocols now before the Senate do not satisfactorily comply with the Senate resolution of 1926.
5. That the Senate cannot accept the three protocols without repudiating its resolution of 1926 or reversing its position on the League of Nations.

Why not recognize the issue for what it really is, a step into the League of Nations itself, and settle it squarely on that basis? If the people of the United States wish to join the League, let us join the League and also its Court by a forthright action. Otherwise, let us refrain from accepting these three protocols until their terms are modified to make the Permanent Court of International Justice a real world court and independent of that closed, armed alliance of the League of Nations in fact as well as fancy.

NOMINATIONS ON THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). The Clerk will state the first nomination in order.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adolph C. Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Katharine F. Lenroot, of Wisconsin, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters may be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to confirming the naval nominations en bloc? The Chair hears none, and they are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. ROBINSON. I make the same request with respect to nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I will not object if the name of Gen. John H. Russell is not included in the list of nominations to be confirmed.

Mr. ROBINSON. At the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama, I ask that the nomination of John H. Russell, to be a major general, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of John H. Russell, to be major general, will be passed over, and the remainder of the nominations in the Marine Corps will be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BLACK. I do not see the Chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee here at the present time, but I desired to request that this nomination go back to the committee. I did not know that it was to be reported; I did not know that it was coming out of the committee, and there are some matters that I desire to have investigated by the committee with reference to General Russell. I have talked with the Chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and told him I would make that request.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not desire to interpose an objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama. While I have no express authority to speak for the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], the Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I assume that he would not object to the nomination going back to the committee.

Mr. BLACK. He did not state as to that. I merely told him that I would make that request. He said he did not know, and the committee did not know, of any objection, and, if they had known, the nomination probably would not have been reported, as another one was not reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the nomination referred to be recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. That completes the calendar.

PRINTING OF EXTRANEOUS MATTER IN THE RECORD

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, while the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was addressing the Senate the question arose as to his right to have printed in the RECORD the statement by Mr. Wright, which he afterward read. The Joint Committee on Printing, under the authority of a general statute, has adopted a rule which provides that—

> No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the same is accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer of the probable cost thereof.

The Senator from California had a complete right, as I think he understands, to present the matter to be printed, and to procure and submit to the committee, or cause to be submitted to it, an estimate from the Public Printer of the cost of the printing.

Of course, the object of this rule is to dispense with a practice to which there is much sound objection. The custom has prevailed, I think in both Houses of Congress of making the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a kind of warehouse, and in some instances a sewer, for disposition or deposit of political waste matter. I do not mean to imply that there is not much information supplied under leave to print that is of great value to Members of the Congress, but I do mean to make clear that the privilege of printing in the RECORD has been abused to the extent that it was desirable and proper that the Joint Committee on Printing exercise the authority conferred on it by statute, which appears to be to take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk.

Being in hearty sympathy with the program of the Joint Committee on Printing, but not for one instant intimating that the matter which the Senator from California sought to have published in the RECORD was in any way related to unnecessary bulk, I desire to say that I think the rule is a wholesome one, even though it does occasion sometimes delay and inconvenience. The Senator unquestionably could have had the matter printed, but it probably could not have been printed in time for study or use in accordance with the convenience of the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I think the rule referred to by the Senator from Arkansas a very salutary one. I think if a Senator presents here anything that he thinks of importance that his fellows should know, it is just as well that he should stand here upon his feet and read it and present it in that fashion so that they should all know of it. That is one reason. The other reason is one of economy concerning printing, because, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, the RECORD has been unquestionably stuffed, and frequently with matter that has been very little looked at except by the individual offering it. So I did not want to be the first one to violate the rule that had just been called to my attention, and that is the reason I was perfectly willing to read the matter in question.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator from Arkansas now hold that the rule can be abrogated by unanimous consent of the Senate?

Mr. ROBINSON. I think if the rule is made under authority of statute neither of the two Houses alone could abrogate it, because if the rule is a valid exercise of the power granted the committee by statute—and I believe that it is—neither the House nor the Senate alone, by any action that either could take, could abrogate the rule.

Mr. McNARY. That is the view I entertained this morning; but I thought the able leader had intimated that the rule could be abrogated by consent. If so, it will be nullified every day, because consent will always be given.

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, yes; that is undoubtedly true. When the rule was mentioned, I assumed the Chair had reference to some mere rule of the Committee on Printing of the Senate. But this is a rule of the Joint Committee on Printing, promulgated under the provisions of a statute, which gives them general authority to make rules to restrict the bulk of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I overlooked that fact when I first spoke. I think the matter is now sufficiently clear that I need not proceed with it further.

LAND VALUES AND HOUSING PROJECTS—ADDRESS BY IRVING BRANT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address by Mr. Irving Brant, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Star-Times on the subject of racketeering land values in connection with housing projects.

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

THE GREAT AMERICAN DELUSION

Like Mark Hopkins' college, which consisted of Mark on one end of a log and you on the other, the housing program needs to be brought down to essential matters. It should be discussed and decisions made by men straddling a carpenter's horse.

This national housing conference has nothing to do with decisions, which must be made by Congress and the President, but we can see to it that the discussion is conducted from opposite ends of the carpenter's horse. Across this let us place a plank to represent the low-cost housing program. The carpenter's horse now becomes a fulcrum, the housing program balanced across it. At one end of that plank place a weight representing the houses to be built. At the other end place a weight representing the cost of building those houses. Now we have a teeter-totter. And what happens? As costs go down houses go up. As costs go up houses go down.

Slum clearance must be kept on a low-cost basis because the purpose is to furnish decent housing for the people now living in these districts, and rents are determined by what they can afford to pay. Most slum dwellers, when able to pay anything, can pay $5 per room per month. Very few can pay $7. Keep the rentals at $5 and you will rehouse the people now living in the slums. Raise the rents to $7 and a new class of higher-paying tenants will move in, while the old tenants will go to the vacated district and blight it with their poverty.

For a vivid illustration of what determines housing costs, I want you to compare New York's most famous slums, the lower East Side, with any of the slums that made St. Louis famous. My city of St. Louis leads in many lines. In beer we have outmilled Milwaukee, in smoke we have outpitied Pittsburgh, and in slums we have outblighted Blighty.

Start rebuilding the blighted districts of St. Louis and New York's lower East Side and what do you find? Construction costs are slightly higher in New York, a little more for labor, a little more for materials. A few cents additional per room per month will cover the difference. But what about land? Land costs $1 per square foot in the slums of St. Louis, $12 to $14 per square foot in New York's lower East Side. You can build low-cost housing on land at $1 a foot. You can't do it at $12 a foot.

When slum-clearance engineers held a meeting not long ago with the bankers and insurance executives who hold the $71,000,000 in mortgages on New York's lower East Side, and told them land prices must come down, these financial gentlemen threw up their hands. Land prices already had come down. They had come down to bedrock. They had dropped from $20 a foot, or thereabouts, to $12. Owners had been forced to reduce their mortgages to the bare value of the land. To go lower meant confiscation.

Confiscation of what? Confiscation of money invested at speculative prices in the hope of a speculative profit. At this meeting I have been telling you about, in lower New York, one of the bankers made this remark: "After all", he said, "what is this land? It is just Peter Stuyvesant's cow pasture. It was a cow pasture once, and maybe it will be one again."

Ladies and gentlemen, if we are going to get anywhere with slum clearance in America, we have got to recognize that we are dealing with cow pastures. The main difference between land in New York and St. Louis is one of nationality—Peter Stuyvesant's cows fed in one pasture, Pierre Chouteau's in the other.

But no, it is said, think of the industrial difference. These slum districts, bordering the great business areas, will be absorbed for commercial purposes. They are future industrial areas. Their sale price is a capitalization of future demand for commerce and industry. Aye, so it is. And the price of a ticket in the Irish hospital sweepstakes is a capitalization of future lottery prizes. How many will win? What are the tickets worth when the lottery is over? I say to you that the price of $12 a square foot for land on the lower East Side of New York, and likewise in every typical American slum where prices are fixed by the hope of industrialization, this, I say, is a price on lottery tickets, most of them past due, canceled, the prices already paid or never to be paid.

Washington is not a commercial city, nor an industrial city. When it was surveyed a few years ago by Harland Bartholomew, following a demand for a more extensive business zoning in the northwest, it was found that 2½ percent of the developed area was used for commercial purposes, a fraction under 10 percent for industry, leaving almost 90 percent for residential and public use. How do you suppose that compares with the average for the Nation? The average for self-contained American cities is 2½ percent for commercial development, the same as Washington, and 11 percent for industry. The range for industrial purposes in self-contained cities is from 10 to 12 percent. In other words, the great industrial cities of the Nation use almost as large a percentage of their areas for housing as the residential city of Washington. There is a definite, universal, almost unchanging ratio between business areas and housing areas, with no possibility of enlarging the business and industrial percentages.

Now, what does this signify for landowners who hold on to vacant or poorly improved property, year after year or even decade after decade, adding each year's taxes and interest to a theoretical investment which is to be returned, plus a fabulous profit, when the commercial or industrial development takes place? It means that with rare exceptions, their profit will remain fabulous. It never will come. They would have done better to bet on the ponies, or buy lottery tickets. Sooner or later, moved by financial stringency or plain disgust and exasperation, they will give up this dream of unearned wealth and sell their land at a loss, or write off their loss and capitalize the land for housing at a figure based on its residence value to the people who live in that district.

For a century and a half wealth through land speculation has been the great American dream. European visitors who came to the United States in the years following the Revolution called this a land of speculation. The Duc de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, following a visit at the home of John Marshall in Virginia in 1795, jotted down in his notebook the statement that the people of Virginia were so addicted to gaming, and it made them so irresponsible in the payment of their debts, that Virginia lawyers always collected their fees in advance. "Speculation", Le Rochefoucauld wrote, "is the favorite passion of the people of New England." He visited Boston in 1796 when the great Yazoo land grants—35,000,000 acres obtained through bribery of the Georgia Legislature—were being unloaded on the people of Boston. The Yazoo agents "opened a kind of office", wrote the Frenchman, "to which purchasers flocked in such crowds that those gentlemen, taking advantage of this inconceivable infatuation, raised the price each day, often twice in the day, for the purpose of more strongly exciting the general eagerness and taking away all time for reflection. Every class of men, even watchmakers, hairdressers, and mechanics ran eagerly after this deception, in which Boston has sunk about $2,000,000."

That was in 1796. The same speculative principle still rules American thought. The farmer signs a note for land which he expects to sell at a profit. The city mechanic or clerk thinks that if he can buy and pay for a vacant lot it will open the way to riches. All this is a bitter delusion, and it fixes a train of thought in the American mind which immeasurably heightens the difficulties of slum clearance.

The Public Works Administration, if it would make its low-cost-housing program a success, must beat down and explode the great American delusion of wealth through land speculation. It cannot in morals sanction a price for land based on the dream of commercial or industrial expansion. Nor can it do so in practice, because the people who are to live in these houses cannot pay interest on swollen land values. How can this problem be handled? Some will say by a national land tax, levied on land but not on improvements. That is politically impossible at this time. It is made impossible by that century and a half of dreaming I have been talking about. It would start a political battle on the subject of rural land taxation, which has nothing to do with the slum problem.

Brought down to the cities alone, there is no way by which the Federal Government could enforce a policy of land taxation because Federal land taxes must be laid according to the census. Nor will the cities voluntarily adopt a taxation policy, even where they can do so under State law, which will deflate land values outside the slum areas. What remains then?

I would suggest three approaches:

First, a campaign of education among the owners of land in blighted districts, to show them the folly of expecting industrial and commercial expansion beyond the normal experience level. Almost 0.9 of the developed area of self-contained cities is and will continue to be used for shelter. The future of the typical slum is in rebuilding for residence purposes or utter ruin.

Second, use of the Federal Government's power of eminent domain, where it can be constitutionally employed, to acquire land at a price based on its genuine value for low-rent housing, with present normal rents as a guide. There are great difficulties in the way of this procedure, and it has been ruled unconstitutional in a United States district court at Louisville; but constitutionality in such a case depends to a great extent upon what is considered to be for the general welfare, and that varies from time to time, in accordance with the development of public opinion. In the Constitutional Convention, for instance, a proposal that Congress be given a power to cut canals was rejected on the ground that canals were not for the general welfare of the Union. "The cost", Roger Sherman of Connecticut said, "will fall on the general Government, but the benefit will be to the local community." As years passed and the Nation spread westward, new avenues of communication were needed. The time came when Daniel Webster could arise in the Senate and say:

"I look upon a road over the Alleghenies, a canal around the falls of the Ohio, or a canal or railway from the Atlantic to the western waters, as being an object large and extensive enough to be fairly said to be for the common benefit."

So too with slum clearance. In the past it has been a local problem, for the cities and private interests to deal with, and consequently for nobody to deal with. Today it is a theme for Federal initiative, through Federal aid, but for local decision. How soon will a challenging public opinion declare that the decent housing of the American people, the elimination of festering centers of disease, crime, and degeneration, is as much a matter for national decision as cutting a canal around the falls of the Ohio?

The full extent to which Federal power shall or can be used is still to be determined. For the present, reliance must be placed upon a combination of Federal initiative, State authorization, and private agreement. That brings us to the third approach I would offer to the problem of speculative land values in slum clearance, through the terms of Federal aid.

It has been suggested that neighborhood taxing authorities might be created in the blighted districts of cities, similar to drainage districts, giving a majority of property owners legal authority to impose a general tax for the purpose of improving the region. I wish to propose a different use of the same plan of organization.

Let Congress, in appropriating funds for a national housing campaign, grant Federal aid for slum clearance on the following general terms:

That States, to share in the housing fund, authorize the creation of improvement districts in cities, these districts to have the following power:

To impose a special tax upon the value of land, not including improvements, which tax shall be abated upon any land improved or offered for improvement under terms and specifications approved by the national housing authority.

For succesful operation, this would need the active suport of a majority of property owners. Their votes would have the same legal standing as if cast by a majority in an entire city, for the district would be a governmental unit. Would a majority support such a proposition? That would depend, undoubtedly, upon the extent of Federal aid, which might be reinforced by a further tax-exemption of slum-clearance projects after completion. For the coming attitude of property owners, look toward Louisville, where 90 percent of the property owners in a blighted district joined in a slum-clearance program, and were blocked by 10 percent and a Federal court decision which prevented consolidation of the improvement area through condemnation proceedings. How long would this 10 percent hold out against a land tax from which the 90 percent were exempt?

Of course, this would not immediately dispose of the delusion that land in the lower East Side of New York is worth $12 a foot, but such delusions are rapidly being destroyed. In every large city, old buildings are being torn down to reduce tax charges. In St. Louis one group of 14 buildings has just been razed. The Chicago Tribune not long ago published two pages of photographs,

pictures of bare land, parking lots, etc., with the ghostly outlines of hotels, apartment houses, etc., destroyed to escape taxes.

Tearing down a city residential building usually reduces the taxes 75 percent. It eliminates a large annual loss, theoretically a temporary one, because it is a loss caused by vacancies in tenantry, but in place of it a smaller permanent annual loss is established. When landowners tear down habitable buildings to escape taxation they are just on the verge of recognizing that the whole speculative jig is up.

That is coming to be recognized in St. Louis. That is why land in the slum areas can be bought for $1 a square foot. It is coming to be recognized in Chicago, where land is being offered for slum-clearance at one-half of the assessed valuation. It will be recognized before long in New York. The lower East Side of New York lost exactly 53 percent of its population between 1910 and 1930, a conclusive answer to those who think American city populations enjoy living in slums, and an ultimate deathblow to the speculative price level of land. Loss of population is the royal disease of the slums—a hæmophilia from which the great families who have inherited these areas can never recover without a revolutionary change in their attitude toward the value and use of land.

Pressure of present taxes, as indicated in this tearing down of buildings, is destroying the great American delusion. Slum landowners are being educated through their pocketbooks, though they still do not know exactly what it is they are learning. Some of them will need a great deal of help in learning. The special, abatable land tax I have suggested for use in the blighted districts of great cities will assist the educational process among those who are slowest to learn. It will force the minority of selfish or short-sighted obstructors to fall in with a policy dictated by good sense and decency. Behind this there must be the stimulus of liberal Federal aid. Even with fictitious values knocked out of these blighted land areas, it will take some governmental benevolence to insure a proper land use, especially the necessary 75 percent of open land spaces. Federal aid must be the prod to action, an aid to those who cooperate, a burden to those who resist.

That, however, is the limit of Federal subsidization. The Government cannot pay off on the lottery tickets of urban-land speculation. The country at large, the Federal and State Governments, and the real-estate owners must recognize this truth, or there will be no Federal housing program. We have reached the end of the great American delusion of speculative wealth for all in city real estate. We have our choice of liquidating our folly through slum clearance or through municipal decay.

RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, there appears to be no other Senator who wishes to address the Senate at this time. I am assured that there is a probability that an arrangement looking toward a vote on the resolution relating to the World Court, now before the Senate, may be entered into on the assembling of the Senate tomorrow. Therefore I now move the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 24, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Wednesday, January 23 (legislative day of Jan. 21), 1935

MEMBER OF FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Adolph C. Miller to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board.

CHIEF OF THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Katharine F. Lenroot to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance

Capt. Harold R. Stark to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance with the rank of rear admiral.

To be rear admirals

Arthur P. Fairfield
Walter N. Vernou
George F. Neal
William H. Allen
James O. Richardson

To be captains

Louis F. Thibault
John B. Earle
Harold V. McKittrick
Thomas A. Symington
Robert C. Giffen
Richard E. Cassidy
Clarence N. Hinkamp
Riley F. McConnell
Ezra G. Allen
Emanuel A. Lofquist
Henry C. Gearing, Jr.

To be commanders

William H. P. Blandy
Laurance T. DuBose
Arthur G. Robinson
Walter E. Doyle
William W. Meek
Charles J. Parrish
Oliver L. Downes
Paulus P. Powell
Samuel N. Moore
Leo H. Thebaud
Henry A. Seiller
Alfred H. Donahue
Gordon Hutchins
Henry F. Floyd
Robert D. Kirkpatrick
Carl H. Jones
Carleton F. Bryant
William J. Larson
John H. Buchanan
Herman A. Spanagel
Paul A. Stevens
Laurence Wild
Hartwell C. Davis
Robert H. Grayson
William G. B. Hatch
Alfred P. H. Tawresey
Joseph R. Redman
Frank L. Lowe
Theo D. Westfall
Theodore D. Ruddock, Jr.
Andrew H. Addoms
George B. Wilson
William K. Harrill
Alfred H. Balsley
William E. Malloy
Charles D. Swain

To be lieutenant commanders

Allen D. Brown
William C. Vose
Harry B. Slocum
Harry R. Thurber
James B. Sykes
Cuthbert A. Griffiths
Franz O. Willenbucher
Ernest H. von Heimburg
John O. Huse
William D. Sample
Alfred P. Moran, Jr.
William E. Clayton
Richard B. Tuggle
John H. Cassady
Lewis H. C. Johnson
Scott E. Peck
George A. Ott
Robert H. Harrell
Emil B. Perry
John J. Fitzgerald
Stewart S. Reynolds
Donald McA. Mackey
Barrett Studley
Thomas J. Bay
John D. Murphy
Thomas H. Robbins, Jr.
William Moultrie Moses
William Sinton
Abel C. J. Sabalot
William B. Goggins
Kendall S. Reed
Felix L. Johnson
Sam L. LaHache
Donald R. Osburn, Jr.

To be lieutenants

Charles A. Legg
Roy D. Williams
Arthur M. Townsend
James R. Topper
Raymond R. Waller
George Edmund Peterson
Burton L. Doggett
Harrell W. Hall
Joseph W. Adams, Jr.
Henry T. Read
Samuel G. Kelly
Hampton M. Ericsson
Clarence L. Winecoff
Charles J. Stuart
Bernard T. Zelenka
Bromfield B. Nichol
Henry C. Doan
Walter C. Dey
John T. Warren
Francis H. Gardner
Edward F. Gallagher
Joseph M. Worthington
Robley W. Clark
William A. Kanakanui
Noble W. Abrahams
Robert W. Larson
Arthur C. Wood
Theodoric C. Linthicum
James F. McDonough
Wilfred G. Lebegue
James J. Cunningham
Paul S. Crandall
Harry E. Hubbard
William H. Benson
John H. Sides
Charles H. Anderson, Jr.
William J. Marshall
Henry Crommelin
Redfield Mason
Dundas P. Tucker
Thomas B. McMurtrey
John W. Murphy, Jr.
Martin R. Peterson
Robert L. Adams
Edward N. Parker
Ernest M. Eller
Lewis Wallace
Richard G. Voge
William P. McGirr
Willis H. Pickton
Austin W. Wheelock
Edward K. Walker
Richard A. Larkin
Edmund B. Taylor
Robert E. Cronin
John L. Melgaard
James S. Smith, Jr.
William G. H. Lind
Cecil B. Gill
Richard E. Elliott
Morton C. Mumma, Jr.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Frank M. Adamson
Francis R. Duborg
Donald W. Gladney, Jr.
Paul L. deVos
Henry G. Clark
Thomas D. Tyra

Alexander C. Veasey
Horacio Rivero, Jr.
Richard K. Anderson
Allan L. Reed
John B. Colwell
John G. F. Prescott
Thomas W. Rogers
Ernest C. Holtsworth
Jesse S. McAfee
Albert K. Romberg
George M. Greene
Winsor C. Gale
James T. Lay
Robert E. Gadrow
Joseph B. H. Young
David D. Hawkins
Thomas B. Hutchins, 3d
John O. F. Dorsett
Ransom A. Pierce
Horace D. Moulton
George A. Hatton
Gordon A. Uehling
Arthur I. Flaherty
John A. Webster
Edward H. Guilbert
Joseph F. Foley
Francis A. McKee
Thomas Ashworth, Jr.
Berton A. Robbins, Jr.
Wayne F. Gibson
Charles R. Almgren
Ralph N. Ernest
William W. Hollister
Francis J. Foley
James M. Wood
Hazlett P. Weatherwax
Ralph W. Elden
John L. Chew
George F. Schultz
Ashton B. Jones, Jr.
Vernon R. Hain
Merrill S. Holmes
Robert E. Lockwood
Ralph Cullinan, Jr.
George K. MacKenzie, Jr.
Maxim W. Firth
George K. Williams
James O. Biglow
John T. Wulff
Donald J. MacDonald
Robert B. Heilig
George R. Stone
Rudolph J. Fabian
William R. Lefavour
Frank G. Raysbrook
Lucian F. Dodson
Oscar E. Hagberg
Norman M. Miller
Edward M. Blessman
Henry A. Renken
Lawson P. Ramage
Louis F. Volk
Byron L. Gurnette
James R. Z. Reynolds
Frederick U. Weir
Donald V. Daniels
Howard J. Abbott
Archie D. Fraser
George E. Peckham
Robert A. Theobald, Jr.
Edward L. Robertson, Jr.
Claude V. Hawk
Albert D. Gray
Schermerhorn Van Mater
Raymond P. Hunter
James M. Peters
Bruce L. Carr
Russell C. Williams
Charles B. Brooks, Jr.
Victor H. Soucek
Orrin F. Black
John F. Castree
Peter M. Gaviglio
Lowell W. Williams
Robert E. Hudson
Curtis E. Smith
Reid P. Fiala
Richard H. Crane
Richard C. Steere
William B. Sieglaff
Donald T. Wilber
Charles L. Crommelin
Anthony C. Roessler
Lion T. Miles
John F. Harper, Jr.
Jay S. Anderson
Karl R. Wheland
Frank R. Putnam
Harry M. S. Gimber, Jr.
Philip H. Ashworth
George B. Madden
Robert P. Beebe
John H. Brockway
John A. Fitzgerald
Lorenz Q. Forbes
Edward F. Ferguson
Seymour D. Owens
John N. Hughes
Bernard F. McMahon
Philip W. Mothersill, Jr.
Bryant A. Chandler
James T. Smith
Benjamin Ghetzler
Robert S. Fahle
Vincent J. Meola
Clarence L. Gasterland
Harlan T. Johnson
George S. Wilson
Joseph T. Thornton, Jr.
Lee S. Pancake
Charles K. Palmer
Charles M. Howe, III
Alden H. Irons
Henry Williams, Jr.
Arthur A. Cumberledge
Wilmer E. Gallaher
Charles S. Vaughn
William W. Fitts
Edward S. Burns
Charles M. Jett
Robbins W. Allen
Ward T. Shields
Albert H. Wilson, Jr.
William R. McCuddy
William C. Hughes, Jr.
James M. O'Toole
John D. Huntley
Alfred B. Tucker, III
Roy O. Gilbert, Jr.
Henry R. Wier
Charles L. Werts
John W. Gannon
James I. Cone
Arnold H. Holtz
Baxter M. McKay
Louis J. Bellis
Edward L. Foster
Joseph W. Leverton, Jr.
Warren R. Thompson
Kinloch C. Walpole
John E. Kirkpatrick
Charles W. Aldrich
Mann Hamm
Prentis K. Will
Warren G. Corliss
Thomas H. Copeman
Peyton L. Wirtz
John W. Crumpacker
James B. Weiler
Ford L. Wallace
Norman Hall
Charles T. Straub
Leland G. Shaffer
John C. Parham, Jr.
William J. Giles, Jr.
David L. Roscoe, Jr.
John S. Reese
John W. Byng
Lester O. Wood
John C. Hollingsworth
Ernest E. Evans
Clifton Iverson
Joseph D. Black
Andrew J. Hill, Jr.
Andrew J. Smith
Frank G. Gould
Francis M. Peters, Jr.
Robert F. Jones
Burton C. Lillis, Jr.
William M. Freshour
Thomas B. Payne
William A. Dunn
Joseph E. O'Brien
Edward J. O'Neill
Hiram Cassedy
Alcorn G. Beckmann
Edward M. Bingham
Thomas E. Gillespie
Paul W. Clarke
George P. Huff
Jerry C. South, Jr.
Robert M. Bowstrom
Evan W. Yancey
Richard W. Peterson
Noah Adair, Jr.
Carleton E. Mott
Floyd B. T. Myhre
Jesse H. Motes, Jr.
Donald W. Todd
Raymond H. Nelson
Reginald R. McCracken
Forsyth Massey
Eugene S. Lytle, Jr.
Henry H. Hale
Robert W. Mackert
Frederick J. Becton
Francis T. Williamson
Robert R. Sampson
Carson Hawkins
Justin A. Miller
Rathel L. Nolan, Jr.
Marshall T. Martin
James A. Murphy
Horace Myers
Willis O. Johnson
Nathaniel C. Copeland
Clark A. Ritchie
William V. McKaig
Elwin L. Farrington
William P. Woods
Julius E. Smith, Jr.
George C. Molumphy
William C. Norvell
John S. McCain, Jr.
Harry E. Seidel, Jr.
Josef M. Gardiner
James H. Davis
Joseph C. Toth

To be medical directors

John B. Dennis
George W. Calver

To be medical inspectors

Franklin F. Murdoch
Harold L. Jensen
Ogden D. King
Irving W. Jacobs
Robert L. Nattkemper
John P. Owen
Thomas C. Anderson
Melville J. Aston
Leo C. Thyson
Alma C. Smith
John T. Bennett
Paul W. Wilson
William J. C. Agnew
Jesse W. Allen
Ross T. McIntire
John R. White

To be surgeons

David B. Peters
Charles F. Behrens
Albert J. Desautels
Robert M. Cochrane
Ben Hollander
Navy F. X. Banvard
James J. O'Connor
Loyd Lewis Edmisten
Robert E. Duncan
Fred M. Rohow

To be passed assistant surgeons

Clarence C. Myers
Irwin L. Norman
Emmett D. Hightower
Harold G. Young
Hubert H. Carroll
Courtney G. Clegg
David J. Cracovaner
Joseph E. Evans
Jesse W. Miller
John H. Korb
Claude R. Ball
Robert S. Simpson
Cecil C. Welch
Julian Love
Carl K. Youngkin
Rupert H. Draeger
Douglas T. Prehn
Joseph G. Schnebly
Jay F. Miller
Gordon B. Tayloe
Dirk M. te Groen
Clyde L. Bozarth
Jesse G. Wright
Charles W. Shilling
Farra L. Read
Clark W. Virtue
Charles W. Stelle
Thomas J. Carter
William E. Walsh
DeCoy Marchand
Clifford W. Moore

To be dental surgeons

George M. Frazier
Frank S. Tichy
Alfred W. Chandler
Albert Knox
Everett K. Patton
Ray E. Farnsworth
Raymond D. Reid

To be passed assistant dental surgeons

Louis D. Mitchell, Jr.
Robert P. Irons
Edwin D. Foulk
Edward O. Andersen
Walter P. Caruthers

To be assistant dental surgeons

James A. Morton
Wilbur N. Van Zile

To be paymasters

Harry E. Stengele
Jonas F. Rupert
Robert G. Robeson
Isaac W. Thompson
Harold R. Lehmann
Myron W. Willard
Archie A. Antrim
Samuel L. Bates
Harry F. Hake
Grandison J. Tyler
William Elliott
James E. Hunt
Hugh J. McManus
William E. Woods
Leo A. Ketterer
Nicholas A. Brown
John W. Overand
Howard N. Hill
Leo V. Flavell
Cornelius A. Brinkmann
Joseph E. Ford
Albert W. Eldred
Jacob H. Kyger
Joseph T. Lareau
Marvin McCray
Paul K. Coons
Roy L. Koester
James H. Stevens
George Scratchley
Ellsworth F. Sparks
Charles B. Forrest
John P. Killeen
William G. Conrad
Karl S. Farnum
Orville F. Byrd
Louis A. Puckett
Ellory F. Carr
James D. G. Wognum
Charles H. Gillilan
Charles H. Ritt
Harry A. Miller
Harvey R. Dye
Verny Carroll
Charles Schaaf
Forrest Ivanhoe
Ray E. Snedaker
Ray W. Byrns
George W. Davis
William W. Wise
Robert H. Lenson
Robert R. Blaisdell
Edward F. Ney
Walter E. Scott
Walter Guerry
George F. Yoran
Webster Gross
William R. Calvert
Herman F. Gingrich
James M. McComb
Frank P. Delahanty
Worth B. Beacham
Carl J. Buck
John M. Speissegger
Hunter J. Norton
Harry R. Hubbard
Charles M. Garrison
John H. Skillman

To be passed assistant paymaster

John E. Wymond

To be chaplain

Emmet O'Neill

To be naval constructors

Edward L. Cochrane
Robert W. Ferrell
Donald Royce
Adrian R. Marron
Gordon W. Nelson
John B. Pearson, Jr.
Henry A. Schade
George A. Holderness, Jr.
Robert C. Bell, Jr.
William S. Kurtz
Emmett E. Sprung

To be civil engineer

John R. Perry

To be chief radio electrician

Nelson M. Cooke

To be chief machinist

Albert F. O'Meara

To be chief pay clerks

Robert W. Underwood
John H. Hampshire
George A. Mullen
Charles J. Forquer

To be commander

Roy Pfaff

To be lieutenant commanders

Ernest W. Litch
Benjamin S. Brown
Marion E. Crist

To be lieutenants

Forrest R. Bunker
Dennis L. Francis
Arthur A. Griese
Eugene T. Seaward
Robert H. G. Johnson
Franklin D. Karns

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Carl A. Lizberg
Douglas T. Hammond

To be paymasters

Benjamin O. Kilroy
Archie B. McKay
Harry H. Hines
Everett W. Brown
Charles S. Bailey

To be chief gunner

Bryan C. Clark

To be chief machinists

Carl Mills
William Smith
Richard G. Sly
John T. Staley

MARINE CORPS

Harry Lee to be major general.

David D. Porter to be the adjutant and inspector with the rank of brigadier general.

Bennett Puryear, Jr., to be assistant quartermaster with the rank of colonel.

To be colonels

Emile P. Moses
Clayton B. Vogel
Henry N. Manney, Jr.
Calvin B. Matthews
Andrew B. Drum
Holland M. Smith
Ralph S. Keyser
Philip H. Torrey
Robert L. Denig

To be lieutenant colonels

Alley D. Rorex
Samuel M. Harrington
Harold L. Parsons
Thomas E. Thrasher, Jr.
Julian C. Smith
Charles J. Miller
Leander A. Clapp
Thomas S. Clarke
Joseph C. Fegan
Francis T. Evans
Alexander A. Vandegrift
Roy S. Geiger
Charles D. Barrett
Oliver Floyd
Harry Schmidt
Earl C. Long
Harry L. Smith
Selden B. Kennedy
Miles R. Thacher
Marion B. Humphrey
William B. Sullivan
Lowry B. Stephenson
Harold C. Pierce
Harry K. Pickett
John B. Sebree
Henry L. Larsen
William H. Rupertus
James L. Underhill
Keller E. Rockey
Allen H. Turnage
Matthew H. Kingman
Alphonse DeCarre
Samuel L. Howard
Lyle H. Miller
Ralph J. Mitchell
DeWitt Peck
Archie F. Howard
Raymond R. Wright
Pedro A. del Valle
Walter H. Sitz
William G. Hawthorne
Oscar R. Cauldwell
Arnold W. Jacobsen
Earl H. Jenkins
Thomas E. Watson
Walter G. Sheard
James E. Davis
Lloyd L. Leech
Raphael Griffin

To be majors

Francis P. Mulcahy
Dean Kalbfleisch
Robert M. Montague
Daniel E. Campbell
Maurice G. Holmes
James E. Betts
James W. Webb
John M. Tildsley
Louis E. Woods
Evans O. Ames
Franklin A. Hart
George F. Adams
Emmett W. Skinner
Thomas B. Gale
Field Harris
Roy C. Swink
Leon L. Dye
Francis E. Pierce
Maurice C. Gregory
Andrew E. Cressy
Donald Curtis
Ery M. Spencer
Martin J. Kelleher
Franklin T. Steele
William N. Best
William A. Worton

John W. Thomason, Jr.
Merritt B. Curtis
Charles T. Brooks
Herbert Hardy
Charles N. Muldrow
John T. Walker
Joseph G. Ward
Robert C. Anthony
James D. McLean
Henry D. Linscott
William T. Clement
Ralph E. West
Frank D. Strong
Lyman Passmore
Clifford O. Henry
Joseph T. Smith
Raymond E. Knapp
Edward L. Burwell, Jr.
Omar T. Pfeiffer
Campbell H. Brown
Lewie G. Merritt
Claude A. Larkin
Lucian W. Burnham
Shaler Ladd
John C. Wood
Richard H. Jeschke
Joseph I. Nettekoven
William P. T. Hill
William E. Riley
Ray A. Robinson
Robert L. Montague
Jacob Lienhard
Victor F. Bleasdale
Merwin H. Silverthorn
John Groff
Leonard E. Rea
William W. Rogers
Curtis T. Beecher
George F. Stockes
William K. MacNulty
Jacob M. Pearce
William P. Richards
Edgar S. Tuttle
Bert A. Bone
Robert C. Thaxton
Harold D. Campbell
William H. Harrison
John P. Adams
Gilbert D. Hatfield
George H. Morse, Jr.
William T. Evans
Benjamin W. Gally

To be captains

William L. McKittrick
Charles W. Pohl
Stanley E. Ridderhof
Morris L. Shively
Max D. Smith
David A. Stafford
Chesley G. Stevens
Walter W. Wensinger
Lawson H. M. Sanderson
Jacob F. Plachta
Harold E. Rosecrans
Leo Sullivan
Hayne D. Boyden
Franklin G. Cowie
Christian F. Schilt
Stuart W. King
Walter A. Wachtler
William E. Maxwell
Clarence R. Wallace
Ronald A. Boone
Paul B. Watson
William B. Onley
James H. Strother
Ivan W. Miller
Joe N. Smith
Louis E. Marie, Jr.
Thomas M. Ryan
James S. Monahan
John A. Bemis
John C. McQueen
Howard N. Kenyon
William N. McKelvy, Jr.
William W. Davies
Vernon E. Megee
Augustus W. Cockrell
James M. Smith
William H. Doyle
Ernest E. Linsert
Orin H. Wheeler
Lewis A. Hohn
William O. Brice
Francis M. Wulbern
Edwin A. Pollock
Randolph McC. Pate
Cornelius J. Eldridge
Lucian C. Whitaker
John C. Donehoo, Jr.
Raymond P. Coffman
James M. McHugh
Rupert R. Deese
James P. Riseley
Harry E. Dunkelberger
Clayton C. Jerome
Emery E. Larson
John M. Greer
George J. O'Shea
Charles C. Brown
Eugene H. Price
Lyman G. Miller
Ralph E. Forsyth
William M. Mitchell
James A. Stuart
Pierson E. Conradt
Howard R. Huff
William W. Orr
Gregon A. Williams
Evans F. Carlson
John W. Lakso
Monroe S. Swanson
Will H. Lee

To be first lieutenants

Robert B. Luckey
Karl K. Louther
Richard P. Ross, Jr.
Paul Drake
Clinton E. Fox
Harold R. Lee
George O. Van Orden
Walker A. Reaves
Robert L. Peterson
George E. Williams
Kenneth H. Weir
Arthur F. Binney
Clovis C. Coffman
Perry O. Parmelee
John J. Heil
Thomas G. Ennis
Ernest E. Pollock
Max W. Schaeffer
Wilson T. Dodge
Boeker C. Batterton
Frank C. Croft
Saville T. Clark
John V. Rosewaine
Hewin O. Hammond
Lester S. Hamel
Joseph J. Tavern
Joe A. Smoak
Louis M. Heinrichs
Alva B. Lasswell
William I. Phipps
William F. Coleman
Homer C. Murray
Frank H. Schwable
Edward C. Dyer
Melvin G. Brown
Manly L. Curry
Samuel B. Griffith, 2d
Raymond F. Crist, Jr.
Otho C. Ledbetter
Harry C. Lang
James B. Lake, Jr.
Dean C. Roberts
Albert F. Moe
James V. Bradley, Jr.
Keith R. Willard
Joseph H. Berry
Zebulon C. Hopkins
Wilfred J. Huffman
Orin K. Pressley
Robert H. Williams
Randall M. Victory
Joseph P. McCaffery
Carson A. Roberts
Richard J. McPherson
John B. Hill
James R. Hester
William F. Parks
Chandler W. Johnson
William A. Willis
John S. Holmberg
Clarence J. O'Donnell
Paul D. Sherman
John F. Stamm
George R. Weeks
John Wehle
James P. Berkeley
William P. Battell
Cornelius P. Van Ness
Edson L. Lyman
Lewis R. Tyler
Archibald D. Abel
George H. Cloud
Charles E. Shepard, Jr.
Peter A. McDonald
Michael M. Mahoney
Thomas B. Hughes
Frank G. Wagner, Jr.
Paul Moret
Harold W. Bauer
William B. McKean
Fred D. Beans
Glen G. Herndon
Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
Francis H. Williams
Paul W. Russell
William B. Steiner
Frank M. Reinecke
John M. Davis
Walfried H. Fromhold
James T. Wilbur
Charles H. Hayes
Donald M. Weller
Samuel S. Yeaton
Edward A. Montgomery
Edgar O. Price
Robert E. Hill
James M. Daly
Nicholas J. Pusel
Ronald D. Salmon
Russell Lloyd
Ernest W. Fry, Jr.
Wright C. Taylor
Marcellus J. Howard
August Larson
Donovan D. Sult
Richard W. Hayward
Norman Hussa
Henry T. Elrod
Robert L. McKee
Edward B. Carney
Austin R. Brunelli
Lewis C. Hudson, Jr.
Edmund B. Games
Albert J. Keller
Luther S. Moore
Harry S. Leon
Nelson K. Brown
Charles R. Jones
Clifford H. Shuey
Wayne H. Adams
John H. Cook, Jr.
Edward H. Forney, Jr.
John A. White
Samuel G. Taxis
Edward J. Dillon
Harold I. Larson
Clifton R. Moss
Bankson T. Holcomb, Jr.
Frederick L. Wieseman
Robert S. Brown
Harlan C. Cooper
Robert E. Fojt
William K. Pottinger
Billy W. King
George R. E. Shell
James H. Brower

To be chief quartermaster clerk

Landreville Ledoux

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Nora M. Wallace, Clayton.
Mary L. Malone, Dothan.
Julia J. Harkness, Eutaw.
Daisy Buice, Good Water.

CONNECTICUT

Ethyl O. Engisch, Cornwall Bridge.
Harry L. Lyman, New Preston.
John F. Connerty, Washington Depot.

MASSACHUSETTS

George W. Seymour, Ashby.
Michael T. Cavanaugh, Ashland.
William E. Hallahan, Charlemont.
Charles J. Dacey, Conway.
George J. Newitt, Duxbury.
Harold J. McCormick, Gardner.
Joseph G. Woodbury, Oxford.

WASHINGTON

James H. Callison, Palouse.

WYOMING

Albert H. Linford, Afton.
Thomas P. Hill, Jr., Buffalo.
John G. Kelly, Hanna.
Robert B. Landfair, Jackson.
Percy D. Sims, Lovell.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, in Thee we live and move and have our being. Unite us this day in the spirit of brotherhood, sincerity, and thoroughness of life. These virtues shall fill many a long day with satisfaction and arrest the wandering mind from the fields of regret. We pray that Thou wouldst chasten the pride of our understanding and of our will, and reveal in us a diviner strength and wisdom. Forbid that our usefulness should ever be disfigured or vitiated by indifference or unreality. O God, spread the olive branch over the nations, ere they grasp the red hand of war. O Prince of Peace, come to the peoples of all the earth, we beseech Thee. We wait in prayer for him who, through the years, has rendered sacred the obligations of a public servant. Our truest sympathy and the tenderness of our spirit are with him. Father of Mercy, make him strong and well again, we pray Thee. In the name of our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1190. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill H. R. 3410, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. BYRNES, and Mr. HALE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order today on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORK RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 65, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 65

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, a joint resolution making appropriations for relief purposes, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said joint resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Appropriations may be offered to any section of the joint resolution at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House, with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY]. I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: Page 1, line 11, strike out, after the word "be", the remainder of the line; and in line 12, strike out the word "been"; and in line 13, after the word "to", insert "sections 1, 2, and 3 of", so that the resolution will read:

"The joint resolution shall be read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to sections 1, 2, and 3 of said joint resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Appropriations", etc.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the rule providing for the consideration of what has been called the "work-relief bill", House Joint Resolution 117. It has been much discussed. It is one of the most important measures that has ever come before any Congress and, as is well known, involves an appropriation of $4,800,000,000, four billion of which is to be placed at the disposal of the President in order to relieve the distress throughout the country and place three and a half million unemployed back to work. It is not my purpose to discuss the merits of House Joint Resolution 117, but to call attention to the rule which, as originally offered as House Resolution 65, provided for 3 hours of general debate, but afforded no opportunity for amendments except those offered by the Committee on Appropriations. The amendments which I have just offered by direction of the Committee on Rules, and which have been read at the Clerk's desk, permits the offering of amendments by any Member of the House to sections 4, 5, and 6 of the joint resolution. About these sections there has been some dispute. Some Members have expressed a desire to have an opportunity to offer amendments to these sections. The purpose of my amendment is to afford the Membership that opportunity by opening up the last three sections of the bill to the consideration of the Committees of the Whole and the House. The rule is also changed in the minor aspect that the House joint resolution will be read for amendment.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I am entirely in accord with the amendment suggested by the Chairman of the Rules Committee, because that goes a long way to help us in the contention that we have made against consideration as originally proposed. Will the gentleman kindly state to the House why, if it is necessary to open up these sections, he will not give us an opportunity to discuss freely and amend all of the sections of the joint resolution?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, by providing 3 hours of general debate we have afforded opportunity for discussion, but section 1 is the meat of the joint resolution in my opinion. It provides for the appropriation of $4,000,000,000 and permits its allocation to project, State, or locality as the President shall see fit. It was thought by the Committee on Appropriations and by the Rules Committee that sections of such a nature should not be opened up for "logrolling" by way of earmarking either the amounts or the nature of the projects upon which this huge sum should be expended. That is why it is thought best in considering this measure that only committee amendments be permitted to be offered to that particular section.

I personally do not believe sections 2 and 3 are of such great importance that they should be closed also, but the fact is that desired amendments to them have not been suggested to any extent.

Mr. SNELL. Then I understand it is the policy of the majority that so far as the meat of this whole proposition

is concerned, the House shall not have opportunity to express itself; but so far as the trimmings, which do not amount to anything, are concerned, they may be discussed and amendments offered as to them. Is that the policy of the majority?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not believe that is a policy as much as it is a legislative necessity.

Mr. SNELL. That is the statement the gentleman made.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It sounds strange to me to hear criticism come from the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the leader of the minority, which, when they were in power, when they were a majority, brought in many tariff bills and many tax bills and many another bill under the same kind of a so-called "gag rule" which prevented any amendments whatsoever except those suggested by their own Republican-controlled committee. It depends on who is "in" and who is "out."

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman will admit that we never brought in any bill of this character under such a rule, and I challenge the gentleman to name one bill similar to this that we have brought in here.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I admit no such thing. If the gentleman's party had brought in a similar bill in those dark days of depression between October 1929 and March 1933, we would not be compelled now to go to such an extreme to save our people from further distress and privation. The gentleman and his side of the House will have plenty of opportunity to discuss the joint resolution under general debate, and to oppose it if they dare. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH].

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to answer questions after I have completed my main statement, and I wish it understood now that I shall not yield until such time.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering a rule for the consideration of a joint resolution purporting to appropriate money for a public-works project, for the purpose of putting to work the unemployed by such means. If there were such a proposition to be considered in this House, the Republican Party would support it. The Republican Party stands for a full measure of relief for unemployment and the distress resultant from it. It stands for every measure that can be proposed that will promise real recovery. The Republican Party further stands, with respect to relief for unemployment, for relief by work rather than by dole; and if the majority of this House should propose, if the administration would send down a measure for such purpose, and for such purpose alone, it could be passed by acclamation, because there would not be a Republican vote against it. [Applause.] But what is the resolution sought to be made in order by this rule? Let us consider the circumstances under which this appropriation resolution and the power it confers upon the President comes to us. We know that the new deal has two major purposes. We know that one of its purposes, and the one continuously publicized, is to bring about speedy recovery from the economic disaster in which we are and, in the meantime, to provide for relief to alleviate the distress and want and the suffering resultant from the depression. The other purpose, which is not generally discussed publicly, is to take advantage of the condition of depression and its resultant distress and almost despair among the people, to entirely revise and reconstruct the economic and social structure of the American people. Those two purposes have many times been in conflict with one another, and example after example can be cited whereby the second purpose, and attempts to bring it about in these last 2 years, have measurably retarded recovery and nullified the measures that have been taken to speed it up.

Generally speaking, those in the new deal who are known to favor recovery immediately, before anything else, are known as the "right wing." Those who seek rather to take advantage of the depression and who are not concerned about its continuance until what they conceive fundamental reforms in our American Commonwealth can be brought about are known as the "left wing."

Now, what does this resolution that is sought to be made in order provide? It appropriates money for this purpose, and to appropriate money for the purposes enumerated is to give the administration authority to put into effect those purposes, an authority which otherwise it would not have, because it is delegation of the authority vested by the Constitution in the Congress. This is the authority that is vested in the President:

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

We will vote for any bill, on the Republican side, having that purpose, and with any reasonable expectation of bringing about that result.

> (2) Relieving economic maladjustments.

This is left-wing stuff, which has nothing to do with the employment of those who are now out of work, for the purpose of bringing about speedy recovery. That is permanent, all-time reformation of the economic and social set-up of the American people.

> (3) Alleviating distress.

Certainly we are for it. That is right-wing stuff. We have no objection to the right-wing program of the new deal. We are for it.

> (4) Improving living and working conditions.

Thus the President can do anything with respect to living conditions and working conditions of the American people that he deems in the general welfare, without any let or hindrance except the say-so of the Supreme Court.

What, for example, can the President do under such powers, entirely unnecessary for any public-works project at all? The President, under the power of this joint resolution, can use the money appropriated to condemn and buy every coal mine in the country, and run it as a Government owned and operated industry. He can do the same thing to piano factories, if he wants to. He can prescribe regulation working relations between the Government and those employees who are intended to be put on those building projects, and he can also regulate the relationship between employees and employers in any and all private industries. Under section 6 he can make rules and regulations that will enable him to throw into jail any labor leader who seeks to modify the regulations concerning the relationship between labor and employer that he may have made. There is not any power not granted in this joint resolution that is not, or cannot be, exercised by Stalin, Mussolini, or Hitler. There is no power that any of those three dictators have exercised that is not contained in that resolution.

It gives the President the right to deem what he considers best for the general welfare as described in the preamble of our Constitution, and then gives him $4,000,000,000 with which to do anything he pleases to bring about what he deems for the general welfare.

Under section 2 and section 4, which have nothing to do with public-works projects, he is authorized to deal with relationships of the economics of our social structure, the relationships between employer and employee. He can even regulate where people may choose to live and can put them in jail if they do not follow his wishes in that direction. He can buy up vast tracts running into a number of States, like the Tennessee Valley project, declare them to be submarginal, move the population off and herd them elsewhere on Government land and in Government built and owned houses; can direct them to till Government-owned fields, to work in Government-owned factories; and if they do not do it, they can be put in jail. There is not any act of tyranny that is not possible under this joint resolution.

The answer of the proponents of this legislation is that the President has no intention of using this power in any such fashion at all. If that is the answer they give, then why put such power in this resolution? Why, when this resolution was written in the administration's chambers, were the left-wingers allowed to put this kind of stuff in this resolution that is entirely aside from the proclaimed purpose of the resolution? Why was it permitted? They hope sometime,

under some circumstances, to push the President somewhat along the road which these powers open; and this is more to be considered seriously now than it would be under some other circumstances because of the fact that the President since the 4th of March 1933 has not yet laid down a major policy with respect to any activity, either concerning the depression or concerning the carrying on of the Government generally. He has frankly said that it was trial-and-error experiment that he was using. He said he would frankly acknowledge the failure of such experiments and abandon them. Well, failure after failure has been abandoned. The C. W. A. has been abandoned, the N. R. A. as it used to function has been abandoned, but never a word of acknowledgment of error. The people do not know where the President stands. Otherwise it would not be a common occurrence that in places where gamblers meet bets are made as to whether the next utterance of the President of the United States is going to be toward the right or toward the left. Everybody knows that that is the case, that the newspapers, the publicists, and those who lay bets on uncertain events discuss for weeks or for days, when it is known that the President is going to take the air, what he is going to say and which way he is going to turn.

Now, in such circumstances and with a determined group at his elbow which seeks to push us into State socialism completely, which seeks to prescribe labor conditions and strip the workingman of his liberty to choose means for bettering his condition through his organization, which seeks to take away the real and personal property of any industry and run it as a governmental concern, we are asked to legislate to make such aims possible. Are you going to vote for any such delegation of power? If you want relief, bring in a bill that gives relief; if you want work, bring in a bill that gives work; but do not bring in a left-wing measure of this sort. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, whenever there is brought onto the floor of the House a bill in the interest of the American people we can be sure that the Republican leaders will oppose it. I am, indeed, gratified that today they cannot and do not find fault with the rule. The rule has been explained. It is a liberal rule. [Laughter.] It permits amendment. It is a much more liberal rule than Republicans ever brought in when they were in power. [Applause.] Of course, my Republican friends enjoyed working under Cannon rules, which gave the Speaker the full and complete power over the House and to name the committees and dictate what legislation should be considered, but which gave the Membership of the House no right or privilege.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the leader of the Republican Party, stated that bills of this character were never brought in by the Republicans, and I agree with him. The Republican Party never did bring in any legislation that was beneficial to the masses or to the country. [Applause.] As a rule the legislation in which the gentleman from New York and the Republican leaders are interested is legislation in favor of the special and vested interests of the United States.

The pending joint resolution is in the right direction. The Nation has the utmost confidence in the President of the United States, and I am satisfied that every dollar appropriated will be expended honestly and wisely for the best interests of the Nation. Why, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] said a moment ago that the policy of the President and the new-deal legislation has retarded the recovery of the country. The gentleman himself, as well as the country, knows that even in 1930–31, when the Republicans were in power under the leadership of Hoover, with a Republican Congress and a Republican Senate, they were sitting here in a complete daze and trance without doing a thing, hypnotized by Wall Street, but absolutely ignoring the pleas of the "Main Streets" of the Nation.

President Hoover and your Republican leadership were immune and cold to the appeals for relief legislation, and conditions continued to become worse and worse during 1930, 1931, and 1932.

It was not until the election of President Roosevelt that there were any indications of a change for the better. On March 4, 1933, President Roosevelt took the oath of office and inherited the wreckage of the previous administrations; 16,000,000 people out of work and millions in dire want and despair, and nearly all of the plants, factories, and banks closed in the Nation. These were only a few of the problems confronting him.

Under his leadership we have put at least five to six million men at work. Contrary to your policy of do-nothing-for-relief, we have taken care of unfortunates all over the United States, and the President proposes to continue to do so. His aim is to find employment for all men who are capable of working, thereby taking them off the relief rolls. You pretend you are in favor of relief, but under various pretenses vote against it.

During the entire Seventy-third Congress you Republicans have assailed us because we adopted some special rules to prevent you from delaying legislation recommended by President Roosevelt to save the Nation from complete ruin, despair, and starvation. You tried to mislead the new Members in making them believe that your vote for these rules would mean your downfall and bring about your defeat. And you are pursuing the same tactics today. But what are the actual facts? The first time in the history of our Nation, the Democratic Party in off-election did not reduce its membership, but has made gains in every section of our country, where the Democratic Party and the Democratic candidates stood by the record of the President and the Democratic Congress, and thereby given approval to our action and the now, by you, despised rule, which secretly you admit is necessary for expeditious legislation.

May I say one or two words to the new Members who feel that the Rules Committee can amend the bills that are submitted or recommended to the committee? The Rules Committee has no such power. All the Rules Committee can do is to grant a rule on a bill recommended by committee, which is your committee, after the committee has given consideration to such legislation and requests such rule.

So do not be misled by the despairing Republicans, who have not yours or the country's interests at heart, but are only trying vainly to create political capital. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DRIVER].

Mr. DRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon seems seriously disturbed because there is in progress a very considerable transformation in the affairs of our Nation covering the past 2 years. The Democratic Party and its administration is to be congratulated that such is the fact and now admitted by our friends the enemy.

The argument directed to this rule is against section 1, which carries the authority to the administrative leader of this Nation, by virtue of an expression from its electorate, to allocate $4,000,000,000 to continue the very wonderful recovery work which he has performed during the last 2 years. The minority objects and says that this section of the bill should be thrown open to amendment and that the great power should not be vested in any one man, though he be the Executive. [Applause.]

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this section cannot possibly be amended and yet accomplish the purpose that is in the mind of the Executive. It is impossible for us to earmark any portion of this money and enable the Executive to accomplish the purposes he desires. His announced policy is to employ 3,500,000 idle employables in our Nation on projects that will leave in the various communities values which can be appreciated and which inure by reason of the expenditure of this Federal fund. It is his further purpose to prosecute this work only until industry may absorb this number of idle people. May I ask how it is possible under the circumstances to earmark one special fund which every Member of this House is interested in—namely, the road fund—or the funds that will be provided for slum

clearance and the various other activities that will be engaged in with the fund made available to the Chief Executive?

These projects may cover only a very limited area. It is hoped that that will be done. We are not in a position to apologize to any one person for the very wonderful progress that we have made in the way of restoring favorable economic conditions in the Nation. It is true, and we must admit, that the improvement is not spread over the country to a like extent. There are sore spots yet that we must give attention to. There are in some places many unemployed people. There are other places, it is my pleasure to say, where that condition has been practically eliminated.

May I point to the great improvement in the agricultural regions where for the first time in the past 4 years people engaged in such pursuits were able to handle some real dollars flowing from the operation of their industry. The same thing is true in many of the industrial sections of our country. There has been great recovery, but there are spots, we must admit, where the recovery is not spread in equal proportion; therefore, it will be necessary in the proper administration of this fund for the application of so much of it as may be necessary to such particular places and only to the extent that it may be used until further recovery in such particular areas may be accomplished.

So far as the administrative features of this bill are concerned, no one will have reason to complain. We throw that wide open to the Members of the House to make such amendments as in their wisdom and judgment they may deem proper to make. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, this rule has a little more sugar coating than it originally had, but it is still a gag rule, and the three most important sections of the bill are not open to amendment.

I do not object to the President's having the power to expend these funds. I think, perhaps, that the President should have this power, but I do say that this resolution should be left open to amendment so that the Members of this House who believe that an adequate amount of money should be appropriated for public works, may have the power to offer amendments and express their views by their recorded votes.

I also protest against the provisions of the rule that do not permit us to strike out the paragraphs of the resolution that nullify the civil-service law and the Classification Act.

I also wish to say that we will not have an opportunity, under the provisions of this rule, to offer an amendment which will guarantee to those who are placed in employment, as a result of this resolution, a wage equal at least to the prevailing wage in their respective communities, because by the time we reach the place where this resolution is opened for amendment we will have passed the place where such an amendment, in my opinion, is germane and in order. If this resolution were broad enough to employ the 11,000,000 people who are out of employment, then there would not be such great necessity for making provision that the wages should be at least equal to the prevailing wage but because it anticipates employing only about three and a half million of the more than eleven million unemployed, we should have a provision in the resolution to the effect that the wages paid employees under this resolution shall be at least equal to the prevailing wage in such communities.

This is a gag rule. I compliment and commend the members of the Democratic Party who forced at least some concessions, but you have not gone far enough and in the name of true democracy we ought to open these bills and resolutions hereafter for amendment in order to give the people of the country an opportunity to be heard. [Applause.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Members of the House that in the first session of the Seventy-third Congress, in 1933, we passed another important measure under a gag rule similar to this one. That measure was the so-called "economy bill", which is now conceded to have been unjust and ill-advised. The majority of the Members who voted for a gag rule at that time have either been apologizing or explaining their vote ever since.

I am strongly in favor of adequate relief legislation, but I am unalterably opposed to the enactment of legislation delegating broad powers and appropriating billions of dollars under rules which practically prohibit all debate and prevent the discussion of questions which are vitally important to the welfare of our people. This measure should have deliberate and mature consideration by this legislative body, and such consideration is impossible under the gag rule proposed. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I have only 5 minutes, and I should like to use that time in making my statement and do not desire to yield.

This is going to be one of the most important measures that is to come before the Congress. It is continuing the program of relief which has been undertaken by legislation of a former Congress.

The emergency of unemployment still exists. One of those who spoke against the rule said that the rule should now be changed because the emergency "should be over", but the emergency is not over, and it will take the efforts of the President in the expenditure of these relief funds to help sweep aside this emergency and bring us back to where employment can be had.

This situation was inherited by this administration from a former administration——

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I said I did not intend to yield, because I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. MOTT. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not hear him say that.

Mr. GREENWOOD. And we are continuing a program which has been begun. A lump-sum appropriation is desired because the unemployment is not uniformly scattered geographically or as between classes of industry.

The President feels, and I think he is justified in the feeling, he should have this fund so that he can shift it from one class of projects to another or from one section to another to relieve the unemployment as he finds such a situation needs solution. Could you or I undertake to earmark any particular portion of this fund so it would take care of the unemployment in the most adequate manner? We might satisfy our constituents concerning some project that we hold dear to our hearts, but in the final analysis, in the use of these funds, it might be found that this money should be used in another section or for another class of projects in order to relieve unemployment and satisfy the emergency in the best possible manner.

My friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] seemed to be greatly alarmed that there would be an economic readjustment. God knows the time has come in this country when there should be some readjustment.

Industry had the opportunity to provide reserves and funds to take care of the unemployed—in their particular class—but they saw fit rather to declare unusual stock dividends and distribute excessive profits.

When the depression came, was there an industrial leader from New Jersey or any other section that came forward to plan a relief situation? No; they closed the factories and took to the storm cellar; and when the man in the White House proposes a plan to bring relief, they are against any new methods or formulas; they are opposed to it. I am one who believes that there should be new methods and new formulas—that we are not going back to the old system of profit taking that existed in the previous administration.

I am willing to follow the President. I am willing to follow him in continuance of the work to bring about relief for the unemployed.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Indiana is not talking to the rule. We who are opposed have been denied an opportunity to present our objections to the rule, and the gentleman from Indiana has been given time and he is discussing the merits of the proposed legislation and not the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana will proceed in order.

Mr. SHANNON. I want a ruling by the Chair as to whether he is in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I appreciate the fact that I was proceeding in order as much as every other man who has spoken on the other side.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield? What I want to ask is when are those who are opposed to the gag rule going to get any time?

Mr. GREENWOOD. The gentleman can go to the committee and get time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania use his time now?

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to speak in a calm and temperate manner upon this most intemperate measure. During the many years that I have been in Congress this is the worst piece of legislation that has ever come before the House. It is an abomination of desolation. What I want to know at the outset of my remarks is this: Who sponsored this legislation?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman wants to know?

Mr. FISH. Who is the author of this legislation?

Mr. SABATH. The President of the United States.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman speak with authority?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman say that the President of the United States approves everything that was in this original joint resolution? I wait for an answer.

Mr. SABATH. The principle of the resolution has been recommended, as the gentleman knows, and requested, in the message of the President to the Congress.

Mr. FISH. Then I ask the gentleman who recommended this resolution to the President for his approval?

Mr. SABATH. The people, because of the conditions in the Nation.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the American people are entitled to know who sponsored this vicious and un-American resolution, who wrote it, and who was behind it before it reached the President of the United States. I have too high a regard for the Membership of the House, particularly the Democratic side, to think for one moment that any Democrat in Congress had anything to do with writing this resolution and thereby helping to betray a constitutional trust and violate his oath of office. This proposed legislation has not been before the House 48 hours. No Member of Congress on either side had anything to do with preparing it, and yet we are told under this gag rule to take this resolution, written by unknown authors, whether the "brain trust" or not I do not know, and rush it through, practically without a hearing, and abdicate 90 percent of the remaining legislative powers of the Congress. The resolution should read:

> Making appropriations to destroy representative government, to establish a dictatorial government similar to fascism, Hitlerism, communism, and every other "ism" except Americanism.

You have been elected Members of this House, and you know that I am apt to criticize measures emanating from the majority party when I believe they are unsound, unworkable, and socialistic. At the Republican caucus the other night, conferring on this joint resolution, some Member said, "Oh, you cannot depend upon the Democrats, only 40 or 50 will vote against the bill." I said that I believe there will be twice that number of liberty-loving, Jeffersonian Democrats who have no patronage collar around their necks who will vote against it without fear or favor unless substantially amended. They were not sent here to vote away all of their legislative power at the request of the "brain trust" or the President. It is not a question of the $4,000,000,000. I do not believe in quibbling over sums. I am for the four billion and I would be for five billion if necessary, although I think provision for raising revenue should be included. That is not the real question. The question is the maintenance of representative government and the constitutional powers of the House. You propose to strip yourselves naked, to abdicate the control of the purse and to leave the Members of Congress without any more legislative clothes than Gandhi. The passage of this will make the Members who vote for it a laughing-stock, not only as rubber stamps in Congress, but a laughing-stock as legislators in their own districts. If you persist in voting for this resolution to deprive the House of the only real power it has, the control over appropriations, you stultify yourself and impair the dignity, prestige, and authority of the House of Representatives and might just as well vote to abolish the Committee on Appropriations, if not the House itself. That was the main reason for its existence, its very lifeblood, and now, because some people, we do not know who, have recommended this resolution to the President—and we are unable to find out who they are—the Democratic leaders are ordered to jam the resolution through regardless of the Constitution or our representative form of government. There is no emergency which warrants such action. If there were a war and a foreign army were invading our shores and we had to act in 24 hours, it might present a different situation, but that is not the situation we are confronted with. There are ample funds available in the Treasury to carry on the relief work for several months. There is plenty of time for hearings.

Let me tell you—because your own leaders, who are leading you astray, will not tell you—this resolution, if you pass it, will make a joke and a travesty of the House of Representatives, and it will be kicked full of holes by the Senate of the United States. We will not be able to even recognize it when it comes back and you Members of the House will be left holding the bag. You will be responsible not only for taking away your own legislative powers but for destroying representative government and the liberties of the people—the constitutional liberties of the people given to this House by the founders and framers of the Federal Constitution—and leave the House of Representatives nothing but a shadow and a name.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield. Let us forget completely about the question of the $4,000,000,000. I have voted for every appropration for relief, but nothing in the world could make me vote for this resolution as it is, and probably even if it is amended. I refuse to be a party to destroying the constitutional powers of the House and impairing its constitutional functions and capacity to legislate by taking away the paramount power that is left to it, the control of the purse strings.

The shades of the great men who have served in this House, of Clay, Calhoun, and Webster, the shades of the men who fought for this identical principle of parliamentary control over the purse strings—of John Hampden in England, Mirabeau in France, and James Otis in our own country! Now, when there is no emergency, you Democrats are going to be driven in like a lot of sheep and compelled to destroy the fundamental principles of the Government, the foundation stones of the separate powers of the Government, and help set up some new form of government, whether fascism or Hitlerism of the right, or socialism or communism of the left. One thing we know for certain, and that is, it is not Americanism. That is the vote that you are called upon to cast; and if you put it through for political reasons, it will be the most evil and the darkest day that the House of Representatives has ever seen. Has the flame of liberty burned so low that Members of this House will sacrifice and betray their own constitutional rights at the bidding of the White House? If this legisla-

tion did not mean sacrificing the rights of the American people, the country, and the House of Representatives we of the minority would say, "More power to you." Rush into this disaster, put it through, and assume the responsibility before the people for deliberately changing our form of government and giving this uncontrolled power into the hands of a superman, a benevolent despot, if you will, and certify by your vote your incapacity, your incompetence to legislate intelligently and within the bounds of reason and moderation. The matter is in your hands. It is for you to decide whether our free institutions have failed and that we must set up an autocratic and dictatorial government; and if you decide wrongly, it will be an evil day for America. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] asked, "Who recommended this to the President?" Nobody. He asked, "Who suggested it to him?" Nobody. The President of the United States does his own suggesting; he does his own recommending; he does his own thinking; he does his own initiating; he charts out his own program; and the gentleman from New York is not used to that kind of procedure.

After the President determines his program, he has ways and means of putting it into execution. Naturally, he disclosed and evolved his plans to Democratic leaders. Very naturally, he called down to the White House our colleague from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and told him in detail just what kind of bill he would like for Congress to pass—that with which he could put his plans into execution and carry out his program, but without which his program would be impossible.

After learning the President's desires, and being willing to follow the wishes and mandate of the American people, who want the President to be given what he requires, it was an easy matter to have the legislative drafting service translate into this bill the exact provisions wanted by the President. If the Democrats in this House had not had confidence in the President, and had not been willing to trust him, and had not realized that the people back home whom we serve here want us to back the President, there would be no bill such as the one now before us for passage.

The people of the United States did not select the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] or the gentleman from Texas, who now addresses you, to lead them. We were selected from one district only. They selected Franklin D. Roosevelt [applause] as the Moses to lead them from bondage and out of the wilderness. Oh, we had grumblings back in the days of Moses. There were some who did not like his leadership. But those who followed Moses got out of the wilderness, and they had plenty of milk and honey as their reward. Here and there and from across the aisle we hear grumblings now. We have here some of those who want to do the leading. They do not like to follow. They want their own way. They are stubborn and perverse.

I have some very definite ideas of my own. I might espouse an entirely different kind of measure. I might have a different kind of program. I might be in favor of this and against that. But I am not in the White House. The 125,000,000 Americans did not elect me as their leader. But when my constituents elected me, they understood that I was backing their President on his economic policies. I would be an embezzler of power if I came here now and refused or failed to back the President.

Every Democrat whose constituents elected him to back the present administration now has a chance to fulfill that duty; now has a chance to carry out the mandate of the people back home. I should hate for the President's recovery program to fail because I had voted against and thereby denied him essential and necessary means he had requested. Regardless of how I think, regardless of my own program, regardless of my own definite ideas, I feel that it is my duty to carry out the wish and will of the people and to give to the President the means to execute his plans. I am backing the policy of my President at this time and I am going to vote for this rule. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN].

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] on the question of who recommended this measure. For 12 years prior to the election of President Roosevelt there was never any question in the mind of anyone as to who were the advisers of the President. It was a group of men interested either in some tariff proposal or some special concession made to the capitalistic group of the country, and this advice has resulted in our present panic conditions.

This proposal is the result of the composite advice of the men who are standing back of the President of the United States with the interest of the people of the United States in their hearts. In the last 2 years those same advisers have raised this country from the depths of the abyss, from the maelstrom which we were in, to the present condition in which the gentleman from New York said there was no emergency. If that remark of the gentleman is true—that there is no emergency now—what a difference it is to the condition which obtained 2 years ago. If that condition does exist, it is due to those advisers who are so diametrically opposed to the advisers of the predecessor of President Roosevelt.

But, gentlemen, there is an emergency. We are not out of the woods yet. This measure calls for the appropriation of $4,000,000,000, not for 1 year but for 2 years. It is a less appropriation than we have been called upon in the past to vote for in carrying out these relief measures. There is no comprehensive building program that can be completed in 1 year. Therefore, we have to provide for 2 years. The departments must know how much they will have, and this is the way it must be done. It is far less than you gentlemen have appropriated before; and if we stand back of the President for the next 2 years, as we have stood in the past, by 1936 the President, with his advisers, will, I believe, have taken this country to a place where there is no emergency. [Applause.]

Gentlemen have spoken about Congress losing its liberty. Well, gentlemen, I was in this Congress during the last Hoover administration session, when we had all the liberty that we could have. We had so much liberty that we went all directions at once. They talk about losing Congressional prestige. Congressional prestige went to the lowest ebb, at the close of the Seventy-second Congress, that it has been to for many years, because we exercised so much liberty. You men who were here when Judge Crisp was trying to pass the revenue measure know that we all turned it into a logrolling on both sides. It was not all on one side. We all went in to get our districts taken care of. The result was that we had a conglomerate measure that nobody wanted to sponsor after the hearing. If we adopt any measure that will permit the emasculation of this bill——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I refuse to yield. I only have a few minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I only wanted to ask the gentleman if the low-ebb Congress he was speaking of was not in the control of the Democratic Party and Mr. John N. Garner was Speaker?

Mr. HARLAN. I will say that Mr. Garner was Speaker and that some days we had a majority of one, and part of the time you would have a majority. We had no leadership; no party had any control. [Laughter.] We had a President in the White House who did not have the nerve to come before this Congress and make any suggestion on a revenue measure. [Applause.] He only made a suggestion on the last day that that bill was before the Senate; but that is not in issue. We have before us today, gentlemen, only one question. If recovery is desirable, this is the only way we can have it. The single question is, Do

you want recovery or not? These dollars are the soldiers that we are to use in this war on depression.

The President, who is our commander in chief, must be allowed to send those soldiers at the time they are needed, at the place they are needed, and not be hampered by a body of men sitting here 2 years before they will have to be sent. It is humanly impossible for us to adopt now any regulation that will be effective.

The gentleman from New York is disturbed because he believes that this bill will lead us into communism. He has been chasing Communists out of every bush for the last 4 years. The one and only way that these hobgoblins of his imagination will materialize is for capitalism to fail to supply human beings with food, clothing, and shelter. If capitalism fails in this respect, communism will come regardless of anything we do or do not do. If we do not pass the present bill, there is no other measure offered to supply the needy with necessaries. The failure of this bill, and not its passage, will bring us much nearer to communism than the most nervous dreams of the gentleman from New York have ever conjured.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, feeling that the Republican minority has shed a sufficient volume of crocodile tears over the fear of "the destruction of our Government" by putting our people back to work, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the previous question be ordered?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 257, nays 142, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—257

Adair	Daly	Hamlin	Maloney
Arnold	Darden	Harlan	Martin, Colo.
Ashbrook	Dear	Hart	Mason
Ayers	Deen	Harter	Massingale
Barden	Delaney	Healey	Maverick
Beam	Dempsey	Hennings	May
Beiter	DeRouen	Higgins, Mass.	Mead
Bell	Dickstein	Hill, Ala.	Meeks
Biermann	Dies	Hill, Samuel B.	Merritt, N. Y.
Bland	Dingell	Hobbs	Miller
Blanton	Disney	Hook	Mitchell, Ill.
Bloom	Dobbins	Houston	Montet
Boehne	Dockweiler	Huddleston	Murdock
Boland	Dorsey	Igoe	Nelson
Boylan	Doughton	Imhoff	Nichols
Brennan	Doxey	Jenckes, Ind.	O'Brien
Brooks	Drewry	Johnson, Okla.	O'Connell
Brown, Ga.	Driscoll	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Brunner	Driver	Johnson, W. Va.	O'Day
Buchanan	Duffey, Ohio	Jones	O'Leary
Buck	Duffy, N. Y.	Kee	Oliver
Buckley, N. Y.	Duncan	Kelly	O'Neal
Bulwinkle	Eagle	Kennedy, N. Y.	Owen
Caldwell	Eckert	Kenney	Palmisano
Cannon, Mo.	Edmiston	Kerr	Parks
Carden	Ellenbogen	Kleberg	Parsons
Carmichael	Evans	Kloeb	Patman
Carpenter	Faddis	Kniffin	Patterson
Cartwright	Farley	Kocialkowski	Patton
Casey	Fernandez	Kopplemann	Pearson
Celler	Fiesinger	Kramer	Peterson, Fla.
Chandler	Fitzpatrick	Lamneck	Peterson, Ga.
Chapman	Flannagan	Lanham	Peyser
Citron	Fletcher	Larrabee	Pfeifer
Claiborne	Ford, Calif.	Lea, Calif.	Pierce
Clark, Idaho	Ford, Miss.	Lee, Okla.	Polk
Clark, N. C.	Frey	Lewis, Colo.	Quinn
Cochran	Fuller	Lewis, Md.	Rabaut
Coffee	Fulmer	Lloyd	Randolph
Colden	Gasque	Lucas	Rankin
Colmer	Gassaway	Luckey	Rayburn
Cooley	Gavagan	McAndrews	Reilly
Cooper, Tenn.	Gildea	McClellan	Richards
Corning	Gingery	McCormack	Richardson
Costello	Goldsborough	McGehee	Robertson
Cox	Granfield	McGrath	Robinson, Utah
Cravens	Gray, Pa.	McGroarty	Rogers, N. H.
Crosby	Green	McKeough	Rudd
Cross, Tex.	Greenwood	McLaughlin	Russell
Crowe	Greever	McMillan	Sabath
Cullen	Gregory	McReynolds	Sadowski
Cummings	Haines	Mahon	Sanders, La.
Sanders, Tex.	Smith, Wash.	Terry	Warren
Sandlin	Smith, W. Va.	Thom	Werner
Schaefer	Snyder	Thomason	West
Schuetz	South	Thompson	Whelchel
Schulte	Spence	Tolan	Whittington
Scott	Stack	Tonry	Wilcox
Scrugham	Starnes	Turner	Williams
Sears	Steagall	Umstead	Wilson, La.
Secrest	Stubbs	Utterback	Woodrum
Shanley	Sullivan	Vinson, Ga.	Zimmerman
Sisson	Sumners, Tex	Vinson, Ky.	
Smith, Conn.	Sutphin	Wallgren	
Smith, Va.	Taylor, Colo.	Walter	

NAYS—142

Allen	Eicher	Knutson	Rogers, Okla.
Amlie	Ekwall	Kvale	Ryan
Andresen	Engel	Lambertson	Sauthoff
Andrew, Mass.	Englebright	Lambeth	Schneider
Andrews, N. Y.	Fenerty	Lehlbach	Seger
Arends	Ferguson	Lemke	Shannon
Bacon	Fish	Lord	Short
Blackney	Focht	Ludlow	Sirovich
Boileau	Gearhart	Lundeen	Snell
Bolton	Gehrmann	McFarlane	Stefan
Brewster	Gifford	McLean	Stewart
Buckbee	Gilchrist	McLeod	Sweeney
Buckler, Minn.	Goodwin	Maas	Taber
Burdick	Gray, Ind.	Mapes	Tarver
Burnham	Greenway	Marcantonio	Taylor, Tenn.
Carlson	Griswold	Marshall	Thomas
Carter	Guyer	Martin, Mass.	Thurston
Castellow	Gwynne	Michener	Tobey
Cavicchia	Hancock, N. Y.	Millard	Treadway
Christianson	Hancock, N. C.	Monaghan	Truax
Church	Hartley	Moran	Turpin
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Moritz	Wadsworth
Collins	Higgins, Conn.	Mott	Wearin
Connery	Hildebrandt	O'Malley	Welch
Cooper, Ohio	Hill, Knute	Perkins	Wigglesworth
Crawford	Hoeppel	Pettengill	Wilson, Pa.
Crosser, Ohio	Hoffman	Pittenger	Withrow
Crowther	Hollister	Plumley	Wolcott
Culkin	Hope	Powers	Wolfenden
Darrow	Hull	Ramspeck	Wolverton
Dirksen	Jacobsen	Ransley	Wood
Ditter	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, Ill.	Woodruff
Dondero	Kahn	Reed, N. Y.	Young
Doutrich	Keller	Rich	Zioncheck
Dunn, Pa.	Kimball	Robsion, Ky.	
Eaton	Kinzer	Rogers, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—31

Bacharach	Dietrich	McSwain	Romjue
Berlin	Dunn, Miss.	Mansfield	Somers, N. Y.
Binderup	Gambrill	Merritt, Conn.	Taylor, S. C.
Brown, Mich.	Gillette	Mitchell, Tenn.	Tinkham
Burch	Holmes	Montague	Underwood
Cannon, Wis.	Kennedy, Md.	Norton	Weaver
Cary	Lesinski	Ramsay	White
Cole, Md.	McDuffie	Reece	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Berlin (for) with Mr. Merritt of Connecticut (against).
Mr. Cole of Maryland (for) with Mr. Holmes (against).
Mr. Dietrich (for) with Mr. Reece (against).
Mr. Romjue (for) with Mr. Bacharach (against).
Mr. Cary (for) with Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin (against).
Mr. Somers of New York (for) with Mr. Tinkham (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Burch with Mr. Mitchell of Tennessee.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
Mr. McDuffie with Mr. White.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Montague.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Ramsay.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Robinson of Utah.
Mr. Taylor of South Carolina with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Binderup.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana, Mr. LUDLOW, and Mr. WEARIN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs upon the resolution as amended.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, on the adoption of the resolution I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 249, nays 147, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—249

Adair	Dockweiler	Kloeb	Reilly
Arnold	Dorsey	Kniffin	Richardson
Ashbrook	Doughton	Kocialkowski	Robertson
Ayers	Doxey	Kopplemann	Robinson, Utah
Barden	Drewry	Kramer	Rogers, N. H.
Beam	Driscoll	Lamneck	Rudd
Beiter	Driver	Lanham	Russell
Bell	Duffey, Ohio	Larrabee	Sabath
Biermann	Duffy, N. Y.	Lee, Okla.	Sadowski
Bland	Duncan	Lewis, Colo.	Sanders, La.
Blanton	Eagle	Lloyd	Sanders, Tex.
Bloom	Eckert	Lucas	Sandlin
Boehne	Edmiston	Luckey	Schaefer
Boland	Ellenbogen	McAndrews	Schuetz
Boylan	Evans	McClellan	Schulte
Brennan	Faddis	McCormack	Scott
Brooks	Farley	McGehee	Scrugham
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	McGrath	Sears
Brunner	Fiesinger	McGroarty	Secrest
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	McKeough	Shanley
Buck	Flannagan	McLaughlin	Sisson
Buckley, N. Y.	Fletcher	McReynolds	Smith, Conn.
Bulwinkle	Ford, Calif.	Mahon	Smith, Va.
Caldwell	Ford, Miss.	Maloney	Smith, Wash.
Cannon, Mo.	Frey	Mansfield	Smith, W. Va.
Carden	Fuller	Martin, Colo.	Snyder
Carmichael	Gasque	Mason	Somers, N. Y.
Carpenter	Gavagan	Massingale	South
Cartwright	Gildea	Maverick	Spence
Casey	Gingery	Mead	Stack
Celler	Goldsborough	Meeks	Starnes
Chandler	Granfield	Merritt, N. Y.	Steagall
Chapman	Gray, Pa.	Miller	Stubbs
Citron	Green	Mitchell, Ill.	Sullivan
Claiborne	Greenwood	Montet	Sumners, Tex.
Clark, Idaho	Greever	Murdock	Sutphin
Clark, N. C.	Gregory	Nelson	Taylor, Colo.
Cochran	Haines	Nichols	Terry
Coffee	Hamlin	O'Brien	Thom
Colden	Harlan	O'Connell	Thomason
Colmer	Hart	O'Connor	Thompson
Cooley	Harter	O'Day	Tolan
Cooper, Tenn.	Healey	O'Leary	Tonry
Corning	Hennings	Oliver	Turner
Costello	Higgins, Mass.	O'Neal	Umstead
Cox	Hill, Ala.	Owen	Utterback
Cravens	Hill, Samuel B.	Palmisano	Vinson, Ga.
Crosby	Hobbs	Parks	Vinson, Ky.
Cross, Tex.	Hook	Parsons	Walter
Crowe	Houston	Patman	Warren
Cullen	Huddleston	Patterson	Werner
Cummings	Igoe	Patton	West
Daly	Imhoff	Pearson	Whelchel
Darden	Jenckes, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.	Whittington
Dear	Johnson, Okla.	Peyser	Wilcox
Delaney	Johnson, Tex.	Pfeifer	Williams
Dempsey	Johnson, W. Va.	Pierce	Wilson, La.
DeRouen	Jones	Polk	Woodrum
Dickstein	Kee	Quinn	Zimmerman
Dies	Kelly	Rabaut	The Speaker
Dingell	Kennedy, N. Y.	Randolph	
Disney	Kenney	Rankin	
Dobbins	Kleberg	Rayburn	

NAYS—147

Allen	Eicher	Knutson	Robsion, Ky.
Amlie	Ekwall	Kvale	Rogers, Mass.
Andresen	Engel	Lambertson	Rogers, Okla.
Andrew, Mass.	Englebright	Lambeth	Ryan
Andrews, N. Y.	Fenerty	Lehlbach	Sauthoff
Arends	Ferguson	Lemke	Schneider
Bacon	Fish	Lord	Seger
Blackney	Focht	Ludlow	Shannon
Boileau	Fulmer	Lundeen	Short
Bolton	Gassaway	McFarlane	Sirovich
Brewster	Gearhart	McLean	Snell
Buckbee	Gehrmann	McLeod	Stefan
Buckler, Minn.	Gifford	Maas	Stewart
Burdick	Gilchrist	Mapes	Sweeney
Burnham	Goodwin	Marcantonio	Taber
Carlson	Gray, Ind.	Marshall	Tarver
Carter	Greenway	Martin, Mass.	Taylor, Tenn.
Castellow	Griswold	May	Thomas
Cavicchia	Guyer	Michener	Thurston
Christianson	Gwynne	Millard	Tobey
Church	Hancock, N. Y.	Monaghan	Treadway
Cole, N. Y.	Hancock, N. C.	Moran	Truax
Collins	Hartley	Moritz	Turpin
Connery	Hess	Mott	Wadsworth
Cooper, Ohio	Higgins, Conn.	O'Malley	Waligren
Crawford	Hildebrandt	Perkins	Wearin
Crosser, Ohio	Hoeppel	Peterson, Ga.	Wigglesworth
Crowther	Hoffman	Pettengill	Wilson, Pa.
Culkin	Hollister	Pittenger	Withrow
Darrow	Hope	Plumley	Wolcott
Deen	Hull	Powers	Wolfenden
Dirksen	Jacobsen	Ramspeck	Wolverton
Ditter	Jenkins, Ohio	Ransley	Wood
Dondero	Kahn	Reed, Ill.	Woodruff
Doutrich	Keller	Reed, N. Y.	Young
Dunn, Pa.	Kimball	Rich	Zioncheck
Eaton	Kinzer	Richards	

NOT VOTING—35

Bacharach	Dunn, Miss.	Lesinski	Reece
Berlin	Gambrill	McDuffie	Romjue
Binderup	Gillette	McMillan	Taylor, S. C.
Brown, Mich.	Hill, Knute	McSwain	Tinkham
Burch	Holmes	Merritt, Conn.	Underwood
Cannon, Wis.	Kennedy, Md.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Weaver
Cary	Kerr	Montague	Welch
Cole, Md.	Lea, Calif.	Norton	White
Dietrich	Lewis, Md.	Ramsay	

So the resolution was adopted.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Berlin (for) with Mr. Merritt of Connecticut (against).
Mr. Cole of Maryland (for) with Mr. Holmes (against).
Mr. Dietrich (for) with Mr. Reece (against).
Mr. Romjue (for) with Mr. Bacharach (against).
Mr. Cary (for) with Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin (against).
Mrs. Norton (for) with Mr. Tinkham (against).
Mr. Burch (for) with Mr. Gillette (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. McDuffie with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Binderup.
Mr. Mitchell of Tennessee with Mr. Knute Hill.
Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Ramsay.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Gambrill.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Taylor of South Carolina.
Mr. Walter with Mr. White.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called Mr. BYRNS' name, and he voted "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CARY, is unavoidably absent today and has requested me to announce that if he had been present he would have voted "yea" on the matter just presented.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years I have consistently voted for all appropriations of moneys for relief purposes, including those for public works and direct relief. I am today, however, voting against this measure before the House which comes to us under the misnomer of "making appropriations for relief purposes."

I will go as far as the President says is necessary in making appropriations to care for the unemployed and needy, but I will refuse to vote for any more measures that take from Congress the powers granted to it under the Constitution and rest them in the President and permit him to delegate the powers conferred on him under this joint resolution to any governmental agency, including a corporation, as provided for in section 4 thereof.

Let us analyze this legislation in a sane and sensible manner and not act too hastily on it. The resolution was introduced but 2 days ago. Brief and secret hearings of but 2 hours' duration were had on it. The witnesses who appeared before the committee were the Secretary of the Treasury, the Acting Budget Director, and the Chief of the Treasury's Procurement Division. No comprehensive plan for the spending of this huge sum to relieve unemployment was presented by any of these men. I recall that we were asked in June 1933 to appropriate $3,300,000,000 for a Public Works program under similar conditions. The wastes and delays that resulted from the uncoordinated and hastily planned projects of the C. W. A. have most certainly demonstrated the need for a carefully prepared plan on which to use the huge sum requested in the resolution. When the C. W. A. program was being carried on Mr. Hopkins, the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator, is quoted as saying:

> Some of our directors are incompetent, some of our projects are lousy, the whole thing is a flop, and I know it.

With that experience, are we going to rush into the appropriating of even more money without first planning its expenditure?

The first three sections of the resolution, with some minor changes, are acceptable to me, but I cannot and will not, as a representative of more than 290,000 people, who sent me here to legislate for them, vote for sections 4, 5, and 6,

and further delegate my constitutional duties and responsibilities as a Representative to an appointive public official.

Under section 4, paragraph (d), which reads as follows:

The President is authorized to postpone, but not beyond June 30, 1937, the termination of the existence of any existing governmental agency, including a corporation—

The Congress would delegate to the President the legislative power of continuing the operation of emergency set-ups in the Government, including the N. R. A., without any further action upon the part of either the House or the Senate. Rubber stamps, you say—why, it is far worse than that; it is a violation of our oath of office. If this measure passes in its present form, Congress may as well adjourn.

Under paragraph (e) of the same section, Congress proposes to authorize the President, in turn, to delegate the powers conferred upon him to any governmental agency, including a corporation, and, under section 6, it authorizes the President, or any governmental agency named by him, to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the resolution, and any violation of such rules and regulations shall be punishable by a fine of not to exceed $5,000, or imprisonment for not to exceed 2 years, or both. We would thus have a situation whereby an appointive governmental officer would be given a power vested in Congress under the Constitution, to prescribe rules and regulations which, in effect, would be laws, and under those rules and regulations to fine and sentence to the penitentiary any citizen who violated them, and this without even a trial.

We talk of Mussolini, Hitler, or Stalin as being dictators and having dictatorial powers. If this resolution becomes a law, Congress will have granted to the President, and his appointees, during the past 2 years, practically all of its constitutional powers, and may as well adjourn and go home.

Again I repeat that I will go as far as may be necessary in the appropriation of Federal moneys for relief purposes, but I refuse to violate my oath of office, and cravenly surrender the obligations imposed upon me by the Constitution as a Member of Congress.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. J. Res. 117) will turn over nominally to the President, but admittedly to Secretary Ickes, the Public Works Administrator, the sum of $4,000,000,000 to be disbursed in such manner as seems to him most desirable. It will, of course, be an abdication of the legislative power of Congress and in violation of the Constitution. Not a Member of this House will have any voice or influence as to where this money goes or as to how it is expended. The combined experience of the Members of the House is thrown into the discard and a political marplot will be in the driver's seat. Congress will again become the laughing-stock of the country and Honest Harold will continue to give Members of Congress the toe of his boot when they attempt to obtain public improvements for their sections.

Ickes has wasted several billions of the people's money. He has tied up a vast sum in projects which in their very nature defeat unemployment relief. To hear him tell it, he is the only honest man in the history of the American Government. He writes off Congress in the public press, charging it with being a pork-seeking group. In one year he has allocated more to rivers and harbors than Congress did in a hundred years. In one year he has done more to destroy the American farmer by unsound reclamation projects, which Congress has repeatedly turned down, than Congress has allowed for that purpose in a hundred years. He says without qualification that honesty in the Government service began when he entered public life. In the same breath he perpetrates a deliberate fraud on the Congress and the country when he writes down the Grand Coulee project as power when in fact it is reclamation. This project was rejected by Congress or its committees on several occasions, and was then placed in work by Honest Harold. While the country is plowing crops under, this gentleman is bringing 1,200,000 new acres into production at a cost of $100,000,000. This against the protest of the National Grange and the technicians of the Agricultural Department. Congress repeatedly turned down Casper Alcova, a Wyoming reclamation project, but Honest Harold at one fell stroke of the pen put this project into work.

Honest Harold will spend $50,000,000 at Fort Peck Reservoir in Montana. I am creditably advised that it will take 7 years to fill this reservoir. Few Members of Congress ever heard of it. Honest Harold says that he is as "pure as the driven snow", and to demonstrate that and the imperfections of others, he maintains an elaborate espionage system on Cabinet officers and Members of Congress. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] stated the other day that Honest Harold is the most hated and despised man connected with the Government at the present time. I agree with the gentleman and desire to add that Honest Harold has fully demonstrated that he is entirely without the necessary training and experience to erect a sizable gasoline filling station.

"Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." No more perfect evidence of this could be found than in Honest Harold's attempt to dictate to the people of the city of New York how they should run their affairs. Recently an order was entered which forbade any man in the municipal service from being connected with any part of the Public Works program. This is, of course, a definite invasion of local government. It throws into the discard the technicians and engineers who have studied local problems through the years.

However, the sole purpose of this order was to drive Park Commissioner Robert Moses off the Tri-Borough Bridge Commission where $42,000,000 are being expended for a bridge at New York City. Honest Harold has done many stupid things. Time will tell whether or not some of them are venal and whether he deserves the self-inflicted appellation of Honest Harold. But nothing he has done is so thoroughly contemptible as his invasion of the autonomy of New York City.

Who is Robert Moses? He is a career man, who has devoted his entire life to the public service. When Governor Smith reorganized the government of New York and established the budget system his right arm was this same Robert Moses. He wrote the statutes that made for efficient government. He then came into charge of the park system of New York State. His achievements in that field were epoch making. When Mayor LaGuardia appointed his cabinet he made Robert Moses park commissioner. The construction of a great metropolitan bridge such as the Tri-Borough involves the coordination of parkways and avenues. Robert Moses was appointed to the Tri-Borough Bridge authority and has served there with distinction and ability. He has created parks and bathing pools in the congested sections of New York. He beautified the existing parks, and his work in this respect was recognized as being most extraordinary. It was all done without additional expense to the taxpayer.

Last fall he was nominated for Governor on the Republican ticket. Millions of the people's money were poured into New York to defeat him. In the campaign his spear knew no brother. One of his targets was Jim Farley. Candidate Moses had no illusions about "Big Jim." On Saturday, November 3, at the city of New York, he made the following statement concerning him:

For some reason I always think of geology when I think of Jim Farley. You begin with rock or granite. That's the basic thing his head is made of. The granite breaks up and forms sand or gravel. This, in turn, is glued together to make sandstone, bricks, and other materials, and, lo and behold! you have Sandbag Jim Farley of the Builders Supply Corporation and National and State Democratic Committees, and last, and by all means least, the United States Postoffice Department.

What a lad! He arrives here, like John the Baptist, in a camel's-hair overcoat, announcing the coming of the political savior from Washington—a voice crying out in the wilderness of the Hudson River brick sheds and echoing through the valleys and up the hills of the State.

And, still speaking of geology, he reminds me of those glacial streams which meander, in a tortuous course, through the valleys and cover all the plains with the wreckage, the muck, and filth of dirty politics, patronage, and graft.

On October 19, in an interview published in the New York Times, emphasizing a former statement that Farley was the "bag man" of the administration, Moses stated:

It is no answer to my statements to say that Jim Farley's firm only got a fraction of the building contracts. Everyone knows that the General Builders Supply people control most of the building materials in this community outside of gravel, sand, and trap rock, and that they have intimate relations with the people who control that branch. The General Builders Supply is a good deal of a racket. If you plan to build anything, you play with them, or you don't build.

Robert Moses served as secretary of state, by appointment of Governor Smith. Speaking on that subject, Candidate Moses said among other things:

I had him (Farley) on the athletic commission when I was secretary of state and I had so little confidence in him that I sent for the three commissioners and said that any question on which they are not unanimous would be decided by me. That's what I thought of Jim Farley. Farley must be describing himself when he talks about ghouls in American politics, because if there ever was a figure to be associated with the decay and death of the principles upon which this Government rests, it is James A. Farley.

It is clear that these references to the Postmaster General stung him deeply. It is equally clear that the present order which Honest Harold issued in regard to Robert Moses was issued at the behest, and perhaps the command, of Farley. At the beginning of this administration, the underground was that Farley and Ickes did not hit it off. This rift between these two formidable characters has completely disappeared and we now find Ickes, who maligns the men who shed their blood on the battlefields of the Revolutionary and Civil Wars by stating that patriotism in America began with him, in the camp of genial Jim. What a spectacle! May I state in addition, that this type of technique is thoroughly "Farleyan." Through the now submissive Ickes, Farley is driving Robert Moses out of public life so far as he can accomplish it. He is doing this against the united protests of 147 civic and business organizations in the city of New York who have protested in thunder tones against this invasion of local self-government. Irrespective of party and without regard to station, from the newsboy to the magnate, the citizens of New York are up in arms against this outrageous performance.

Hand this $4,000,000,000 to Honest Harold and every section of the country will be subject to the coercion of the mugwumpian Ickes and the nimble Farley. Incidentally, and repeating what I said before on the floor of the House, in doing this you are laying the foundation of a fascism where there will be no personal liberty and no Congressmen. In the beginning, this was the way Mussolini and Hitler wrote off popular government. In Italy and Germany today there is neither parliamentary body nor free press.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the rule and will vote for House Joint Resolution 117 because I am convinced that great good will result to the American people, including the citizens of my district, from the expenditure of the funds thereby provided—$4,880,000,000—to enable President Roosevelt to carry forward his work relief program.

I am particularly gratified that Rear Admiral Christian J. Peoples, director, Procurement Division, United States Treasury Department, in his testimony at the hearing before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, emphasized the fact that probably no other type of necessary Public Works expenditures will show a greater proportion for labor than that embraced in Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Works, of which there are a number of very worthy and meritorious projects pending and contemplated in southwest Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of flood control, which has heretofore been confined principally to the Mississippi and Sacramento Valleys, has become Nation-wide. During the past 2 years very disastrous floods resulting in vast loss of property running into many millions of dollars and some loss of life have occurred in almost every State. In order that we may realize more fully the scope and magnitude of the problem we have to deal with, I am going to call attention to the following list of flood disasters compiled from United States Army Engineer and Red Cross sources:

Floods in United States, 1932–34

Date	Place	Buildings destroyed or damaged	Persons— Killed	Persons— Injured	Persons— Assisted
1932					
July 1–6	Southwest Texas	712	6	2	2,428
July 3	Coleman County, Tex	106	1		900
July 4–11	Clay, Fayette, Kanawha Counties, W. Va.	1,564	18	5	2,835
July 5	Coffee, Lyon Counties, Kans				315
July 6	Nogales, Ariz	66		1	181
July 8	Alcorn County, Miss				738
August 3	Fayette, Jessamine Counties, Ky.	119	6		1,535
August 15–16	Cherokee, Okla	530	2	8	666
September–October.	Rio Grande River, Tex	816	32	6	5,263
November 6–7	Everglades, Fla				6,669
December 17–26	Pearl River, Miss	20			994
December 27	Rome, Ga				200
December 30	North Montgomery, Ala				375
1933					
January 27	Port Norris, N. J				600
March 3	Mayaguez, P. R	144	19	3	7,372
March–April	Ohio River Valley	5,588	4	16	25,800
Do	Cedar River, Iowa	165			650
April–May	Tallahatchie River, Miss	476			3,270
Do	Arkansas-Illinois				3,580
May–June	Ohio River Valley	370			2,202
June 13	Kelso, Cowlitz County, Wash				1,060
June 25	Bonner's Ferry, Boundary County, Idaho.	50			300
July 7	Bear Creek Canyon, Colo	90	3	15	290
July 27–30	Northwest Louisiana	835			7,170
August 23–24	Delaware, Lehigh, Montgomery, and Philadelphia Counties, Pa.	83			940
August 23	York County, Pa	754			1,600
September 16	Westfield, Mass				44
September 16–17	Luzerne County, Pa		2		89
December 16–31	Pacific Northwest	2,445	9	5	10,600
December 31	Los Angeles County, Calif	886	44	150	3,300
1934					
April 4–5	Western Oklahoma	153	17		250
April 19	Northwest Wisconsin				
June 3	Heppner, Oreg				370
December 7–8	Sioux City, Woodbury County, Iowa.	293			2,065

SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON FLOOD, DECEMBER 1933

According to official advices from Brig. Gen. George B. Pillsbury, Assistant Chief of United States Army Engineers, under date of November 28, 1934, the damages caused by the floods of December 1933 were as follows:

Cowlitz River Basin	$3,340,000
Lewis River Basin	645,000
Lower Columbia River	450,000
Chehalis River	300,000
Crooked, Grays, and Deep Rivers	31,000
Deschutes River	9,000
Humptulips River	7,000

FEDERAL AID SECURED

We succeeded in obtaining through Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, funds for repair work, which was the first aid ever extended to our district by the Federal Government, as follows:

Clark County

Expended for labor	$13,857.55
Expended for material	51.15
Expended for equipment	564.60
Total C. W. A. expenditures	14,473.30
Total expended on project	14,773.30

Number of men employed, 200.

Cowlitz County

Expended for labor	$63,193.05
Expended for material	55,005.36
Expended for equipment	3,197.68
Total C. W. A. expenditures	121,396.09
Total expended on project	121,396.09

Number of men employed, 1,833.

Grays Harbor County

Expended for labor	$19,851.80
Expended for material	4,650.00
Total C. W. A. expenditures	24,501.80
Total expended on project	24,501.80

Number of men employed, 482.

Lewis County

Expended for labor	$31,088.80
Expended for material	1,485.36
Total C. W. A. expenditures	32,574.16
Total expended on project	33,124.02

Number of men employed, 775.

Mason County

Expended for labor	$14,782.65
Expended for material	556.40
Total C. W. A. expenditures	15,339.05
Total expended on project	15,625.65

Number of men employed, 218.

Pacific County

Expended for labor	$11,910.57
Total C. W. A. expenditures	11,910.57
Total expended on project	11,910.57

Number of men employed, 267.

Skamania County

Expended for labor	$10,991.18
Expended for material	181.60
Expended for equipment	22.50
Total C. W. A. expenditures	11,195.28
Total expended on project	11,360.28

Number of men employed, 350.

Thurston County

Expended for labor	$16,564.55
Expended for material	1,494.94
Total C. W. A. expenditures	18,059.49
Total expended on project	19,415.39

Number of men employed, 437.

Wahkiakum County

Expended for labor	$5,550.00
Expended for material	1,000.05
Total C. W. A. expenditures	6,550.05
Total expended on project	6,550.05

Number of men employed, 215.

Recapitulation

Expended for labor	$187,790.15
Expended for material	64,424.89
Expended for equipment	3,784.78
Total C. W. A. expenditures	255,999.82
Total expended on projects	255,657.15

Number of men employed, 4,777.

LEGISLATION FOR SURVEYS PASSED

We also succeeded in securing the passage through Congress of Public Laws Nos. 336, 337, 338, and 339, to provide preliminary examinations of the Cowlitz, Chehalis, Lewis, and Columbia Rivers and their tributaries with a view to the control of their floods, which is the first legislation of this character affecting the rivers of southwest Washington which has ever been enacted. These preliminary examinations are now being made by the United States Army Engineers, and under date of December 22, 1934, I was notified by Maj. Gen. E. M. Markham, Chief of Engineers, United States Army Engineers, in regard to their present status as follows:

The district engineer at Seattle, Wash., has reported that his report on preliminary examination of Chehalis River will be ready for submission to the division engineer at Portland, Oreg., about April 1, 1935. The district engineer at Portland will submit his reports on investigations of the Lewis, Cowlitz, and Columbia Rivers, to the division engineer at Portland, about February 25. The reports of the district and division engineers, when received in this office, must be reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, prior to their transmission to Congress by the Secretary of War, with my recommendations. I may assure you that the reports will be expedited in every way consistent with their proper study.

FLOODS DURING PAST 30 YEARS

Floods have occurred recurrently in southwest Washington every few years during the past 30 years. The reports of the United States Army Engineers show the following flood records:

COWLITZ RIVER

During the past 25 years eight floods of a damaging nature have occurred in the Cowlitz Basin.

Under date of November 16, 1906, the Portland Oregonian stated that the flood at that time was the highest known, the river at Kelso reaching a stage of 20.5 feet above low water. This account undoubtedly had reference to the highest known Cowlitz River flood, as the Columbia River flood of 1894 probably exceeded this height at Kelso.

Cowlitz River floods of a damaging nature occurred in 1906, 1909, 1911, 1912, 1918, 1923—when Longview Bridge was washed out—1927, 1928.

The flood of 1906 was very destructive. In the Kelso vicinity it caused damages to an estimated extent of $50,000, including the loss of the drawspan of the highway bridge over the river at that locality. At Castle Rock the same flood cut a new channel through the low peninsula upon which a portion of the town is situated, destroying a number of residences on the lowlands of the town, and also washed away about 150 acres of land bordering the stream above. The total amount of damages in the vicinity was $60,000. Floods of other years have caused loss of land from erosion at a number of localities, loss of fences bordering the stream, carrying away of log booms, and so forth. The yearly losses have never been less than $5,000.

Three means might be made available for protecting Cowlitz Valley lands from loss from Cowlitz River floods. These are: First, detention reservoirs; second, reservoirs for power and flood control combined; third, levees, bank protection, and channel clearing, straightening, and deepening.

As organizations within counties for protective purposes are practicable, there appears to be no reasons for removing the solution of problems of Cowlitz River flood control from local hands. The Federal Government is not considered justified in bearing a part of the cost of such works (Dec. 11, 1930).

LEWIS RIVER

The Lewis River floods, of a more or less damaging nature, occur practically every winter; during some years two or more damaging floods have occurred.

Flood conditions on the bottom lands along Lewis River below Woodland have resulted in damages to crops and farm property by submergence, to business by interruption of traffic, and to the public well-being by closing of schools and discomfort in living conditions.

Levees at higher grade and storage dams recommended as protective measures.

Bearing of any part of the cost of works for flood control on Lewis River, either storage or levees, by the Federal Government is not considered justified (Dec. 13, 1930).

COLUMBIA RIVER

The flood of 1894 was one of the greatest on record, severe floods occurring every 3 to 4 years.

1923: Higher levees considered as most suitable method for protection of lands in flooded areas.

While flood protection of the lowlands along the tidal section of Columbia River is a matter of concern to the owners and cultivators of the land and of importance to the States of Oregon and Washington through affording means of augmenting the assets of those States, national interest justifying expenditure of funds of the general public in works for flood control or protection of these lands is not present. This case is unlike that of the lower Mississippi Valley, where the area of land subject to overflow is enormous, occurring in many States, and where works of flood protection in one State have adversely affected the conditions in another.

In the lower Columbia case both Oregon and Washington and their citizens can proceed with flood-control plans without fear of adverse effects produced by or in the other State. Nor does the fact that the waters of the lower Columbia come from several States constitute a reason why the general Government should participate in the cost of flood control in the tidal section of the river. No upstream State or agency will, in connection with river flow or works, take action adversely affecting the right of the lowlands in the lower river. On the other hand, some benefits, as stated, may flow from power development and irrigation in the upper river (Mar. 29, 1932).

CHEHALIS RIVER

The most severe flood of record occurred in November 1909. Other floods came in December 1891, 1892, 1897, 1903, March 21, 1908, January 1914, December 21, 1915, 1917, and January 1923. In other words, floods have occurred at the rate of one every 4 years.

The flood of 1897 cut a channel through a farm between Oakville and Porter, and made travel by road difficult for almost 2 months. The flood of November 1909 washed out a 90-foot section of the right-of-way of the Northern Pacific

Railroad between Montesano and Cosmopolis and submerged the rails in other places by 2½ feet.

The area now submerged at high stages of the river could be protected by levees and dredging.

Protection of land by diking is possible but is of purely local interest and Federal participation is not warranted (Dec. 9, 1931).

PROPOSED FEDERAL WATERWAYS PROGRAM

Secretary of War George H. Dern has recently announced a huge waterways program for future work calling for the expenditure of $8,000,000,000 on 1,600 projects, "if and when approved", to carry out "navigation and flood-control improvements which will be of continuing benefit to the economic life of the Nation." Three flood-control projects in southwest Washington are listed as meritorious, to wit:

Lewis River, north fork of Lewis River above Woodland, $240,000 for 4 miles of bank protection and channel clearing for flood control and prevention of erosion, 3,000 acres.

Cowlitz River, Cowlitz River from Kelso to Toledo, $120,000 for reconstruction of damaged bank-protection works for immediate flood relief in Castle Rock section, if the combined system of five reservoirs is not built.

Cowlitz River, Big Bottom area, $869,000 for channel improvement to protect 8,900 acres.

VIEWPOINT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

In a discussion of the subject of economic justification for Federal participation in flood control, Lt. Col. Thomas M. Robins, division engineer Pacific coast division, United States Board of Army Engineers, before the Northwest Rivers and Harbors Congress at Seattle, Wash., on October 12, 1934, said:

In the case of flood control it is well recognized by the Government generally that the special interest of the locality in its own protection is fundamental, and there can be no general benefit unless a national concern has been brought about through interruption of mail and interruption of trade and commerce generally, great loss of life, or some other situation which affects the prosperity of the whole Nation. In general it might be said that the amount of general benefit in flood control in any one case depends to a large extent on the damage done. Colonel Hanson touched a little bit on what has been done for the Mississippi Valley and the Sacramento Valley, and I should like to add just a word. I know you folks think they have gotten a lot of money, but the Mississippi Valley is one-third of the United States, and the Sacramento and San Joaquin are just as long as the Mississippi Valley from Cairo to the Gulf. So you have got to have pretty wide-spread flood-control problems before you begin to talk in figures the same as the Mississippi Valley.

Colonel Robins, in an address delivered a month previous at a meeting of the Lower Columbia Chambers of Commerce, held at Clatskanie, Oreg., pointed out that the Federal Government was absolutely opposed to assuming the burden of both construction and maintenance of dikes. Such a policy would necessitate the expenditure of $5,000,000,000 solely for the tributaries of the Mississippi, it has been shown by requests made from these tributaries.

He held out the possibility that the Federal Government might agree to repair and build dikes, providing local communities cooperated in the original cost and agreed to bear the full burden of maintenance. The present policy of the Federal Government, as exemplified in such projects as the Sacramento River project, has been to make local communities bear a good proportion of the original cost and all the cost of maintenance, Colonel Robins said. Local communities are also required to furnish the rights to land needed for the dike construction, he added.

The matter of local cooperation in financing dike and flood-control work should be considered now while the preliminary report of flood-control needs is being assembled, Colonel Robins pointed out. He also pointed out the vital importance of making the preliminary report as complete and as accurate as possible so that there might be no delay in getting the project before Congress.

One of the things to be considered in assembling information for the preliminary flood-control report and in seeking the project's approval is the necessity of proving that the average annual damages resulting from floods will exceed the average annual cost of protection. Once that is proved, the problem of determining who will pay for that protection can be argued. The preliminary examination of the need for flood control is under way at present and is really a local responsibility, Colonel Robins told his audience.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to sketch in concrete form an outline of the history of flood control in southwest Washington and its status at the present time. I will conclude my remarks by repeating substantially what I stated in my address delivered before the Northwest Rivers and Harbors Congress at Seattle, Wash., on October 12, 1934.

The Federal Government in the past has taken the position that as far as our flood-control problem in the State of Washington was concerned, it was a local problem for local communities. The Federal Government has always refused to render any aid. In December 1933, when we had the flood, it was the first time we ever succeeded in obtaining any financial aid from the Federal Government, and it was important, of course, because it resulted in a lot of repair work being done that was valuable and gave employment. But, in my opinion, it was more important because of the precedent it established. For the first time the Federal Government recognized that we have a flood-control problem in the State of Washington as well as along the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers. As a result, as we have already noted, we were able to secure the passage through Congress of bills for preliminary surveys of the main rivers and their tributaries in the States of Washington and Oregon. I introduced a bill relating to the Columbia River which was amended to include Oregon. That survey is now being conducted. Similar bills were passed, favored by the Flood Control Committee of the House, signed by the President and became the law of the land, for preliminary examinations of the Lewis, Cowlitz, and Chehalis Rivers, which will soon be completed. These are the first bills for preliminary examinations in regard to flood control that have ever been passed by the United States Congress affecting the rivers in the State of Washington and in the State of Oregon; so, I feel, we are making real progress. Now we are in the picture; and when this national program is carried out, which it will be in the very near future, as that legislation will come before Congress early in the present session, it is going to result in our obtaining protective measures in the Pacific Northwest against floods in the future and against soil erosion. However, we cannot expect the Federal Government to assume the entire cost, as it has not done that along the Mississippi or Sacramento Rivers, as Colonel Robins declared, but I think we will find in many communities that by constructing the dykes, by constructing tide boxes, by building roads and bridges, and making other improvements, we have already made a valuable contribution and the Federal Government will more than match our expenditures, in order that after a delay of 30 years without any action being taken, the property and lives of our citizens will be protected.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the gentlemen on the other side of the House are not straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

They all proclaim most fiercely that they are in favor of spending the four billion called for in the resolution, or even a greater amount, if by so doing they can aid in pulling the Nation out of the morass of depression into which they, when in power, permitted it to sink.

How many of these copious weepers of crocodile tears will vote for this joint resolution in the end I do not know; but I do know that, whether they vote "yes" or "no", the Democratic majority is going to pass this measure and give to President Roosevelt the authority to take three or four millions of able-bodied Americans off the relief rolls and put them on pay rolls in the doing of useful work on wealth-creating projects.

The gnat these gentlemen are straining at is the method we are employing to bring about this highly desirable end. The camel they are willing to swallow is the $4,000,000,000 sum.

The Democratic majority is in sympathy with President Roosevelt's objective. Because of their unbounded confidence in him, they are willing—he being the Executive charged with the doing of this great job—to trust him to

do it in the most expeditious manner and without the red-tape and other time-wasting restrictions that the earmarking of the funds would entail.

For that reason, gentlemen, and because I am convinced that the people of this great Nation have full confidence in their President, I am going to vote for House Joint Resolution 117, and I hope that every good Democrat and every fair-minded member of the minority will do likewise and thus tell the people throughout the land in clear and unmistakable terms that we have confidence in their judgment in selecting President Roosevelt to lead them out of this morass of depression, back to a saner and safer way of life in America.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, with great interest I have listened to the arguments presented for and against House Joint Resolution 117, and at the beginning of my remarks I wish to emphatically state that I am in favor of relief measures; that I prefer to have all relief extended by the Federal Government to flow to the recipients thereof through the payment for work which they perform rather than through some kind of a dole, and, that insofar as is possible, this assistance be given to our people quickly so as to bring into constructive work as far as is possible the millions of idle people scattered throughout the land today. At the same time, however, as a practical operator who understands what is involved in the operation of farms, mines, factories, banks, and transportation lines, both rail and highway, I have some comprehension of the difficulty there will be in placing two or three or four or five millions of workers in productive activity within a few months or even within 2 or 3 or 4 years.

No one man living is powerful enough, without staggering waste and inefficiency and graft and racketeering, to go out and plan and put into operation the works necessary for the consumption of four and one-half to five billions of dollars. Do the proponents of this legislation now come to us and recommend that we attempt to change the laws of economics, defy the sound and fundamental forces of natural law, and reverse the procedure followed by all sound economics through having us appropriate in one lump sum almost $5,000,000,000 of the future earning power of this country and all without a plan of procedure or a single project being proposed other than that four or five billion dollars be handed over to the Chief Executive without check or balance, without any plan, without any appropriation of Congress being made for any specific job, without the people of our country, who must provide this money, having any right to say, through their chosen Representatives, one single thing about what job and where the money shall be spent? That appears to me to be the situation. Furthermore, it would appear to me that through this bill it is being proposed to draw away from those of our people who are unable to secure work in any form that subsistence which has been heretofore provided by the Federal Government for their food and clothing and shelter during this time of need. Let me emphasize again that I prefer that all Federal assistance be given to our needy through work rather than through dole, but when Federal Government, through its many bureaus, so interferes with private industry that people cannot secure work, then I do not propose to add my vote to the passing of a bill which will take the food out of the mouths of our hungry people and let them starve when they cannot secure work and while bureaucrats sit up nights trying to devise more and more plans for the further interference by centralized Government with private initiative and enterprises and while those same bureau administrators design hour by hour and day by day more and more legislation, which, when passed into law, further convinces our people that there will be more and more Government competition with private enterprises in all the industrial and economic walks of life.

I ask, What are the unemployed to do while the process of closing private industry takes place through the fear of Government competition and the swinging into line of all the Government action which will be necessary to take over and provide work for the millions of workers now out of work and who will yet be thrown out of work as private industry closes shop? Shall we let those unfortunate people starve, as is proposed in this bill, through the taking away of the direct relief which this administration has heretofore led the people to expect and take for granted? I submit to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that Government is not big and powerful enough, even if we appropriated 10 times the amount called for by this bill, to replace the private and individual enterprise of our people and thus provide work for their daily activities. There is no bureau or combination of bureaus that can be created by this House. There is no sum of money within the realms of reason that can be voted by this House. There is no plan of action that can be designed by the administrators of an act of this nature that can be comprehensive enough to care for the needs of our people. This country has not developed in a manner which will permit centralized government to replace private industry to the extent here proposed when we take into consideration the destructive influences which must necessarily follow the putting into operation of this kind of an act.

On the introduction of this bill the industries of our country have been served notice that they may expect any kind and every kind of Government competition that can be devised by bureaus and commissions and agencies. The skilled laborers of this country have had notice served on them that a precedent is being established through governmental procedure to reduce their wages to around $50 per month, and this because it is always the custom of private enterprise to bargain for labor as it bargains for any other commodity that is offered on the market, and this I do not agree with at all, but that does not alter the fact. Emphatically I wish to state that I have preached in public and in private life and practiced in private life that labor should be paid on the basis of production and not on the basis of mere subsistence merely because the laborer could not help himself in time of dire distress. I wish to ask how governmental planning commissions expect to go out and spend within a year or 2 years $4,000,000,000 on public works, road construction, and other activities mentioned so briefly in this bill without at the same time setting the wage scale for all industry in that line of work at or about the scale paid for by governmental activity? Who will answer to labor for the destructive influences the administration of this bill will undoubtedly put into operation? To merely say that this bill, providing $50 per month for labor, is better than nothing or better than a dole, is beside the question. That answer does not suffice. So long as Government carries on a program of this kind, just so long our people with money to invest will sit back and watch governmental performance and thus let centralized government carry the load and ultimately fail in its undertakings.

Therefore, it is not reasonable for us to assume that these people are in position to legislate in the interest of the people with whom they have no direct contact such as is maintained by the Members of this House with the people who sent them here.

In conclusion let me make the observation that if you desire to carry on a war of destruction on the battlefield you need powder and bullets and gas and then you need men to use these destructive agencies through and against. If you desire to carry on an economic war you need goods to hurl into the camp of your enemy at a price to the consumer which he cannot afford to hesitate in accepting to the end that you drive your opponent out of the field. In a political war it has been found that dollars are pretty good bullets and I am not unmindful of the way public funds were used in the last election and I shall not overlook, in the consideration of this bill, the power these "dollar-bullets" provided for may have in the 1936 election, for certainly it is not proposed to have this spending spree under way to any great extent before that time. There can be no justification on any ground for this amount of money to be appropriated by this Congress to any department of the Government without specific checks and balances. Four or five billions of dollars will not put five to ten millions of

workers back to work and it is reasonable to assume this vast sum of money will not meet the issue that is before our people today—that issue is to find a remunerative job for the 11 millions of workers who walk the streets today looking for the right to earn a decent living and thus create a market for the labor of more than 30 millions of farm folks who are entitled to fair wages for the work they sell in the form of the farm crops placed on the American market.

Furthermore, I am opposed to this bill because I believe it is unconstitutional for Congress to delegate such sweeping and unquestioned and unchecked powers to the Chief Executive. No man is a god and no mortal man has the power to carry on with equity the far-reaching duties delegated under this act. The responsibility goes far beyond that any man should be permitted to assume in the administration of the affairs of a race of people carrying the intelligence, resourcefulness, and private initiative such as that possessed by the people of this great country of ours. It is morally wrong and legally unconstitutional for us to rob our people of their rights in this matter and I for one am willing to stake my support for this statement on the answer which time will give. The vote of the people of my district (the eighth) of Michigan did not give me the authority to vote in favor of such a bill and I am willing to go back to them for their answer as to whether or not they intended that I come here and give away the power of this body, to come here and vote for the entry of Government into competition with their individual enterprises back home, to come here and vote away the relief direct or indirect which they have been led by this administration to take for granted, to come here and set up a scale for skilled laborers of no more than $50 per month, to come here and by my vote in favor of this bill say that I desire wages to be set on a mere subsistence basis to the end that the farmers of my district will not be able to sell their labor in the form of farm goods for more than a pittance and to come here and vote for a bill which will call for a further reduction in the farm crops of my district because private industry is interfered with and industrial workers are set a wage scale which will not permit them to buy and consume the goods from American farms.

Again, I cannot favor a bill which creates bureaus and gives them the power to make rules and regulations which have for the average citizen, the force of law. To me this is something more than the mere shift of legislative duties from where they belong to the executive branch of the Government. I do not believe that is right. It is my understanding that the executive branch of our Government has more than 700,000 employees and that of this staggering number only one—the President—is elected by the people.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, during my service in Congress I have never knowingly voted for a gag rule of any kind whatsoever.

The leaders of the Democratic Party in my section of the country have preached for more than a third of a century the iniquity of Republican gag rules. To me the iniquity of these rules becomes more iniquitous, if that is possible, when practiced by Democrats.

Mr. KNUTE HILL, a Democrat from the State of Washington, put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11, 1934, the following quotation from a speech of Franklin D. Roosevelt made while he was Governor of New York State:

> There are three ways of defeating proposed legislation. One is the method followed in the early days of our Republic, and which most truly conforms to the correct practice of a democracy. This is consideration of each proposal in open session and serious debate, in an open-minded and nonpartisan spirit and with a sincere desire to weigh its merits. If it is found inadvisable or unwise, it is then slain after a fair and open battle, and the reasons for such action are open for all the voters to examine and judge for themselves. This is the way in which all bills of real importance which have been shown any considerable approval and support by the voters of the State should be treated.
>
> The second method is by the lash of the party whip, the demand on the legislators by their party leaders that they divide according to their political affiliations and leave to the master minds of their organizations the responsibility as to whether such action is justified or not. In this procedure the bill, when brought up for discussion, is foredoomed to failure, and all debates thereon are of a purely perfunctory nature; nor can any argument of reasoning change the final vote. There is no possible justification for the adoption of this course on bills which are avowedly nonpartisan in character.

The third method, as given by Mr. Roosevelt in the same speech, is:

> Then, there is the third method of killing legislation by secret strangulation, known more politely as "killing a bill in committee." If it is a measure that commands considerable support, or if it is a measure the principle of which no party would dare openly oppose, it is given a mock hearing or no hearing at all. The committee which holds the power of life or death over the measure solemnly meets and behind closed doors and for reasons best known to themselves proceeds, by a vote of its majority * * * to refuse to report the measure for open discussion and debate. * * * This is the most objectionable and least defensible method of defeating legislation of any importance that could well be conceived.

Now let me quote from the founder of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson:

> If Members of Congress are to know nothing but what is important enough to be put into a public message, and indifferent enough to be made known to all the world; if the Executive is to keep all other information to himself and the House to plunge on in the dark, it becomes a government of chance and not of design.

From my observations, I have reached the conclusion that this evil of "gag" rules is being made use of in recent Congresses because the so-called "leaders" lack the intestinal fortitude required to bring their measures out in "a fair and open battle", as suggested by Mr. Roosevelt. Hence, they resort to the despicable rules of former Republican Congresses, the rules which have brought the Republican Party into disrepute all over the United States. We hear it said by every weak leader of the majority, to the minority, "You did this." The inference is that, the Republican Party having done a wrong, we are justified in continuing that wrong. Let me say to these benighted pretended followers of Jefferson what he said on the subject:

> It is more honorable to repair a wrong than to persist in it.

I urge that we cease persisting in Republican wrongs.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, humane considerations alone prompt me to vote for this combined relief and public-works bill. I am for relief for those in distress, and I am against great outlays for public works. I shall vote for this bill because if I were to vote against it I would be voting to cut off relief from the hungry, cold, and naked, thousands upon thousands of whom would be subjected to untold suffering in the dead of winter if this bill should fail. I am looking to our unfortunate fellow citizens who are on the verge of starvation and who have to have temporary assistance when I vote "aye" on the passage of this bill. If they were out of the picture, if their interests were not on my heart, paramount to all things else, I would vote "no."

This bill has two distinct provisions. One provision appropriates $880,000,000 to continue the relief to distressed humanity that is immediately and imperatively necessary. The other provision appropriates $4,000,000,000 for a vast new program of public works. I am for the first provision and I am against the latter. I want to vote to accept one and to reject the other. The gag rule prevents me from doing this. The gag rule ties the two propositions together inseparably. I must vote to accept both or to reject both, such being the peculiar pernicious effect of the gag rule. I opposed the gag rule in caucus and in the House in order that we might be able to divide the bill into its substantive parts and vote on them separately, but in common with others who thought as I do I was voted down and my hands were tied.

I am required, therefore, to decide on one of two alternatives. Either I must vote to let thousands of our people suffer from starvation, nakedness, and lack of fuel in midwinter, or I must vote for the bill as a whole, and I shall do the latter, because humane considerations will not allow me to do anything else.

In my opinion we should have been allowed separate votes, at least on these two propositions—immediate relief and public works. I think we also should have had a bill of particulars showing what the $4,000,000,000 fund is to be used for, so that as Representatives, coming direct from the people, we might have had a chance to vote on the

merits of the various items that will enter into the expenditure of that stupendous sum. With all good wishes for our great Executive, I believe that Congress, in order to promote the national weal, should do its own legislating and should not "pass the buck" to the President, as it has so often done. I believe that, with the worst of the emergency over, it should begin to recapture the powers it has abdicated. I do not believe that the branch of the Congress that is charged with responsibility of controlling the purse strings should vote colossal sums en bloc without having some chart or explanation showing what the money is to be spent for.

I supported the various parliamentary moves which, if they had succeeded, would have separated the fund for direct relief from the public works appropriation, because I wanted to vote for the former and against the latter. To break off Federal relief in the dead of winter would be dreadful and unthinkable. It would mean that thousands upon thousands of our fellow citizens would die of starvation, cold, and nakedness, and that there would be widespread suffering on a national scale, because local relief agencies would not be organized or able to take over the load on sudden notice. At the same time I do not think the proposed vast public works program should be adopted.

When I asked recently how many persons had been put to work as a result of the $3,300,000,000 former public-works program, the personnel director of the Public Works Administration gave the number as less than 900,000. At this rate it would require an expenditure of about $44,000,000,000 to give temporary synthetic employment to the 11,000,000 persons now out of work. This, in my judgment, shows the absolute futility and utter hopelessness of the public-works program as a means of solid national recovery.

Mr. Speaker, in this great Republic of ours one of the privileges inherited by every citizen, however humble in the walks of life, is the privilege of writing, as the spirit moves him, to the President of the United States on the state of the Union.

Exercising this cherished right of the common man I have recently sent two communications to President Roosevelt setting forth my idea of how the country, under his leadership, may be led rapidly through what remains of the depression to a solid and permanent recovery.

I believe I am stating a solemn truth when I say that in these days of dire distress nearly all men who feel the weight of responsibility are actuated by the common purpose of trying to serve humanity. We have the same objectives, but differ only as to methods. The Nation's peril is realized by all. Selfishness is content for the time, at least, to slink far back among the shadows and men are united by a nobility of effort for the common good. We have in the White House a leader whose name is synonymous with nobility, whose sympathies are as far-reaching as the human race.

The purpose of my letters to the President was to convey my belief that the time has come to call business and industry to the colors and to make use of business and industry to provide the capsheaf of recovery. Donald Richberg has wisely said, in substance, in recent speeches, that there are two courses open for the future. One course is to return the load of employment to private industry, and the other course is to provide a large program of public works, at the expense of the taxpayers, to further carry that inescapable load. I prefer to return the load to business and industry, where it normally belongs.

Nor do I believe that this purpose is impossible of achievement. I believe that the foremost problem before the new deal now is to bring about the transition from governmental activity to private activity—how to get business to take up the burden of spending and employing the idle—and I believe as implicitly as I ever believed anything in my life that if the President were now to place his powerful support under the business and industrial structure of the country, with a pledge of suitable governmental approval and aid for suitable performance, business and industry would come running to his call.

What the country yearns for is normal employment, not synthetic employment. What the workingman wants more than anything else in the world is the good old job he used to have. I should like to hear factory furnaces roaring. That would be real music. I should like to see smoke pouring out of factory chimneys. That would be a sight worth seeing. Even if it should be black, dirty, grimy smoke of the kind that used to arouse the ire of the smoke abatement leagues. Our millions upon millions of workmen would be happy if they had regular jobs. They do not want to be idle and they do not want relief, except as they are compelled to take it. They want to hear the whistle blow, and they do not see any prospect of the whistle calling them back to normal employment if vast public-works programs are to continue indefinitely, for there are half a million more workmen unemployed in America now than there were a year ago, and they can only see private industry growing more weak and impotent as public works add billions to the Nation's debt burden and throw the Budget further out of gear.

So it was with the thought of contributing at least a little impetus to the idea that the time is at hand to begin making the transition of employment from public-works rolls to the rolls of private business and industry that I wrote to the President, and I can only add that in presenting these letters to the reading public in the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I do so for the purpose, which I believe to be permissible and partiotic, of stimulating thought along that line.

My first letter to the President was as follows:

NOVEMBER 19, 1934.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I know you will not regard me as presumptuous if I address you on the state of the Union, for our long and friendly acquaintanceship, dating back to your service as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, has taught me that you are ever ready to welcome well-meant, constructive suggestions and to weigh and analyze them fairly and impartially, whether in the final outcome you agree with the proponent or otherwise.

Your administration is already secure in history. In my judgment, you have made a name as a humanitarian second only to Jefferson and Lincoln. No President since Jefferson has done more for the laborer and the common man than you have done. You have written into the social structure certain great and salutary reforms and practices and there they will remain forever. The abolishment of child labor and sweat shops, the guaranty of bank deposits, the establishment of order and security in the banking system, the protection of innocent investors from the rapacity of "blue sky" vendors, the spread of employment and resultant happiness through the shorter work week, these and other great triumphs of social regeneration make up an imperishable record of achievements. While these mighty changes were being wrought the hungry have been fed and the naked have been clothed.

With these things accomplished and the worst of the depression over, I believe the direct way to prosperity is by a cessation of extraordinary expenditures and by such encouragement as the national administration—and it alone—is capable of giving to honest business. We need to instill confidence in business in place of the abysmal dejection that now exists. We need to do something to supplant in place of the gloom and paralysis that now engulf business the old fighting spirit and a willingness among business men to cooperate more freely and actively in bringing the country out of the rut. I believe that you, Mr. President, with such safe and sound advisers as Donald Richberg, have the power to put the business of the country on its feet and make it an important, willing, and militant factor toward bringing about early recovery and reemployment along normal lines.

In my talks with business men I have found that in a vast majority of instances uncertainty is the cause of their halting attitude. They do not know what to expect next, and not knowing what to look for they are not willing to risk anything. This has caused a business stalemate on a national scale, with lethal ramifications into every walk of life. Let me stress what I believe to be the importance of completing your program at the earliest possible moment and announcing it forthwith. Business can adjust itself to almost any program if only it knows what that program is. I hope the time will come real soon when you will be able to announce through the newspapers, over the radio, and from the housetops, figuratively speaking: "This is my program. It is my entire program, and it is going to remain stabilized just as I have given it to you. There will be no further changes in the currency and no additional legislation will be proposed. I have shown you my entire hand."

There must be no lessening of restraints over evil practices in business, but honest business should have encouragement to get on its feet. There cannot be employment unless there is money to meet pay rolls. If honest business could have the benefit of loans—not gifts—from the Federal Government, it would be a

great incentive to a rational revival. The law we passed at the last session of Congress providing loans to industry needs liberalization. It has been weakened by administrative restrictions and the loans that are being made under it are so few and inconsequential that they constitute a negligible factor in recovery. The policy of not making loans to any business concerns that have been "in the red" in recent years makes the law virtually a nullity. The concerns that have not been "in the red" are few and far between. It seems to me the character of the borrower would figure in these loans quite as much as the collateral offered, but character counts for nothing under existing administrative policy.

As a Member of Congress with a voting responsibility, and with a little added responsibility due to the fact that I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am anxious that the future expenditures of the Government shall be kept within limitations. We must continue to care for the hungry and naked and acutely distressed, never for a moment neglecting them, but in my opinion it would be a collossal mistake to embark upon another enormous program of uneconomic public works, thus adding to the debt burden and bringing us a step nearer to the danger of uncontrolled inflation, for when inflation gets under way the possibility of controlling it is about equal to that of stemming the waters of an impounded stream, once the dam has broken. My anxiety on this score has been intensified by a startling proposal by a Cabinet official which appears in the newspapers under the glaring headline "Secretary Forecasts Spending of Billions." The article goes on to outline an enormous proposed program of national spending, one feature of which is to be "a four-lane transcontinental highway avoiding all cities, with no grade crossings, over a 1,000-foot right-of-way, landscaped to make it the most beautiful road in the world."

Can it be possible that at a time like this, when retrenchment is clearly indicated as the proper national policy, such a proposal is seriously advanced? I cannot imagine that with the country deeper in debt than ever before in its history, with interest and taxes mounting to unprecedented proportions, we will pour out untold millions for such an iridescent dream. More than any other country in the world, America already is spanned with hard-surfaced roads. There is no demand for this glorified Appian Way from the standpoint of economic necessity and the project would not be justified as an employment measure because the employment created would not be commensurate with the vast outlay. In the last analysis, such projects must be paid for by taxes, and taxes are paid by the sweat and toil of the masses. We cannot pull money like rabbits out of a hat to pay these enormous construction costs. In my opinion, the entire proposed public-works program should be scrapped and the country should be spared the great burden of having these additional billions piled on top of our staggering national debt.

I sincerely believe that if business is given the benefit of a definite, stabilized program so that it will have a chart to go by, and if in addition it can have the assurance from the administration and Congress that temporary emergency measures that have served their purpose will be repealed and that every reasonable effort will be made to bring about retrenchment in governmental expenditures so that ultimately tongue and buckle will meet and the Budget will be balanced, an accelerated business momentum will be the turning point of the recovery program, and the result will be a new era of abundant prosperity with jobs for all.

No one is more sincere in wishing you well than I am. That is my excuse for bothering you with this long letter. I believe that your superb leadership in the direction I have indicated would definitely end the depression and bring about a glorious future for America.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

On November 27 the President sent me a reply which I do not feel at liberty to quote, and I answered his communication with the following letter:

DECEMBER 3, 1934.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States, Warm Springs, Ga.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I thank you for your courteous reply and I appreciate your gracious invitation to discuss current problems with you at the White House, but I really have but little more to say, and with your indulgence, I shall put these additional thoughts in writing, so that if they are of any value you may have them before you at Warm Springs while you are engaged in the formulation of your program to be placed before the approaching Congress.

So if you will bear with me, I will amplify somewhat my former letter, hoping and believing that whether you can agree with me or not you at least will credit me with an honest and forthright effort to be of some assistance to you in this critical period, when momentous decisions involving the future welfare of the Nation, if not the character of its government, have to be made. To my mind, no less important than that is the issue involved.

Permit me to say that in my opinion it is not an alternative between the cash dole on the one hand and public works on the other hand, but the alternative is between Government relief on the one hand and a return to normal employment on the other hand. I am one of those who believe that prosperity is really near at hand, and that it is actually attainable by cooperation of government and honest business, not by large additional governmental expenditures for public works. In other words, I sincerely, truly believe the time has come to make a start toward transferring the relief load from government to business. I hold no brief for business, and when I take this view I believe I am taking the view of labor as well as business, for the welfare of both is inseparable. I would not for one moment relax the Government's hold on crooked business. If the laws against monopolies and financial pirates are not strong enough, I would enact more laws with more teeth in them, but I would give more freedom to honest business, which is now prostrate, but which wants to do its patriotic part—freedom from governmental restrictions, freedom for creative enterprise, freedom as far as posible from tax burdens.

I should like to see you, as the President of our great country, call the business men of America to the colors. President Harriman, of the United States Chamber of Commerce, who speaks in a large way for business and industry, has said that "business is rarin' to go." I should like to see you call these gentleman to the colors and give them a chance to make good.

Now for a concrete suggestion: I believe, speaking by and large, the way out of the depression from this time on is by adopting a policy of lending, instead of spending. If one-half, or less, of the nine billions proposed by Mr. Hopkins for public works could be loaned to manufacturers and business men under liberal terms, I believe the result would be not only a general reabsorption of the unemployed into regular employment but in the end practically all of the amount would be returned to the United States Treasury as the obligations fall due.

A plan of loaning this money might be devised whereby the granting of a loan would be contingent upon a pledge to employ a certain number of men for 1 year or 2 years. I believe, Mr. President, that if you would call the leaders of the business and industrial world into conference, a system could be devised, based on loans and pledges as stated above, that would wipe out unemployment in record time and make a real start toward a quick national recovery. I firmly believe that under the inspiration and incentive of your call and with the assistance of Government loans apportioned on a basis of employment possibilities business would respond and would, as it should, take over the burden of the relief load by opening the way to reemployment on a large scale.

Let me offer an illustration in point: Some gentlemen from Connersville, Ind., were here the other day to make an appeal for a Government loan for a manufacturing plant there. The visitors were among the best citizens of the community. They have been trying for a year or longer to borrow $150,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for working capital. Their plant is worth half a million dollars. They have actual, bona fide orders already on hand that would enable them to repay the loan with a nice profit, yet they have not been able to get a dime. The tragic part of it, from the standpoint of the public welfare, is that if they can get the loan they pledge themselves to give work to 1,400 men. The question occurs to me: Would it not be much better for the Government to grant that loan and thus give normal employment to 1,400 men who will be happy if they can get work than it is to maintain these good workmen and their families on relief rolls?

Exactly that situation exists over and over again, times almost without number, in the various States of the Union, and I only cite it as an incident which I believe is in point illustrating how business, with the aid of Government, might function to hasten normal recovery. If, on the other hand, billions are added to the Government debt, I fear that next year will find no decrease of unemployment, just as this year finds no decrease of unemployment over last, and the Nation's relief burdens will grow heavier as debt and taxes weaken carrying power and destroy business confidence.

Of course, I realize that the goal of complete business and industrial recovery is not attainable at a single stroke, and until there is full recovery the hungry must be fed and the naked must be clothed. There must not be, and there will not be, any neglect of our humanitarian responsibilities. I believe that when impartial history is written recording your epochal achievements and the conditions under which you wrought, you will be given a place along with the outstanding commoners of all time—Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln. I am just one Member of the House of Representatives out of 435 whose views as to trends and policies may be unimportant, but I thank you for this opportunity to express myself, and I close by saying, "Lord bless you in your sincere, devoted, and courageous efforts to serve this Nation."

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave of extending my remarks in the RECORD on House Joint Resolution 117, I desire to submit the following statement of facts and principles upon which I stand.

When our forefathers drafted the Constitution of the United States, they very wisely inserted as one of the provisions of that great document, the division of Government into three departments, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, each having certain duties and functions to perform and yet all correlating to the working of a harmonious Government.

Article I, section 1, of this Constitution provides for a Congress of the United States consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

When I was elected as Congressman from the Sixth District of Michigan the motivating factor in my thought was the support of the Constitution of the United States and the defense of constitutional government.

When House Joint Resolutilon 117 was introduced I was amazed at the unprecedented dictatorial power which would be given the President of the United States under that $4,880,000,000 public-works bill. From a reading of this resolution I became convinced that the delegation of power to the Chief Executive provided for in said resolution was really a surrender of the rights and privileges of Congress and that the conferring of such power upon one single individual or group was adverse to the principles of American government. I am in favor of worthy relief from the hardships attributable to wide-spread unemployment and conditions resulting therefrom, but when that relief is coupled with principles absolutely reprehensible to American government, then I am opposed to such legislation.

Under the provisions of this resolution, the President of the United States, provided that his actions were motivated by the broad purposes of the act, could:

First. Issue edicts, violation of which would amount practically to felonies punishable with $5,000 fine or 2 years' penitentiary sentence, or both; the provision with reference to the 2-year penitentiary sentence, however, was stricken out by amendment.

Second. Consolidate, change, or abolish existing governmental departments, establishing such new ones as he might desire; which provision, however, was amended by the insertion of the word "emergency" before the words "governmental department"; and continue the provisions of the N. R. A. or other emergency agencies until June 30, 1937.

Third. Acquire by eminent domain any real or personal property which he might consider necessary to carry out the provisions of such resolution, but by amendment the words "or personal" were stricken out.

Fourth. Between now and June 30, 1937, spend $4,880,000,000 not only for public works but in any manner he might claim necessary to accomplish the purposes of the act.

While in my judgment these amendments may have slightly improved the resolution, yet the resolution still stands as an unprecedented delegation of power to the President, and is adverse to American principles.

My first act in coming to Washington was to take the oath of office in which I agreed to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and to discharge well and faithfully the duties of the office to which I was elected. This oath I intend to keep inviolate.

In my judgment the power conferred by said joint resolution is unconstitutional, is dangerous, and is un-American, and for that reason I am opposed to this resolution and shall vote against the same.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau." An aged father, whose eyes are dim, is anxious to give a blessing to a worthy son, one whose birthright has been bartered away. With the cunning connivance of the mother, a savory dish is prepared to satisfy the father's longing. The garments of his brother are put on Jacob, and to make the deception more complete he covers his smooth skin with the hair of a goat. Under the cover of Esau's garment and the masquerade of an animal's skin, Jacob depends upon the blindness of his father to stealthily secure the blessing intended for his brother. With the kiss of a Judas the treachery is complete and a father's blessing debauched. It is an intensely dramatic story, a recital of mockery, an episode of trickery, a narration of craftiness. "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau" has become the legend, the title, the name by which we characterize masquerades of artifice and programs of deception.

No other story quite so accurately describes the circumstances attending the resolution before the House today as this recital of how an old parent was played upon by an artful son.

It is unfortunate that the efforts of the present administration have not been effective enough to relieve the distress of unemployment. In spite of the expenditures of vast sums of money and the imposition of extraordinary exactions upon industry, we are faced today with a most acute and serious unemployment problem, a problem which demands sympathetic, constructive, and capable consideration and action on the part of all who are able to aid in its solution. I do not yield to any man in my conscientious endeavor to find a solution for this problem, or in my willingness to approve the use of every legitimate and sound means for the relief of those upon whom misfortune has come as a result of the world cataclysm. Nor have I been content to still my conscience with the acquisition of political theories of the causes, and the charting of statistical records of the results of the depression, but on the contrary I have endeavored to sympathetically discharge my portion of the obligations of neighborliness and brotherhood. I crave the opportunity of supporting any sane measure, irrespective of party lines, which will insure the reemployment of idle wage earners in my district and bring to the homes of my people contentment and security.

It is my conviction that the resources and credit of the Nation should be utilized to the fullest possible extent to secure the speedy solution of our economic problem. Were the resolution before us today a measure of this character, I would give it my whole-souled and energetic support, but this is not the case; for while it is clothed in the raiment of relief and masks itself with the hairy skin of reemployment pretense, the strident tones of a political Jacob are the accents which reveal its true purpose. That purpose is to strengthen and develop the political fortunes of the majority Members of the House in the name and under the caption of relief and reemployment.

The resolution proposes to place at the disposal of the President $4,800,000,000 of taxpayers' money without any control of the Congress as to the projects upon which this enormous sum shall be spent. No justification has been presented to the Appropriations Committee of the House for this extraordinary grant nor has any adequate hearing been held to warrant the departure from constitutional and time-honored precedent of the proper methods to be pursued in spending public funds. The only excuse which has been offered for the contravention of safe and sound practice is the statement that it is an administration measure, but even the loudest proponents of the measure cannot produce any public utterance of the President of his approval or request for such legislation.

Certainly his laudable endeavor to restore to the unemployed workmen of the country a spirit of self-respect by opening avenues of gainful employment rather than continuing upon relief roles does not comprehend a program of the character now before the House. Under the grant as contained in the resolution, funds may be spent on almost any project which the administration may deem feasible without any limitation or specification as to the character, location, or purpose of the venture. The costly experiment at Reedsville entailing a loss of approximately $500,000 is mute but eloquent testimony of the dangers of spending taxpayers' money without proper investigation and deliberate determination.

My interest lies chiefly in the district which I represent. The needs of these people are my first concern. The advancement and protection of their rights is my obligation. This resolution gives me no assurance that the needs of my people will be ministered unto nor that the distress which prevails among them will be alleviated. Nowhere in the resolution can I find even a scintilla of promise that a small part of this fund will find its way into my county to provide gainful employment. Certainly my experience with the practices of the present administration in the distribution of Federal benefactions does not provide any assurance or even hope that an equitable proportion of these $4,800,000,000 will come to my district. Is it unreasonable for me to ask for assurance that a fair distribution of these public funds shall be

made for my district? The Southern States receive the premiums, the Northern States pay the price. To earmark and allocate this fund upon a justifiable and equitable basis is a reasonable and common-sense demand on the part of the representatives of the people.

The delegation of authority to the executive branch of the Government does not stop with the spending of the fund. The resolution provides for a complete abdication of power by the Congress to the President. Under its sweeping and all-inclusive terms the President may prescribe the duties and functions of governmental agencies, transfer and abolish such agencies, employ individuals at his pleasure, delegate authority vested in him to others, and promulgate rules and regulations for the conduct of all citizens. He may buy, sell, lease, improve, and develop property and exercise the right of eminent domain. And to make the investiture of authority complete and absolute the President may penalize a citizen in the sum of $5,000 for the breach of any of the decrees or regulations made by him. By one fell swoop this resolution turns over to the executive branch of the Government the right to legislate, appropriate, and penalize without let or hindrance. To this revolutionary course of procedure I cannot subscribe. It is not a question of the amount of money to be spent. It is not a question of alleviating distress. It is not a question of providing employment.

The issue far transcends such matters, as important as they are. The issue is whether our system of government is to be completely altered and changed. The tried and true system of checks and balances is at stake. No dexterously devised or cleverly crafted phrase of explanation on the part of any of the proponents of this measure can change to the satisfaction of any sensible person its true intent and purpose. It sacrifices on the altar of political power the sacred heritages of constitutional democracy. It makes inaudible the cry of distress as it bellows for political favor and preferment. It holds up to scorn and ridicule the Members of this House who but a few days ago assumed a solemn obligation to represent their people. It devises a mightier weapon of potential woe for this Nation and for all the people thereof than any implement of war ever wielded by the arm or ingenuity of man. Private rights, private property, private industry, personal liberty, personal immunity are left stark, impotent, unprotected, and defenseless before this grim monster.

The refusal of those of us who oppose the measure cannot be characterized as a policy of obstruction nor as an effort to deter the President in his efforts at recovery. It is obvious that the President cannot give his personal attention to the details of the allotment and expenditure of this enormous sum of money. He must of necessity commit the powers and duties to others who are in no way answerable to the people for their course of conduct or the methods adopted by them. We advocate the submission of projects to the Congress through the duly constituted channels of operation and the proper authorization for the allotment of funds on the basis of merit and justification.

Millions can justifiably be spent for relief, but not one penny should be wasted for political tribute. I stand ready to support a public-works program which will give honest employment to our people, but I will not espouse the cause of those who advocate a program of profligacy, waste, and dissipation. Let us provide the funds for a public-works program bringing to each of our districts a proper proportion of this fund for meritorious projects; let us bring to private enterprise the assurance that the Government does not propose to enter into fields of competition; let us impress upon the citizens our desire to advance their interests and safeguard their rights. Let us provide for the common welfare by practicing policies of proved worth. Let us demonstrate that representative democracy is virile and capable of meeting the problems with which we are faced. But above all, let us cast aside the garment of Esau and the masquerade of hairy skin and be honest in motive and purpose.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to give power—the greatest grant of power that Congress has ever given. Other bills did leave in the hands of the people some semblance of control. The purpose for which the money was to be spent was specified—there was some assurance as to how much was to be spent and who was to have the spending. There were arrangements for an accounting, subject to a check on it by the Comptroller General.

In this bill you take $4,000,000,000 and say to one man, "Here it is. Get rid of it! We do not care what you do with it; spend it as you please." Under this bill you would give the wealth of a Nation in a lump sum and then add to it double that amount for the benefit of the money kings in interest. You will relieve these money changers of all taxes. You lay down the principle in this bill that the money changers shall profit and the masses shall pay. By means of this obsolete system of paying interest on what already belongs to the Government—money—you pile suffering on top of misery and then call it relief.

Under this bill you give this vast sum and specifically provide that there will be no check on its spending or the purpose for which spent until after it is gone. Then after the money is used a statement must be made to Congress stating how it was spent. What good will it do to know who got the money after it is gone and no provision made to have it returned?

You curse Stalin, you execrate Hitler, you condemn Mussolini, and all the while you are seeing the mote in your brother's eye and leaving unnoticed the beam in your own. How can gentlemen stand before us in this House and condemn, as they do, the Nazi, the Fascist, or the Communist and vote a grant of one-man power such as this bill holds in its innocent-looking black print? The shades of every great American who ever had faith in representative government will rise to condemn your vote.

If you pass this bill, you are willing to trust Mr. Hopkins, who may be appointed under its terms, to spend this money. You are willing to trust Mr. Ickes, who may be selected, or Mr. Baruch, or Mr. Astor, or any one of a thousand men who might be in favor at the moment and of whom you nor I have ever heard. Whosoever he may be, he will have power to spend this four billion according to his own sweet will. You are not willing to trust the American veteran to spend only $2,000,000,000, which we owe him and which we could pay to him without paying at the same time tribute to the bankers. You are afraid that the veteran will spend his money unwisely, but the same fear does not actuate you in the case of an administrator, to you unnamed and as yet unknown, who will spend this four billion.

My colleagues, you are being so very inconsistent.

No one will contend that these bonds will not exist and bear interest for the next 30 years. Four percent will be a reasonable interest to expect on them. This means that to obtain four billion to give aid to the destitute and unemployed the taxpayer must pay back to the money changers $4,800,000,000 in interest, or a total of $8,800,000,000. France went into financial oblivion in 1925 because it was necessary to use 80 percent of its total income to pay the interest on the public debt. With all our interest burdens mounting, how long can we endure? This bill means a minimum tax burden of $73 on every man, woman, and child in the United States. This bill, if enacted into law, means a tax burden on the Fifth District of Indiana of $18,836,701.

So far as the provisions of this bill are concerned, all this money can go to such projects as the Reedsville Homestead venture. Certain it is that some of it will go there. Can you conscientiously vote to expend money wrung from taxes on prostrate business, bankrupt farmers, and destitute labor to be expended on a project born of someone's whim, conceded to be obsolete before its inception and now adjudged a failure, as is the Reedsville project, merely to endeavor to justify a judgment that was erroneous in the beginning? That project was repudiated twice by a vote of the Membership of this House and yet thousands of dollars have been spent, and under the terms of this bill thousands more will be spent before the caprice of its sponsors will be satisfied.

You are throwing money riotously into the capricious maw of such adventures in insane spending as are these

projects. Projects where with thousands of furniture workers unemployed you would train miners to make furniture, and other projects where with farmers receiving less than the cost of production you train miners and factory workers to produce more farm products. You gentlemen are trying to do the impossible. You are endeavoring to make a board with only one side—you are trying to make a rope from twisted sand.

We have drifted through a tragedy of errors. We have seen individuals who came from we know not where, given a place of great authority, make colossal mistakes, and drop out again from public sight leaving the public to hold the bag for their mistakes. The public did not elect these flashing great ones. Congress did not appoint, approve, or know them. But the whole Nation suffers because of them. For that reason I feel that the people should know whom they will have to spend this vast sum of money.

This is called a "Federal emergency relief measure." Is it to be like the present system with the administrators of it in the local communities required to possess a college degree as "case workers" so as to be able to determine whether or not starving children are hungry and freezing adults are cold? Some of them draw $200 a month and some more than that amount to sit in a warm office and decide whether a man without a job, without a coat to his back, or a crumb of bread to eat, and with a family, is entitled to work out in the cold with a shovel for $4.70 a week. To call the roll of our present relief personnel is to have pass in review the strutting mistakes of the army of errors.

The R. F. C., with its billions, aided the bankers and big business and forgot the small and independent manufacturer and businessman. In this bill before you now there is not one specific provision by which aid will be granted to this great class of people and those dependent on them. They helped pay the bill for relief of big business, but are denied relief for themselves. Their stores are still closed; their factory stacks are smokeless.

The C. W. A. as a relief measure was of benefit, but it was temporary in character and displeased even those that it was most intended to benefit. Its faults as well as the faults of the R. F. C. lay largely in its administration.

Almost every one of these ventures was a parallel to this present bill. In every one of them Congress flung money into the lap of some unknown and undetermined individual to spend. The Members of Congress saved themselves the necessity of mental effort and attempted to shift their responsibility by delegating the power they were elected to assume and which the Constitution vests in them. For the mistakes, the sins of omission and commission in the spending of these billions of dollars, Congress is responsible, not the man who accepted the front position in the sun and the newspaper headlines, as the chief spender of the bureaucracy created.

Under this bill, as drawn, section 6 would allow the President of the United States to determine and designate a felony. The President of the United States can establish a rule and give it all the force and effect of a criminal law. For the violation of that rule the offender can be imprisoned for 2 years and fined $5,000. If such a rule provides that a man with two children could only receive $4.70 per week and this destitute man accepted $5, he would be guilty of a felony and punished as indicated in the law. Even if the 2 years' penalty is stricken out of the law, still the punishment for such offense by such an amount is preposterous. Congress has no right, in my opinion, to delegate to anyone the authority to establish criminal laws and allow him to define what constitutes a felony.

And even a graver injustice than this is that such rules and regulations need not be published so that the general public may know of their existence. Under section 6 of this law it is not necessary even to prove that a man intended to violate the law or that he did it maliciously to make him subject to this punishment. He may have violated a regulation which he had not intended to violate and of which he had never heard and the general public had never heard and be punished for such violation. I was surprised, amazed, and astounded to think that a Congress composed of representatives of the people would defeat an amendment inserting the word "malicious" before the word "violation." I was amazed that an amendment was defeated requiring these rules and regulations to be printed and published.

Under this bill you would allow the President of the United States or someone designated by him to both establish corporations and subsidize private corporations for the purpose of entering into business in competition with other private corporations and business. Under this same bill it is provided that these corporations, being Government owned and Government subsidized, must employ cheap labor in competition with private concerns that, under the provisions of other laws, are required to pay standard rates to labor. What chance would the private concern have to operate under such competition or by virtue of what stretch of the imagination can it be said that this will raise either the morale or purchasing power of labor?

If this bill is enacted into law, you give to the President or to anyone to whom he may delegate the authority the same right that is given to commanders of armies in time of war—the right to commandeer private personal property. Not only does this bill confer on the President the right of eminent domain over real estate, it extends that right to your furniture, your piano, and your automobile.

I realize that a vote against this bill is unpopular, but the provisions of it violates all that I conceive to be the duty of a Member of Congress. It is contrary to all veneration for the Constitution that is mine by teaching and inheritance. It is contrary to all my conclusions reached in 20 years in the active practice and study of law. I hold my office by virtue of that Constitution which contemplates that I am to represent the people of my district in a legislative capacity. For me to vote for this bill would be for me to prostitute on the altar of political expediency all my convictions of duty to my constituents and to myself.

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT AND HIS POLICIES

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech I made on the radio yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made over the radio yesterday:

Last Tuesday on this program Mr. SNELL, minority leader of the House, made certain statements that appear to me to be misleading. Mr. SNELL quotes the old Latin proverb, "Lack of confidence is not the result of difficulties; difficulties come from lack of confidence."

Webster defines confidence as "act of confiding, trust, belief." There is no lack of confidence on the part of the American people in the present administration. This is quite evident from the recent State elections. Proponents of declared new-deal administrative policies were swept into office, showing conclusively no lack of trust or belief in what is being done in the light of bringing about economic security. No more striking example can be illustrated than the recent contest for votes in the great State of Pennsylvania, my home State, November last, when the people rose in their might and eliminated from control of the government of Pennsylvania the monopolies and special interests that had control for the past 50 years.

Completing a year and one-half of the 2-year span given N. R. A. by the National Industrial Recovery Act, the new year of 1935 finds the Recovery Administration making for the maximum efficiency of its widespread code structure.

Stock-taking indicates several definite accomplishments including:

1. Elimination of child labor and the curtailment of industrial home work.

2. Establishment of the principle of a limited work week and minimum rates of pay.

3. Decrease of industrial unemployment and augmented wage purchasing power. This information on the three above-enumerated points is readily available, collected through the medium of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, one of the best known and recognized authorities on the collection of statistics.

The great advantage of using this medium is that it is the official administrative source of information. I should like to give at this time their index of factory employment taken a month

prior to the effective date of N. R. A. and bring it up to the last month recorded.

	Percent
March 1933	58.8
June 1933	66.9
September 1933	80.0
November 1933	76.2
March 1934	80.8
June 1934	81.1
September 1934	75.8
November 1934	76.8

These figures speak for themselves, and it is on such returns that the people predicate their confidence in the new deal.

4. Curtailment of cutthroat price competition by eliminating the possibility of sweatshop wages and the practice of wage cutting.

It is gratifying to note that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce reports that factory pay rolls for 1934 were 32 percent higher than 1933.

Construction activity showed a 51-percent gain.

Freight-car loadings (sure-fire trade barometer) gained 8.6 percent.

Chain stores improved 8 percent.

Holiday sales were better by approximately 30 percent.

Combined figures of 290 national manufacturing companies showed increase of 11 percent for first 9 months of 1934.

Increase in farm income during year, more than $1,000,000,000, approximately 22 percent greater than 1933.

Virtual cessation of bank failures.

These figures depict the march of recovery in convincing terms.

Irrespective of people who feel that present conditions are not what they ought to be and find fault with whatever is done by the administration, this country is getting along pretty well, as the facts and figures show. Chronic critics will always be with us. There are still millions of wage earners, men and women, out of work. These must be taken care of until most of them find employment in industry.

There are two ways of meeting this inescapable problem—by direct relief, that is, the dole, or by putting them to work on public jobs. The first course would probably be the cheaper, in terms of what it takes to provide a living for an individual. The work system, however, takes into consideration not only the circumstances that the country gets back something in the form of public improvement, greater securities against such calamities as floods, fires, etc., but still more important is the value of preserving in the American people a spirit of self-respect. No self-respecting person wants charity where there is the alternative of earning a living.

Eighty-nine percent of the total households (families and single persons) receiving unemployment relief in five eastern cities of from 250,000 to 1,000,000 population is reemployable and willing to work. The Government should provide employment until private industry absorbs them.

President Roosevelt said in submitting the Budget: "The country will henceforth have the assurance that with the single exception of this item (unemployment relief) every current expenditure of whatever nature will be fully covered by our estimates of current receipts. Such deficit as occurs will be due solely to this cause and it may be expected to decline as rapidly as private industry is able to reemploy those who are now without work."

The Budget, which is for the fiscal year July 1, 1935, to June 30, 1936, shows total estimated receipts will be $59,000,000 in excess of regular expenditures.

The deficit, all caused by the relief program to June 30, 1936, in the form of emergency public-works projects, with the single exception of $575,000,000 for paying of debts, is estimated at $4,869,000,000. This, the President proposes to finance by drawing on the working balance of the Treasury for seven hundred and forty millions and borrowing three and three-quarter billions. This is a billion dollars under the borrowings for the current fiscal year.

Mr. SNELL stated that Mr. Ickes refuses to allocate funds to the city of New York until and unless Robert Moses, recently Republican candidate for Governor in New York, resigns from his position in the New York City administration if he is to direct the P. W. A. activities of New York as well.

Mr. SNELL has been grossly misinformed. The administrative order was not issued by Mr. Ickes to discriminate against Mr. Moses, but applies generally, and rightly so. Can any man serve two masters and do it well? Here we have a definite conflict of interest, Mr. Moses attempting to represent the Federal Government and the city of New York, and this the order is meant to correct, just that!

This demand has not emphatically been made to satisfy a personal political grudge as Mr. SNELL would have you believe.

Further, 12 requisitions from New York City for P. W. A. funds totaling $3,469,000 were honored in the last week.

In another portion of Mr. SNELL's speech he severely criticizes the reciprocity treaties now being negotiated by the State Department. If this process was an approved Republican policy under President Howard Taft, what makes it an iniquitous thing under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. SNELL states as his first demand that the Government "will immediately stabilize our currency at home and abroad." And the answer to that is that "The present purchasing power of our present gold dollar is still in excess of the purchasing power of the gold dollar at the dates Liberty bonds were sold." (From Robert H. Hemphill, financial authority of the Hearst newspapers, Friday, Jan. 18.)

And from the Wall Street Journal, January 18:

Mr. SNELL's second demand that "It—the Government—will withdraw from the competitive field of honestly conducted private business and industry."

Answer. If by this Mr. SNELL means that the Government, through its advances by the R. F. C. has made it possible for solvent banks to be safe depositories of the people's money, the question might be asked of Mr. SNELL why he thinks it would be better if the R. F. S. recalled its loans to these institutions and so permitted a resumption of the runs which destroyed thousands of banks in the period antecedent to the advent of the present administration.

The R. F. C. lists actual disbursements as $2,027,064,236 in the Hoover administration and $4,821,008,987 since that time.

The capital structure of banks throughout the United States was strengthened by the releasing of the depositors' money in closed banks by the R. F. C. purchasing preferred stock, capital notes, or debentures of these institutions. Approximately 50 percent of the loans made to these institutions has been repaid.

If Mr. SNELL means that the Federal Housing Administration should let the foreclosure of homes go unchecked; if he means that the Farm Credit Administration should have permitted, and should now permit, the mortgaged farms of the country to be taken over by the banks, already overloaded with farm mortgages, what does he think the result would be of such procedure? If, on the other hand, he is referring to the N. R. A. codes, with their provisions for minimum wages and maximum hours, does he mean that he would reestablish the old order under which child labor disgraced certain branches of industry and made possible sweatshop competition which forced the selling of clothing and similar commodities at less than the cost of production? Moreover, does he not know that these codes for the major part were formulated by the industries themselves and are being administered by code authorities selected by these industries, with a nonvoting Government representative who is there solely to see that the code provisions are not nullified?

Mr. SNELL's third proposal is that the Government "will reduce its bureaucratic expenditures and insist upon an honestly balanced Budget." The Treasury figures show that last year's expenditures for the normal processes of Government were a billion dollars below the figures for the previous year. As to the emergency expenditures to keep people from starvation and to preserve order in the country, which could not be done if millions of our population were left unaided, perhaps Mr. SNELL would be willing to suggest some program for doing this work that did not involve the spending of money. These millions could hardly be expected to starve peacefully. The so-called "bureaucratic expenditures" are constantly being decreased, but if this money is not to be wasted it requires a suitable personnel to administer it. As to whether they would have been under Hoover administration, that is solely a matter of opinion. Perhaps Mr. SNELL would like to make a comparison between the difference in policy of the last Republican administration and the policy and effort under the present administration and let the country decide again which of the two it prefers.

ZACHARY TAYLOR

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the life and public service of Zachary Taylor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

One hundred and forty-nine years ago Zachary Taylor, the twelfth President of the United States, was born. On November 24 last, over a National Broadcasting network, Hugh Gordon Miller, attorney and author, and my friend, under the auspices of the New York Southern Society, viewed the highlights of President Taylor's career. Mr. Miller was appointed by Governor Pollard, of Virginia, as chairman of the President Taylor One Hundred and Fiftieth Birthday Commission to inaugurate a program for the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary celebration of the birthday of President Taylor.

History indicates, as Mr. Miller so ably pointed out, that Zachary Taylor is one of the eight Presidential sons of old Virginia, being born in Orange County on November 24, 1784. Of seven Whigs nominated, he and Harrison were the only ones elected. He was the second President to die in office.

Many historians give Taylor's birth as September 24, but Abraham Lincoln, a contemporary statesman, at a contemporaneous date, gives it as November 2. Chambers' Encyclopedia, Appleton's, and the National Biography give his birthday as September 24. The New International Encyclopedia

gives the date as November 24. There is no record of his birth in Washington. That point will, by a commission, be definitely settled before next year, when we will appropriately celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of the great President who was the outstanding hero of the Mexican War.

The New York Southern Society is now inaugurating a movement to so honor President Taylor, as a part of its 1934 program in reviving the history and traditions of the South. Governor Pollard of Virginia has recently appointed a commission for that purpose which will act in conjunction with the Southern Society.

In his infancy, Taylor's family took him to reside in Kentucky, where he grew up in a log cabin. He was the son of Col. Richard Taylor, a gallant Revolutionary officer. Like many other great men, he was self-educated. When his parents moved to Kentucky it was a part of Virginia. He lived on a frontier farm until he was 24 years of age. His elder brother, a lieutenant in the Regular Army, died and Zachary, then known as "Zachariah", was appointed in his place. His early military career was occupied in campaigning against savages.

Zachary Taylor was the first Regular Army man to be President, the only other being General Grant. Several other Presidents have seen war service but as citizen soldiers. Professional soldiers in this country are not usually promoted to high civil office. General Pershing, for instance, is not bothered with nominations for President.

At 23 Zachary Taylor was appointed by President Jefferson a lieutenant in the Regular Army. He remained in the Army until he was inaugurated President.

Taylor's part in the War of 1812 was not as spectacular as that of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans, or Admiral Perry on Lake Erie, but it was important. A great many Indian tribes allied themselves with the British. That presented a vital front for the new Nation. A special point of Indian attack centered on the Wabash River. Taylor was sent with a company of men to Fort Harrison. His little force was attacked by a large band under the great chief, Tecumseh. The Indians were beaten effectively. He was in active service against the Indian allies of the British until the close of the war.

He was colonel in command at Fort Crawford when the Black Hawk War began. He defeated and himself received the surrender of Black Hawk. In 1836 he defeated the Creeks and Seminole Indians in Florida at the Battle of Okeechobee, for which victory he received the rank of brigadier general.

In the Mexican War the United States had two commanders, Zachary Taylor, known as "Old Rough and Ready", and Winfield Scott. Scott's army landed on the coast at Vera Cruz and marched toward Mexico City. He had authority to take what troops he wanted from Taylor's army, which had been gathered together in the Southwest, where he was stationed.

Taylor, with mostly raw recruits, moved on toward the Rio Grande, which the United States now considered its southern border, and opened up his campaign with victorious battles, at Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma. He was outnumbered 3 to 1. The Mexican general ordered him to retreat beyond what Mexico claimed was the boundary, but he refused and fought a half-dozen victorious engagements. The Mexicans attacked him first and thus started the conflict. In the victorious attack on Monterey, Col. Jefferson Davis, Taylor's son-in-law, took a gallant part. We are prone to forget this part of the record of the future President of the Confederacy. Nevertheless, it is a part of our inspiring American history and our great southern tradition.

At the Battle of Buena Vista, Scott had borrowed nearly all of Taylor's regular troops, and he was outnumbered more than 4 to 1. To the Mexicans it appeared at first like a holiday parade.

It was here that Taylor at the critical moment ordered Captain Bragg to give them the "little more grape" which ended that impressive parade of the brilliant looking army of General Santa Ana. The Mexicans were decisively defeated. The decisive defeat of General Santa Ana at Buena Vista probably decided the Mexican War. Brilliant and pivotal movements of the American troops in the battle were commanded by Col. Jefferson Davis and by Captain Bragg, later a general in the Confederate Army. Indeed, the Mexican War furnished the training for Civil War generals on both sides.

A captain serving with distinction in the Quartermasters Department was Ulysses S. Grant. Grant got no special glory or mention in that unglamorous branch of the service but did get an experience in provisioning an army under difficulties which later made him the outstanding figure of the Union Army in the Civil War. U. S. Grant learned in Mexico, under Taylor, how to provision an army on the march, far from base, and amid great difficulties.

Capt. Robert E. Lee, later the imperishable hero of the Army of Northern Virginia, was at the same time fighting gallantly in the Engineer Corps and winning high honors from his commander, General Scott, who at the outbreak of the Civil War was unsuccessfully to urge upon Lee the command of the Union Army.

The Mexican War grew out of the fact that Texas, which had revolted from Mexico because of persecution of American residents it had invited to settle there, and which section had been a separate republic for 8 years, was, on its application, taken into the Union as a State. Mexico considered that admittance a cause for war and undertook to reclaim Texas. Over Texas, as a wilderness, before its settlement by those Americans and the establishment of that independence, Mexico had maintained a shadowy sort of jurisdiction.

General Taylor was simple in his home life, also as an official. General Grant recites that the one time he saw General Taylor in Mexico, though in action, he was wearing plain civilian clothes. His wife lived with him in tent and stockade, sending her children back to the settlements to be raised, as they came along.

His second daughter ran away and married Lt. Jefferson Davis, afterward President of the Confederacy. Taylor was furious with his eloping daughter and scornful of Davis. In a few months she died, unforgiven. Years passed, and the disowned son-in-law, Davis, who had never been reconciled with his father-in-law, kept out of the old man's way, until his bravery and brilliant success at the Battle of Buena Vista brought tears to the eyes of the old general, and they were reconciled on the battlefield.

Like Washington, Taylor's "modesty was only exceeded by his gallantry." When an oratorical visitor to his tent ventured to toast him as the next President he exclaimed, "Stop your nonsense and drink your whisky." The idea grew upon him, however, as it usually does upon those so mentioned, and he yielded.

The Whigs nominated him without knowing where he stood on any political question; and to cap the climax they made no platform for him to run on. Great problems confronted the Nation, but what they wanted was the prestige of Taylor's brilliant military record. For a while the Whigs were frightened at what they had done. No word came from their nominee for days as to whether he would accept the nomination or not, and they took alarm. He had not received his letter of notification. They had forgotten to prepay the postage at a time when the post office carried letters collect, and Zachary Taylor, on his plantation in Louisiana, not knowing its contents, was refusing to receive that unpaid mail.

Webster, Clay, and General Scott had all three been candidates for the Whig nomination. Clay, when Taylor was nominated, being a sport, then made the historic remark, "I would rather be right than be President." But Webster showed great bitterness.

Taylor, as already indicated, was not sure to which party he belonged, but finally declared, to the amusement of the country, that "he was a Whig, but not an ultra-Whig." There are times when lots of us, being Americans first, are not ultrapartisan. Taylor was merely more honest than most political candidates in making his other admission that,

as to the campaign issues, he had "only the crudest impressions." We have seen many candidates in that state of mind, but not so candid.

As usually happens, however, with American Presidents, of which the present one is no exception, when faced with responsibility Taylor turned out to be a tower of strength. He showed an uncompromising determination to uphold the Union, though so much of a southerner that his daughter had married Jefferson Davis and his son became a general in the Confederate Army.

Prominent citizens told him some States would secede from the Union if California was admitted as a free State. He denounced their talk as treasonable and warned them that for any overt act they would be treated accordingly. The same interests claimed a large part of the State of Texas and threatened to drive out the Federal troops stationed there. President Taylor replied:

> Then I will command the Army in person and hang any man taken in treason.

He kept himself fully informed, and, like Andrew Jackson, when South Carolina threatened to secede, he prepared the forces against a sudden outbreak regardless of the threats of southern extremists and thus avoided a break at that time and postponed the sectional conflict for more than 10 years. Had he lived out his first term and been reelected, the whole bloody climax might have been avoided.

The admission of California into the Union and the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty with Great Britain for a water route across the Isthmus of Panama, upon which is founded our title to the right-of-way of that international highway and the Panama Zone, were the most important achievements of the 16 months of the Zachary Taylor administration.

In 1849 Nicaragua had granted a concession to a company of United States capitalists to build such a canal, but Great Britain controlled one end of the route and the United States the other.

The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and its successor, the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, which succeeded it in 1905, reaffirming its "general principle" of "equal tolls for all nations", along with Washington's Farewell Address and the Monroe Doctrine as at present interpreted, in principle will no doubt permanently dominate our foreign policy. Those commitments certainly furnish a large part of the background of our permanent foreign policy.

Taken together with the Monroe Doctrine, the Canal-treaty arrangements, begun under President Taylor and completed under President Theodore Roosevelt, certainly tie the foreign policy and the fate of the English-speaking world together permanently for good or ill.

Upon the request of the United States, and on its basic commitments, which have been mentioned by Mr. Miller, Great Britain surrendered its Canal franchise and allowed the United States to assume the responsibility of building and operating the project alone.

Few people know that the father of President Franklin D. Roosevelt was deeply interested in the early Nicaraguan canal project. President Roosevelt's father was one of the pioneers of that isthmian canal enterprise. In that connection Mr. Miller quotes a paragraph from a letter from the President written to him in reference to the first edition of a volume he wrote relating the history of that great American adventure, under the title of the "Isthmian Highway." The then Governor Roosevelt wrote:

> I am particularly glad to read it (the book) as it brings back many personal memories; in fact, I go back in my early memory to the days when my father was tremendously interested in the original Nicaraguan canal project. From then on I had had a deep interest in the whole question of the Isthmus. You have done a real service in telling the story of it.

Parenthetically, that comment illustrates how progressive and adventurous, even to the point of experiment, both branches of the Roosevelt family have always been. It shows also how our present President reads even the dryest books, if they might throw special light on the Government of the United States. That is why he has shown himself such a master of the workings of our Government and its necessities at this trying hour. The Roosevelt motto might well be "nothing ventured, nothing gained."

It was peculiarly fitting that Theodore Roosevelt should have been finally responsible for inaugurating the construction of that great adventure, the history of which began under President Taylor with the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. Theodore Roosevelt was criticized for the Canal adventure even more severely than Franklin D. Roosevelt is criticized now for his recovery adventure. They said the Panama adventure was not constitutional. The spirit of adventure is truly the spirit of America.

Zachary Taylor was honest, independent and fearless, and devoted to the country which he served with distinction for more than 40 years. As a part of our birthday tribute we intend to nominate him, as one of our great Presidents, to the Hall of Fame.

FEDERAL FEED AND SEED LOANS

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of H. R. 3247—a bill to meet the conditions created by the 1934 drought and to provide for loans for farmers in drought- and storm-stricken areas. I represent the First Congressional District of Nebraska, comprising 11 counties in the southeastern part of the State. In my campaign I traveled over 10,000 miles, visiting every hamlet and section of this part of the State. No one who has not seen these drought-stricken areas has any conception of what it means to these people and the far-reaching consequences it entails. Normally eastern Nebraska is one of the finest and most productive districts of the so-called "Corn Belt" section.

This drought was the most severe and most extensive that American agriculture has experienced. There were many fields where the seed did not have moisture enough to germinate and the fields were bare and dead. In other fields the corn plant had gained a growth of a few feet, and under the scorching heat and wind the white, withered leaves lay prostrate on the ground. The pastures were bare and not a spear of grass was to be seen. Cattle were mere skeletons and bawling from hunger. In some instances farmers shot cattle to put them out of their misery since these cattle were too emaciated to be marketed for food purposes. Feed was not obtainable, or only at exorbitant prices which made the feeding unprofitable.

This situation was made all the worse by the impoverished condition of our farmers. For years they had been operating at a tremendous financial loss. For years their fixed and overhead expenses, based on a high price level, had to be met by the sale of their products which were based on a low price level, so they were ever sinking deeper and deeper in the mire of financial ruin and despair by no reason of their own.

In this situation the farmers were overtaken by the most unprecedented drought in American history. Their situation is a national catastrophe of major proportion. These farmers need financial aid, and need it at once. Preparations for seeding must be made soon. Time is the essence in this case.

We must bear in mind that in aiding the farmers' recovery we are getting right at the root of the recovery problem. By restoring the farmer to his rightful economic position and by restoring his purchasing power we are opening our best market for American industrial products. The prosperity of America depends on the prosperity of American agriculture. There is nothing that this Congress can do at this time that will help more to enable the farmer to make a new start than to aid him in saving his stock and provide him with funds to buy seed to plant his fields.

I am sorry that this bill comes before us in this way, which makes it impossible to amend. I think $1,000,000 for feed is too small. It should be much more. I hope the Senate will see fit to double this amount.

The provision in the bill requiring that the applicant for a feed or seed loan shall comply with the crop production control program is a proper requirement. Private loan organizations and banks prescribe requirements before granting loans to applicants. There is nothing in this bill that is at cross purposes with the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

I demand that in the administration of this act red tape be cut down to the minimum. I hope it will be administered in a just and common-sense manner. Much criticism has been made, and justly so, as to the manner in which some of these governmental agencies have been conducted. It is deplorable that we cannot undertake any governmental activity without being tied hand and foot in a maze of red tape.

I want to register my protest here against the silly and childish way that some of our bureaucrats are conducting public business. I am also opposed to paying these bureaucrats exorbitantly high wages at a time when millions of people are out of employment and are dependent upon charity or Government relief.

I am in favor of this bill as a whole but wish that the defects in section 4 could be eliminated.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Mr. GILLETTE, would like to be excused on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on this bill which we have just had under consideration.

The SPEAKER. On the bill or resolution?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. On the bill and resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would it not be well to put in there that the gentlemen who spoke this afternoon may also be allowed to revise and extend their remarks?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is included in my request.

Mr. SNELL. If that is included in the gentleman's request, all right.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—it seems to me that the Membership of this House should have at least 5 days to explain to their constituents back home why they voted for this gag rule and dictatorship. They should have a month to explain such action.

Mr. MEAD demanded the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATION FOR RELIEF PURPOSES

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, making appropriations for relief purposes.

The resolution was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, with Mr. O'CONNOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for an hour and a half, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for an hour and a half.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the President in his message to us last Congress used this language:

> Among our objectives I place the security of the men, women, and children of the Nation first.

In his message to us this Congress he sets forth the method by which he thinks the welfare of the men, women, and children can be accomplished.

He stated three objectives that he hoped to obtain: First, the security of a livelihood through the better use of the national resources of the land in which we live; second, security against the major hazards and vicissitudes of life; and, third, the security of decent homes.

I submit that these objectives can never be obtained, or any one of them obtained, as long as we have some fifteen to twenty million people on the relief rolls in this country. Therefore, as a foundation, and as a starting point toward obtaining these great objectives which he named, we must first put the employables who are on the relief rolls to work. No nation can progress, no nation can ever retain its station, with one-fifteenth of its population on relief. In other words, any nation that has and maintains that percentage of its citizens on relief will have to go backward and not forward.

This appropriation and this resolution are fundamental necessities for the recovery and the progress of our country out of this depression.

Again the President used, in speaking of unemployment problems, the following language:

> The lessons of history, confirmed by the evidence immediately before me, shows conclusively that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit. It is inimicable to the dictates of sound policy. It is in violation of the traditions of America. Work must be found for able-bodied destitute workers.

This sentence will stand out like a star throughout the world. I may state that his message was about eight pages long and about half of the message was taken up in dealing with the unemployment and relief situation.

He also stated in that message that since the adjournment of the last Congress he had devoted his time, his attention, and his research in an endeavor to work out a just and fair solution of the relief problem. He presents this solution to you as Members of Congress and asks for your cooperation in carrying it forward in the interest of our common country. He stated that he would later send his Budget; that he would request the amount that would be necessary to carry out the program of stopping the dole and putting the three and one-half million employable people now on the relief rolls to work. He stated that these figures would be well within the sound credit of the Government. He sent these figures, and here is what he said in his Budget message:

> I recommend that $4,000,000,000 be appropriated by the Congress in one sum, subject to allocation by the Executive, for giving work to these unemployed on the relief roll. An estimate of expenditure covering this amount is included in the Budget—

And it was included in the Budget, and it is $4,000,000,000.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Does the gentleman contend that the purpose stated in the President's message, for which he wants to use this four and a half billion dollars, is the same purpose stated in the bill with respect to the use of that amount?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Absolutely; the same purpose stated in the bill, and I state this, not only from a reading of the resolution but from several personal conversations with the President in which this subject was fully discussed, and from hearing his representatives disclose the purposes before my committee. The entire appropriation and the joint resolution is for the one purpose of taking three and a half million men off of the dole and relief and putting them to work.

Mr. MOTT. Then may I ask the gentleman what language contained in this joint resolution limits in any way the expenditure of any part of the four and a half billion dollars—what restrictions are put upon the President in the expenditure of this money and what purposes are stated?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The restrictions are placed upon him in the fourth provision at the beginning of the resolution.

I cannot yield further, because I have only 20 minutes. I wish I had more time, but the demand for time is such that I have had to cut my time short.

In this brief discussion I am going to call your attention to a few facts and figures which will demonstrate to you beyond question that we are making progress in reducing the appropriations and expenditures for relief and recovery—making great progress.

First, if your present system is continued, whereby the Federal Government furnishes 75 percent of the total amount for relief and local committees determine who shall be put on the relief roll and what amount shall be given them, God pity Uncle Sam and his Treasury. If you had started out in the beginning and required every county to furnish 25 percent, every State to furnish 25 percent, and the Federal Government 50 percent you would have at least 30 percent less on the relief rolls throughout the Nation, because when people are dishing out money which they personally contribute, they dish it out with more caution and economy.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will permit, does that argue that 30 percent of the people on the relief rolls should not be there?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Absolutely and unquestionably.

Let me give you some figures. In 1934 we expended for relief and recovery $4,283,000,000. In 1935, this fiscal year, we have expended or will expend $5,260,000,000, making a total for the 2 years of $9,543,000,000.

What do we ask here? We ask $4,000,000,000 in this appropriation. Add to that the processing taxes that will be expended as a part of the recovery plan, add to that the $112,000,000 that is unexpended in past appropriations but obligated, and this will make a grand total for 1936 and 1937 of $4,582,000,000. In other words, for 2 years, 1936 and 1937, we are appropriating only $4,582,000,000, whereas for this year and the last year, 1934 and 1935, we appropriated and expended $9,543,000,000, or a retrenchment or reduction in relief and recovery of $4,961,000,000.

Some man may say, "They will spend all this money in the next fiscal year and come back to us at the next Congress for another relief appropriation." My Democratic colleagues, and I am talking to you now, it is confidently expected that this $4,582,000,000 will complete the job, and if we have any appropriation to make for relief at the next Congress, it will be infinitesimal compared with the amount we have spent in the past and the amounts we are carrying in this bill.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield there? The gentleman has lots of time that he can get and I have a pertinent question I should like to ask. The gentleman has mentioned the expenditure of this large amount of money for direct relief and work relief.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Relief and recovery.

Mr. MOTT. At the last session. I simply want to suggest to the gentleman that if this bill simply provided four and a half billion dollars for direct relief and work relief there would not be a single objection on the Republican side of the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I know, but on the Democratic side there would be great objection, because we are determined to stop the dole in this country. Do you want to destroy the spirit, the initiative, and the enterprise of American citizens, and teach them to be dependent, and even demand of the Government that it support them in this Republic?

Mr. MOTT. Then I limit my statement to work relief alone—there would be no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is one other subject I want to call your attention to very briefly. I get this from the last report of the Emergency Relief Administration. Between August and September, just 1 month, 31 States of the Union increased their relief rolls 8 percent, and only 17 States decreased their relief rolls, and such decrease was 4 percent.

What is the cause of this increase when recovery and employment is progressing as we expected? Some of your local committees are putting hundreds of thousands of people on the rolls who have no business there.

In January 1933 the Federal Government furnished only 51 percent of the entire money for relief. The States and local districts furnished the balance—49 percent. In January 1934 the Federal Government furnished 53 percent, and in December 1934 the Federal Government is furnishing 75 percent.

Ah, gentlemen, if you let that system go on, your Relief Administration will become such that it will consume every dollar in the Federal Treasury.

It would consume one-third of the net income of the Nation. There is no check to it, no stop to it.

The President has wisely said that the dole must and shall be stopped. I say it must be stopped, if the financial standing and credit of the United States is to be preserved.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. What has the Federal Government done to stop the expenditure of these Federal funds in the States where they are being expended? What has it done to put a stop to the situation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It has not done anything effective so far, but this resolution proposes to stop it once and for all.

As I stated, the Federal Government started out by the States contributing 14 percent, then they went up to 32 percent of the entire amount of relief, and now in December they drop down to 7 percent. The States and local communities are shifting the burden onto the shoulders of the Federal Government.

Now, gentlemen, I am going to conclude. I look upon the President's message as one of the greatest state papers ever filed in the history of the world. It sets him out as one of the outstanding philosophers and philanthropists of the world. I tell you that I firmly believe that when the great men of other nations are known only in story and song the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt will be remembered and revered as one of the greatest philosophers and philanthropists that the world has ever known. You will do well to follow his leadership. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. This legislation is neither alone relief legislation nor work relief legislation. I am going to give you the history of the legislation a little bit so that the Members of the House may know what they are voting on. I am going to describe this joint resolution to you so that you will know what it is, and some of the insidious things that it will lead to.

We started in on this program of the present administration when in the middle of June 1933 we appropriated $3,300,000,000 for relief. That money was turned over by the Executive to Messrs. Hopkins and Ickes to allocate and spend; and what has happened? They told us that we were to have work-relief programs, and that we were to have relief immediately. Out of the $3,300,000,000 that was appropriated at that time there still remains in the Treasury of the United States $1,700,000,000, or more than half of it, and it has not in a year and 8 months been spent for relief or relief work.

The only work-relief project that was undertaken by them—the C. W. A.—was pronounced by Mr. Hopkins, the man in charge of it, a complete flop. You are asked now to turn over to that same incompetence $4,000,000,000, to be monkeyed with in the same way. They have placed it upon projects which do not take care of the relief, on projects that are far away from the centers where great relief was required, far away from where employment could be provided for the people who needed it, and then just twiddled along without accomplishing anything except this. During that time we have increased the number of families on relief by 1,000,000. During that time we have established the C. C. C., and that means a half million more on relief.

During that time, with these projects which they have operated, we have provided a sort of employment for a half million to a million men. It is now proposed, they say, to place three and a half million men at work. Three and a half million men at $50 a month, as Admiral Peoples said

they would be placed for a year, would be $2,100,000,000, and the cost of keeping them at work would be double that. That means it would take $8,000,000,000 for 1 year. Just as they came to you before in June 1933, they come to you now, with no definite program of what they would do. They have things they imagine, things that they tell you they might do, but they have no definite program. Is the Congress of the United States going to be so supine, so foolish, and so ignorant that it will turn over to the same incompetence the authority to allot money without having definite proof of the projects before it? This is not legislation under which men can be put to work, and the Congress of the United States will never have a bill under which men can be put to work until it allots the projects and sets them up. Within 3 months' time they could set up these projects and could come before the Committee on Appropriations, and they could be established and the money appropriated, and not unconstitutionally attempt to turn the powers of Congress over to an incompetent authority as is done in this bill.

On top of this, this joint resolution does a lot of other things. Under section 1, the way it is worded, read in connection with section 4, it permits the Executive or those incompetents, Hopkins and Ickes, to whom he delegated authority, to put the Government into business directly or through agencies he may set up. During all this time, under their operations, we have increased the number of unemployed in America.

We have two courses open to us, one to provide for direct relief—and this bill does far more than that—the other to provide for work relief—and this does not do that. Will the credit of the United States stand the other thing? That is for you to say. But in saying so—and we must meet our problem of relief—do not turn over to the Executive the power and authority to regiment and socialize the United States. The people do not want that. That means the end of progress, the end of development. It means the breakdown of those institutions that we have fought and bled for for 150 years. I beseech you to cast politics aside and meet the problem that is before you and vote down this proposition, designed to destroy the institutions of America.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COX. What are the powers, if any, that are covered up in paragraph (d) of section 4 of the resolution?

Mr. TABER. I will be frank with the gentleman. The Committee on Appropriations this morning voted to offer an amendment as a committee amendment, behind which was supposed to be the support of the administration, to wipe out paragraph (d).

Mr. COX. All of paragraph (d), without substituting anything to effectuate the purpose that was evidently intended in the language of the clause?

Mr. TABER. That is correct?

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield for one more question.

Mr. COX. I wanted to ask the gentleman with respect to paragraph (a) of section 4.

Mr. TABER. That paragraph is the paragraph under which the socialization of industry can be set up. Under it people can be made to work or not to work.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman construe that paragraph to delegate the power to charter corporations and to fix their duties?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely. There is no question about that. It seems to me that this legislation is the worst thing that has ever been brought before the House of Representatives. Not only is it the delegation of authority, but a delegation of authority to continue the incompetent method of handling the relief situation, which has gone on for a year and a half and has done nothing except to build up the number of unemployed, destroy the confidence of the people, and governmentally prevent private industry from putting people back to work.

A vote against this resolution is not a vote against relief.

It is against throwing away a lot of money by turning it over to the people who will not spend it for what it was intended. If the Members of Congress will have the courage to vote this bill down, to study the situation, and provide definite projects that could provide work relief where the work relief is needed, there would be an argument in favor of a work-relief bill, if it would not cost so much that it ruined the credit of the Government. If no projects can be found which the Government can afford to put through, we cannot go on with the work-relief program.

Frankly, in my opinion, if it is going to cost between $12,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000 a year, as I believe it is, to provide employment for all with work relief, I do not believe the credit of the Government can stand it. This bill does not provide work relief for the unemployed. It is a half-way measure. The $4,000,000,000 carried in this bill, I predict, will be handled in the same drag-out way that the previous appropriations have been handled and will not be spent within 18 months.

I want to see a course laid out which will restore confidence, which will stop this foolish, reckless proposition, tending to prevent everything that we in our own hearts want to see come back. I am going to offer some amendments as we read the bill, and I hope this House will, in no uncertain terms, go on record against putting the Government in business. [Applause.]

I hope the House will go on record, in no uncertain terms, against the incompetent method of handling this relief situation without knowing what it is doing and without seeming to care.

We must meet our responsibility here today. Let us do it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, as my good friend and colleague on the committee [Mr. TABER] was inveighing so vehemently against this novel principle of government, introduced in this bill, my mind traveled back about 8 or 10 years ago when, as one of a very few Democrats on this side, I voted with the gentleman from New York and his party, when that identical principle was first introduced into our governmental system, as far as I know.

My friend knits his brow. He does not recall. We had for a number of years followed the detestable, illogical, and unworkable policy of trying to have the House of Representatives and the Senate write our public-buildings bill. It had always brought confusion, logrolling, trading, and the charge of pork-barrel legislation leveled against the legislative body. So the gentleman's party wisely, and we all occasionally have lucid intervals, wisely upon that occasion—

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman also tell the House that when we passed that bill we had before us a definite allocation from the Supervising Architect as to what we were to build?

Mr. WOODRUM. No; I beg to differ with the gentleman. Wisely, the gentleman's party came to the Congress and in the interest of good sense and orderly legislation and economy, asked the Congress to appropriate $100,000,000 for public buildings, and give it to the President of the United States to allocate those projects upon the advice of the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury; absolutely identical with the principle involved in this bill except as to the amounts.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield? I just want to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not want the gentleman to take up my time arguing with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANKIN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from New York if he had before him the plan of this Commerce Building down here that was built below sea level, at an expense of $16,000,000, and out of which they now have to pump the water?

Mr. TABER. We did not have the plan, but they had a set-up for it, and the amount of money.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman said we had an allocation. We had a list of projects filed in the hearings, with

the definite, specific statement that they were in no way binding upon the Department; and hundreds of them never were built. I know because I served upon the Public Buildings Committee.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. TABER. They could not be built until the specific appropriation had been made.

Mr. WOODRUM. And some of them never were built.

Now, what is the proposition here today? I believe it is the desire of the American people to see able-bodied American citizens, who are now being given bread baskets in front of relief stations, put to work to earn their salaries, earn their wages, and not to have it handed to them at relief agencies. That is what the President asks you to do. That is what we are fighting for. That is what the minority side of this House is opposing. They are opposing the effort of the President to take able-bodied people off of direct relief and give them honest employment in a work-relief program.

Now, if there is one fundamental principle involved in this recovery program to which the Congress ought to be willing to subscribe, it is the effort of the President to get off of relief and onto a work-relief program. Now, what has he done? Questions have been asked as to who prepared this bill; whose idea is it? Well, if the gentlemen had kept abreast of what was going on during the summer, they would know the President appointed an Emergency Advisory Council. For months they have been studying the situation, taking evidence, studying contracts, getting sample projects, figuring how best men can be immediately put to work at gainful employment at wages above relief doles and yet not high enough to attract them away from industry. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, was a member of that council. Admiral Peoples, now head of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, was a member of that council. I should like to have you gentlemen between now and tomorrow get a copy of the hearings and read the splendid, admirable statement of Admiral Peoples, who has studied the bill and studied the plan and will give you a very convincing argument, I think, upon the merits of this bill.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Who is the sponsor of this legislation?

Mr. WOODRUM. The President of the United States asked for this legislation. He has back of it a thorough survey and comprehensive study made by responsible officers of the Government.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman mean to tell this House that the President of the United States wrote this bill?

Mr. WOODRUM. He may have sat down to a typewriter and typed it off.

Mr. FISH. Well, did he? The gentleman is trying to be facetious. Who is the sponsor of the bill?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is an administration measure.

Mr. FISH. Well, who is the author of it? Does the gentleman maintain the President is the author of it?

Mr. WOODRUM. I maintain that the President asked for the provisions of this bill, and I imagine that he has the advice of legislative counsel and others.

Mr. FISH. Who recommended the bill to him? The gentleman knows the President did not write the bill. We are entitled to know who wrote the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not think the gentleman's question deserves the taking of time from a speech on the floor of the House.

If Congress undertook, as has been intimated, to handle this legislation by having the Members of the House sit down and try to allocate $4,000,000,000, or even $2,000,000,000 of work projects, we would never get it out. There is only one way under high heaven that it can be done and that is the very way it is being done here. And I want to say in reply to the arguments that have been made about the delegation of power and about dictatorship and all the other similar criticisms we have been hearing ever since Franklin D. Roosevelt went into the White House, that the people of the country last November answered just what they thought about it; and their answer was that they would rather live in America under the humane, beneficent dictatorship of Franklin D. Roosevelt than under the colorless, spineless, devastating leadership they had had for 12 years. [Applause.]

Of course, it is a broad delegation of power. Why, the President could wreck this Government with the power we have already delegated to him, if he wanted to; of course, he could do it. When we went into the World War, General Pershing was made the head of our troops. He could have given the order "about face" and turned his army so that the withering fire of the enemy would have gone into their backs, if he had wanted to. But is there any man who can think he wanted to? Is there any man who is idiot enough to stand up here and think that Franklin D. Roosevelt is any less interested in the permanent recovery of the Nation than we are? He has a plan, and under that plan recovery is going forward. During the 2 years he has been in office he has given us a good government. He has used wisely the powers that have been delegated to him. If he has made mistakes, God knows he has not made half as many mistakes as you or I would have made had we undertaken to do what he has done. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I would suggest to my friend the gentleman from Virginia as an answer to the query of the gentleman on the other side that by reason of the fact the House of Representatives has a Membership of 435, we have some 25 or 30 committees to which we refer matters because we cannot settle them all ourselves.

Mr. WOODRUM. Certainly.

Mr. MAY. And each committee deals with a particular subject.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. EATON. In this delegation of power, how will it help afford relief to have the President take personal property by eminent domain?

Mr. WOODRUM. Of course, I would expect that kind of a question from my friend over there.

Mr. EATON. Sure; because it is a sensible question.

Mr. WOODRUM. If it comes to a question of condemning somebody's property when men are starving, I am ready to help commit the larceny. We are thinking about human life, and by February 1 the $880,000,000 carried in this joint resolution for direct relief must be available. If it is not then available, how will the gentleman explain to his constituents the delay? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a bill which I have introduced dealing with a relief project.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise in support of House Resolution 117, said resolution making appropriation for relief purposes.

This resolution has, after careful study, been prepared by the President and submitted to the Congress and represents his supreme effort toward recovery and the relief of unemployment and the care for the needy in our great Nation. He has called upon the Congress in his message for cooperation to provide employment for three and a half million people who are able to earn their living and who are now on the relief rolls. It represents his effort to pass from the dole to gainful employment and occupation. I do not admit any great degree of the delegation of legislative powers to the Executive, but if powers are delegated, I have no fear that the small powers delegated in this resolution to the Chief Executive will be abused by President Roosevelt. The public welfare is not at all in danger through the small delegation of power which this resolution may carry. On

the other hand, the public welfare and the best interest of the American people demand prompt and effective action, and this resolution and method has been selected by the President as the proper medium.

It is interesting to note the strong opposition to this resolution on the Republican side of the House. You, gentlemen, should be the last to resist an honest and earnest effort toward recovery in our country, and toward relief of destitution. Those of us who have served in the Congress for the past several years must be fully aware of the Republican policies and privileged legislation passed over Democratic opposition, which has largely brought about the chaotic conditions found in our country when the people delivered the Government to the Democratic Party. Instead of opposing, you should rise in unanimous support of the President's gigantic effort to correct mistakes made by your own administration.

It is obvious that the President may well be trusted to carry out the provisions of this resolution in every respect, as the best evidence of his ability to thus perform is the improvement in general of conditions in our country since he was inaugurated President. This improvement in industry, in business, in the price of farm produce, in the loosening up of credit, in the strengthening of financial institutions, has been brought about through the wisdom and action of the President and his administration. This is a huge appropriation, it is true, but the conditions demand it and the purposes are most laudable. It is believed that with the carrying out of the provisions of this resolution, recovery in our country will be assured. This huge public-works program will give employment to millions of our people and will reestablish in them hope, courage, and that individual responsibility which has always been conducive to the stability of our Government.

Practically all of us are interested in many projects which will be carried forth when this appropriation is made, and among those which I believe are outstanding I would list first the ship canal across northern Florida, connecting the waters of the Atlantic Ocean with those of the Gulf of Mexico. This project has been thought of and talked of for about a century, but of recent months has gained the ear of our leading advocates of waterway improvements and wisest industrialists. Under provisions of the bill which I introduced in 1925 preliminary examination of proposed routes was made. Under the provisions of H. R. 9650, which was introduced by me on February 7, 1930, actual physical surveys of several routes across northern Florida have now been completed. Standing out among preferred routes are the St. Marys-Okefenokee-Suwannee route, the Black Creek to Deadmans Bay route, the St. Johns-Santa Fe-Cedar Key route, and the St. Johns-Ocklawaha-Withlacoochee route. Surveys have been made by the Public Works engineers and by the Board of United States Army Engineers, and it has been agreed that the canal is an engineering possibility and will redound great benefits to the commercial life of America.

On January 3, 1935, I introduced H. R. 2785, which is as follows:

A bill to provide for the construction of a canal across northern Florida, connecting the waters of the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to acquire, through purchase or otherwise, from the State of Florida, persons, individuals, firms and/or corporations, for and on behalf of the United States, upon such terms as he may deem reasonable, perpetual control of a strip of land not less than 7 miles in width, extending from the Atlantic Ocean across northern Florida to the Gulf of Mexico, and the right to use and dispose of the waters thereon, and to excavate, construct, and to perpetually maintain, operate, and protect thereon a canal of such depth and capacity as will afford convenient passage of ships of the greatest tonnage and draft now in use, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico, and also jurisdiction over said strip of land and the ports at the ends thereof.

That the President may acquire such additional territory and rights from the State of Florida, persons, individuals, firms and/or corporations as in his judgment will facilitate the general purpose hereof.

SEC. 2. The President shall have the right to rebuild and replace bridges on said lands and rights-of-way.

SEC. 3. That when the President shall have arranged title and control for the necessary territory from the State of Florida, persons, individuals, firms and/or corporations, he is authorized to pay not exceeding $2,535,000 for said lands and rights-of-way, and is authorized to rebuild and replace bridges over said canal at a cost of not to exceed $4,910,000, and a sum sufficient for both said purposes is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid on warrant or warrants drawn by the President.

The President shall then, through the Florida Roosevelt Canal Commission, hereinafter authorized, cause to be excavated, constructed, and completed a ship canal from the Atlantic Ocean across northern Florida to the Gulf of Mexico. Such canal shall be of sufficient capacity and depth as shall afford convenient passage for vessels of the largest tonnage and greatest draft now in use, and such as may be reasonably anticipated, and shall be supplied with all necessary locks and other appliances to meet the necessities of vessels passing through the same from ocean to gulf; and he shall also cause to be constructed such safe and commodious harbors at the termini of said canal, and make, in his discretion, such provisions for defense as may be necessary for the safety and protection of said canal and harbors. That the President is authorized for the purposes aforesaid to employ such persons as he may deem necessary, and to fix their compensation.

SEC. 4. That the President shall utilize any helpful information obtainable in surveys heretofore made by the Board of United States Army Engineers and the Public Works Administration engineers.

In the excavation and construction of said canal, rivers, lakes, and other natural waters, or such parts of each as may be made available, shall be used. The most feasible route across northern Florida shall be employed.

SEC. 5. That the sum of $25,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, toward the project herein contemplated by such route across northern Florida as is selected.

And the President is hereby authorized to cause to be entered into such contract or contracts as may be deemed necessary for the proper excavation, construction, completion, and defense of said canal, harbors, and defenses, by the route finally determined upon under the provisions of this act. Appropriations therefor shall from time to time be hereafter made, not to exceed in the aggregate the additional sum of $200,000,000.

SEC. 6. That to enable the President to construct the canal and works appurtenant thereto as provided in this act, there is hereby created the Florida Roosevelt Canal Commission, the same to be composed of seven members, who shall be nominated and appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve until the completion of said canal unless sooner removed by the President, and one of whom shall be named as the chairman of said commission. Of the 7 members of said commission at least 4 of them shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering, and of the 4 at least 1 shall be an officer of the United States Army, and at least 1 other shall be an officer of the United States Navy, the said officers, respectively, being either upon the active or retired list of the Army or of the Navy. Said commissioners shall each receive such compensation as the President shall prescribe until the same shall have been otherwise fixed by the Congress. In addition to the members of the said Florida Roosevelt Canal Commission, the President is hereby authorized through said commission to employ in said service any of the engineers of the United States Army at his discretion, and likewise to employ any engineers in civil life, at his discretion, and any other persons necessary for the proper and expeditious prosecution of said work. The compensation of all such engineers and other persons employed under this act shall be fixed by said commission, subject to the approval of the President. The official salary of any officer appointed or employed under this act shall be deducted from the amount of salary or compensation provided by or which shall be fixed under the terms of this act. Said commission shall in all matters be subject to the direction and control of the President, and shall make to the President annually and at such other periods as may be required, either by law or by the order of the President, full and complete reports of all their actings and doings and of all moneys received and expended in the construction of said work and in the performance of their duties in connection therewith, which said reports shall be by the President transmitted to Congress. And the said commission shall furthermore give to Congress, or either House of Congress, such information as may at any time be required either by act of Congress or by the order of either House of Congress. The President shall cause to be provided and assigned for the use of the commission such offices as may, with the suitable equipment of the same, be necessary and proper, in his discretion, for the proper discharge of the duties thereof.

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow on the credit of the United States from time to time as the proceeds may be required to defray expenditures authorized by this act (such proceeds when received to be used only for the purpose of meeting such expenditures), the sum of $200,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and to prepare and issue therefor coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, and in denominations of $20 or some multiple of that sum, redeemable in gold coin at the pleasure of the United States after 10 years from the date of their issue, and payable 30 years from such date, and bearing interest payable quarterly in gold at the rate of 2¼ percent per annum; and the bonds herein authorized shall be exempt from all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under the State, municipal, or local authority: *Provided*, That said

bonds may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Treasury at not less than par, under such regulations as he may prescribe, giving to all citizens of the United States an equal opportunity to subscribe therefor, but no commissions shall be allowed or paid thereon; and a sum not exceeding one-tenth of 1 percent of the amount of the bonds herein authorized is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay the expense of preparing, advertising, and issuing the same.

SEC. 8. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to, in his discretion, employ any funds appropriated for the Public Works Administration, or general waterways development and improvement funds, in lieu of bond issuance as mentioned in section 7 hereof.

This bill is now before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and a large number of my colleagues have expressed a deep interest in its prompt report and passage. Practically all waterways-improvement organizations in the country have repeatedly endorsed the project and petitioned the Congress for its completion. High State officials from practically all States east of the Rocky Mountains have from time to time expressed a deep interest in this great project because it will bring to the American people, in general, a substantial reduction in transportation cost, and a huge saving to the shipping public, producers, and consumers.

On one of the routes surveyed, the canal would be 200 miles in length, including 27 miles in the shoal water of the Gulf of Mexico. The summit level would be 40 feet above sea level. The available water supply is adequate for the maximum development of traffic on this route. The final estimates, based on costs now anticipated, show a net construction cost to the United States of $199,481,000, not including the lands and rights-of-way with a value of $2,535,000, and bridges over existing waterways at a cost of $4,910,000.

The annual cost of operation and maintenance of this canal on the most advantageous route is estimated at $1,930,000. Adding the interest charges, the total annual cost becomes $11,439,000. These costs have been disputed by some of the best engineers in the country because it is believed that the canal can be constructed for about half the above figures, and we may be assured that if this canal is constructed under the provisions of House Joint Resolution 117, every possible economy will be observed and every possible waste eliminated.

The estimates hereinafter set forth are for a canal having a depth of 35 feet, a width in the contracted rock sections of 250 feet, and in the remainder of the land section of 400 feet. Locks are provided in duplicate with a clear length of 1,000 feet and width of 110 feet in one lock, a length of 610 feet and width of 110 feet in the second lock, and with 40 feet over the sills. The estimates include the provision of the necessary bridges over the land cut with a minimum vertical clearance of 135 feet. The dimensions of the canal and locks are considered necessary to realize the primary purpose of the canal, which is to reduce the time of voyages between the Gulf ports and Atlantic ports.

It is believed that a canal of these dimensions will be adequate to handle vessels which use the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean. A careful survey has been made as to the extent of use of this canal, and it has been conservatively estimated that about forty-five to sixty million tons will pass through it. Huge quantities of oil, pulpwood, turpentine, rosin, lumber, logs, fruits, vegetables, cotton, and other items of commerce will pass through it, and it will derive the benefit of approximately 25 hours' reduction in time from the place of its origin to port of destination. It is believed that the shipping concerns will rapidly utilize it when completed. It has been conservatively estimated that during the first year of operation 10,000 vessels will pass through it. This will be about 1 every 40 minutes, day and night.

Opponents of the canal, of course, minimize its future use by commercial interests, but it stands to reason that as soon as the canal is constructed commerce will find its way through it on account of the great saving in time and transportation cost. It will be a great asset to America in time of war. It will afford an inlet and outlet for fighting craft, troops, ammunition, and supplies. It will strengthen America's advantage in the Gulf of Mexico and make possible there in the Gulf of Mexico the supremacy of the United States and our Navy, even under the circumstances of great odds against us. It will be a great asset to commerce borne through the Panama Canal from either direction. In saving the 25 hours in time, naturally it will save the great cost incurred in making the extra ten or twelve hundred miles around the peninsula of Florida. It will also eliminate the storm hazard to commerce off of the south end of the peninsula of Florida. Practically all shipping craft will utilize this canal, if for no other reason than to avoid the hazard of storms. The Atlantic States from Maine to Florida and the Mississippi Valley States from the Lakes to the Gulf will be direct beneficiaries of this cut-off or connecting link in the chain of water-borne commerce. All other States of the Union will receive an indirect benefit. That which prospers one State or section of our great Nation benefits and prospers every State and nook in our great country. No chain is stronger than its weakest link. The entire chain is supported by its own strength. This canal is not a local project. It is not a project for the Southeast. It is a worth-while project for America and is an American project. It will develop new industries. Noteworthy among industries to be developed would be the pulpwood and paper industry, the iron industry in Alabama, and others.

At this particular time the relief of the unemployed is primary in our minds, but we must also consider the permanency of improvements and their benefit to the American people. From 70 to 75 percent of every dollar that is spent on this project will go to labor and to relieve the unemployed. In fact, even 90 percent could go to labor, if less-improved methods of construction and dredging should be resorted to. As to the permanency of the improvement and its benefits to the American people in the future, it has no peer or equal. Generation after generation our people will utilize this artery of commerce and time and time again will be repaid in benefits for the initial cost of construction. This was learned centuries ago, particularly by the countries in Europe. Every possible waterway was provided and improved. This was done in the interest of economy and in the best interest of the commerce and people of those old countries. Our Nation is in its infancy, so to speak, in the way of waterway developments. We must come to the utilization and development of all possible waterways. In this respect the shackles of the special interest must be stricken from the shipping and consuming public, and these natural resources developed for the benefit of the American people.

Our great President Roosevelt has manifested already his keen interest in developing American resources for the American people. This is well demonstrated in his Tennessee Valley project. No special interest is strong enough to divert him from pursuing the course which is for the best interest for the present and future America. When the Florida Canal is completed, it will be another step accomplished by him on his ladder for a greater America.

It is true that some engineers with short vision have failed to see the future benefits of this canal to American commerce and the American people, and have on this account or for some other reason failed to agree as to its feasibility. Such was also the case with the great Panama Canal. Engineers and more engineers reported against it, but the mind of a then President Roosevelt superseded, and riper wisdom dictated the feasibility and practicability of this great project. Now even those who are less informed wonder why we waited so long to construct the Panama Canal. The Florida Canal will be built at about one-third of the cost of the Panama Canal and will be built without the hazard of tropical disease and foreign claims. It will bear far more tonnage than is borne by the Panama Canal and will redound greater benefits to America than has been realized or ever will be realized from the Panama Canal.

The Panama Canal was constructed not as a partisan project. It was constructed for the benefit of our country. Likewise, the Florida Canal is not a partisan project. It is for the American people.

Therefore, I call upon all of my colleagues to lend their fullest cooperation for its prompt realization. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I was not given the opportunity to address the House yesterday. It was the first time I have ever asked unanimous consent to proceed for even 15 minutes, and I would have been satisfied with 10. My only reason for making the request yesterday was that I wanted to call the attention of the Members of this House to House Joint Resolution 117, which is brought up for consideration today. The huge appropriation—almost $5,000,000,000—called for by the resolution, and the peculiar and unusual powers which are granted to the President in spending this sum warrant, in my judgment, a greater opportunity for discussion and debate than the Rules Committee has granted Members of the House.

Manifestly, the majority party, which outnumbers us 3 to 1, is afraid to listen for even 10 or 15 minutes to the views of the opposition. Perhaps this is due to the discord and dissension in their own ranks, and they did not want any more rancor in their caucus, held yesterday afternoon. In other words, the majority leaders wanted to bind and gag their own Members and rush this bill through with the least possible time for discussion or debate.

Should I wish to be mean and little, I would for the remainder of this session be flies in the soup and a thorn in the side of the acting majority floor leader and the astute Chairman of the Rules Committee. However, I shall try to follow the dictum of Holy Writ: "Bless those who persecute you, bless and curse not."

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which is so momentous and far-reaching in its consequences that it transcends the level of party politics. I have no quarrel whatever with any Thomas Jefferson, constitutional Democrat, but this resolution was not drafted by a follower of Thomas Jefferson or by one who still believes in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. I do not think it is a Democratic resolution, and it most certainly is not a Republican resolution. This resolution bears all the earmarks and smell of the "brain trusters." Its author must be a megalomanic, and if this House votes this bill, we might as well adjourn and go home, for we will have become a hollow chamber full of hollow heads that but echo the orders coming from the bureaucrats at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. What sort of men are we? Do we have a bone or a rubber band up our backs? What Member of this House had anything whatever to do with the writing of this resolution? Mr. Morgenthau, Mr. Bell, and Rear Admiral Peoples are the only witnesses called before the Appropriations Committee, which listened to them for only 3 hours, behind closed doors, in a star-chamber session. No Member of this House had access to this resolution until night before last, and the hearings were not reported to us until this morning. Yet this House this afternoon, with its overwhelming Democratic majority, under a tyrannical and unprecedented gag rule, will cram down the throats of their own Members this monstrous measure, because of the club of patronage which is wielded over their heads.

Mr. Chairman, speaking from a political standpoint, I have never been so foolish as to give my enemy a pistol with which to shoot me; yet every Republican who may vote for this resolution is furnishing ammunition to the opposition to destroy him. This is a camouflage bill. Let us pierce its masquerade and tear the mask from its face. The enormous sum of $4,880,000,000 which we are asked to give over to the executive branch of Government to spend in any such manner, at any such time, and on any such project as he may deem advisable, is ostensibly for relief, but, sir, this resolution is not for relief; it is for a Democratic campaign fund for the election next year.

All of us know the experience we had in the election last fall. During the month of October it cost the Federal Government, in one county of my district, $1,000 to distribute $600 of relief money to the needy people of that county. The people who need relief most are not getting it, or only a small proportion of what goes to the white-collared tax-eating politician who does not need it. How is this relief money spent? Nothing is said in this resolution about old-age pensions; nothing is said in this resolution about the disabled veterans or paying their bonus. No; the old-age pensions and the soldiers' bonus have been pigeonholed and postponed until this vile and vicious resolution can be railroaded through the Congress.

Many of these ex-service men who had volunteered and gone through hell in France, who slept for days and nights in blood-soaked, rain-drenched trenches, who went over the top and crawled on their bellies like snakes through the mud and muck and mire under barbed-wire entanglements, breathing poisonous gas and baring their breasts to the fire of machine guns and artillery, having the brains of their comrades blown into their faces, discharged at the end of the war, mere shadows of the men they once were—these men who were promised, 3 years ago in the Democratic platform, full and exact justice, had their compensation cut or their pensions taken completely away from them by the iniquitous and infernal so-called "economy bill", passed shortly after the inauguration of the new deal.

This great Government cannot take care of the men who have fought, bled, and died in its defense, but it can spend relief money—and how has it spent it? In my home county last year the relief agency hired a little girl scarcely out of high school, young, single, with no dependents, from a comfortable home, and paid her $125 a month to ride over the hills of Stone County to teach the kids out in the sticks how to play.

They hired another fine little woman in my county, the wife of a professional man who needed not the position, and paid her $127.50 per month to teach the good old country housewives out in the hills how to make soap—and God knows she had never seen an ash hopper in her life. In two other counties in my district the "new dealers" have employed three men, Government agents at good salaries, to roam over the hills in Wright and Howell Counties hunting for Indian mounds. After several weeks' search I asked if any mounds had been found, and the answer was, "Nope; but we're still hunting for them." In another county of my district able-bodied men and women were hired at $2.10 per day to make rag dolls—in order to have industrial recovery. In another county a bedbug inspector was employed to inspect the mattresses which the relief agencies dealt out to those who would vote the straight Democratic ticket, while in another county the Government employed a bunch of old maids to teach the mothers of the Ozark Hills how to pin diapers on their babies. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, no Member of this House is against relief to those who are destitute and worthy of assistance. No American wants to see any of his fellow countrymen starve, or even suffer. The President has no copyright on this emotion. The Republicans gathered here are willing to vote the $880,000,000, or even $1,000,000,000 if necessary, for relief, but we are bitterly opposed to voting a $4,000,000,000 slush fund to this administration to be spent in the future as so much of this money has been spent in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I care not what other Members of this House might do here today, but I am unalterably and unequivocably opposed to this resolution, which is so filthy, foul, and rotten that it stinks to high heaven. My opposition is based wholly upon principle. In my humble judgment, this resolution is unwise, unsound, unconstitutional, and un-American.

A schoolboy with the most elementary knowledge of constitutional law knows that the Congress has no right or authority to delegate its legislative powers to the Chief Executive, and it is most amazing that this resolution should be offered so soon after the Supreme Court of the United States, in its recent decision in the oil case, gave Congress and the country to understand that under the Constitution the Congress cannot abdicate its powers, shun its responsibilities, transfer its duties, and grant blank-check authority to either of the other branches of this Government. And

we propose here today once more to make a jackass out of this body, to become the laughing-stock of the Nation, by doing these very things.

I deeply and sincerely regret that this body has degenerated into a supine, subservient, soporific, superfluous, supercilious, pusillanimous body of nitwits, the greatest ever gathered beneath the dome of our National Capitol, who cowardly abdicate their powers and, in violation of their oaths to protect and defend the Constitution against all of the Nation's enemies, both foreign and domestic, turn over these constitutional prerogatives, not only granted but imposed upon them, to a group of tax-eating, conceited, autocratic bureaucrats—a bunch of theoretical, intellectual, professional nincompoops out of Columbia University, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue—who were never elected by the American people to any office and who are responsible to no constituency. These brain trusters and "new dealers" are the ones who wrote this resolution, instead of the Members of this House whose duty it is, and whose sole duty it is, to draft legislation. [Applause.]

My friends, there is only one conflict in America today, and that is a conflict between two diametrically opposed fundamental political philosophies. There is only one issue at the present, and that issue is between two opposing and irreconciliable theories of government. The question for us to decide here and now is whether we are going to continue to live under the Constitution and believe in our American institutions under which we have lived for a century and a half and grown to be the greatest nation on earth and the happiest and freest people under the shining sun, despite all the vicissitudes of fortune through which we have passed, or whether we shall abruptly depart from the historical precepts and sacred tenets of our forefathers who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States to follow a new-deal philosophy, unknown, untried, which is put forth by a group of impractical, inexperienced visionaries whose political philosophy rests upon the economic teachings of Marx and Lenin, and whose communistic doctrines would set up a Bolshevist state with a collectivistic society.

I want to know what you believe in, my fellow Americans. Do you want to follow the Constitution or do you want to follow the code? Do you want to live under the Stars and Stripes or do you prefer to live under the outstretched wings of the blue buzzard? Do you stand for U. S. A. or for N. R. A.? Are you going to follow history or are you going to follow hysteria? Are you going to base your life upon facts or are you going to flee after flitting fancy? Are you going to base your future and that of your children upon experience or are you going to follow every unknown, unsolved, unworkable, unconstitutional, dangerous, and destructive economic experiment of this small group of willful, autocratic, egotistical, tax-eating bureaucrats? Will you follow George Washington or Prof. Raymond Moley, Thomas Jefferson or Rexford Guy Tugwell? And I should like to know if we still believe in the genius, courage, and patriotism of Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln or whether we want to overthrow their philosophy to follow the strange and insidious doctrines of Mordecai Ezekiel, Felix Frankfurter, and his "hot-dog" boys?

Mr. Chairman, you have asked for constructive criticism: Carry out the planks written into your platform 3 years ago. Really balance the Budget. Maintain a sound currency at all hazards. Reduce the public debt instead of increasing it to the point of bankruptcy. Abolish all unnecessary bureaus and cut the cost of government instead of increasing it. Restore once more the antitrust laws which will protect the little-business men of this country. Stop giving the American people shots in the arm and artificial respiration, which continues their illness. Let this sick Nation, in its convalescent stage, remain quiet, free from the meddlesome interference of quack doctors, and America once more, because of the genius, courage, and resourcefulness of her people, will emerge from this depression triumphantly. Once again the bright sunshine of prosperity will break through the black clouds of depression, driving despair out of the souls of men and restoring faith and hope once more to their eyes, until they can again truly sing "happy days are here again." [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ELLENBOGEN].

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is an important part of the President's program of economic security. This program, Mr. Chairman, consists of two parts, one part is to end relief and to give employment to all those who are unemployed, who are on relief, and who are able to work; and the second part of the program is to care for those who are unemployed, but unable to work, through the bill for social security introduced last week and now before the Committee on Ways and Means for hearings.

This bill means a fundamental departure in our methods of dealing with the problem of unemployment.

In his message delivered on January 4 before a joint session of Congress, President Roosevelt promised to terminate relief payments to unemployed and to substitute jobs for relief. This bill carries out that promise. For that reason it is one of the most important that ever came before Congress. It blazes a new trail. It means salvation to millions of unemployed who are at present ekeing out a bare existence on the dole which they are receiving, but who are in danger of becoming mentally and physically unable ever again to perform useful work.

Let me briefly sketch the policies pursued by the Federal Government in dealing with the problem of relief for the unemployed:

First. At the beginning of the depression, President Hoover took the position that distress and economic want brought about by enforced unemployment should be cared for by the usual charitable organizations. With the deepening of the depression and the ever increasing number of unemployed, it was but to be expected that charitable organizations and special welfare drives carried on in all communities throughout the United States would be inadequate to raise the enormous funds which were required to care for the unemployed. This leads us to the next phase:

Second. The raising of funds for unemployment relief by local and State government.

Soon municipal governmental units and State governments began to show the results of financial strain and quickly approached a condition where they were unable to raise sufficiently large sums for the care of the unemployed. It became apparent to students of conditions that the depression would last for some time and that only the financial resources of the Federal Government would be sufficient to raise the sums necessary for the care of the unemployed. The demand for Federal contributions toward unemployment relief became more and more persistent. President Hoover was strongly opposed to it, and determined to resist it, without regard to the immense amount of suffering which it brought to hundreds of thousands throughout the land.

Third. Immediately upon his induction into office, President Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government to cope with catastrophe which was not local or State-wide, but national in scope. President Roosevelt immediately announced that it was the duty of the Federal Government to see that no man, woman, or child should go hungry in the United States. He immediately recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government to raise the necessary funds and to contribute whatever was required to the States and localities for unemployment relief.

Let me call attention to the fact that in all these three phases the method of caring for the unemployed was to give them the minimum requirements for physical existence in the form of cash relief, or else in orders for food, clothing, and other necessities of life. To put it succinctly, the care of the unemployed consisted in giving them relief.

This method was proper in the beginning. It was proper for a depression of short duration, but in the fifth or sixth year of unemployment, in the fifth or sixth year of the deepest depression of our time it is a method which has gradually

become destructive of the morale of the unemployed and detrimental to the welfare of society. After 5 years of suffering, deprivation, and want there is only one way of dealing with the unemployed—and that is to give them jobs.

The time has come when we must understand that unemployment as it has existed until now must end in the United States. When I say it must end, I mean that when industry fails to provide the opportunity for work, the Government must step in and provide a job for everyone who is willing and able to work. This is the next step in the development of our method of unemployment relief.

Fourth. Now the President seems to have come definitely to the realization that unemployment relief should stop and that in its stead employment must be given. In the message of January 4, 1935, President Roosevelt said that:

> The Federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief.
>
> I am not willing that the vitality of our people be further sapped by the giving of cash, of market baskets, of a few hours of weekly work cutting grass, raking leaves, or picking up papers in the public parks. We must preserve not only the bodies of the unemployed from destitution, but also their self-respect, their self-reliance, and courage and determination.

The President has determined to take the most forward-looking step that he could by saying that this business of relief must end, and that those who have suffered for 4 or 5 years patiently and who have eked out a bare existence on a few dollars of relief money will hereafter be given employment, so that they can maintain their families in some degree of comfort and keep their self-respect.

The President has definitely committed his administration to the fact that he will provide 3,500,000 public jobs, which means jobs for every employable person now on relief. Those who are unemployable are to be taken care of by a social-security program now pending in the Congress.

The funds to provide jobs for the 3,500,000 employables are to be provided in this bill. For that purpose the President has asked Congress to appropriate $4,000,000,000, and I sincerely hope that this bill will be passed so that the program of the President will be carried out and every employable person who is on relief may at last be able to obtain a job.

The American way of dealing with the problem of unemployment created by a depression which is national in scope is not through relief, not through the dole, but through the creation of useful work—work which is socially and economically desirable in the community for which it is provided. The dole may be the European method of providing for the care of the unemployed. A public-works program is the American method.

I believe that my friends on the Republican side are opposed to this bill, not because it gives away any of the powers of Congress, because it does not—they are opposed to it because work relief costs more than direct relief. The Republicans want to continue the dole in America. They are against the American system of unemployment relief, and this is the true reason for their opposition—not the fact that it gives away power to the President.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I am sorry, but my time is too limited.

They are opposed to it not because it gives the President $4,000,000,000 with which to give employment to the employables, but because it means the expenditure of more money than the retention of the dole.

This bill embodies the American way of dealing with the unemployment problem, and therefore it is the most forward-looking step we can take.

Insofar as this bill appropriates the sum of $4,880,000,000 for the care and relief of the unemployed and for providing jobs, it is not amendable. The bill makes this appropriation in a lump sum; the specific projects and the localities where the money is to be spent are to be determined by the President. That is as it should be, because otherwise there would be no end to logrolling. In all other respects the bill is wide open to amendment. There are many provisions in the bill not devoted to the appropriation of the money for the unemployed which should be amended, and I hope will be amended.

And after we have passed this bill, Mr. Chairman, I, for one, and I hope I speak for everyone in this House who wants to see these black days gone forever, shall not feel that we have solved everything. To take all the employables off relief rolls and give them work is a portion—and it is in truth the smaller portion—of the task to be done.

For our task is twofold. There is that vast army of unemployed who are not on relief rolls but whose condition is just as precarious and just as desperate. These come next. To some extent they will be helped by the removal from the field of unemployment of people on relief, and therefore will have a better chance to be called to private industry.

But the same principle which is good and true and just for one group is just as just and true for the other, and until private industry is ready to give them employment the Government must and shall. We should not—and shall not—make a distinction between those who are on relief rolls and those who are not. The relief roll is no criterion of need. There are between five and six million employables in this country today who are not on relief rolls, but shall we therefore say that their need is not real and their plight no concern of ours?

It is our concern, and we must attend to it at once.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of this House are in favor of an advanced method for the caring of the unemployed, if they desire to terminate unemployment relief with its devastating influence upon the morale of the unemployed, if they desire to give the country the benefit of the energy, of the skill, and of the knowledge of those who are unemployed and are on relief, then, Mr. Speaker, each and every Member will vote for this bill as I shall.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I am now and always have been, like every other Member of this House, for relief of our unemployed people to the utmost limit of the powers and resources of our Federal and State Governments.

But this bill is not a relief bill, although it is decked out with that name. It is a cruel mockery of the distress of our people and offers the hungry a stone when they ask for bread.

I believe it my duty and the duty of every Member in this House, regardless of party, to vote against this bill in its present form for the following reasons:

First. It cannot and will not give the employment it promises to 3,500,000 unemployed. The daily statement of the United States Treasury sets forth that out of some thirteen billions appropriated by Congress to emergency organizations in 22 months of the new deal, more than five billion seven hundred millions are still unexpended, which proves what everyone of experience knows, that it will be a physical impossibility for the Federal Government to properly expend these five billions and four billions more asked for in this bill in the next year or two by furnishing employment on public works.

Second. To vote for this bill in its present form and under the limitations of this gag rule constitutes the most cowardly betrayal of public trust on the part of this House in 150 years. Not a Member of this House, Democrat or Republican, high or low, old or new, knows who wrote this bill, who will administer it, where or how the four billions will be spent, who will be employed under its provisions, where they will be employed, what projects will be started, and how and where.

The only hearings on this bill were a mere travesty held for an hour or two behind closed doors with two or three witnesses from the bureaucracy testifying mainly to the effect that they, like the rest of us, know practically nothing about it. In its whole history this bill, in its present form, is a denial and betrayal of the sworn duty of the Appropriations Committee, the Rivers and Harbors Committee, the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, the Public Lands Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and of every individual in the entire Membership of this House. It is a prostitution of the Rules Committee, because its unknown author, or authors, have forced that committee to

attempt to gag and bully this House in a fashion so shameful as to make the House a laughing-stock.

In the consideration of this bill, who is it, in the opinion of the Rules Committee, ostensibly acting for the President, that needs to be gagged? Certainly not the Republican minority. We could not by our vote defeat this measure. Oh, no! It is the sane, American-minded Members of this House in the Democratic majority whom the President apparently does not trust, and who, therefore, had to be gagged before they could be forced to lay aside their reason and sense of duty and support this vicious resolution in its present form.

This situation involves much more than a question of loyalty to the President, or of the keeping of individual campaign promises. The brilliant gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] told us this morning that he had promised his constituents to support the President. But I hope he did not by that promise announce himself as a mere rubber stamp; nor, if he was in his right mind, would he promise to violate his oath of office or side-step his duties as a Member of this House. At least I have never known him to behave in that irrational and unmoral manner.

The Democratic Party in its Chicago platform of 1932, which was the best platform that party ever wrote, made many promises to the American people, but since the election of 1932 neither the President, his Cabinet, nor his great majorities in both branches of Congress have more than once or twice been within a million miles of keeping those promises. So, in determining his duty with reference to this iniquitous measure, why should any individual Democratic Member of this House side-step his duty by taking refuge behind his campaign promises? What is involved here today is our solemn oath of office and our duty thereunder.

Third. This bill in its present form carries the most dangerous, complete, and unqualified delegation of powers to the Chief Executive in our entire history, in either peace or war. Under sections 4, 5, and 6 it authorizes the President, at his discretion, to make over, continue, postpone, suspend, abolish, utilize, or prescribe practically every branch of our governmental organization, including the House of Representatives itself. These sections empower the President to seize the personal property of any citizen by eminent domain and to do anything with this property that he sees fit.

And last, but by no means least, these sections 4, 5, and 6 authorize the President directly or through some delegate or subordinate to make rules and regulations with the full force and authority of laws passed by Congress and if any unfortunate citizen disobeys one of these rules, he shall be fined $5,000, or sent to prison for 2 years, or both. And this House is now by authority of this gag rule expected to pass such a law as this without fundamental amendment, without adequate debate, and under the pretense of relieving unemployment.

Fourth, instead of this bill in its present form increasing employment, it will decrease employment by slowing down normal business recovery through putting the Government, on a tremendous scale, into competition with private business thus increasing fear and uncertainty.

This bill in its present form is saturated with hypocrisy. While it purports to relieve unemployment, which every Member of this House is anxious to do, this bill empowers the President to take away most of the liberties guaranteed our citizens under the Constitution. He can do anything, anywhere, to anyone. And to achieve this purpose it is proposed to use the Members of this House.

Our duty, regardless of party or personal consideration, is to turn this un-American vicious and dangerous bill back to our Appropriations Committee. I believe that our Appropriations Committee, after full consultation with the administration and full public hearings, can and will bring back to this House a relief bill that will really give employment to millions of our people and which will not jeopardize a single right or liberty of our citizens by provisions such as sections 4, 5, and 6 of the present bill.

Such a bill presented by our Appropriations Committee would unite all the resources of private industry and of our Federal and State Governments in the task of finding employment, not only for three millions but for the ten millions yet unemployed. By restoring public confidence it would start the whole country on the way to prosperity. It would save the President from the addlepated, unofficial advisers who are luring him to the failure of his plans.

It would save the Democratic Party from self-destruction at the height of its power. It would save the Members of this House from violating their oath of office and their sacred trust as representatives of the public.

It would save our beloved country from taking one more step toward an economic and social crash which no sane man can contemplate without sorrow and shame. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer two amendments later when we come to the reading of the bill, and I rise now to call the attention of the House to these amendments.

On page 6, line 9, after the word "contract", to insert:

> But all such grants and/or loans to finance construction projects and/or contracts let for construction projects shall contain such provisions as are necessary to insure that all employees employed on such projects shall be paid not less than the rate of wage prevailing in the locality in which the project is prosecuted.

That is one amendment, and later I shall offer an amendment, as follows:

> On page 6, line 23, after the comma, strike out the balance of line 23, all of lines 24 and 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "*Provided*, That the President or any governmental agency, including any corporation or any individual to which or to whom may be delegated any powers under this joint resolution, shall not issue any rules and regulations which change existing law."

The purpose of the first amendment is this: In the N. R. A. law, section 206, title II, we find the following language:

> All contracts let for construction projects and all loans and grants pursuant to this title shall contain such provisions as is necessary to insure (1) that no convict labor shall be employed on any such project; (2) that except in executive, administrative, and advisory positions, so far as practicable and feasible, no individual directly employed on any such project shall be permitted to work more than 30 hours in any one week; (3) that all employees shall be paid just and reasonable wages, which shall be compensation sufficient to provide, for the hours of labor as limited, a standard of living in decency and comfort.

There is more to the section, which I shall not read now, such as veterans' preference, et cetera.

I am in favor of section 206 of the N. R. A. law and its provisions as they exist in the law today. I do not want to have the House get the impression that this is a 30-hour-week amendment. I am offering this because it is in the law today, calling for the payment of reasonable and just wages.

What I am trying to do in this first amendment is simply to demand that the prevailing rate of wage shall be paid on these projects which are let out under contract, as is provided for in the law today. Admiral Peoples, in the hearings which you have, said that if this bill goes through what they intend to pay on these jobs is $50 a month. I do not think that $50 a month comes anywhere near being a reasonable living wage for anybody, let alone any skilled workman working on a construction job. I rose to call the attention of the House to this at this time in order to protect the rights of workers who are going to work on these construction jobs.

The other amendment, providing that no changes shall be made in existing law, of course, will take care of the provisions of the Davis-Bacon law, which provides that the prevailing rate of wage shall be paid in the building program. This amendment will take care of everything that is in existing law. In other words, I do not believe that that section 206 of the N. R. A. law, which passed the House and the Senate and was signed by the President, should be thrown out now. It has been working well. There are men in your district working on these construction projects getting the prevailing rate of wage, and I do not think they should be cut down from $1.20 an hour for skilled workers to 90 cents or 80 cents for unskilled workers to $50 a month; and that is what

will happen, according to the testimony of Admiral Peoples before the committee, if my amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. We all know what a champion of the labor class the gentleman from Massachusetts has been in the past and is today. There are some things in the first section of this bill which I am concerned about. I read here the words:

(2) Relieving economic maladjustment, * * * (4) improving living and working conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CONNERY. I am very sorry that my time has expired. Otherwise I would be glad to answer any questions of my good friend from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, under the present rule by which this joint resolution comes before us today I am reminded of the statement made by Mr. O'CONNOR, Chairman of the Rules Committee, speaking in reference to another rule, which is in the RECORD of January 3, as follows:

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House this is not the most pleasant duty which could devolve upon me on the opening day of the Seventy-fourth Congress, but by reason of my membership on the Rules Committee it is a duty I have to perform, and I do it with reluctance.

To some of you new Members I might state in advance that the Rules Committee is an arm of the leadership of this House. It is sometimes called an "arm" of the administration in power in the Nation. Some people have also referred to it as the "political committee" or the committee which shapes or brings before the House the policies of the leadership of the House and the administration.

I expect before this Congress is over we will hear a lot of talk about gag rules alleged to have been brought in by the Rules Committee. Of course, this particular resolution is not in that category. This is not a gag rule of any kind.

I say this rule today is a gag rule. As was stated this afternoon on the floor of the House by Mr. SABATH, this is a bill sent to the House of Representatives by the President of the United States, and he respectfully requested that it be enacted into law. In this bill the President of the United States requests—yea, demands!—of the House of Representatives that we turn over to him the power delegated to us by the Constitution of the United States. We who have sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States, if we enact this legislation, are nothing but a bunch of jellyfish or as spineless as a sailfish—drifting, drifting, drifting away from the Constitution to a great unknown dictatorship, carrying this beloved country of ours into a communistic government or probably a soviet union, or who knows but what we may ruin the country entirely.

It required 150 years to build this Nation, the strongest Nation in the world, and are we going to permit it to be torn down in 6 or 8 years? That is the great question before us this afternoon. If I were to have asked the Membership of this House 3 years ago whether they would approve a dictatorship the same as Mussolini then had in Italy, you would have said, "No; never!"; if I were to ask you whether you would want a dictatorship such as the Hitler reign now in Germany, you would say, "No; never!"; if I were to ask you if you wanted a dictatorship such as administered by the "Kingfish" over the State of Louisiana at the last two sessions of the legislature in that State the past year, you would say "No! No!" And, gentlemen, if I can see the trend of the times, we are setting up such a dictatorship over this land of the free and the home of the brave—a country that has stood for 150 years. But we are tearing our Constitution asunder, and if our forefathers were to see us today we certainly would never have them approve of the action that we are now taking. What would Thomas Jefferson think of us?

As for me, I believe in relief and am willing to go the limit to assist in relief by proper procedure under the Constitution, but I will never submit to the course we are pursuing under this bill. I could never relieve my conscience of voting for a bill such as this. It will only lead to greater chaos to the American people rather than to benefit. It is only prolonging the day for greater agony for the American people.

Who is going to spend this great sum of four and one-half billion dollars—a sum so large that there is not a Member of the House of Representatives who knows what it all means. Yet we are going to put that great sum of money in the control of one individual. Who will that individual be? It certainly will not be the President of the United States. He must delegate this to others. The one who is administering the P. W. A. funds at the present time is Secretary Ickes. He has under his jurisdiction now the Department of the Interior; he also has no less than 8 or 10 alphabetical organizations which he is supervising. Any one of them is sufficient for all the time of any one individual. Yet he is going to be given the work of allocating this great fund of four and one-half billion dollars.

I take from the RECORD of January 9 the statements made by Mr. Cox and Mr. BLANTON when speaking on the H. O. L. C.—remarks in reference to Mr. Ickes and what they think of him.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I should like to cite a parallel to the Board to which the gentleman refers. In the Budget message provision is made for giving the Secretary of the Interior an under secretary. Can the gentleman imagine any reason in the world for the Secretary of the Interior wanting to name an under secretary other than it gives him the further opportunity to insult Members of Congress in rejecting recommendations that they offer? He has done this to the extent that he is the most thoroughly hated and despised man connected with the Government at the present time.

Mr. BLANTON. If there is a Member on this floor, either Democrat or Republican, who wants to get up here and defend that particular official, the present Secretary of the Interior, I will yield him the balance of my time. I want to hear some defense of him, if there is anything that can be said in his favor.

Are you Members of the House of Representatives going to turn over this unprecedented sum of money to him to be expended? Let the party in power carry out the pledges made in the platform of 1932; let them give us sound money; let them balance the Budget; let them give industry an opportunity, and it will not be long until men will have jobs. There are more men out of employment today, according to the statements of the Department of Labor, than there were 2 years ago, and we are $10,000,000,000 deeper in debt and going in the red millions of dollars every day. We have now the greatest national deficit this country has ever known. When will it ever stop? Restore confidence by sound laws and constitutional government. We must place our foot on the brake before it is too late. Let us regulate mass production in industry and give men the jobs that machinery is now doing. Let us give idle men something to do that will occupy their minds. We want more work, not more idleness. We want men to be working for an honest living wage rather than to be passing out a dole to them. Honest American citizens want a job to earn a livelihood, not a dole.

If we will let industry absorb the unemployed population, the men will receive wages instead of a dole. We will not build up a national deficit such as we are doing now. Industry will pay the bill.

Let us stop idleness! Let us go back to some of the old, sound fundamental principles that have made this country great. If you and I are honestly and sincerely desirous of trying to help the people of this country, we will forget politics, forget dictatorship, and will settle down to try to give a good, honest, conscientious administration of the affairs of government according to the Constitution, and if we do this in a very short time men will find work, unemployment will cease, and we will have a happy and contented people and a better country in which to live. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD].

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, it has been very interesting today to hear the arguments presented from the Well of this House as to some of the provisions of this resolution and as to the ultimate effect of some of those provisions.

They would have you believe Congress is surrendering all its power and prerogatives to the Chief Executive and that those powers can never be regained. Such is not the case.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who has just preceded me, is fearful of the question of the delegation of powers which is included in this resolution. Of course, there is authority, and a lot of authority, vested in the President of the United States by this resolution. From the very nature of the object sought, that of relief of unemployment and of destitution, that authority must be lodged where there is flexibility. It can only be in Congress itself, in the President, or in some subordinate official in the governmental service. I think it is very clear that from the nature of the task confronting us, namely, relief of unemployment and distress, with the shifting sands of unemployment from one section of the country to the other, it would be absolutely impossible for this Congress to specifically designate the various projects that may be proposed to accomplish this purpose. Business is recovering; it is coming along slowly, it is true. We are hopeful it will be speeded up and soon the employables on relief will find employment in private industry. This program that is designed by this joint resolution is a program of transition from dole relief to work relief until private industry and individual initiative has recovered to such an extent that it will take up the slack of unemployment and the people who are employable off of relief rolls.

Then with the security program, consisting of unemployment insurance and old-age pensions, the picture will be complete, and the people of this country will enjoy that greater fullness of life and the security of old age, so much desired by the President and the people of the American Republic. The primary purpose of this resolution is relief of unemployment and of distress, and the relief rolls are to be looked to to get the men to do the work proposed to be done under the direction of the President of the United States. It is absolutely impossible in advance, and with recovery progressing in some sections of the country greater than it is in others, with the unemployment problem not so acute in some sections as it is in others, for this Congress to lay down definitely a program of specific projects to be undertaken to get the best results from the money that is here made available. In order to get the greatest amount of efficiency and the greatest benefit for the money that is here proposed to be appropriated, it is essential that the authority to allocate be vested somewhere, in some agency available at all times, and not so unwieldy as the Congress, that can take care of situations as they fluctuate from time to time. Should the matter of allocation of projects be attempted in the House, a certain amount of logrolling would inevitably result, thus defeating in part the very purpose sought. It becomes necessary, then, to either vest that authority in the President of the United States or with some subordinate body of this Government—and I do not believe anyone seriously wants to leave that authority in some subordinate officials in the Government who are not responsive to the will of the people.

I remember since I have been here, as was referred to by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], when you gentlemen now on the minority side of the aisle delegated your authority and your power and your right to designate and to allocate projects under the public-buildings program, not to the President of the United States, but to a subordinate group of individuals in this Government, who were not elected by and were not responsive to the will of the American people, and this was done not in the time of an emergency, as now exists, when taking people off the relief rolls by placing them on work rolls was the primary purpose, as now.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. ARNOLD. In just a moment. I remember very well that not so very long ago you gentlemen now on the minority side of the aisle caused to be written upon the statute books authority to a subordinate of this Government to use the money of the people of this country by entering into 10-year subsidy contracts with the great shipping interests of this country, under the guise of carrying ocean mail, whether there was mail to carry or not. Had you lodged that authority in the responsible head of your Government it would not have been so bad, but you clothed the Postmaster General, a man who was not elected by and was not responsive to the will of the people of this country, with power to enter into contracts, giving millions of dollars to the shipping interests of this country by way of subsidy, and now, under these contracts, we are paying out something like $28,000,000 a year in direct subsidies to those interests, and Congress was not consulted and had no power or authority in the matter except to appropriate moneys from year to year to fulfill the Government's obligation thereunder after authority was vested in the Postmaster General to enter into such contracts.

I yield now to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. All of these public-building projects were subject to specific appropriations by Congress in detail.

Mr. ARNOLD. The Interdepartmental Committee was given full and complete authority to make allocations and to provide where those projects should be located.

Mr. TABER. Only after specific appropriation by Congress.

Mr. ARNOLD. The Congress appropriated the money in a lump sum, the allocations were made and places selected and Congress had no power to change those allocations.

Mr. TABER. The authorization was in lump sum, but the appropriation was in detail as to projects.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it not clear to the gentleman that the power to legislate is in this resolution delegated to the Executive? If the gentleman will turn to paragraph (a) of section 4, the power is vested in the President to establish and prescribe the duties and functions of governmental agencies, including corporations. In other words, that vests the President with the power to charter a corporation or to set up a corporation or to establish any other agency of the Government, such as the Federal Reserve, or any other agency. Is that not true?

Mr. ARNOLD. That is true so far as it concerns the carrying into effect of the purposes set forth in this resolution, but it does not and cannot go beyond that authority.

Mr. COX. But it does carry with it, as the gentleman construes the language, the power to legislate. Does that concession not mean that the bill in this respect would not stand an attack made upon it? Is it not in the very teeth of the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the oil case?

Mr. ARNOLD. It may be necessary for the President in carrying out the purposes of this resolution to make available some agencies that are not now existing; and in making use of agencies that are not now existing he may clothe them with corporate authority, but solely for the purpose of carrying out the relief and recovery items specified in this bill. That is not a legislative power, but an administrative authority, as I interpret it.

Mr. COX. Under paragraph (c) of the same section is not power delegated to the President to abolish any corporation or any governmental agency heretofore set up by the Congress, and is not this a legislative power?

Mr. ARNOLD. That matter will be taken care of to some extent by amendments, as I understand it, applying specifically to emergency activities and to other activities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I have always been classed as a liberal. The only real opposition that has been directed against me in my political contests has been backed by the so-called "big interests" on the plea that I was too liberal and friendly to the common people, the working classes, the farmers, and the defenders of our country and their dependents.

No one could be more sincerely and deeply interested in providing adequate relief and employment for the needy than I. The Republican Party in the House stands as a unit for necessary and adequate relief for the needy and jobs for the unemployed, and my Republican colleagues and myself stand ready to vote all necessary appropriations for

these laudable purposes; but we do not favor this un-American gag rule under which this bill is considered, and neither do we subscribe to the dictatorial powers conferred upon the President in this force bill.

If this measure is passed, Congress has surrendered its powers to legislate and has supinely abdicated and turned over to the executive branch of the Government the duties, responsibilities, and powers delegated to Congress by the Constitution. Members of Congress become merely messenger boys.

This bill was not written by any Member of Congress. It was prepared by the executive branch of the Government. It was sent over to the House with the demand that it be pushed through without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i."

If this "force" bill is adopted as sent over here by the administration, President Roosevelt will have more dictatorial power than Hitler in Germany or Mussolini in Italy.

Of course, I do not think the President wrote this bill. It was prepared by his subordinates. Section 4, subsection E, provides—

> Delegate the powers conferred on him (the President) under this joint resolution to any governmental agency.

Section 6 provides that the President is authorized—

> To prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this resolution, and any violation of these rules or regulations shall be punishable by a fine not to exceed $5,000 or imprisonment for 2 years, or both.

This gives the President the right to delegate these unheard of dictatorial powers to his subordinates, and under section 6 he and these subordinates or any one of them to whom he may delegate these powers—and he must delegate the carrying out of these provisions to thousands of subordinates—has the power to make criminal statutes, a violation of any one of which will subject a citizen to a fine not to exceed $5,000 or imprisonment for 2 years, or both. If we would go just one step further and confer upon the President the power of life and death, then it could be said that the President is clothed with powers equal to those exercised by the Caesars under the Roman Empire.

The other day my distinguished Democratic friend, Mr. CELLER, of New York, made a most eloquent appeal against the unwise practice of the executive branch of the Government issuing orders and regulations under the dictatorial powers given to it by the Seventy-third Congress, and in effect giving it the power to make criminal statutes. It appeared that approximately 11,000 of these orders had been issued. Of course, no lawyer is sufficiently advised to keep track of, know, and understand all of these orders and regulations. What chance would the average citizen have to know about them and understand them? Yet our citizens have been brought into court and subjected to prosecution on these orders and regulations. This bill enlarges these dictatorial powers.

It is the duty of Congress, and it should guard that duty and its powers most jealously, to formulate and to write into law the criminal statutes of our country.

This bill gives the President the power to extend the period, to stop, to combine, or to change in any way he may desire the many, many agencies of this Government, and without submitting it to Congress he may prolong or shorten the periods for their operation any and all of the emergency acts passed by the Seventy-third Congress.

If this bill is passed in substantially the form it has been sent to Congress by the President, Congress ought to quit and go home. I want the President to have all the power and authority granted to him by the Constitution and no more. I shall always insist that Congress have no less power than is granted to it by the Constitution and that it assert that authority. Representative government, the freedom of our people, and the rights of our citizens cannot be safeguarded and protected by any other policy.

The Democratic President and Democratic Congress undertook to justify their disregard of the Constitution on the plea that an emergency existed, and that when this emergency was over we would return to the ordinary processes of constitutional government. This administration is entering upon its third year. This bill enlarges the dictatorial power of the executive branch of the Government and its subordinates, and these extraordinary powers are to be exercised for the next 2½ years.

This country has seen great times of stress. It has come through all of them, not by overthrowing parliamentary government and ignoring the rights of the people but by upholding and maintaining these principles.

RIGHTS OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY THREATENED

No measure ever enacted by Congress gave the President such dictatorial powers over labor and industry. If this bill is adopted as presented, there is scarcely a limit to the power of the President over industry and agriculture, and this is true as to labor. The toilers of this country are deeply interested in certain measures. For many of them I have the greatest sympathy, and if given an opportunity will support them most earnestly and actively. This bill grants to the President these dictatorial powers up to June 30, 1937, and if this measure becomes a law I expect to see many conflicts between labor and the subordinates of the President who will undertake to carry out these dictatorial powers for him. And may I warn the friends of labor, if this measure becomes a law, none of your major bills will see daylight? And may I also warn industry and agriculture that this measure gives the President such power over you, your property and the management thereof, that in the end it will create a great deal of discord and will greatly retard recovery? This measure gives to the President—and he may delegate it to his subordinates—the power to make rules and regulations affecting industry, agriculture, and labor that in effect amount to criminal statutes and the violation of which calls for a penalty of as much as $5,000 or 2 years in the penitentiary, or both. Under the new deal more than 11,000 orders and regulations were issued. I am unwilling to defeat the purpose of the toilers or hamstring and retard industry or agriculture by conferring upon the President and his subordinates these arbitrary and dictatorial powers. It might turn out very well if the President could supervise and direct each and all of these activities. But he cannot do so. He must delegate it, and he has the right to under this bill, to thousands of subordinates. There really is no place in America for one Hitler or Mussolini. This would make a Hitler or Mussolini out of hundreds and hundreds who will undertake to execute the provisions of this bill.

FIVE BILLION SEVEN HUNDRED MILLION UNSPENT

A statement of the Treasury Department dated January 18, 1935, shows that out of the tremendous sums of money heretofore appropriated by the Seventy-third Congress and turned over to the President, there remains in the Treasury unspent approximately $5,700,000,000. Notwithstanding this enormous unspent sum, the President now comes and demands that Congress turn over to him without any strings attached to it $4,000,000,000, placing in his hands in all $9,700,000,000 to spend as he and his subordinates may see fit. This is more than twice the amount of money expended by the Federal Government in the 4 years of the Civil War.

This money is not to be spent for relief, but, as they contend, to provide jobs for the unemployed. During the last 18 months the Government has spent $1,500,000,000 for the alleged purpose of providing jobs. Can any reasonable man contend that this $5,700,000,000 now in the Treasury would not provide all the money necessary for the next year for the purpose of providing jobs? At least it would be more than the Government could legitimately spend, taking into consideration what it did do in the last 18 months.

It is said that this Congress will not adjourn until about June or July, and the next Congress will meet early in January 1936. Mark you, the President and his subordinates have no program. They have no definite plan, so they say, as to how they will spend this enormous sum. The President insists that this money must be handed to him without any strings and he can do as he pleases.

We see in the press where many Democratic leaders assert that this is unprecedented. There never was anything like it. I wonder what the board of aldermen or the city council

of any city would say to its mayor, even of a city like New York, if he came before them and demanded $10,000,000 and refused to disclose the purpose for which the money was to be used. I wonder if any legislature of any State would grant to any Governor his request for even $1,000,000 if he refused to disclose what he was going to do with the money. Is there any business institution in the land whose board of directors would vote its president $100,000 unless that president would inform them what use was to be made of the money?

And the answer would not be sufficient that he desired to provide some new jobs or that he had in mind to make some betterments. The query would at once come back, "What jobs, what work, what betterments, what improvements do you have in mind?"

What head of a family, if his wife should come to him and request a thousand dollars, at a time when he was deeply in debt and would have to borrow the money, would not demand the purpose for which the thousand dollars was to be used?

I have always opposed granting lump sums to the President or to the various bureaus and agencies of the Government. When I was in Congress before, the Republicans passed the Budget bill. Practically all the States have followed in that lead, and the States, as well as the Federal Government, have budget bureaus. I am unwilling to place such a tremendous sum of money in the hands of anyone when the person asking it refuses to give the general purposes for which it will be spent and admits that he has no program.

If we had a full Treasury there might be some excuse for such action. This is not the case. We must borrow this money. This administration has increased the national debt $10,000,000,000 already, and if we vote this $4,000,000,000 the increase will amount to approximately $15,000,000,000 on June 30, 1935, and our national debt on June 30, 1935, will reach the stupendous sum of $35,000,000,000, and this does not take into account the losses that will be sustained on the loans that have been made.

President Roosevelt was elected on his platform and upon his declaration that he would decrease governmental expenses at least 25 percent and balance the Budget and also reduce taxes. He further declared that the Government must live within its income and these policies must be carried out in order to overcome the depression and bring about prosperity. How different are his performances compared with his promises! The expense of government has more than doubled. There have been billions in deficit for each of the years he has been in office. The deficit this year will amount to $5,000,000,000, and he and other Democratic leaders admit that there will be deficits of billions next year and the next year and throughout President Roosevelt's term.

NO PROGRAM OR POLICY

As there is an unexpended balance in the Treasury of $5,700,000,000 of emergency appropriations made by the Seventy-third Congress to be used for recovery and relief, it seems to me that before the President should be granted an additional $4,000,000,000 for these purposes he and his subordinates should submit a general policy and program so that Congress might intelligently vote on this matter. We should like to know what amount of this money is to be used to set up strictly private enterprises. One of the great drawbacks to recovery is the fact that the Government has been engaging in every sort of private enterprise against the citizens of this country. It seems to me that this sum of money should be used to construct highways, build bridges, improve rivers and harbors, improve our system of national parks, and build park-to-park highways, construct public buildings for the Government, and aid States, counties, and municipalities to construct necessary buildings, and to provide aid for the public schools and other public educational institutions of the country. This would bring the expenditure and distribution of this money into every county and community of the Nation and give all of our able-bodied citizens who need work an opportunity to make a livelihood for themselves and their families, and this policy will greatly encourage private enterprise and private industry. The President and his subordinates have had 2 years in which to map out a program of work and relief recovery, and if they have not worked out such a program with the billions that have been spent, why place into their hands an additional $4,000,000,000 without any program or definite policy? Would it not be well to let them try their hand on the $5,700,000,000 of the emergency funds that is now in the Treasury unexpended?

The record shows that although the President has had all of these billions at his command, yet during the last 18 months he has expended approximately one and one-half billion dollars for work jobs. Congress will be in session until about the 1st of July. Why all the haste to rush this bill through giving the President these unheard-of dictatorial powers? Why not take some time to work out a program? Congress will be in session again next January. Unless they spend money three or four times faster during the next 11 months to provide work and jobs than they did for the last 18 months there will be plenty of this emergency money unexpended in the Treasury when Congress meets again. The adage "Haste makes waste" is true under a "new deal" as well as an "old deal." Is it because the President thinks he has Congress that he can control absolutely now but might not be able to control a year hence? Therefore he is going to get these dictatorial powers and these billions of dollars while "the getting is good."

I am not opposed to the appropriation of billions of dollars for the purpose of providing jobs for the unemployed or relief for the needy. They say very little of this four billion will be used in 1935. We thought a lot of money was spent last fall during the campaign. If we vote this four billion, you watch the money fly in 1936. You know there will be something doing in 1936.

NO RELIEF FOR THE VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

I listened to every word the President uttered in his eloquent annual message to a joint session of the House and Senate and was greatly disappointed when he closed that address without even mentioning the words "veterans, their widows or orphan children."

On March 20, 1933, the President jammed through Congress, under another gag rule, the so-called "Economy Act", in order, as he said, to balance the Budget—to keep our expenditures within our income. Nearly all the economies effected by that act were against the disabled defenders of our country and the widows and orphans of our veterans. Approximately 500,000 disabled veterans and tens of thousands of poor widows and orphans of veterans were taken off the pension rolls and practically all of them are still off the pension rolls and are in dire need.

There is not a word in this bill proposing to restore these rights or to right these wrongs to the veterans and their dependents. The same Economy Act reduced the salaries of the President and all other officers and Government employees 15 percent. An act of the Seventy-third Congress has already restored 10 percent of that cut, and it is provided that the other 5 percent shall be restored on July 1, 1935, but the administration is fighting every effort to restore those benefits that were taken away from the disabled veterans and the widows and children of veterans.

C. C. C. TO BE MORE THAN DOUBLED

The President did point out in his message, and it is generally agreed by the Democratic leaders, that the C. C. C., which has now approximately 300,000 in its camps, will be increased to a point somewhere between six hundred thousand and a million. This item alone will cost this Government approximately $1,000,000,000. This will come out of the $4,000,000,000, this bill, or, if the President desires, will come out of the $5,700,000,000 emergency fund now unexpended in the Treasury.

Tens of millions of dollars will be expended to acquire, equip, and maintain "hobo hotels." I wonder how much of it will be used to burn pigs and plow under cotton.

Yes; we have millions and millions for the "hobo hotels", for the C. C. C.'s, to burn pigs, and to engage in other unprofitable and foolish ventures, but not one cent to restore

the benefits that were taken away from the disabled defenders of our country and their widows and orphans, and not one cent to pay the adjusted-service certificates.

Let me say to my Democratic friends, you went out last year and in order to secure the support of the veterans and their families and friends, pledged the veterans that if they would support you you would vote for the cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates and would vote to restore the benefits that had been taken from the disabled veterans and the dependents of veterans. If you vote for this measure and spend all the money, you will be told by the President and other Democratic leaders that nothing can be done for the veterans as the money has already been spent.

It is my opinion that one of the purposes of this $4,000,000,000 bill at this time is to sidetrack the soldiers' bonus and to prevent any other relief to the veterans and their dependents. This will be the effect of your vote on this gag rule and this "force" bill.

Many business men and others as well as veterans have urged me to vote for the bonus and other relief for the veterans and their dependents. I pledged them in my campaign that I would do so. If I voted for this $4,000,000,000 at this time, I would in effect defeat that pledge.

Just after the war I helped to pass a bill in the House to pay this adjusted compensation. It was a just obligation of the Government. Recent investigation has shown that billions were made out of munitions. The railroads and more than 7,000 cost-plus contractors had their pay adjusted soon after the war. We waited until 1925 and handed these veterans these adjusted certificates, due in 1945. If this additional pay was right, it should have been paid just after the war and not in 1945. The President and the Democratic leaders of Congress appear determined to defeat the bonus or any other measure restoring benefits to the veterans.

FAVORS ADEQUATE RELIEF

In order to force all of the Members of the House to grant to him these dictatorial powers and this additional $4,000,000,000 without any strings or limitations to it, the President has included in the bill $880,000,000 for relief. This was appropriated in the Seventy-third Congress. It is stuck in this bill as a club. Of course, I strongly favor this $880,000,000 for relief, and my only objection is that it is not sufficient. The people of my district and, as I understand, in most of the States and districts remember very well how the Democrats urged the people to vote for the Democratic nominees for Senator and Congressman last fall if they desired the relief to go on. It was charged that the Republican Party was against relief, and it would stop if the people failed to give President Roosevelt a Democratic Congress. The election was barely over and the results certified when those high in the councils of the Democratic Party began to denounce relief and declared it would have to stop. I heard the President, in his joint message to Congress, declare that relief had to stop at an early date. This bill provides that it must stop by June 30, 1935. The leading Democrats on the floor of the House declared it was vicious, wrong, un-American, would destroy the country, and that it must come to an end.

How different they are talking now to what they did before the election! The President declares there are at least a million five hundred thousand unemployables on the relief rolls. What does he mean by the unemployables? The aged needy, the blind, the cripples, poor widows with young children, and those so broken in health that they cannot follow gainful employment. They are the unemployables. They cannot work, even though jobs might be available. They, their wives and children, represent at least 5,000,000 people. The President declares and this bill before us provides that these 5,000,000 of needy people go off the Federal relief rolls June 30, 1935, and they are thrown back on their respective States, counties, and communities for help. This is another provision of the bill that I am opposed to.

There is not now any Federal pension law, and neither does Kentucky have any pension law that will take care of these people, and Kentucky will not be in shape to provide and take care of them by June 30, 1935. I think this is a cruel policy. If there is any class outside of our disabled veterans and their dependents that should receive consideration and relief, it is this great group of aged needy, poor blind, poor cripples, poor widows, and those who are physically unable to work. This relief should have been continued until a pension could have been provided for them. We must not forget that among these unemployables are tens of thousands of disabled defenders of our country.

NO ADEQUATE OLD-AGE PENSIONS

I favor a Federal pension for the aged needy, for the blind, cripples, widows with minor children, and those so broken in health that they cannot follow any gainful occupation. This covers the so-called "unemployables." This pension should be a sum sufficient to take care of this group of needy people, and to provide them real support in the way of food, clothing, shelter, and other necessaries. These, with their families now on relief, number more than 5,000,000 people. Of course, we know that all of this group of people who are needy are not on relief. What is to become of these people? The President says they must be taken off relief and thrown back on the States, counties, and communities not later than June 30, 1935, and all relief to them from the Federal Government must stop at that time. I do not agree with that policy. The administration says it favors a pension for them, and it is suggested by the administration that $50,000,000 be appropriated for the year beginning July 1, 1935, and $125,000,000 for each year thereafter, these sums to be matched by an equal sum provided by the States. Of course, it will require a long process for the State of Kentucky, and a number of the other States, to provide the money to match this. The Government will not put up anything until the State matches it. Kentucky cannot do so until a constitutional amendment is voted on in November 1935, and funds cannot be provided in Kentucky until the legislature meets in 1936. I repeat, What is to become of the aged needy, the blind, the cripples, widows, and small children until this pension plan can be put into effect? Let us see what benefits will come to these poor people if this pension measure is passed by Congress and these funds are matched by the States. Under the administration bill no persons can get a pension unless they are needy at least 65 years of age. The Government reports show that there are seven million five hundred thousand more than 65 years of age, or crippled, or blind. At least six million of these are needy and would qualify for a pension.

If the Government put up fifty million the first year and the States would match the fifty million, we would have $100,000,000 to divide among 6,000,000 people, and this would give each person $16.66⅔ per year, or one and one-third dollars each per month for the first year. For the year beginning July 1, 1936, the Government would put up one hundred and twenty-five million and the States one hundred and twenty-five million, making $250,000,000 in all to divide among 6,000,000 people. This would give each person less than $7 per month, the Government providing about $3.50 per month and the States the other $3.50. Of course, if the State of Kentucky did not match the Government's money, this needy group of people in Kentucky would not get anything. I do not agree with the administration's pension bill at all. Not one dollar of this $4,000,000,000 bill that is now before us can be used for these pensions this year or any other time. The President asserts and this bill provides that this $4,000,000,000 will be used for other purposes. Our Democratic friends went strong last year when they were campaigning in favor of old-age pensions. I did likewise. My people are for it. Let me say to our Democratic friends who pledged themselves to enact an old-age pension bill, if you vote for this four-billion measure, you will be unable to keep your promises. The administration will say to you after this large sum is appropriated that there are no funds to provide an adequate pension for the aged needy, the blind, the crippled, and poor widows. I should like to see this bill amended so that we might pay off the adjusted-service certificates, restore the benefits that were taken from our disabled veterans, their widows and orphans, provide an adequate pension for these unemployables, and use the balance of this money, together with the five billion seven

hundred million that are now in the Treasury, to build a lot of farm-to-market roads in each of the counties where needed, splendid park-to-park highways, public buildings, improve and develop our rivers and harbors, aid our public schools, and other activities of a public nature; but under the gag rule no such amendments can be presented or considered.

FOR AMENDMENTS

We have been told over and over by Democratic leaders that the emergency is over. We are well on our way to full recovery, yet this bill is the most drastic emergency measure yet proposed, and it runs until June 30, 1937—2½ years more. This measure should be amended and limited to expire June 30, 1936. If the necessity requires, Congress can then continue the program. It has been announced in the expenditure of this money a wage will be paid that is less than that paid for the same kind of work in each community. This bill should be amended so that the Government will pay the same wages as is paid by like services by private enterprises for the same character of service in each particular community. It should be further amended by taking away from the President the power of eminent domain, and sections 4, 5, and 6 of the bill should be stricken out. It should be further amended giving to each State such proportion of the money that is to be expended as the unemployed of each State bears to the whole number of unemployed in the Nation. It should be clearly set out by proper amendment that no favoritism or partisanship should be allowed in the distribution of relief or in providing employment. We have seen a lot of this, and thousands have made complaints. Many of us have seen political advantage taken with people on account of their distress and misery. I am more interested in a square deal than I am in a new deal. The Democratic majority in the House will refuse to adopt these salutory amendments, and I shall vote to recommit this bill to the committee with instructions that these and other amendments be adopted.

WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED

Our Democratic friends are obsessed with the idea that in their hearts is to be found all the humanity and sympathy for the distressed people of this Nation, and that in some way they have a monopoly on the wisdom and patriotism of our country. All in all there was turned over to President Roosevelt, by the Seventy-second and Seventy-third Congresses more than $23,000,000,000. In addition to the $4,000,000,000 asked for in this bill for so-called "work relief", they are demanding about $4,500,000,000 more to carry on the ordinary business of the Government. There is an unexpended balance in the Treasury now of $5,700,000,000 for emergency purposes. The Congress will appropriate around $4,500,000,000 to carry on the ordinary activities of the Government; and if we give the President $4,880,000,000 asked for in this bill, he will have at his disposal approximately $15,000,000,000. What are some of the outstanding results after the present administration has had an unlimited sum of money and more than 2 years to deal with the depression? What do we find the situation to be? Taxes have been raised to new high levels. The national debt has been increased more than $10,000,000,000, and it is now approximately $29,000,000,000 and at the end of this fiscal year it will be $35,000,000,000; more than 11,000,000 workers in industry out of employment. This is 500,000 more than there were a year ago, approximately 20,000,000 people on the direct relief. This is an increase of over 5,000,000 more than a year ago, and there are at least 5,000,000 more people who are suffering and need relief, and the demands for relief are growing by leaps and bounds, and the President comes along in this bill and declares to the country that he must have nearly $5,000,000,000 more with dictatorial powers to deal with recovery and relief. I wonder if our Democratic friends have very much to brag about?

This country will never come out of the depression under the present policy and set-up. There is one important factor lacking and that is confidence. There are more than 11,000,000 unemployed in industry. More than 40,000,000 acres of productive farm lands have been cut out. Nothing is said about the millions of unemployed farmers, and the millions of unemployed merchants, clerks, and so forth. With all of this power and money the President and his spokesmen declare they hope to put as many as 3,500,000 men to work, and my honest judgment is that a year from now there will be as many unemployed as there are today. When Congress first gave to the President large appropriations and extraordinary power in March 1933, it was freely predicted by the Democratic leaders that they would put at least 6,000,000 men or more to work by Labor Day, 1933, but unemployment has increased. Neither the President nor his spokesmen have told us what is to become of the other 7,500,000 of unemployed in industry. They are able to work. They are not included in the pension proposals, and everybody is to be taken off the relief by next June. It proves that the Government cannot furnish everybody with a job who is able to work and wants to work. Industry and agriculture must provide these jobs. Let the Government encourage private industry and private enterprise and not on every hand be their competitor. The banks are full of money, but those who have money do not have confidence in the present policies of our Government. Persons with money are putting it in tax-exempt securities. In that way they avoid taxes and have liquid assets. Let the Government spend its money on public projects, restore confidence, and we will see the ranks of unemployment thinning and prosperity return. Let the Government take its finger out of everybody's eye and its nose out of everybody's business. I favor the necessary and proper regulation of business to protect the workers and consumers and prevent unfair practices, but the Government cannot run all the business of this country successfully. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER].

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Chairman, as the debate has progressed this afternoon I have given close attention to the reasons which have been advanced by Members for supporting this bill. I regret that there have been a few Members who have stated that no matter what their common sense may indicate, no matter what their conscience may direct, and notwithstanding the oath which they took some 3 weeks ago to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States", they are now willing to support this bill no matter what it contains, just because the President of the United States asks it. I sincerely hope that there are not many Members of this nature, for if so then surely has representative government fallen low in this country.

The chief reason given for the support of this measure is that it is a relief bill, but what assurance have we of this except for the name? When some irresponsible bureaucrat comes into your district and spends some of the millions appropriated by this bill for the construction of a Government owned and operated factory to compete with the private industry which is already established and which is trying its best to keep in existence, will you believe that this is "relief" just because the bureaucrat justifies his action on the ground that he is "relieving economic maladjustments"? When some one of the disciples of "economic planning" establishes a highly socialized federally controlled community in your district something along the line of those of which the Soviet Government boasts, will you believe that it is "relief" just because the Government official in charge informs you that he is "improving living and working conditions"?

It is easy enough to provide relief in the orderly and ordinary way. We have done it a number of times in the past few years, and we can do it again. Must we vote for this abomination just because the draftsman has labeled it a relief bill? Surely a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

Why is it necessary to proceed in this way? We have been informed that the President has had a committee studying the relief question for some months, and that this bill is the result of their conclusions. Is it seriously stated that such a committee with the information which it must

have before it can be no more specific than this legislation would indicate? Surely they must have some general theory on which to proceed and have some general categories within which allocations of different expenditures should be placed. Could not the results of their studies be transmitted to the Congress and incorporated in a proper relief bill? Has the President no confidence in this House which his party controls by a more than 3 to 1 majority?

We are informed by the gentleman in charge of this bill that in all its various provisions it is the work of the President alone, and that he is now asking that it be passed. What is he demanding of the legislature?

First. The right to spend $5,000,000,000.

Second. The right to change completely the functions and duties of all governmental agencies, and even abolish them.

Third. The right to extend, for more than 2 years, agencies which would otherwise terminate, as for instance, the N. R. A. and the A. A. A.

Fourth. The right to delegate his power as he may see fit.

Fifth. The right to buy or sell all kinds of property, invoking even the great governmental power of eminent domain.

Sixth and last, and worst, the right to fine and send to prison anyone who violates a rule or regulation which he may in his own discretion establish.

Mr. Chairman, if the President of the United States has indeed asked for powers of this kind, his demand is the high-water mark of Presidential arrogance. I could not vote these powers in peace time to any President in our history—not even to a demigod. If this bill passes, it rings the temporary death knell of representative government, but it rings equally the final death knell of the new deal. "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it was with grave reluctance that I felt impelled to oppose in the Rules Committee the granting of the gag rule for the passage of this bill, appropriating as it does in a lump sum, $4,000,000,000, without any specific provisions as to how any part of it is to be expended and with only the most vague specification of the general policy for which it is intended.

It is with equal reluctance that I must oppose the bill coming to us as it does with administration approval. I have heretofore consistently supported the measures proposed by this administration, and I would support this measure if I did not feel that under my oath to support the Constitution of the United States that there are certain legislative functions which the Congress itself must perform, and in the performance of which it cannot abdicate in favor of the President of the United States or anyone else.

I take this position reluctantly, because I have every confidence in the President. I know that this Republic has rarely been blessed with an Executive so earnest and so sincere in his purposes and in his efforts to relieve the suffering, heal the hardships, and adjust the wrongs of the great masses of our people. But, after all, this is still a Republic. We are living under the Constitution given us by the founders of our Union, a Constitution that has happily survived up to this moment economic storms, foreign invasions, and civil strife. If it is to continue to survive, it must have the respect and support of the elected Representatives of the people, who are sworn to uphold its provisions.

The provisions of this bill are a clear and complete abdication by the Congress of the United States of its functions and a delegation by the Congress to the President, or whomsoever he may select, of the legislative duties imposed upon this body.

Let us briefly analyze this bill.

The first section appropriates a lump sum of four thousand millions of dollars. Under the law we are required to appropriate money for specific purposes. But the only information that the House is given by this bill of the purpose for which this huge sum is to be expended is of the most general nature.

These terms are so broad and general as to make them meaningless. They may mean the expenditure of public funds on almost any conceivable project that the ingenuous minds intrusted with the ultimate expenditure of the funds might devise.

No limitation or specification upon the kinds of work or the class of projects is provided. No allocations or limitations of any character are imposed upon any part of the fund, even in general terms. The legislative body utterly fails in this provision to prescribe even a general policy of what, if anything, the legislative mind had in view when the legislation was passed.

The fourth section of the act authorizes the Executive not only to coordinate and consolidate any and all Government agencies but authorizes him by Executive order to continue the life of any existing governmental agency even though its life may be definitely limited by a previous act of Congress, and confers the further power to delegate to any others, whom he may select, including corporations, the legislative powers which have been delegated to him by the Congress under the provisions of this act.

The fifth section authorizes the President "to guarantee loans to, or payments of, needy individuals." To make grants and loans and to acquire by the power of eminent domain real and personal property of unlimited kind and character, for unlimited purposes, and to improve, develop, maintain, grant, sell, or lease the same.

The sixth section authorizes the President to prescribe rules and regulations, having the force and effect of criminal laws, the purport and extent of which we are unable to hazard a guess and by virtue of which a citizen may be fined as much as $5,000 and imprisoned for not exceeding 2 years, or both.

After diligent inquiry from authoritative sources I have been unable to obtain any information as to why the great necessity for the immediate passage of the whole of this enormous appropriation before any plans or policies are formulated for the expenditure of the same. This Congress will doubtless be in session for the next 5 months. Surely in that time the Congress could be informed of the plan and the purpose and the policy for the expenditure of these sums, so that we might legislate intelligently and with a due sense of the deep responsibility owed to our constituents, who must ultimately pay the debt. I am not concerned with any particular projects or any particular class of work relief, and I am sure that I could subscribe to the President's plan when it is formulated, but I am impressed with the profound conviction that I have no right under my oath and in conformity with my duty to my constituents to vote away such a huge sum of money until I can obtain intelligent information as to the purpose for which it is designed. All I ask is intelligent information as to the plan and specific provisions and limitations in the bill itself that will make it conform to the existing law and the clear purpose of the Constitution.

The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, section 204 B, expressly prohibits the passage of any lump-sum appropriation such as here contemplated. It provides as follows:

SEC. B. Estimates for lump-sum appropriations contained in the Budget or transmitted under section 203 shall be accompanied by statements showing, in such detail and form as may be necessary to inform Congress, the manner of expenditures of such appropriations and of the corresponding appropriations for the fiscal year in progress and the last completed fiscal year.

As to constitutional precedents, we have the decision of the Supreme Court in the "hot oil" cases, so recent that the ink has hardly dried on the opinion of the Court. That opinion contains a stern and mandatory admonition to this Congress against the delegation of its constitutional duties. In that case the Supreme Court has laid down a chart for this Congress and has done so in the last 2 weeks. Will the Congress not pause to even read these words of warning and admonition? The Supreme Court there tells us what is a proper delegation and what is an unconstitutional delegation of our legislative authority. Will you not pause long enough in your haste to peruse and ponder upon a few brief extracts from the chart thus given you?

In referring to Section 9 (c) of the Recovery Act, the Court says on page 9:

So far as this section is concerned, it gives to the President an unlimited authority to determine the policy and to lay down the prohibition, or not lay it down, as he sees fit.

Again, on page 12:

The question whether such a delegation of legislative power is permitted by the Constitution is not answered by the argument that it should be assumed that the President has acted, and will act, for what he believes to be the public good. The point is not one of motives but of constitutional authority, for which the best of motives is not a substitute.

And again, on page 20:

If section 9 (c) were held valid, it would be idle to pretend that anything would be left of limitations upon the power of the Congress to delegate its lawmaking function. The reasoning of the many decisions we have viewed would be made vacuous and their distinctions nugatory. Instead of performing its lawmaking functions, the Congress could at will and as to such subjects as it chooses transfer that function to the President or other officer or to an administrative body. The question is not of the intrinsic importance of the particular statute before us, but of the constitutional processes of legislation, which are an essential part of our system of government.

Is it not clear to everyone from this opinion of the Supreme Court that Congress cannot delegate to any other person or body its constitutional duty to lay down the legislative policies of the Government in specific terms and that that policy must be contained in the act itself?

I shall have nothing to say relative to the remaining clauses in the bill, because with respect to those sections containing improper delegations of authority the advocates of the bill have finally and reluctantly accorded to the House the right to amend or eliminate the objectionable features.

The mere fact that this concession has been made at the insistence of the minority on the Democratic side of the aisle is a striking indictment of the hasty preparation of so important a measure and the speed with which it has been attempted to expedite its passage. If in the hasty preparation of this bill such grave errors have been made in 4 of its 7 paragraphs as to impel the advocates of the measure to confess error on the floor of the House, is it not probable that equally grave errors lurk within the provisions of the remaining paragraphs which we are prohibited by the "gag rule" from amending or correcting in any particular. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the first section of this bill which gives the President of the United States the right to relieve and adjust economic maladjustments and to improve living and working conditions which cover a wide field in our economic life. Ever since section 7 (a) in the National Industrial Recovery Act has been on the statute books there has been a continual conflict between employer and employee, inasmuch as they cannot get together under the provisions of the law for the settlement of labor disputes between employer and employees. Under the provisions of this bill now before us the President of the United States can step into a labor controversy where employer and employee cannot agree and put into force a rule or regulation which if not respected by the employer and employee would subject them to a penitentiary sentence and a fine of $5,000. There is no question about that.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I only have 3 minutes.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I have 3 minutes only, and I have another question I want to touch upon here.

Mr. Chairman, section 6 of this bill now before us for consideration gives to the President of the United States power to prescribe whatever rules and regulations may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution, and any violation of such rule or regulation set forth by the President shall be punishable by a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or imprisonment not to exceed 2 years, or both.

It has been stated on the floor this afternoon that this is a delegation of power to other agencies of government. It gives the President the right to make rules and regulations which have the force of law back of them and which may send an American citizen to the penitentiary and subject him to a fine of $5,000 for a violation of the rule or regulation which Congress did not write into the law.

During the last session of Congress I had very deep convictions on that very question in reference to a certain provision in the stock-exchange-control bill. I campaigned on that issue during the last election and I am bitterly opposed to Congress delegating legislative powers to any other agency of Government that has the force of law back of it and send an American citizen to prison.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, it is hard for me to understand the haste with which this bill, House Joint Resolution 117, involving $4,800,000,000 and involving principles heretofore unknown, came into the House. My information is that a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee first reported it out on January 21 and not the full committee. Not until yesterday, January 22, were we able to obtain copies of the bill. The entire Appropriations Committee met today and reported it out.

I do not have anything to say about the expenditure of the $4,800,000,000 or about its being left to the President—this is the least of my concern—but I do want to bring to your attention sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the bill and I think these were the sections I aided in helping open up the rules so that amendments could be offered to them. [Applause.]

So far as the appropriation is concerned, I do not care who spends it just so it is spent right. However, there is a matter very dear to me, and that is the integrity of the House of Representatives. When by one swoop we wipe out and delegate all authority that we have, we might as well close shop and come back here in 1937.

Someone, I think, stated that this bill was carefully drawn. May I point out to you one small thing that shows it was not carefully drawn? To the lawyers in the House I call attention to the fact that it provides, in section 5, subsection (c), line 11, the right of eminent domain for personal property. Under this authority those to whom the President delegates this authority may go and take the personal property of any man in this country. Have you, as lawyers, ever heard of this before? The right of eminent domain applying to personal property? I shall offer amendments to these sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 and under the 5-minute rule I shall speak on them, but I call attention to some of the reasons why the bill should be amended.

In connection with section 4, a rumor has reached me that the Appropriations Committee will offer an amendment. Why the committee did not consider it first before reporting it out, I do not know. Under section 4 not only is the power given the President to establish agencies, to utilize existing agencies, but to consolidate, redistribute, and change any existing agency of the Government without reporting to the Congress, without any report to the creators at all, and then, finally, this is to last until June 30, 1937.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not yield in my admiration or respect for the President to any man, but, on the other hand, I do not yield the conscientious views I have of the oath that was administered to me when I assumed my duties here in the House.

To say that this Congress should so abrogate its rights that all these departments or agencies could be abolished while we sit supinely here and agree to it, I for one shall not subscribe to.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will permit an interruption in support of his argument, paragraph (c) of section 4 gives him power to annul acts of Congress, which the courts have time and time again held he has not the constitutional power to do.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Under section 7, after all this is done and after the $4,800,000,000 is expended, what report does this House get? It merely gets a report of the obligations incurred.

In justice to the Membership of this House I shall offer an amendment requiring this report to go farther than the obligations incurred and give the expenditures made and to classify the expenditures, so that all may be public property, and the people of this Nation, as well as this House of Representatives, may know what is passed and what is done.

Then I come back to section 6. I have fought this provision every time I could in this House. It is the matter of delegating the right to a board or to any single person to provide penal statutes, to make criminals, without the Congress passing upon what the law is.

In this section 7, while I know it would not be done under the present Chief Executive of this Nation, yet a precedent is established, a precedent which is abhorrent to my idea of criminal law, and that is this: That under the rules and regulations which may be issued by the President any number of acts could be made criminal. I say frankly that I cannot conceive of any criminal acts which might be committed by any precedent on account of the provisions of this bill that are not already on the statute books. And by providing for rules and regulations without the criminal part to it, all civil obligations could be taken care of. For these few reasons that I have given in the short time that I have spoken, I feel that the bill before it is passed should be amended materially in these sections. I will gladly go the limit to relieve suffering, to provide for reemployment, and to back the administration in every particular along these lines, but I cannot vote for this bill in its present form, and I do not intend to do so unless it is amended very materially. There are other matters that I could speak of, but these I hope that in the time I have under the 5-minute rule I can bring to your attention.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENERTY].

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is most unusual for a newly elected Member of this House to seek to express his views on any measure until he shall have become intimately acquainted with the rules that govern the House of Representatives, and the even more strict traditions of forensic propriety that dominate us here. It is therefore with hesitancy that I rise in my place to state briefly, and I hope with complete clarity, my attitude toward this resolution.

Let me say at once that I regret that the majority in this House did not introduce a resolution to which wise and patriotic men of both parties could repair. I am one of those who believe that no appropriation of money is too great, if necessary for the alleviation of human distress, unemployment, and the misery that results from hunger and privation. This resolution calls for a bulk sum of $4,000,000,000 to be intrusted to one man, authorizing him in carrying out its provisions to expend money at will "without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws" and "without regard to the Classification Act of 1923." In addition to this tremendous grant of legislative power, it permits him to buy or sell any real and personal property or to acquire it by right of eminent domain, and in addition to take such extensive powers and delegate them to any agency of the Government.

Under this unamended resolution any bureau to which this all-embracing power was delegated could use the entire four billions for some rural or other purpose in the West or South while the people of a great metropolitan area like Philadelphia or New York or Chicago or Boston or Detroit or Los Angeles are left standing unaided in the breadlines. As the Philadelphia Record stated editorially only this morning:

> For the work-relief bill the gag rule was drastically applied, limiting debate to a mere empty formality and choking off any possible amendments to the measure.
>
> It demonstrated anew that gag rule is not democracy. When it takes a majority of the House to force a bill out of a committee, the minority is not only deprived of its rights but the majority is transformed from a group of thoughtful and understanding legislators into a procession of goose-steppers.
>
> One of the voter's basic rights in a democracy is that of compelling his Representative to stand up and be counted on a measure in which that voter is interested.
>
> Because of that right Congress remains the greatest agency for expression of the popular will. To stifle that popular will by parliamentary suffocation is dangerous at this time above all times.
>
> Here was a bill which not merely gave the President power to spend $4,800,000,000 but a bill which delegated to him the power of life and death over virtually all Government agencies and bureaus, a bill which gave him the right of eminent domain in public-works construction and the right to distribute the $4,800,000,000 in any way he might see fit.
>
> The Record has every confidence that the President would use those powers wisely.
>
> But that does not negative the duty of Congress to know and understand just what is in the legislation it enacts.
>
> This flare-up will pass. But the taste of the gag rule will remain bitter—
>
> Unless administration leaders in the House recognize the trend of public sentiment and abolish that rule.

I share the confidence of the Philadelphia Record that the President would use this power with discretion, but there is one important reason why I cannot vote for this resolution unless it be properly amended. The resolution is a surrender, absolute and unconditional, of the power which we, as representatives of the citizens who elected us, are obligated exclusively to exercise in their behalf. There is no question in anyone's mind about the desirability of allotting money for relief. Four billions! I will vote for five billions or more for unemployment and other social-security measures. I will vote for all legislation that will properly protect the worker and his family and give him an opportunity to better his condition in life, just as I would support any measure that will protect our Nation's war-time defenders.

Does this bill guarantee that? It certainly does not. Instead, it opens the door to playing politics with human misery, it appropriates a huge sum of the moneys taxed from the people with no definite plan for its expenditure, no formulated system by which it is to be used; merely a surrender of the people's money to be expended at random, no funds allotted to the laboring group, not even a mention in the resolution of the veterans of America's wars, or the widows, orphans, and families of the men who, deserving most, have in recent years been deprived even of the little they had theretofore received.

Only 3 weeks ago I stood in this Chamber and for the first time as a new Member of Congress was asked to swear without mental reservation to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Today, 3 weeks later, I am asked to vote for a resolution that demolishes the Constitution I swore to protect. I am asked to vote for a measure that would deprive the people who voted for me of the representation which I promised to give them. I refuse to do that. Our duty, as I see it, is to the people and the Nation. How can we serve either of them by supinely abandoning the only instrument that today stands between them and the dictatorship of a little group of department heads?

I ask those who are defending this measure to remember that it is a betrayal of the unemployed, of the deserving laboring people, of the veteran and the others who really deserve help from the Government. Amend the bill—even raise the four billions to five for the needy and unemployed—and I will support it. But let us stop throwing away the people's rights under the Constitution. Let us stop thinking about the next election when we should be thinking about the next generation.

Apart from all other considerations, the important issue in this bill is the demand made upon the Congress to betray the plain people of the country by the setting aside of the

American Constitution. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land. It states that all legislative powers granted are to be vested in the Congress, which shall have the power, among others, to provide for the general welfare and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying such power into execution. It further provides that the judicial power shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. Now, the present resolution not only casts away this legislative power heretofore jealously guarded for the people by the Congress, but in section 6 it calls for the surrender by the Congress of its legislative power and at the same time provides new and drastic penalties for any violation of the latest departmental rules and regulations. Surely no one in this House can properly defend a bill which so far destroys the constitutional rights of our citizens that they must now face the danger of new laws made by Executive and departmental decree, and new jail sentences to be imposed whenever some bureau head or other decides that a citizen has violated one of the novel regulations.

The bill speaks, in line 3 of page 1, of the general welfare. We hear much of that in these days. But the Constitution uses the words in just two places. Once in the preamble, which was never intended to contain any grant of power, but merely to assert the great object which the people aim to secure, and again when the instrument mentions the taxing powers. This clause was never intended to contain a grant of authority to tax in order to promote the general welfare of any single individual in the country. The phrase " general welfare of the United States " refers to the United States as a political entity or corporation and not to the individuals who constitute it. To presume that this clause of the Constitution means that taxes are to be raised for the general welfare of any single individual or group is false and misleading, and the words, not having any such meaning in the Constitution itself, should never have been inserted in this resolution. There are today large establishments of the Government using tremendous sums of public money which rest only upon the fragile foundation of this mistaken notion as to the meaning of " general welfare " in the Constitution.

It is about time, gentlemen, that the Congress began to exercise the powers delegated to it by the Constitution. It is only by amending this measure that you can save the American people from the humiliation of an abject surrender by their Congress of the power which the people have delegated to their Representatives in trust, as it were, for themselves. The Republicans in this House have no opposition to the granting of $4,000,000,000 for proper relief purposes. They would willingly give more than that, if necessary, to assist the unemployed, the homeless, the disabled and deserving veterans, the aged, and the needy. But all Republicans stand, as all Democrats should, against that sort of government which timidly throws up its hands in despair, cowardly abandons the American people, surrenders its constitutional powers, and leaves the country without adequate safeguards against bureaucracy and usurpation.

The founders of our Government, from long acquaintance with tyranny, realized that the problem of escaping it and of preserving liberty could be solved only by placing and maintaining limits upon governmental power. So, for the first time in history, they drew up a written constitution of government, containing a body of limited, definite, enumerated delegations of power, solemnly reserving to themselves all powers not enumerated in that instrument. It was hoped thus to protect for all time the person of the citizen against the innate inclination of government to despoil him. One of the essential features of the Constitution is the clear separation of the powers of government into three coequal branches. It is fundamental that no branch shall usurp the powers of the others. To combine them or any two of them was declared by both James Madison and Alexander Hamilton to be despotism.

It is about time that the Congress, as the representatives of the ordinary people, put a stop to the procedure of delegating to new departments and agencies not only its lawmaking power but even the judicial, so that these bureaus may make and execute their own laws, change them overnight so that no lawyer can locate or find them in any digest, and then send to the penitentiary as criminals American citizens who have been guilty of no greater crime than a refusal to abide by one of the thousands of these bureau-made sumptuary regulations.

No depression or so-called " emergency " can justify such oppression of the citizenry. As Mr. Justice Davis said in the famous Civil War case of *Ex parte Milligan:*

> The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and for the people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times and under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government.

Let us go back to orderly constitutional government. Give us the kind of government in which men not only have the right to be heard through their representatives when laws are passed, but to read upon the statute books today, without fear of sudden and momentary change, the rules of conduct they will be called upon to follow tomorrow.

Let us have the courage to protect the ordinary people against the bureaus that today dictate how they must live. " Millions for defense; not one cent for tribute." Billions for the unemployed; yes; but not one iota of surrender of the people's rights under the Constitution. We must protect the unemployed and the hungry against further departmental usurpation. There is only one sure method to assist the needy and to safeguard the people in their constitutional rights. Vote for such an amendment as will give even five billions for relief and at the same time prevent further tampering with our traditional institutions of government. We are sworn to defend the Constitution. I shall therefore vote for the resolution, if so amended. If it be not thus amended, I cannot vote for it and thus betray the people I have been elected to serve. I am interested in the people of a great city area who need work and relief. I cannot conscientiously vote for a measure which gives any individual or agency the unrestricted power to give four billions of the people's money to some rural section of the South or West while the people who carry a great part of the burdens of government are left to starve in the great cities of the land. The plain, ordinary people, who never have their voices heard but who love America and her Constitution as much as we do, today call to us to protect them against further abandonment of the traditional Americanism that made our country great and beloved in the family of nations. Let us beware that we do not betray them. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to no man for the position that I take on this bill; neither do I bend my head to any man in the sincere, honest, workable method of putting men back to work and relieving distress; but when we look at this bill and strip it of its window dressing and its decoys, we are confronted with a proposition which, if supported, stultifies the judgment of any fair-minded, right-thinking Member of this House.

I was not sent here by my constituents to delegate the constitutional authority vested in this House to any single individual or any set of individuals, and I do not propose to start my congressional career on this day by doing so.

There has been much said about this bill concerning the $880,000,000 which is to be used for relief; and yet, as I analyze it, not one word is contained concerning relief for that amount of money.

An analysis of this bill clearly establishes that this is an out-and-out grant of $4,880,000,000 to one individual, to do with as he sees fit, in the way in which he prescribes, and under rules and regulations which he formulates or those to whom he may delegate this authority. This, Mr. Chairman, is in the teeth of the decision of the Supreme Court in the recent oil case, which has already been referred to here.

There is one other reason why I am opposed to this measure, and I call the attention of the House to the state-

ment made by the President of the United States to the joint Congress on January 4, wherein he said, in reference to putting men back to work:

Preference shall be given to those projects which will be self-liquidating in the sense there is reasonable expectation that the Government will get its money back at some future time.

If I understand the English language, this means nothing more or less than the Government going into private business and in competition with industry. I think this is un-American, not based upon American principles, and, for one, I shall ever oppose it. It is generally conceded that the existing Public Works Administration has not achieved the results claimed for it, and neither will the operation of the powers granted under this joint resolution produce the results its advocates claim.

The only argument advanced for the absence of a plan by the proponents of the resolution is that there has not been time to prepare one. Why, then, this extreme haste? In the absence of a plan, how can labor be put to work?

Let a sincere, honest, and practical plan be submitted to this House and I will support it. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CHRISTIANSON].

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, those of my colleagues who served in the Seventy-third Congress will, I am sure, concede that I never made it a practice to oppose for any factious or partisan reason measures proposed by the majority. Unless deterred by a sense of duty, I should vote for this bill. Because of some definite objections which I shall set forth, I cannot do so unless it is so amended as to make it a substantially different measure.

This bill goes entirely too far. It empowers the President, without further authority from Congress, to abolish any governmental agency or to extend its life beyond the time fixed by law for its termination, to lend the Government's funds or credit without limitation, to take from a citizen even his personal property under the right of eminent domain, to sell the Government's property, either real or personal, to issue regulations the violation of which shall subject a person to imprisonment for up to 2 years or a fine of up to $5,000, and to delegate any of these powers to any department of the Government. Under the terms of this measure the President, or any official designated by him, could continue the life of N. R. A. beyond June 30 and abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, or the Tariff Commission, or consolidate them with each other or any other governmental agency. Some one has said, perhaps facetiously, that he could even sell the Capitol and transfer the seat of government to Reedsville, W. Va., where it appropriately belongs, the Government having become the most important of all subsistence projects.

Personally I am sure the President does not want these extraordinary powers, for they are the powers of a dictator, not those of the head of a democratic government. They are being wished on him by legislative draftsmen who have not learned to use language carefully; and I should do the Chief Executive a disservice, if I did not raise my voice in caution against an indiscretion which might cause the administration great embarrassment.

If I had no other reason for opposing the passage of this bill, I should do so because, although ostensibly a relief measure, it does not make definite provision for direct relief. Not a dollar is earmarked for the support of those not fortunate enough to share in the employment opportunities furnished by Federal building projects. My apprehension for those luckless people is, I believe, justified by the fact that it is the expressed purpose of the administration to shift responsibility for those who cannot be accommodated with jobs back to the States and their municipal subdivisions. That purpose was clearly indicated this afternoon in the remarks of the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and the chairman was but echoing the statement made by the President when in his annual message he declared:

The Federal Government must and shall quit the business of relief. * * * Local responsibility can and will be resumed, for, after all, common sense tells us that the wealth necessary for this task existed and still exists in the local community.

Read in connection with that announcement of policy, the purpose of the present measure becomes apparent. It is the intention of the administration to use the money appropriated in this measure for public works and to refuse to accept any further direct responsibility for those who are not lucky enough to get jobs. If I should vote for this measure, I should give sanction to that policy. I should sentence to unspeakable and intolerable privation tens of thousands of my constituents, scores of thousands of citizens of my State, for whom it is my duty to speak.

For I must remind you that in the Middle West, where the depression began, not in 1929, but in 1920 when Woodrow Wilson was President and where the general distress was aggravated by the most destructive drought in the history of the country, many States, counties, and cities are without means to take over the responsibility which the Federal Government now seeks to shift. There are $75,000,000 of delinquent taxes in my State alone; and, in many counties, levying higher taxes will not yield more revenue. Numerous municipalities, and even some counties, have exhausted their credit and cannot borrow. If the Federal Government withdraws from the field of direct relief, I shudder when I think of what will happen to the unemployed in the Northwest during the next 2 years.

We have assurance from one Democratic member of the Appropriations Committee that the $880,000,000 of the pending $4,880,000,000 authorization which is appropriated from unexpended balances, will be used for direct relief. I wish he would give substance to his assurance by placing a specific proviso in the bill. If that is the intention of the majority, why not say so in the only place the assurance will have legal effect—in the bill itself?

But even if the $880,000,000 were definitely allocated, it would afford only a 6 months' respite, if the present need should continue unabated. How will the unemployed provide themselves with food, clothes, fuel, and shelter after the 6 months have expired?

The proponents of this bill have, I acknowledge, an answer. They say that the $4,000,000,000 provided for public works will give jobs to 3,500,000 men and that it will no longer be necessary to give direct relief to anybody willing and able to work. What optimism, what simple faith in the power of government to perform miracles.

Let us look at the record, as one prominent Democrat is wont to say. Two years ago we were assured that if we would but appropriate $3,300,000,000 for public works, the specter of unemployment would no longer haunt us. Supplemented by N. R. A. and a few other alphabetical expedients, P. W. A. would give every man a job and restore prosperity. Despite that assurance, given undoubtedly with the utmost sincerity, there were, according to the American Federation of Labor, 850,000 more jobless men in the United States on September 1, 1934, than on the corresponding date in 1933. On November 1, 1934, after plenty of blueprints had been drawn and enough projects given the official approval of Secretary Ickes to afford P. W. A. the utmost job-dispensing potency, there were, according to the Department of Labor, only 475,000 men employed on public projects, despite the fact that $2,000,000,000 was spent during the year.

Let me ask our Democratic associates, in all sincerity, not to embarrass them or to suggest even the slightest shortcoming in their administration of P. W. A., but to get them to do some straight thinking on the unemployment problem—which is their major responsibility—if an expenditure of $2,000,000,000 put only 475,000 men to work in 1934, what leads them to believe that spending $4,000,000,000 during the next 2 years—$2,000,000,000 in 1936 and a like amount in 1937, will make possible the reemployment of 3,500,000 men.

The experience with public works as a pump-priming device has failed in this and other countries. Great Britain tried it and gave it up. Germany toyed with the same idea

for a while and charged the cost up to experience. Evidently the United States is the one country that refuses to learn from its past failures. If we persist in our folly, we shall wreck the country instead of saving it.

Experience has shown that it costs approximately $4,000 to keep one man employed a year. If we should try to give each of the 10,000,000 unemployed a job—and there is no reason why we should discriminate against any—the annual cost would be $40,000,000,000—one-fifth of the present value of all the physical wealth in America. In 5 years the Nation's resources, private as well as public, would be completely exhausted. Such a cure is worse than the disease. Its folly is comparable to that of advising a hungry man to appease his hunger by dismembering and eating his own body.

Happily it is not necessary to ask America ultimately to destroy itself in order to prolong life for a few years. There is a better way. Primarily our present trouble is due to a debt burden which was the aftermath of war and post-war inflation. In that respect the present depression follows the pattern of 1837, 1857, 1873, and 1893. When price levels advance, speculation inevitably follows, and men go into debt. When the bubble bursts, prices and incomes fall sharply, but debts remain stationary, with the result that the net incomes of debtors shrink to almost nothing and the incomes of creditors increase in terms of buying power. In 1929 the income of the American people was $85,000,000,000, of which $10,000,000,000 had to be paid out as interest on $200,000,000,000 in indebtedness. By 1933 the total income had shrunk to $39,000,000,000, but interest still exacted its $10,000,000,000, for rates had remained stationary.

After the people had met their interest charges in 1929 they had $75,000,000,000 left with which to buy the products of the farms and factories. After they had met the debt charges in 1933 they had but $29,000,000,000 left. It is impossible to reduce the buying power of the debt-owing majority of the American people two-thirds in 4 years without paying the penalty of unemployment. To me it is not strange, in view of this terrific dislocation, that there are 10,000,000 people out of work. It is strange that a single wheel is turning and that the economic machine has not stopped entirely.

So I say to you members of the majority that if our present trouble is due to debts, you are engaged in a hopeless task when you try to get us out of trouble by putting the country deeper into debt. If you should force an average reduction of 50 percent in interest rates and make the creditor bear his fair share of the cost of the depression, you would leave $5,000,000,000 more buying power in the hands of the debt-ridden masses—two and one-half times as much each year as you will give them even if you succeed in the impossible task of putting 100 cents into the wage worker's pocket for every P. W. A. dollar spent. That would stimulate recovery, and would do it without leaving posterity the legacy of a bankrupt country.

I have little faith in the expedient of equalizing wealth by taxing the people. Excessive taxation does, it is true, make the rich poorer, but it makes the poor poorer too. I would rather bring about that fairer distribution of income which all forward-looking men desire by removing the special advantages that enable some men to get more than their share of the common income. The one privilege which, more than any other, results in disparity is that of collecting 6-percent interest on a 3-percent investment. We can stop it, not by adopting any fantastic monetary or banking devices, but by following the examples of Great Britain and Australia, where interest rates have been lowered by resort to methods that are tried and sound and where, without any of the bootstrap-lifting expedients of N. R. A. and P. W. A., real progress has been made on the road to recovery

Our Democratic colleagues show remarkable clarity of judgment at times, when they speak off the record. One of them said to me the other day, "You cannot get water by priming a pump in a dry well." The wisdom of that remark I commend to your thoughtful consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the impassioned oratory and idealism that we have heard this afternoon, I am going to content myself with realities, because my boss lives away out 900 miles from here and consists of all of the people in six counties in the Sixteenth Congressional District of Illinois. I am concerned with what they think about this bill and nobody else, because they are the only folks to whom I am accountable for my actions and for my vote. I just looked outdoors and I see 6 inches of snow on the ground. I went in and looked at the weather map and find that it is 30° below zero at St. Paul, 10° below zero at Milwaukee, and it is even freezing down in TOM BLANTON's country around Abilene, Tex.; and if they had this $4,000,000,000 right now, they could not use it particularly because of the state of the weather that prevails all over the country. Secondly, I am not interested in any pork barrel. Even if I had a taste for pork, you folks on the majority side would not let me have any anyway, so I am not concerned about that. Third, I am not concerned about the political implications in this bill. If President Roosevelt's economic theories and conceptions are correct, he would doubtless be elected and reelected in 1936 in spite of anything that we could do. On the other hand, if his theories are wrong, if you had $4,000,000,000 or 10 times $4,000,000,000, you would never reelect him to office. So I am not concerned about the political implications that may be written into this bill.

Here is what concerns me: First of all, I am going to have to go back to Illinois and answer to those people on the basis of equity and fairness. Under the relief program for the first 9 months of 1934, Florida got 99 percent of all her relief expenditures out of the Federal till. Mississippi got 99 percent, and we got 57 percent in Illinois. If you are going to scrape the bottom of the Federal till for your States, why not give us an opportunity to do the same thing. Yet there is no safeguard or assurance in this bill that we are going to receive fair and equitable treatment from Uncle Sam when it comes to relief and relief work.

This great disparity in sharing in the largesse of the Federal Government is true in many other States. New Mexico, for instance, received 99 percent of her relief expenditures from Uncle Sam, Louisiana received 98 percent, and Tennessee 98 percent. On the other hand, standing alongside Illinois is New York, which received but 54 percent, and Iowa, which received but 51 percent. Nine States, mostly from the North, received around 55 percent, whereas 16 States, many of which are in the extreme South, received well over 90 percent of all their relief funds from the Federal Treasury.

Now, whatever is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. I maintain that in my State the proportion of our population that is either on relief or unemployed is just as large as in other States. They get just as hungry. They have the same requirements of fuel and clothing and necessities, and it is high time that these donations from the Public Treasury, whether it be direct relief or expenditures for relief projects, be made equitably and on the basis of the ratio which the unemployed and needy in Illinois bear to the whole number of such folks in this entire Nation.

I hope no one will come into the Well of this House again this afternoon or at any other time and say that the Republican Party is opposed to a public-works program for relief. First of all, you insult the Members on the Republican side, and you never heard anybody on that side say it. We are for a work-relief program just as you are, and in the interest of truth, candor, and accuracy you have not any right to come into this Well and make a charge of that kind.

I am willing to go as far as the most liberal Democrat in this House in providing relief of all kinds, and particularly work-relief projects such as contemplated in this bill, and if the present amount is inadequate, I am in favor of providing more. It is not a case of the amount involved;

it is not a difference of opinion as to how best to lift people out of their distress. There seems to be a singular unanimity of opinion among Democrats and Republicans alike that projects must be found to give employment. The question involved here is the ruthless way you seek to go about it. Not a single soul has been persuasive or convincing that this need be hurried. Mr. Hopkins still has some relief money. Secondly, the money appropriated in this bill will not be available until June 30 of this year. You have no well-defined program for the expenditure of this money. You completely nullify the provisions of the Civil Service Act and the Classification Act and set in motion thereby a tremendous force for the destruction of civil-service principles and substitute inefficiency.

Then you hand over to the Chief Executive a broad delegation of authority, under which he can abolish, revise, alter, consolidate the functions of the various agencies of government. By the terms of section 4 he could by proclamation continue the N. R. A. in effect until the middle of 1937, even though both labor and capital have repeatedly expressed themselves in favor of changes and alterations so as to make the N. R. A. more effective.

If this resolution is passed and the House completes the regular appropriation bills and the security measure, it might just as well adjourn, so far as its effectiveness is concerned. In fact, one might almost perceive in this measure an attempt to hasten adjournment and thereby defeat possible action on the bonus and some other important legislation.

Just bear in mind, gentlemen and ladies of the House, that you are accountable to the folks back home. You will be accountable to labor, to the farmer, to the business men, and to the unemployed back home.

When I return home and make a report to labor and laboring men in my district, what shall I say to them? Shall I say that I voted for a bill which was to provide for them the munificent sum of $50 per month, according to the testimony of Admiral Peoples himself? Shall I say to them that I voted for a bill to take them off the dole and give them starvation wages as a kind of subsidy on the theory that to hold the wage level so low it will retain their incentive to go back into private industry. The theory is all right, but is there anyone who will contend that $12.50 is a living wage? Will anybody contend that an American family can live in decency and respect on $12.50 per week. You know very well how it will work. A man procures a job on one of these projects. He is removed from the relief rolls. Even though the $12.50 is wholly inadequate to his needs, he will not receive any aid from relief sources. They will complacently say that he now has a job and should be able to get along. If he quits because it is inadequate pay, they will say he is lazy. I am not willing to vote for any measure which under the pretext of saving the fiber of our people from disintegration places them on a starvation wage. Fine phrases do not fill empty bellies.

Moreover, this $50 wage level may work two ways: Instead of being an incentive to pull men back into industry it may also provide an excuse for pulling present wage levels down, and anyone knows that they are low enough now. I cannot see the workingmen in my district, and to whom I am accountable, take that chance; and I cannot endorse a measure which makes a diminution of wages possible.

I shall have to report to the farmers in my district, and what kind of a report shall I make? You will recall that the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange both passed resolutions condemning the expenditure of more public money for reclamation projects while the A. A. A. is still in operation and reducing some of the very best acreage and taking it out of production for the next crop year. Last year, as you remember, when the Interior appropriation bill came before this body, we specifically wrote into it a clause to the effect that no portion of the funds therein should be used to reclaim additional land. It would be the height of folly and inconsistency to do so. Now, if present reports are accurate, it was indicated that one of the reasons for the disagreement on this rule in Rules Committee was because it did not specifically provide for additional reclamation and irrigation projects in the West. Pass this resolution, and you know very well that some of this money will be used for that purpose, and will not provide much employment, either.

Shall we now permit millions of this money to be spent to expand our agricultural domain while we still pay wheat, tobacco, cotton, and corn farmers cash benefits to curtail production and reduce acreage? I promised the farmers in my district that I would never vote to spend a single dollar to add more land so long as many of their fine, fertile acres lie idle.

We can have a relief measure brought in here that can be passed in ample time to start the works program; we can bring in a bill that is free from so many objectionable features. We can bring in a bill that will be agreeable to most of the Members of this House and do it within a week. We can have a bill that is free from the "pork barrel" taint. Then why not do it?

I am not unmindful of the important aspects of the doubtful constitutionality of this measure; nor am I unmindful of the fact that Congress in this measure abdicates its rights and powers. But of equal importance is the stern fact that you must ultimately report to the folks back home and not to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Stop for a moment and ponder on what so far-reaching a measure as this may do to the laboring man, the farmer, the business man, and the unemployed folks back home, and let that be your guide when you are recorded on this measure. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON].

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me I want to again emphasize what to me is the basic and most serious fundamental change contemplated in the proposed legislation, namely, that of Congress surrendering its duty and power of definitely appropriating the taxpayers' money.

Under the Constitution Congress is charged with levying and collecting taxes to pay the debts and provide for the general welfare of the United States. This is the function as laid down by basic law, and has always been adhered to until the present administration came into power. Congress has never surrendered its prerogatives heretofore, even in times of war and of great distress.

With little opportunity for amendment or debate, the House is today asked to pass an appropriation of nearly $5,000,000,000 and place the sum at the disposal of the Chief Executive to do with as he sees fit during a period running beyond his present term of office and during which there will be two subsequent sessions of Congress, the only limitation being that it is to be spent for the general welfare of the country. In so doing, Congress surrenders all right it may have to designate the use and purpose to which this immense fund should be applied, a responsibility which it should be better able to discharge and with which it should, as a body, be more familiar than any one individual could be.

The people of the country elected their Representatives to act for them in matters of this sort. They did not expect them to delegate their constitutional duties to the Chief Executive, to be in turn assigned to subordinates and appointive officers, in the selection of which the people have had no choice whatever and who are not in any sense representative of the people.

My opinion is confirmed by the words of Mr. Justice Story, formerly a member of the Supreme Court, who, in volume III of his Commentaries on the Constitution, wrote:

> As all the taxes raised from the people, as well as the revenue arising from other sources, are to be applied to the discharge of the expenses and debts and other engagements of the Government, it is highly proper that Congress should possess the power to decide how and when any money should be applied for these purposes. If it were otherwise, the Executive would possess an unbounded power over the public purse of the Nation and might apply all its moneyed resources at his pleasure. The power to control and direct the appropriations constitutes a most useful and salutary check upon profusion and extravagance as well as upon corrupt influence and public peculation. In arbitrary govern-

ments the prince levies what money he pleases from his subjects, disposes of it as he thinks proper, and is beyond responsibility or reproof. It is wise to interpose, in a republic, every restraint by which the public treasure, the common fund of all, should be applied with unshrinking honesty to such objects as legitimately belong to the common defense and the general welfare. Congress is made the guardian of this treasure; and to make their responsibility complete and perfect, a regular account of the receipts and expenditures is required to be published, that the people may know what money is expended, for what purposes, and by what authority.

There can be no doubt as to the opinion of that able justice on the duties of Congress with regard to the appropriation of public moneys.

Every single one of us is interested in relieving conditions surrounding those in distress, and this necessity must be met. But I am not unmindful of the fact that I represent the populace of a district and a State paying a large proportion of the taxes of this country. It is my duty to assume the responsibility placed upon me and not delegate it to the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague on the committee, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I am not very much concerned about the political implications of this bill. As he said, if the President's program is successful, he will be triumphantly reelected and the Democratic Party will remain in power. If it is a failure, we are the ones who are taking the political responsibility for it. There is no other program for us. Neither the Republican Party nor anyone else has any program. The President has evolved this program, and I feel we are not only justified but also obligated to the American people to carry it out. There is, practically speaking, not a single power granted in any of the provisions of this bill which has not been granted heretofore, and many of them are on the statute books at the present time. But I am not going to discuss the bill.

There is one angle of the matter to which I want to refer. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member and my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, in his speech a few moments ago said "this law would be administered by incompetent substitutes, such as Ickes and Hopkins." I hold no brief for either Secretary Ickes or Mr. Harry Hopkins. They are abundantly able to take care of themselves, and their public records speak for them. But I have been closely associated with all of the Secretaries of the Interior for the past 40 years.

For many years, as you all know, as a member and in recent years as the chairman of the Interior Department appropriations subcommittee, I have had a great deal to do with appropriation of the funds that have gone to that great Department. I have, necessarily, every year made an intensive study and investigation of all its thousands of activities, extending from the Arctic Circle to the Equator. Our country has been very fortunate in having some really great men in that office, and two of them came from Colorado. The West has always been especially proud of Henry M. Teller. Among all those Secretaries we have never had one who has been more courageous, more honest, or more efficient than the one we have at the present time. [Applause.] I feel that we western Members cannot, in fairness to an exceptionally able and conscientious public official, sit on the floor of this House and listen to aspersions cast against our Secretary of the Interior without expressing our protest and condemnation. He has made enemies and millions of our people admire him for the enemies he has made. He has made those enemies; he kicked the lobbyists, crooked contractors, and grafters out of the Interior Department Building, because he had the honesty, the courage, nerve, backbone, and patriotism to stand up against the combined power interests of the United States; to defy the "hot oil" combinations of the United States, to protect the Indians of the United States, to stop the looting of the public domain of the United States, and to protect Uncle Sam's property. [Applause.]

In all of the $2,000,000,000 that he has expended during the past 2 years, no one can point a finger to a single dollar that has been misapplied as far as he is concerned. He has a clean record and the effort to besmirch it is an outrage. I feel that we from the West owe him and owe this administration a statement of our confidence in the Secretary of the Interior in administering those activities.

I have heard the statement made that one reason certain factions seek to block this bill that the President so earnestly requests is that of fear that the Secretary of the Interior may be charged with the duty of administering some of the funds.

I have no fear of Secretary Ickes being called upon to administer portions of this fund. So far as the West is concerned, I hope he will be charged with that duty. If he is, the funds will be honestly, courageously, and intelligently handled.

His is a job which, if honestly and efficiently carried out, inevitably causes antagonism. No human being could faithfully perform all his duties without making enemies.

Never before in the history of our Government have such gigantic tasks and overwhelming responsibilities been imposed upon any Secretary of the Interior, and never before has a Secretary discharged them with so much credit. As Federal Administrator of Public Works, Administrator of the Petroleum Code, in addition to his countless tasks as Secretary, he has a thousand seductive opportunities to betray his oath of office to curry favor with many. No one can or dare say he has ever betrayed his oath. It seems to me that much of this criticism of Secretary Ickes is a subterfuge for trying to handicap the President's recovery program by discrediting this worthy and efficient Cabinet officer. There is no official in the Government service that works longer hours day and night than he does.

As Public Works Administrator he has hewed to the line, and the land speculators, skimping contractors, and their kith and kin have been stopped. Where, before in our history, can we find such a vast sum of money as this Public Works Administrator has distributed, handled without a breath of suspicion, scandal, or graft? Nowhere. It is an enviable record. Those crooks did not get theirs and they are out for revenge. I will not fight their battles. I say, "More power to the Secretary of the Interior."

The Public Works Administrator has not hesitated to supply funds to municipalities desiring to build and own their power plants and free themselves from the yoke of the Power Trust, which has long extorted exorbitant rates from them. Dozens of such allotments have been made by the Public Works Administrator, and every one was a thorn in the side of the Power Trust. Great Federal power projects have been financed by the Public Works Administrator, carrying out the President's policy of providing wide distribution of cheaper electrical power to the profit of the country. The power interests dare not attack the President openly, for they read the election returns, so they attack his Public Works Administrator, and he receives their blows without a cry for mercy or a move to dodge.

There is another group who would harass and curb him. That greedy group consists of those who look with longing eyes at the wealth and domain of the Indians, for he is protector of the remnants of these original Americans and fulfills this task well. He could dissipate the Indian wealth and he would have many friends, but he prefers to be true to his trust and now we see the result.

There is another group who are enemies of this public servant, and in this I "know whereof I speak." Those who are willing to despoil the public domain for their own gain have been curbed by his fearless administration of the public domain. At the last session of Congress, I had the honor of bringing forth upon this floor a measure now known as the "Taylor Grazing Act", designed to protect this domain. It was passed by the House and by the Senate and became the law of the land on the 28th of last June and the duty of adminstering the act was entrusted to the Secretary of the Interior. I have followed its administration closely since that time and I am proud of the way the act that bears my name has been administered and well do I know the enemies that such honest administration has aroused.

We hear cries of those who are curbed that the Public Works fund has not been distributed rapidly enough; that too many safeguards and checks have been put upon it. Since when has it been against the public interest to put safeguards and checks on the expenditure of public money? Who is it that feels that such safeguards are improper and who is it that does not wish a full accounting made of public funds? But despite all this sharpshooting and these fraudulent accusations, the record of the Public Works Administrator is an excellent one. When this Administrator took up his task, it was a new duty, without precedent, without organization, without policy—all of these he has developed. Let those who have challenges be specific and look at the record P. W. A. has built.

At the beginning of this year, expenditures on all phases of the Public Works program exceeded $2,000,000,000. Does any one think that that record is not one of sufficient speed in such a mighty task?

At the beginning of the year, 9,100 projects had been completed, 7,600 were under construction, and 2,800 others had been set up and received allotments so that construction could commence promptly. P. W. A. signs dot the map of our entire country and every one is a hallmark of merit, and behind each sign is a useful public work, honestly and conscientiously built. I predict that the future history of our country will honor the Secretary as one of the greatest constructive conservationists our Nation has ever produced.

Some 2,000,000 persons have received gainful employment directly attributable to P. W. A. With their dependents, this means some 7,000,000 persons are kept from the relief rolls by the Public Works program.

Now our President, who has examined this effort and judged it, deems it wise that we enlarge it. Who is it that wishes to check his hand by attempting to prescribe, in an arbitrary manner, how and what he shall do and which public servant or agency he shall call to his assistance. I disclaim any such desire or intent. What the President seeks I appeal to my colleagues to give to him.

The great mass of the people of the West appreciate this Herculean work and are duly grateful to Secretary Ickes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague on the committee, Mr. BLANTON.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, our new evangel from Galena, the Republican pinch-hitter for McGugin, is very, very apprehensive about a possible dictator. I used to travel through the Galena country straddling the line between Missouri and Kansas, and on the right I would see mountains of lava and on the left more mountains of lava, and never until today did I know what caused all that eruption. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SHORT rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Directly I will yield. All of the dictators with whom our friends across the aisle have been intimately familiar, have been financial dictators, who selfishly ran the affairs of this Government in the interest of the few as against the welfare of the many. The few were enriched and became richer. The many were impoverished and became poorer. It has been the financial dictators of America, who have invested their swollen fortunes in tax-exempt bonds, and paid little of the expenses of this Government, who have almost brought ruin upon us. I wish that it were possible for us to make all bonds and income from all securities taxable.

Let me say to our eloquent exhorter from Galena that Webster defines a dictator as one who has absolute authority. His will is supreme. He is all powerful. His word is law. He is the law. He controls the courts. He uses his power as he wills. He is beyond the reach of legislative control. He makes all laws.

Has this Congress abdicated? Why, no; we are legislating now. Have courts been abolished? Why, no; they are functioning now. The decree of the Supreme Court of the United States is the law of the land. It has to be obeyed. There is no executive power that can persuade it.

If the people of the United States did not have absolute confidence in and respect for the President of the United States they would not be so unanimously in favor of our backing and supporting him. If we did not have absolute confidence in and respect for the President we would not be passing this measure of stupendous magnitude and importance.

We have no Caesar in the White House. We have no Sulla there. We have no Louis XIV giving us commands. We have no Hitler or Mussolini there at the other end of the Avenue. We have no man there who has assumed the powers and the prerogatives of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is still functioning; it still has its powers. We have no man there who has the "all say."

We have a man there who is using faithfully in behalf of all the people of the United States the powers this Congress has delegated to him. Why, our friend is used to the kind of dictator who would use the power selfishly in behalf of the few against the many. I will say to our friend from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] who gives us great preachments, that this particular man we have in the White House has tugging continually at his heartstrings all of the many calls of humanity from one side of the land to the other, even up in cold Minnesota where lives our distinguished friend, Governor CHRISTIANSON, whose people are now out of jobs and who are to be helped by this bill. He is using just what powers we have given him. Suppose he were to attempt to misuse those powers, suppose he were to attempt to misapply them, suppose he were to attempt to benefit the few as against the many. We would stop him in a minute; we would take the power away from him in the twinkling of an eye. But we have all confidence in him, I may say to my friend from Galena.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. It has been my privilege since the war to have seen and heard Mussolini, Stalin, Hitler, and Horthy, but not a single dictator in all Europe has the power with the money back of him that the present occupant of the White House has.

Mr. BLANTON. No; they have not, because our President has the power to do good. He has the power to relieve suffering. He has the power to restore self-respect, self-reliance, initiative, and self-support in the breasts of American manhood. He has power, but is not abusing it. We have no alarm about dictators because we have no fear of anything of that kind. All of us have confidence in our leader. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD tonight, for the information of the Members, the amendments to this bill that will be offered by authority of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The amendments referred to follow:

Committee amendments to be offered by Mr. BUCHANAN:

Page 1, line 11, strike out the signs and letters "(in-", and strike out all of line 12, and on page 2, strike out all of lines 1, 2, 3, and 4, and all of line 5, down to and including the word "work)", and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", Federal or non-Federal."

On page 5, line 18, after the word "any", insert the word "emergency", and in line 21, after the word "exist;", insert "and."

Page 5, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive.

Page 6, line 1, change "(e)" to "(d)."

Page 6, line 11, strike out the words "he may also" and insert in lieu thereof the word "to"; in line 12, strike out the words "or personal"; in line 15, strike out the colon, and strike out all of lines 16 to 20, inclusive, except the period.

Page 6, line 23, before the word "violation", insert the word "willful", and after the sum "$5,000" insert a period and strike out all of line 25.

Page 7, transfer the words and figures "before the 10th day of January", in lines 3 and 4, to follow the word "submitted" in line 2.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'CONNOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 117, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WHITE (at the request of Mr. CLARK), on account of serious illness.

To Mr. SOMERS of New York, indefinitely, on account of illness.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object simply that I may ask a question—I shall not object—I wish to know at this time if the Membership of the Committee of the Whole may have the assurance from those in charge of the majority that when our patience grows a little thin and is being taxed by amendments we will not receive the treatment that so often is accorded, but that instead upon all amendments there may be a short debate at least.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, and speaking for the Committee on Appropriations, I want to be just as liberal on amendments under the 5-minute rule as I possibly can be, just so we finish the bill tomorrow.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are we going to use the entire day tomorrow for the consideration of this bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think so.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that we hope to finish the bill tomorrow and we may take up the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill Friday, and I hope to adjourn over Saturday.

Mr. BUCHANAN. We have got to finish the bill tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 267. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 859. An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1190. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 24, at 11 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

163. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting copies of recommendations of five proposed amendments to the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

164. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report containing its recommendations concerning the proposal that Congress, by statute, allocate fixed percentages of radiobroadcasting facilities to particular types or kinds of nonprofit radio programs or to persons identified with particular types or kinds of nonprofit activities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BUCHANAN: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 117. Joint resolution making appropriations for relief purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 3979. A bill to safeguard the estates of veterans derived from payment of pensions, compensation, emergency officers' retirement pay, and insurance, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to provide for defraying the expenses of the American section, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KERR: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 67. A bill to repeal certain laws providing that certain aliens who have filed declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States shall be considered citizens for the purposes of service and protection on American vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4304. A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 330. A bill for the relief of Sophie de Sota; with amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 2569. A bill for the relief of Dee Erick Treat; with amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Anna S. Carrigan; with amendment (Rept. No. 19). Refered to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4043) granting a pension to Emma Cole, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 4502) to amend section 17 of the Bankruptcy Act of 1898; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4503) for the relief of employees of the United States Government who are engaged in the enforcement of Federal laws, and their dependents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYERS: A bill (H. R. 4504) authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 4505) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Maine and the Dominion of Canada to maintain a bridge already constructed across the St. John River between Madawaska, Maine, and Edmundston, Canada; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 4506) to provide for a building in which to store Government records; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 4507) to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the commemoration of the termination of the War between the States at Appomattox Court House, Va.", approved June 18, 1930, and to establish the Appomatox Court House National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEROUEN: A bill (H. R. 4508) to authorize the use of public lands for camp sites, refining works, and other purposes in connection with mineral permits and leases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 4509) to provide that transferors for collection of negotiable instruments shall be preferred creditors of national banks in certain cases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 4510) to provide pensions for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: A bill (H. R. 4511) to extend for 1 year contracts covering existing star routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act, and to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN: A bill (H. R. 4513) to authorize payment of claims for unauthorized emergency treatment of World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KVALE: A bill (H. R. 4514) to amend the act entitled "An act to give war-time rank to retired officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and/or Coast Guard of the United States", approved June 21, 1930, so as to give class B officers of the Army the benefits of such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 4515) to provide for the refund of stamps used in respect of beer, ale, porter, or other similar fermented liquor which has become spoiled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4516) to authorize the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to make loans on the security of certain rural or suburban real estate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 4517) to provide for the appointment of one additional judge for the northern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNER: A bill (H. R. 4518) to exempt not less than 2 bushels of field corn per week from the processing tax in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 4519) to amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes", approved May 15, 1928, as amended; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DONDERO: A bill (H. R. 4520) to provide for an additional $2,000,000,000 of bonds to be issued by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, to make mortgages in default on December 1, 1934, eligible for refinancing, and to authorize additional cash advances; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 4521) to extend the benefits of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act to provisional commissioned officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 4522) authorizing the Southern Ute and the Ute Mountain Bands of Ute Indians, located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico, to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 4523) providing for the recording of patent pooling agreements and contracts with the Commissioner of Patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SADOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 4524) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURNHAM: A bill (H. R. 4525) amending the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating common carriers by water; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4526) amending the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating common carriers by water; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 4527) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cairo, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MALONEY: A bill (H. R. 4528) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Gretna, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAMSAY: A bill (H. R. 4529) to amend section 113 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 194); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4530) authorizing the Brookewell Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4531) to provide for the taking of depositions in criminal proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4532) to make the husband or wife of accused a competent witness in all criminal prosecutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4533) to regulate the defense of alibi in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act approved February 13, 1925, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, and to further define the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of appeals and of the Supreme Court, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4535) providing for waiver of prosecution by indictment in certain criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4536) to amend an act entitled "An act to make persons charged with crimes and offenses competent witnesses in United States and Territorial courts", approved March 16, 1878; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 4537) authorizing Charles V. Bossert, his heirs and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the East River between Bronx and Whitestone Landing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 4538) to change the designation of Lefler Place to Second Place; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 4539) to alleviate the hazards of old age, unemployment, illness, and dependency, to establish a social insurance board in the Department of Labor, to raise revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 4540) to authorize a postponement of the effective date of the first sentence of sec-

tion 15 of the act of June 12, 1934, to revise air-mail laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 4541) to extend the provisions of section 2 of the act of February 28, 1925, authorizing reservations of timber, minerals, or easements to exchanges of lands in the State of New Mexico, under the act of February 14, 1923, and the act of February 7, 1929; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOXEY: A bill (H. R. 4542) to promote sustained yield units of forest management and to stabilize dependent local communities and industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GAVAGAN: A bill (H. R. 4543) to establish a national conservatory of music for the education of pupils in music in all its branches, vocal and instrumental, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4544) to authorize the Secretary of War to prosecute the work of improvement of the New York State Barge Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 4545) to authorize an emergency appropriation for flood control and flood protection in areas where human life and property are endangered; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 4546) to provide for legalizing the residence of certain classes of aliens in the United States of America; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4547) giving preference within quotas to certain relatives, who are aliens, of citizens of the United States of America; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4548) permitting the husband or wife of an American citizen entitled to nonquota visa to remain in the United States of America and obtain visa from the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4549) to exempt certain aliens from quota; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4550) fixing the liability of owners of vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4551) to provide for the deportation of and exemption therefrom of certain aliens who have entered the United States of America unlawfully; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4552) to provide for the cooperation of the Federal Government with the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia in maintaining the public-school system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF: Resolution (H. Res. 68) to reduce the Membership of the House; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 127) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Oil Equipment and Engineering Exposition at Houston, Tex., to be held April 8 to April 13, 1935, inclusive; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on certain incomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 129) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of Puerto Rico", approved December 21, 1928, to permit an adjudication with respect to liens of the United States arising by virtue of loans under such joint resolution; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. WEARIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131) authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation with respect to agricultural income and the financial and economic condition of agricultural producers generally; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERLIN: A bill (H. R. 4553) for the relief of Charles N. Fetters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 4554) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Constant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4555) for the relief of Wiener Bank Verein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 4556) authorizing the estate of John Gellatly, deceased, and/or Charlyne Gellatly, individually, to enter suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of the State of New York, for the return of an art collection and objects of art claimed to have been obtained by agents or representatives of the Smithsonian Institution and of the United States Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 4557) for the relief of George A. Voss; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4558) authorizing the payment of the claim of Letty Lash, Nina B. Burroughs, and Emmie Dabney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4559) for the relief of George Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4560) for the relief of the Dalton Grain & Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARDEN: A bill (H. R. 4561) for the relief of S. Q. Adams; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARLSON: A bill (H. R. 4562) granting a pension to Bertha A. Kendall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 4563) for the relief of Lawrence J. Kessinger; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4564) granting a pension to William R. S. Lane; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLMER: A bill (H. R. 4565) for the relief of Lucile Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4566) for the relief of Elsie Lovell Weeks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 4567) for the relief of Robert E. Callen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4568) for the relief of Forrest D. Stout; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 4569) for the relief of C. N. Markle; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4570) for the relief of Amy McLaurin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4571) for the relief of William W. Bartlett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4572) authorizing the retirement of First Lt. Lucius L. Handly, Medical Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4573) for the relief of the Concrete Engineering Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4574) for the relief of the heirs of Frank Boddeker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4575) to correct the naval record of John Edward Anderson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 4576) for the relief of Fred J. Byers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 4577) for the relief of Thomas Joseph Strahan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4578) for the relief of Thomas Alexander Patterson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 4579) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Kooken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4580) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Wagner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4581) granting an increase of pension to Cora L. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 4582) granting a pension to Gabriel Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4583) granting a pension to Margaret Officer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4584) granting a pension to Martha J. Hopper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4585) granting a pension to Bettie A. Reese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4586) granting a pension to Lau Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4587) granting a pension to Gemima Reeves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4588) granting a pension to Lillie Siemiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4589) granting an increase of pension to Fronia L. B. Norwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4590) granting an increase of pension to Ada A. Bevers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 4591) granting a pension to James M. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAVAGAN: A bill (H. R. 4592) granting a pension to Matthew A. Henson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4593) granting a pension to Margarita T. Downing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 4594) to provide for an examination and survey for the purpose of constructing a canal between Cambridge Creek and Fishing Bay by way of Little Blackwater River, in Dorchester County, Md.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4595) to provide for the examination and survey of Nanticoke River at and up Jones Creek at Waterview, Wicomico County, Md.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 4596) granting a pension to Cornelious Spilliane; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HESS: A bill (H. R. 4597) granting a pension to Ida L. Becker; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4598) granting a pension to Mary A. Ruble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4599) granting an increase of pension to Olive J. Ebert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4600) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Pritchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEE: A bill (H. R. 4601) for the relief of the heirs of Gladys Picklesimer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINZER: A bill (H. R. 4602) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the First Columbia National Bank, of Columbia, Pa.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN: A bill (H. R. 4603) for the relief of John Liscovitch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4604) granting a pension to Ann M. Callery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4605) granting a pension to Hattie E. Clapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4606) granting a pension to James H. Devlin; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4607) granting a pension to Thomas J. Kileen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4608) granting a pension to Excelia Lague-Leyo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4609) for the relief of Minnie Rosenblatt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4610) for the relief of John J. Moran; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) for the relief of Thomas F. Gibbons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4612) for the relief of John Neuhs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4613) for the relief of James F. Flannigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4614) for the relief of Andrew M. Jeffrey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4615) for the relief of Albert A. Clay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4616) for the relief of William Rusk; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4617) for the relief of John S. Carroll; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4618) for the relief of Walter Kaszubski; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4619) for the relief of Joseph Salinghi; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4620) for the relief of Guiseppe Rossi; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4621) for the relief of Edward C. Sullivan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 4622) for the relief of the Reliable Importing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 4623) for the relief of George Brackett Cargill, deceased; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 4624) granting a pension to Jennie Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4625) granting a pension to Clara R. Bretney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4626) granting a pension to Marille Andrews Buchwalter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4627) granting a pension to Nellie Mae South; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4628) granting a pension to Belle Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4629) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4630), for the relief of William A. Ray; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4631) for the relief of Paul H. Creswell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4632) to compensate Harriet C. Holaday; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 4633) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta C. Schofield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4634) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Galligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4635) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Hoppock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4636) providing for the examination and survey of the Passaic River from the Eighth Street Bridge, Wallington, N. J., to the Passaic Street Bridge at Garfield, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stagg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4638) for the relief of Elizabeth Halstead; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4639) to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Joseph A. Dugan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4640) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Springster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEYSER: A bill (H. R. 4641) authorizing the President to present a gold medal to George M. Cohan; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4642) for the relief of Alice F. Martin, widow, and two minor children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 4643) granting an increase of pension to Willmina Porste; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4644) to authorize the presentation to William A. Pummill of a Distinguished Service Medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4645) to authorize the presentation to Harold L. Stewart of a Distinguished Service Medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 4646) for the relief of Ike Kearney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4647) granting a pension to Ernest E. Morris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4648) for the relief of Robert E. Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4649) for the relief of Edward J. McCrea; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHULTE: A bill (H. R. 4650) for the relief of Fred C. Rowley Co., Hammond, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SECREST: A bill (H. R. 4651) for the relief of the Noble County (Ohio) Agricultural Society; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 4652) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Neiderhiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4653) granting a pension to Anna Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Hochstetler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4655) for the relief of the Sachs Mercantile Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 4656) granting a pension to Ida Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 4657) granting a pension to Margaret J. Russell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 4658) for the relief of Victor Burran King, deceased; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILCOX: A bill (H. R. 4659) granting an increase of pension to Diadamia C. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4660) for the relief of Robert C. E. Hedley; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

350. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition signed by George H. Bartlett, president of the Haverhill-Townsend Plan Clubs, and 200 other residents, of Haverhill, Mass., favoring the adoption of the Townsend plan of old-age revolving pensions; to the Committee on Labor.

351. By Mr. BACON: Petition of the Senate of the State of New York, urging that the Government of the United States take appropriate action in condemning the tactics of such officials of the Mexican Government fomenting campaigns against freedom of religion, the press, right of assembly, and freedom of education in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

352. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the board of directors of the Franklin Society for Home Building and Savings, protesting the discrimination in favor of Federal Savings and Loan Associations exempting all shares of such associations, both as to their value and the income derived therefrom, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

353. By Mr. BLAND: Petition of 20 citizens of Accomac County, Va., urging the enactment of the old-age-pension legislation as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Labor.

354. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of Lincoln Council No. 312, Knights of Columbus, Astoria, Long Island, New York, regarding conditions in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

355. Also, resolution of Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, regarding conditions in Mexico; to the committee on Foreign Affairs.

356. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of 366 signers, of Rockford, Ill., calling upon Congress to enact into law the so-called "Townsend old-age-pension" plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

357. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of W. W. Adams and about 170 other citizens, of Fergus Falls, Minn., and vicinity, requesting the support and the enactment of the Townsend old-age-pension plan into Federal legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

358. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of Oswego Council No. 227, Knights of Columbus, Oswego, N. Y., protesting against religious persecution in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

359. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., protesting against the conduct of certain officials in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

360. Also, petition of certain residents of Watertown, N. Y., for the passing of the Townsend old-age revolving pension; to the Committee on Labor.

361. Also, petition of certain residents of Oswego, N. Y., endorsing the Townsend old-age plan; to the Committee on Labor.

362. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Kings County Consolidated Civic League, urging that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation be granted an appropriation to continue to give relief to distressed home owners entitled to receive same under the provisions of the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

363. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Erie, urging the passage of a bill authorizing the appropriation of $4,000,000,000 recommended by the President, and said bill to contain a provision alloting to the railroads a suitable appropriation to be used for grade-crossing improvements; to the Committee on Appropriations.

364. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Rahman-DeBella Motion-Picture-Machine Operators Post, No. 1114, American Legion, repudiating and condemning the vote recorded by the New York State delegation of the American Legion at the national convention of the American Legion on the bonus resolution at Miami, Fla.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

365. By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of Lille Deshong and a number of other residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, regarding old-age pensions (H. R. 2856) for the relief of the aged; to the Committee on Labor.

366. Also, petition of A. B. Gochmour and a number of other residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, regarding the old-age pension (H. R. 2856) for the relief of the aged; to the Committee on Labor.

367. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Monticello (N. Y.) Council, No. 63, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, urging that Congress do all within their power to resist any attempt to lower the bars erected against unrestricted immigration, and to strengthen existing laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

368. Also, petition of Knights of Columbus, urging the Government of the United States to make representations to the Government of Mexico that unless the evils complained of in said petition are ended forthwith, further recognition of the Mexican Government will be withdrawn and diplomatic relations between the United States and the Mexican Government will be severed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

369. By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Petition of the commissioners of the county of Yankton, S. Dak., urging Congress to enact legislation authorizing hydroelectric development of the Missouri River and the allocation of funds necessary for the construction of a dam and an electric-power plant at Yankton, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

370. Also, petition of the board of commissioners of the city of Huron, S. Dak., urging Congress to enact legislation authorizing hydroelectric development on the Missouri River and the allocation of funds necessary for the construction of a dam and an electric-power plant at Yankton, S. Dak., this site on the Missouri River, a few miles

upstream from Yankton, S. Dak., known as "Gavin's Point"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

371. By Mr. HOEPPEL: Resolution of the Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West, endorsing the Civilian Conservation Corps and urging that a permanent National Conservation Corps be created by act of Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

372. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9, California Legislature, urging the enactment of legislation to provide for a working week of not more than 5 days of 6 hours each, without any corresponding reduction in the present compensation or salary; to the Committee on Labor.

373. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 of the California Legislature, urging enactment of legislation to provide for the immediate payment, at face value, of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

374. By Mr. HULL: Petition of John Thompson and 33 other residents of Deer Park, Wis., favoring the Townsend plan for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

375. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition of members of the Bergenfield Democratic Club, Bergenfield, N. J., asking favorable consideration by the Ways and Means Committee of bill for national lottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

376. Also, petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., asking favorable consideration by Ways and Means Committee of bill for national lottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

377. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West, with respect to the benefit of the Civilian Conservation Corps in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

378. Also, resolution of the council of the city of Oakland, Calif., relating to making funds available for the use of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

379. Also, resolution of the City Council of Los Angeles, relative to a Budget allowance being provided to continue the work of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the operation of strong motion seismographs in various sections of the State of California; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

380. Also, resolution of the California State Legislature, relative to the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

381. By Mr. KVALE: Resolution of Unit 158 of the American Legion Auxiliary, Madison, Minn., urging enactment of the legislative program of the American Legion; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

382. Also, resolution of the Peter Leuze Post, No. 420, American Legion, Raymond, Minn., urging immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

383. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Mrs. James T. Bloser and a number of other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging that the Nye munitions investigation be continued; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

384. Also, petition of Mrs. Louise Stitt and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging that an adequate appropriation be made to continue the Nye munitions investigation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

385. By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of Anoka County Council of Labor and the Farmer-Labor Club of Anoka, Minn., urging immediate legislation opposing any attempt to shift the burden of taxation from people who have the ability to pay to a class of people who are in reality bankrupt, and proposing a plan whereby school districts, towns, cities, and villages may under certain conditions be declared bankrupt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

386. Also, petition of George S. Lang Post, No. 339, the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, protesting against the enactment of the McKellar rider to the deficiency bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

387. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Resolution adopted by the James T. Cullinan Post of the American Legion, Department of New York, endorsing the action taken by the American Legion at the national convention held in Miami, Fla., regarding the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

388. Also, resolutions adopted by Parkway Council, No. 1433, Knights of Columbus, protesting against the activities of the national revolutionary party in Mexico, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

389. Also, petition of Rahman-DeBella Post, No. 1114, New York City, N. Y., urging immediate payment of the bonus and repudiating the vote of the New York State delegation of the American Legion at its sixteenth annual national convention at Miami, Fla., on October 25, 1934, against payment of the bonus at the present time; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

390. By Mr. MORAN: Memorial of State Legislature of Maine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

391. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of New York City Fireproofers & Cement Floor Finish Contractors Association, Inc., New York, concerning the proposed Public Works program on a day's labor basis; to the Committee on Labor.

392. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of the $4,000,000,000 appropriation bill recommended by the President, and that it include allotments to railroads for grade-crossing improvements; to the Committee on Appropriations.

393. Also, petition of National Fur Tax Committee, New York City, opposing the 10-percent excise tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

394. Also, petition of Rahman-DeBella Post, No. 1114, the American Legion, New York City, favoring the immediate payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

395. By Mr. WELCH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4, California Legislature, memorializing the President and Congress to enact old-age-pension legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

396. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1, California Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact proposed legislation directing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates of sailors and soldiers of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

397. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9, California Legislature, memorializing the President and Congress to carefully consider and enact legislation to provide for a working week of not more than 5 days of 6 hours each, without any corresponding reduction in the present compensation or salary; to the Committee on Labor.

398. Also, resolutions adopted by California State Federation of Labor concerning Federal legislation, as follows: Proposition no. 36, Menace to Civil Service Laws; proposition no. 37, Postal Substitutes Automatic Promotion; proposition no. 39, Establishing Motorized Railway Post Offices; and proposition no. 74, *Morro Castle* Disaster; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

399. Also, resolution adopted by the Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West, urging the continuation of the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

400. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Science Foundation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, Jan. 21, 1935)

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

PETER NORBECK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, appeared in his seat today.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.