HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 1939

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rabbi Alfred G. Moses, Government Street Temple, Mobile, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our fathers, God of America and all mankind, into Thy presence have we come to dedicate ourselves to Thee and Thy enduring kingdom of truth, justice, and liberty. Here and now do we conjoin with these splendid delegates of a free nation to think, to labor, and to legislate for the government of the people, by the people, for the people. Send Thy Holy Spirit into our midst, that in all our works, continued and ended in Thee, we may glorify Thy sacred name and build up the house of America, not made by hands, eternal in the heaven. Bless the President and Vice President of these United States, our beloved Speaker, upon whose able shoulders rests the Elijahlike mantle of a beloved, honored father. Fill them and all our citizens with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of the knowledge and fear of Thee. As we stand in this historic forum of democracy, teach us from Thy living word that righteousness exalteth a nation and that sin is a reproach to the people. Finally, may our vision of a greater America be realized in the imperial poem written by a brilliant daughter of our people:

Oh, beautiful for patriot dreams
That sees beyond the years,
Thine alabaster cities gleam
Undimmed by human tears.

America, America,
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown Thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea.

Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5619. An act to provide for the training of civil aircraft pilots and for other purposes.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN PETROLEUM AND ITS PRODUCTS

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time to consider the bill (S. 1302) to make permanently effective the act entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes," approved February 22, 1935, as amended, and for other purposes, under the general rules of the House, and that there shall be not to exceed 2 hours of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], debate to be confined to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LABOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1940

Mr. TARVER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5427) making appropriations for the Labor Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

WAGE DIFFERENTIALS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1939, there were inserted in the RECORD certain statistics relative to the pay of W. P. A. workers in the different States of the United States, divided into four different classes, unskilled labor, intermediate labor, skilled labor, and professional and technical labor.

I now have statistics, just furnished me by the Works Progress Administration, which do not appear in the hearings on the pending bill. These statistics disclose the differentials existing in the same types of labor within the boundaries of States and also the differentials existing among 24 different specific types of occupations of W. P. A. workers. I ask unanimous consent to insert this information in the RECORD at this point, and in connection therewith to insert also a summary of a survey made by the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor of the differences in the cost of living in certain cities of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, did I correctly understand the gentleman to say he wanted these statistics inserted at this point?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct. May I say to the gentleman that I hope the consideration of these wage differentials may possibly be deferred until after the Members have an opportunity to examine this material in the RECORD. It ought to have been in the hearings but it did not appear there. I hope the gentleman will not object to its occupying a place in the RECORD where it will attract the attention of the Members of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman appreciates that the majority leader laid down a rule the other day to the effect that such a practice was not going to be allowed. If we permit the gentleman to do this, then, of course, everybody else should have an equal opportunity.

Mr. TARVER. Then I will revise my request, Mr. Speaker. I intend to make some remarks today in Committee of the Whole on an amendment I propose to offer, and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend the remarks I shall make in the Committee of the Whole by including the matter to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

WORK RELIEF AND PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the relief measure which we have been discussing for the past 2 days, and which will be debated today, does not provide sufficient funds to take care of the many thousands of persons who, through no fault of their own, are unemployed. Unless this bill is amended hundreds of thousands of persons undoubtedly will be compelled to go hungry.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of yesterday in an editorial has referred to us as a pusillanimous Congress. The other day the Speaker ruled that this term was not objectionable when applied to the action of a

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

committee of the House. The News states as one reason why we should be described that way is because we have failed to bring out the National Labor Relations Act for amendment.

So that we may all have some idea of what the News meant when it referred to us as being "pusillanimous," herewith is the definition and a few of the synonyms of the word:

1. Lacking strength of mind, courage, or spirit; mean-spirited; cowardly. 2. Characterized by weakness of purpose or lack of courage. Synonyms: Cowardly, dastardly, effeminate, faint-hearted, feeble, mean-spirited, recreant, spiritless, timid, timorous, weak.

You may agree with this description of the News or you may have other reasons for not amending the National Labor Relations Act, but for myself I deny that the description applies and believe that the demand of the people as shown by so many popular polls to the effect that we amend the National Labor Relations Act at this session should be followed.

There is no reason why John L. Lewis, who yesterday announced there would be no peace between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., should continue to use that act and the National Labor Relations Board to wreck the A. F. of L. and industry and levy tribute upon employees.

Let us bring out that act and amend it this session.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add to my remarks parts of two letters from manufacturing concerns in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that I have complaints from a large manufacturing concern in my district, which employs several hundred people, about the competition of cheap labor in Japan and Germany through the reciprocal-trade agreements that will eventually ruin their business unless Congress acts and prohibits these reciprocal-trade agreements to throw our men and women out of work. I quote from their letter:

On May 24 the Wood Turners Service Bureau, at our request, filed a brief with the United States Tariff Commission. In it you will note we request some relief from competition of cheap-labor countries, particularly Japan and Germany.

The result of this complaint is answered by the United States Tariff Commission in their letter of May 29 to the Wood Turners Service Bureau, and I quote from their letter as follows:

The act under which trade agreements have been negotiated specifically provides that the provisions of section 336 of the Tariff Act shall not apply to any article covered by trade agreement, and the Tariff Commission could not entertain an application for an investigation and change of duty on the articles named above. There is no law administered by the Tariff Commission by which a quota could be imposed on the articles in question.

Pretty tough on American labor, is it not? Let me say to the Members of the House of Representatives that if you are going to give work to American laborers and give employment to the people who are unemployed, there is nothing you can do that will give greater impetus to putting men to work, not only in agriculture but in manufacturing establishments, than to take away from the President of the United States and Mr. Hull the power to enter into reciprocal-trade agreements, which are ruining our supply of jobs in America. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain letters addressed to me concerning W. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on next Monday following any previous special orders of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

OUR NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, our national debt is $44,000,000,000. We are adding to it at the rate of $7,000 per minute. It increased from $21,000,000,000 to $44,000,000,000 under the present administration in 6 years. The interest is more than $1,000,000,000 per year.

In 1913 our Government cost $34 per family. In 1939 it cost $540 per family. Our national debt is $1,332 per family. This statement refers only to our Federal Government.

We have appropriated for all relief purposes since 1933 about $23,000,000,000 and now have 11,000,000 unemployed people.

The Federal Government has appropriated for farm relief since 1933 more than $3,000,000,000. This amount is, but should not be, figured in the farm income.

The "gentle rain of checks" through the South and West has not helped our agricultural situation. The United States has 11,000,000 bales of surplus cotton. We imported 184,000 bales of cotton in 1938. Other imports were as follows: January, February, and March, 1939: 622,617 bushels of potatoes, 18,522,000 pounds of canned tomatoes, 90,000,000 pounds of hides, 64,667,000 pounds of wool, and 2,595,000 bushels of wheat.

We imported vast quantities of meats last year. We imported 78,000,000 pounds of beef from the Argentine in 1938. The President says, "It is better beef." The Argentine feeds only grass, we feed our cattle corn. The American market belongs to the American farmer.

Let us maintain our constitutional form of government with its checks and balances, remembering that under our form of government "what the people really want they generally get."

In countries ruled by dictators the dictators change the people. In countries governed like our own the people change the President.

GOVERNMENT RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, about the only person in this country who is enjoying prosperity is the red-ink manufacturer.

There has been an increase in expenditures of 165 percent in 1939 over 1938, and here are the figures:

U. S. Government receipts

Fiscal year 1939	$4,658,520,479.50
Fiscal year 1938	5,092,316,930.23
Loss of income (red ink)	433,796,450.73

U. S. Government expenses

GENERAL EXPENDITURES

Fiscal year 1939	$4,959,620,193.66
Fiscal year 1938	4,468,558,620.64
Increase of expenses (more red ink)	491,061,573.02

RECOVERY AND RELIEF EXPENDITURES

Fiscal year 1939	2,591,249,692.25
Fiscal year 1938	1,717,111,548.29
Increase of expenses (still more red ink)	874,138,143.96

TOTAL EXPENSES

Fiscal year 1939	$7,550,869,985.91
Fiscal year 1938	6,185,670,168.93
Increase of expenses (and more red ink)	1,365,199,816.98
Total red ink, fiscal year 1939	2,892,349,506.41
Total red ink, fiscal year 1938	1,093,353,238.70

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 94]

Allen, Pa.	Curley	Hill	Smith, Ill.
Andresen, A. H.	Dies	Kelly	Somers, N. Y.
Barton	Faddis	McReynolds	Sumners, Tex.
Boykin	Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	White, Idaho
Connery	Fulmer	Murray	White, Ohio
Courtney	Gamble	Plumley	
Crawford	Hancock	Reece, Tenn.	
Culkin	Hendricks	Richards	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 402 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short petition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial in the Winston-Salem Journal favorably commenting on a speech by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

WORK RELIEF AND PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 326, with Mr. McCORMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this opportunity in order to give information to the House about several amendments which will be offered not only to this section, but to other portions of the bill.

I believe if just a few moments are taken at this time to give this information to the Committee, it will save some time in the ultimate consideration of amendments that may come hereafter.

If you have the bill in front of you and will turn to page 3, line 6, you will see that the types of projects contemplated under W. P. A. in the bill as presented by the committee would not permit of the prosecution of any Federal projects. Since the bill has been reported to the House a great many Members have called the atttention of the committee to various types of Federal projects of much merit and upon which relief labor is employed, and the committee, at a meeting this morning, decided to strike out the word "non-Federal" in line 6, on page 3, and to insert in place thereof the words "Federal and non-Federal," which would permit the prosecution of Federal projects.

Then on page 14, to strike out the matter in section 11 (a) and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The Board is authorized to allocate not to exceed $50,000,000 to other Federal agencies for the operation, under such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe, of projects of the type specified in subsection (b) of section 1 which are within the scope of the functions usually carried out by such agency, including administrative expenses of such agency incident to such operation: *Provided,* That not to exceed 4 percent of the total amount so allotted to any such agency shall be used for such administrative expenses: *Provided further,* That no project shall be prosecuted under any allotment under this subsection upon which the percentage of nonrelief persons employed exceeds 15 percent of the total number of persons employed.

Under this language Federal projects would be permitted to the extent of $50,000,000, provided they come within the usual functions of the agency and provided not less than 85 percent relief labor would be employed thereon.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Virginia has just said, the bill, as now written, would have placed an inhibition on all Federal projects after July 1. On behalf of a very large number of Members of the House, and I believe a very large majority of the House, I wish to thank the gentleman from Virginia and his entire subcommittee on both sides of the aisle——

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield right there, I will be frank and state I did not, nor did the other minority members, go along with this particular proposition. [Laughter.]

Mr. WARREN. I am sorry I will have to withdraw it as to the gentleman from New York [laughter], but the gentleman from Virginia and those on the majority side promptly realized the terrible situation that this would cause, and we are, indeed, very grateful to him. Personally, I think the amount should be $75,000,000, but I am not going to quibble over that, because a very bad situation has been thoroughly taken care of.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It does not affect the total amount in the bill at all.

Mr. DARDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield briefly.

Mr. DARDEN. In the gentleman's statement he said "provided the work shall be work usually done by the agency." Does the gentleman mean an establishment such as the Navy in certain sections of the country, or is it the agency of the W. P. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Navy in the instance the gentleman mentions.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield briefly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There are some Members on the minority side who are very much interested in lifting this ban on Federal projects, and we appreciate the action of the committee. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. On page 4, at the bottom of the page, the paragraph provides for a material limitation of $6 per man-month. The limitation under existing law is $7 per man-month. In the bill presented by the committee we reduced that to $6, in an effort to try to compel larger local sponsorship. Our attention has been called to the fact that there conceivably might be a material increase in the index

cost of materials and that under the $6 per man-month limitation a situation might arise which would make it very awkward in carrying out the projects. So the committee will offer an amendment giving some discretion to the W. P. A. as to that $6 limitation per man-month for material, but providing that the material cost shall in no event go higher than $7 per man-month, which is the existing rate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood the gentleman to say awhile ago that he was offering an amendment that would allocate $50,000,000 additional to subsection (b) of section 1. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. RANKIN. What was the gentleman's second proposition?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know what the gentleman has in mind. I explained we were making available $50,000,000 for Federal projects.

Mr. RANKIN. That was your first proposition?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. What was your second proposition?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know what the gentleman has in mind. That is all I have mentioned so far.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has just suggested an amendment to subsection (d) on page 4. It has come to my attention that W. P. A. is paying thousands of dollars for road equipment and ditch-digging equipment. Has the gentleman's committee given any consideration to limiting the amount which W. P. A. or its agencies might pay for equipment, which, of course, if it runs into thousands of dollars, replaces work?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The reason W. P. A. has been able to spend large sums for heavy machinery and equipment is because the $7 per man-month material limitation applied to the Nation at large. Therefore in certain areas they were able greatly to reduce that and to have an accumulation in the Nation-wide average from which they might buy machinery. The gentleman will see that the section as now worded limits the average to a State, which the committee thinks will put a stop to or curb the practice to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield briefly.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. With reference to Federal projects.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will that take care of subsections (a) and (b) in section 11, on page 14, regarding the inefficients there with respect to Federal projects?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is the gentleman speaking of the theater and arts projects?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I want to know if the amendment of the committee will take care of Federal projects with regard to the inefficients in section 11. I am not speaking of the theater project.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. On page 14?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. On page 14.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; it covers that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There are Federal projects in my district, such as building roads in the national forests, which are exclusively Federal projects. Would the committee amendment permit continuance of the construction of those roads and such improvements in the forests?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Within the limitation of $50,000,000 and 85 percent relief labor.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Under the first amendment which the gentleman proposes to offer, does that also include rehabilitation and repair projects, say, in Army posts, just as it will under a new project?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It does.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that he be allowed to proceed with the discussion of these amendments until he has completed each and every one of them without interruption, because we will all have an opportunity to ask questions about them when the amendments are offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas that the gentleman from Virginia be permitted to proceed with a discussion of each amendment without interruption until they are completed?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, on page 5, section (f), the committee will offer an amendment which is merely clarifying but which requires some additional language on account of the reorganization going into effect. It is purely technical and nothing that any member of the committee, I am sure, would be particularly interested in.

On page 8, under the title of National Youth Administration, when we reach that part of the bill, the committee will offer an amendment which will permit the use of 5 percent of their funds for administrative expenses.

The amendment on page 14 I have already explained.

On page 15 the committee will move to strike out section 12 as it now stands and in lieu thereof insert the following:

SEC. 12. None of the funds made available by this title shall be expended on the construction of any building (1) the total estimated cost of which, in the case of a Federal building, exceeds $50,000, or (2) the portion of the total estimated cost of which payable from Federal funds, in the case of non-Federal building, exceeds $40,000, unless the building is one (a) upon which construction is in progress on June 14, 1939, or for which the project has been approved by the President on or prior to such date, or (b) for the completion of which funds have been allocated and irrevocably set aside under prior relief appropriation acts.

This amendment will permit in the case of Federal projects—that is, nonsponsored Federal projects, building construction projects not to exceed $50,000 each—in the case of non-Federal projects such as armories, or whatever it may be, it will permit the use of as much as $40,000 of Federal funds. The usual community contribution is 25 percent. That would permit a $50,000 building, or the community might decide to contribute a larger percentage and would get the use of as much as $40,000 of Federal funds. There are three situations to which the limitation does not apply. If the project is already under construction, the limitation does not apply. If the President on June 14 had approved a project, no limitaton applies; or if the funds have already been allocated and set aside, no limitation applies.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BEAM. I wish the gentleman would enlighten the Committee on whether that $50,000 pertains solely to the construction of a building as a building or does it pertain to a construction project?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is the construction of a building.

Mr. BEAM. A building solely; so, as to a sewage proposition or some other improvement there will be no limitation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No limitation. It applies only to the construction of a building.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Within the last few days I have received a great many complaints from communities that heretofore have been unable to finance the projects, and which they are now in a position to finance. Most of those projects will be public buildings that will cost from $100,000 to $150,000 or $200,000. Under this provision, and even the gentleman's amendment, these communities could not proceed and will not come under the provisions of the act as amended, as suggested by the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not out of P. W. A. funds, but this does not apply to the Public Works Administration. These are W. P. A. projects.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday afternoon I talked with the gentleman from Virginia and several other members of his committee regarding the acceptance of an amendment which would remove the limitation of $25,000 on any project unless construction had actually been begun on June 14, 1939. My amendment would have provided that this limit would not apply in the event the sponsor is a municipality, school district, or county, and the projects are for a courthouse, jail, city hall, public building, or similar project where the governing authority had already issued bonds for the purpose of taking care of the sponsors' part and the application had not been approved but may now be in the process of being made or approved. Would the gentleman's amendment exempt projects from the $25,000 limitation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The amendment, of course, would not apply if the application had not been approved; but I cannot conceive of a situation where a bond issue would be authorized in advance of the approval of a project.

Mr. GARRETT. It is often the case that bonds are actually voted before sponsors file their applications. There are a number of cases, Mr. Chairman, in Texas and other States where the municipality, school district, or the county, being desirous of aiding in providing work for the unemployed, had no funds with which they could sponsor these worth-while projects until they voted bonds. W. P. A. in many cases had gone to these sponsors and encouraged the filing of applications and have cooperated with these sponsors in order to relieve the unemployment situation and at the same time construct much-needed and permanent structures. Applications are now being made or are pending, but not yet approved. These people in good faith have voted these bonds and in some instances could not qualify under P. W. A. even though ample funds were provided by Congress. It seems to me, therefore, that these sponsors who in good faith have issued these bonds for these purposes should not be excluded by this legislation; and my amendment, which I propose to offer at the proper time is intended to protect these sponsors.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This amendment would not reach any case where there was no application filed, but, as I said before, I cannot conceive of a case—certainly it would be most unusual—for a community to go to the trouble of issuing bonds when there had not been at least a tentative approval of the application.

Mr. GARRETT. Would the gentleman indicate at this time whether his committee would accept my amendment, which would take care of such cases?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I could not indicate, because I am merely outlining to the House the action of the committee, I may say to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. May I ask if by far the majority of the projects which will be aided by these funds, local projects, are not non-Federal projects? This being the case, it seems to me the larger amount the gentleman has indicated, $50,000 for Federal projects, ought to go to the aid of non-Federal projects where sponsors will find it very difficult to make a contribution, rather than to Federal projects. I do not believe in the district I represent there is anything in the way of a small Federal project. They are schools, auditoriums, small county and city buildings, and so on. I think it would be a very wise thing if we switched the figures on Federal and non-Federal projects.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. When the amendment is offered it will be open to discussion.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think I will ask the indulgence of the House to be permitted to finish what I am outlining. When the amendment is offered it will be open to discussion.

On page 27, line 3, the committee will offer an amendment to strike out the word "misdemeanor" and to substitute "felony." On the same page, line 4, we shall offer an amendment to strike out "1 year" and substitute "2 years."

On page 31, under the Public Works Administration title, line 20, the committee will offer the following amendment after the word "agency":

> Unless such agency agrees to require that not less than 25 percent of the labor to be employed on such project shall be taken from relief rolls.

The purpose of this amendment is to require, insofar as projects which will be undertaken by the Public Works Administration out of this $125,000,000 transferred from relief money, that at least 25 percent of the labor shall be taken from relief rolls. I direct the attention of the committee to the fact that there will not only be available for projects the $125,000,000 transferred from W. P. A. to P. W. A. but there will be an additional amount of local sponsorship. So instead of there being $125,000,000 for projects, there will be $288,000,000 for projects with this provision that at least 25 percent of the labor must be taken from relief rolls. The committee believes that under this provision just as many people will be employed on the relief rolls as would have been employed had the $125,000,000 remained in W. P. A.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. But it is the purpose of the committee to hold the limitation to $225,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is a different matter than I was talking about.

Mr. BOLAND. Has the committee done anything about the $225,000 limitation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is on the same page, page 31, section (c). I may say to my friend from Pennsylvania that the limitation of $225,000 upon Federal contributions to P. W. A. projects applies only to new projects undertaken out of the $125,000,000 set aside from W. P. A. Let me reiterate, because I think there is a very general misapprehension about that: The $225,000 limitation does not apply to existing projects; it does not apply to any project for which there has been an allocation of funds. It applies only to new projects which may be initiated pursuant to new applications out of the $125,000,000 taken out of W. P. A. and put under P. W. A. This will permit $500,000 projects. The committee felt that if only $125,000,000 was to be allowed P. W. A. for new construction, and that to come out of relief funds, the type of the project should be relatively small and of a character that could be gotten under way quickly. Therefore the limitation. It does not affect any existing project because P. W. A. cannot start a project until it has the money with which to start and complete it.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOLAND. I want to give the gentleman this information. In Pennsylvania we have 64 projects that ran over $500,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It does not affect those.

Mr. BOLAND. They are not yet in operation. The necessary legislation has been passed in Pennsylvania by the general State authorities. These will be new applications. You hamstring those and throw them out of the window. We have not a chance in the world to get any of this money.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They are over $500,000?

Mr. BOLAND. They are over $500,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is a question of policy. If you want to take this $125,000,000 and give it to a few big projects, the House may do that.

Mr. BOLAND. There are 64 of them in Pennsylvania alone.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There are some other States besides Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOLAND. But you are hamstringing our organization in Pennsylvania so that they cannot take advantage of the $125,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That only applies to the $125,000,000. If the Congress wishes to embark upon a new public-works program, this limitation would not apply to that. It only applies to the $125,000,000 here provided.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Are there any additional funds to the $125,000,000 in here?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. How much?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not in this bill; no.

Mr. SABATH. Have they any money left?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If they do, this does not affect that.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman know whether they have any funds left?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think so. They have no funds for new allocations, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. If that applies to the State of Pennsylvania, does it apply to Illinois and every other State?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes, surely.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia, what is the status of the present Starnes bill? Is there any opportunity or any chance that the Starnes bill will be enacted into law?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Starnes bill is pending in the Committee on Appropriations. There has been no Budget or administration request for its consideration.

Mr. DINGELL. What reasoning does the committee apply in placing a limit on projects? In my city of Detroit, we have built several monumental structures; we have put into operation a giant sewage-disposal plant. Suppose the city of Detroit wanted one large project instead of a dozen small ones, what difference does that make to the committee?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee felt if there was a very small sum made available, it might be a good idea to divide it up all over the country and not give it to one or two cities for large projects. Maybe that is not good reasoning; I do not know, but I think it is.

Mr. DINGELL. Why not limit the amount in a community rather than base it on one project? One community may want to build one large project, and another community might want a dozen small ones.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I have been informed by the W. P. A. that the number of projects under $25,000 is 18 percent of the total; the number of projects under $50,000 is 15½ percent of the total; so that under the gentleman's proposed amendment well-nigh 65 percent of the total number of projects may be eliminated unless the local sponsors would come forward with substantial sums of money. Has the committee inquired whether or not the local communities and cities have sufficient funds to actually do this work?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee feels that the W. P. A. should not engage in large building construction. That is the purpose of the amendment being put into the bill. Large building construction costs from 40 to 50 percent more under W. P. A. than it does under P. W. A. It is very demoralizing to the skilled trades to have such a great differential in the efficiency of labor. I do not want to take all the time now.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. In the city of Spokane, my home city, after approval of a P. W. A. project to renovate, reconstruct, and rebuild some 60 school buildings, a bond issue carried by a vote of 5 to 1 involving $1,225,000 for the sponsor's contribution. Would this limitation throw that project out, or could they take each building as a separate unit?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Has it been approved?

Mr. LEAVY. It was approved as a single project.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If it has been approved, it comes under the exception.

Mr. LEAVY. But no work has ever been done.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If it has been approved, as I stated, it comes under the exception.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. May I ask whether the committee has investigated to find out why the cost under W. P. A. is higher than under P. W. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Because of the inefficiency of the labor.

Mr. KELLER. I shall, of course, question that and will try to show that is not so at the right time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to return to the first amendment that the gentleman explained and ask whether that amendment will make possible the continuance of the radio programs which the Office of Education has been carrying on in reference to Federal projects.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It does not reach that. That is under the National Emergency Council.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; I do not think so.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it is under the National Emergency Council. This does not reach that. There will have to be a separate appropriation for that if it is to be carried forward.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the gentleman from Virginia believe that the Members of the House should bear in mind that we are considering a bill for the relief of the poor people of this country who cannot secure jobs in private industry, and that we are not considering a bill for the relief of private contractors or for the relief of communities that want to build monumental structures?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 3, line 6, strike out "non-Federal", and in the same line, after the word "projects", insert "Federal and non-Federal."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for turning $50,000,000 of relief money over to W. P. A. to use on Federal projects; projects for which in many cases there is no authorization by Congress; projects for which Congress in many cases has refused appropriations; projects on which it is impossible in the locality and has been impossible in the past to procure real relief labor.

I was hopeful that the Congress would continue the elimination of these Federal projects so there might be more

money available for real relief. I do not feel that I can support this proposition. There is little enough relief in the W. P. A. the way it is managed by Federal authority in Washington. I hate to see the little relief that is left contracted. I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Can the gentleman tell the House what percentage of the projects aided by this legislation will be Federal as compared with non-Federal? Are not the large majority non-Federal projects?

Mr. TABER. This calls for $50,000,000 out of $1,477,000,000, or approximately 3½ to 4 percent of the total.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Three and one-half to four percent of the total; and the rest of them are non-Federal, then?

Mr. TABER. The rest of them are non-Federal.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Does not the gentleman believe that the greater aid ought to be given to the non-Federal projects?

Mr. TABER. It should, but I am objecting to putting in the word "Federal" because I do not believe we ought to get into constructing projects for which the Congress has refused appropriations or that have not been authorized or that are in localities where the real load of relief labor does not exist.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. If the committee amendment is adopted, however, I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that many projects, such as the shelterbelt project and some of the irrigation projects in the West which tend to rehabilitate the country out there, can be continued; whereas if the amendment is not adopted, these projects will fall by the wayside.

Mr. TABER. The Congress has voted specifically against the shelterbelt project whenever it has had the chance to do so. That is the kind of projects that are carried out under such a provision as this, projects for which the Congress would not appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, as the lone Member of the Congress of the United States singled out and marked for radical treatment at the instance of radical control and hands of the Workers Alliance, I sought time when this resolution was under general debate, and being unable to obtain recognition then, sought it now, and take occasion to thank the Committee for its indulgence.

When House Joint Resolution 83 was before and passed the House last January, representatives of the Workers Alliance from points elsewhere than my district called at my office and, in my absence, left a memoranda of their demands, exacting a statement as to my position, did not return for it. Their demand was for an increased appropriation of $150,000,000 over and above that favorably reported by the Committee on Appropriations. Thereupon I received a letter from the State headquarters of the Alliance bearing the signature of one M. Dean Weiner as secretary, referring to the call at my office by their representatives and exacting a statement of my position. I did not answer this mimeographed form letter.

After the vote on the proposed amendment to increase the appropriation in the amount of $150,000,000 had been taken by tellers, I received a first letter from Labor's Non-Partisan League inquiring how I voted on the teller vote. This letter admitted that though the Members were checked from the galleries they were without information on some 131 Members of the checked total vote. It was stated that, not wishing to do anyone an injustice but intending to report the vote back to the district, the opportunity was afforded the Members to state how they voted. Accepting full responsibility for my record votes and not proposing to be catechized on unrecorded votes, especially by other than my constituents, I disdained to answer the inquiry. I next received a mimeographed letter from the magazine called Tac, published in New York, N. Y., asking the same information as to my vote. I threw this one in the wastebasket.

Shortly thereafter Labor's Non-Partisan League, previously so reluctant to do a manifest injustice, recorded and published my name as one who had opposed the amendment. The Workers Alliance, similarly not knowing how I had voted, but more generously disposed, recorded and published my name as for it. Personally knowing that not one single qualified project had been rejected in my district, and therefore considering the extra appropriation unnecessary, I voted against it in the Committee of the Whole. The Tac magazine favored me along with colleagues with a copy of their February issue, devoted exclusively to propagandizing the Federal theater projects. Right here I might say that on Wednesday, June 14, I was called on the telephone by an employee of the Federal theater projects under Works Progress Administration, soliciting my support for the continuation of their cause, proposed to be eliminated under the resolution now pending, expressing his fears for their future at the hands of the Committee on Appropriations.

I took occasion to question this man concerning this Tac magazine, which he described as a former publication devoted to the stage, which, having failed, was taken up, renamed, and as a Communist front was now catering and devoted to that element and the supporters and beneficiaries of the Federal theater projects. This man laid claim to service rendered me when the Federal theater project operating in Reading, Pa., was ordered discontinued by Mrs. Hallie Flanagan in the face of protests from, and endorsements of, those attesting to its satisfactory services, as well as its beneficiaries in my district.

It so happens the Federal theater project was operating in my district before I was elected a Member of this honorable body. When the sudden order was issued for its termination in a few days, I received protests from the persons affected, one city, and one county official. These were communicated to Mrs. Flannigan, who explained the action in detail, expressing regret at the necessity and pointing out the wisdom of thus prejudicing my constituents to the interest of the greater cities, including Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Unwilling to let this project be thus dropped in the face of its responsible testimonials, particularly if they were to be continued elsewhere, I placed the protest before Mrs. Ellen S. Woodward, with no effect, only causing the receipt of a letter from Mrs. Flannigan outlining the result of the project's operation, as follows:

> Eight musicians of poor quality, unfitted for pit music; 2 stagehands; 1 supervisor; 13 actors, capable only of outmoded vaudeville. Unfortunately, the unit has by this time (January 8, 1938) exhausted its possibilities of audience support in and near Reading and we cannot afford to tour it. At the present time it is giving four performances a week, and in a total of 91 performances the box office has taken in only $126.94, an average of $1.39 per performance. The best professional people of this unit have been offered a transfer to the Philadelphia unit. Four have accepted. The rest will be picked up by the local Works Progress Administration, excepting for six single persons who are not eligible for such jobs. These six have been offered a transfer to Philadelphia, but have refused.

The unit was discontinued.

Here was a group of experienced players. Little did I then anticipate I was destined to learn the character of interest this prejudice served. The active lives of these people had been devoted to the stage, as contrasted to the novices rehearsed for a year and more in the groups we have here heard described. Outmoded vaudeville and musicians unfit for pit music, playing before C. C. C. camps, prisons, and others not privileged to amusement, were all prejudiced, that the appropriated funds might be diverted to the uses and practices that have impaired the standing of the Federal theater projects to the degree that, in alarm, those fearing

the projects may be abolished have now sought my support to aid in the cause of continuing their racket, to which the Communist Front Tac magazine is stated by its own beneficiaries to be devoted.

The Workers Alliance remained rather quiet until the full import of the so-called Hatch amendment to the first deficiency relief resolution became understood. With the alleged abolition of political sponsorship for administrative appointment, the alliance as the collective bargaining agency of those on relief and work relief, demanded and obtained recognition at the hands of the area supervisors under Works Progress Administration. To obtain this recognition the quicker they instantly agitated labor unrest, demanded dismissal of foremen, and demanded that their own members be favored for the foremen assignments. Vaunting, their having run five foremen from a job, they attacked the next, beat him up, ordered him from the project. He, being unable to secure the protection of the administrative organization of W. P. A., called State police to preserve order, and who did preserve order until the supervisor closed it down the same day. Such is the sworn testimony and affidavits in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

As the time approached for the consideration of the second deficiency resolution passed for an additional $100,000,000 for relief and work relief, I began to be flooded with dodgers, carrying a demand that I vote for $150,000,000 or be held personally responsible for any or all of a number of conditions and situations that might ensue, as follows:

> Mr. Congressman, either your support * * * an additional $150,000,000 for W. P. A., or * * * I will hold you personally responsible if W. P. A. workers are laid off; if unemployment increases—which means more taxes for relief—if business suffers and recovery is crippled in the district you represent.

That projects have been suspended in my district before and since this additional appropriation is equally true, but there is not one single instance that any project has been suspended because of inadequate appropriations by the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

Projects have been closed down for other reasons, most instances at the request of the sponsorship. Last year a Republican Governor was elected in Pennsylvania, committed to reduce taxation, restore employment, bring back industry that had migrated, and many other commitments that were easier to make in a political campaign than effect after he assumed his high office of Governor. Operations on many State highway projects have been reported suspended through lack of available funds at the disposal of the sponsorship. The Reading Times, of this very date, June 16, on page 32, reports Colonel Harrington, as follows:

> Harrington said at a press conference that a shortage of suitable projects existed in Pennsylvania in as great, if not a greater degree than anywhere in the United States. While this did not cut the total W. P. A. employment for the State, he explained, distribution of work was spotty. * * * He would not name any area he regarded as overmanned by relief workers.

Since I have been a Member of Congress not one qualified application for a project has been rejected in my district. This certainly indicates adequate appropriations for the district's needs on its regularly sponsored applications.

The previously described dodgers, on receipt immediately arrested my attention, for, from my long years of experience as a post-office inspector, I instantly knew they constituted blackmail in violation of the Revised Statutes, Criminal, and Penal Codes of the United States, and its Postal Laws and Regulations. This was confirmed by the Chief Post Office Inspector and his assistant, with both of whom I have served in official capacities. Among constituents, well known to me, I took immediate occasion to reproach them and offer admonition against violation of these laws and to cling to law observance. Their responses took the immediate form of apologies, adding they were induced to sign the dodgers at the instance of the Workers Alliance agents who visited the projects for this purpose and that to sign them would provide additional safety and security for its members. Personal contacts elicited the information, subsequently sworn to, that W. P. A. workers on these projects were cajoled, threatened, and intimidated into signing up to join this so-called union or be run off their jobs, and that under this duress they reluctantly signed to avoid trouble and possible loss of their jobs because the alliance was rapidly gaining a position of dominance, and these workers had information of meetings between the alliance officials and the area supervisor in a Reading hotel. This was further confirmed by W. P. A. workers and a county official who had personally witnessed such gatherings.

When the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], having the floor on March 27 yielded to me, I stated in part that W. P. A. workers under the duress and domination of the Workers' Alliance agents had signed these dodgers, it had the effect to cause David Lasser, the president of the alliance, to write me a letter taking me to account for my statement, admitting it constituted serious charges that needed looking into, and asking me to furnish the names of the persons involved. I obliged him, and though requesting advice as to the result of his own findings, to date have received no additional advices from him on the subject, and am justified in assuming his information proved fully as accurate as my own.

On May 11 I was unexpectedly called to the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, there to find amazement in hearing the sworn testimony of that committee's investigator, to the effect that in a meeting of the Workers' Alliance in Reading, Pa., on May 9, a resolution was offered, discussed, and advocated by one Ben Rubens, whose purpose was to effect adoption of his plot to resort to physical force, if necessary, to remove and take me away from the speaker's platform if I appeared in Reading on May 13 at the cornerstone laying of the new post office in that city. This investigator reported that the alliance members agreed only to picket the ceremonies in protest at my failure to accede to their demands to vote the unnecessary increased appropriation. To carry out their plans it was averred the leaders left to hold another meeting elsewhere. This plot to kidnap a Member of Congress had the instant effect to have it broadcast to the entire Nation by the news announcers of the Nation-wide radio hook-ups. The press wire services, carrying it instantly, also had the effect to cause it to be published in the press of the Nation from coast to coast.

The breaking of this news had the effect to cause Mr. Lasser to send me a telegram assuring me that the members of the alliance are law-abiding citizens, of their respect, and that they would turn out the entire membership that my speech would not be interfered with by any "hoodlums or stool pigeons that may have been sent into his organization by reactionaries." But the next day a group of his organization's officers visited him here in Washington, prepared and filed a letter attacking me, and seeking to have it incorporated in the subcommittee's hearings after finding the committee was not in session that day and could not be called together to hear them. This letter, written on the regular stationery used by Mr. Lasser in his communications to Members of Congress, had every earmark of having been prepared in his office. These visitors, contacting newspaper reporters, stated as their purpose to call on me at my office. The press asked to be admitted to the interview, if I gave them one, to which I readily agreed. They neither put in an appearance nor contacted me, though I remained in my office the remainder of the day constantly for that purpose, frequently answering the telephone calls of the press. At 7:30 that night the Washington Post and Baltimore Sun representatives concluded we had better call off the rendezvous.

The Workers Alliance immediately announced their abandonment of the plan to picket the ceremonies. When I attended and took my scheduled part in the ceremonies there was no disturbance. At its conclusion two strangers placed themselves between my position as I started to ascend the stairs to the platform and the cornerstone. One sarcastically asked, "Where is your bodyguard?" I responded, "I don't have any, don't need any, don't want any; I live here." His

rejoinder was, "We heard you were bringing one with you." My response was, "My ancestors took land here on a patent issued by William Penn 231 years ago, and have lived here from generation to generation ever since. We have become deeply rooted and will not pull up easily." His next retort was, "Well, you haven't been kidnaped yet?" To this I responded, "No; up to the present moment I haven't experienced any such sensation, much to my disappointment; but if you have anything in mind, let's start it now." My interrogator, with his companion, moved away.

Later on W. P. A. workers in the crowd looking on approached me to say who these strange men were, and named two of the group who had been here to Washington the day previous. I have since received letters from W. P. A. workers assuring me the plot to resort to force to seize and remove me—in effect, kidnap me—was not in any sense mythical, but in grim reality factual, and the only reason the plot was abandoned was on account of the wide publicity the conspiracy had received in the press and on the radio.

The first strikes on W. P. A. projects brought to my attention in the district I have the honor to represent occurred before I was first elected, and in which one "Red" Dean was an alleged leader. It is my information that he is the M. Dean Weiner functioning as State secretary of the alliance at Harrisburg. I have never met him, but have always heard that he is a Communist, and as such is included in sworn testimony in the hearings of your Subcommittee on Appropriations.

In 1937, after "Red" Dean engineered a sit-down strike in W. P. A. administrative quarters in the city of Reading, operating as a branch of the Lancaster office of district No. 7, the then district administrator, William A. Trees, was directed to proceed there and restore order. Francis H. Dryden, special field representative, came to my office and informed me that an undercover man reported that Trees trembled like an aspen leaf, in awe and fear of this radical organization. Sufficient unto itself is the fact that the press announced the administrator was ill in his rooms in the Abraham Lincoln Hotel in the city of Reading, and from there during the continuance of the sit-down strike issued orders and threats that all projects would be closed if the strike was not abandoned, which was not accomplished until the irate women of the sewing project, whose work was stopped, organized and ran Dean and his "sit-downers" from the building, when he left town.

Complaints from W. P. A. workers received and previously alluded to, with such evidence as personally collected, form the basis of sworn testimony laid before the subcommittee and establish fighting and rioting on the projects invariably incited by agitators. I accept full personal responsibility for furnishing the subcommittee of our colleagues in this body with what information I possessed and their investigators with the leads developed. As for me, personally, I hold myself in readiness to discharge the duties and responsibilities evolving upon me in consequence of the office I hold as a Representative. As such I conceive it my duty to represent all and not prejudice the silent trusting majority to the selfish fancied interests and articulate demands and exactions of a vociferous few, styled by David Lasser as "hoodlums or stool pigeons." I defy them to do their utmost, even to laying violent hands upon and kidnap me. I shall do my sworn duty under the Constitution. [Applause.]

As for Ben Rubens, I never heard his name mentioned before I heard it as the arch conspirator advocating this plot. I have taken time to inquire into his background, if any is known. My information is that he is a comparative stranger in my district and is reputed to be a deserter from the Loyalist Armies in Spain, which, it is believed, will sufficiently identify and classify him among my colleagues.

My records are that school districts and other municipal units, who have sponsored made-work projects, complained of loitering and loafing to the prejudice of having the work completed. Almost invariably each continuation project has brought forth some such complaint. A school district, having sponsored a project, sought through its secretary to have me ask that a certain experienced W. P. A. foreman and timekeeper be assigned to their project that they might thus have the supervision in friendly hands, with whom they might confer in the interest of the effecting of satisfactory and completed work. Having communicated their wishes as a Representative, and not attempting to politically sponsor or recommend these men unknown to me for these positions, their plea being rejected that strange supervisors and strange labor might be transported to their project, the board instructed the secretary to notify me they canceled the project.

School district secretaries have informed me that steady employment of W. P. A. workers has resulted in a higher earning capacity to them than the school term afforded the same township's teachers, yet the teachers paid their school taxes and the W. P. A. workers refused to pay taxes to the school district educating their children, and in instances even transporting them to school, on the ground their salaries from the Federal Government could not be taxed. This occurrence was that frequent that I took the matter up with the Works Progress Administration. Nels Anderson sent me a copy of his regulations set-up indicating the wages might not be assigned. I explained in detail to Mr. Holmes, who assured me he would attempt to effect an order through the State administrator.

Township assessors and tax collectors have submitted to me the accumulation of taxes even against the properties of W. P. A. workers. In some instances these taxes have been accumulating for several years. In other instances I have been asked to keep the matter in strict confidence lest the Workers Alliance picket the tax collector's home. In still other instances citizens have privately complained and prayed secrecy lest their buildings catch fire some night. In another instance where a tax collector became very active and energetic, a certain W. P. A. worker went to his home and in his intoxicated condition wanted to lick the tax collector in his own house for allegedly reporting him to Washington, as he had threatened to do, but had not, at least through my office.

Private citizens have petitioned me to help them get on W. P. A. that they might give up private employment and not be required to work as hard, or give up a small business, not very lucrative but furnishing enough to live upon, on the ground the work-relief employment would provide an easier livelihood. Members of the Committee, it is a sad state of affairs in our Nation when the humanitarianism of the President of the United States and the liberalism of this great body, voting the expansive appropriations we have been doing, find ourselves confronted with an administration of affairs to the extent that has fostered and engendered a situation as deplorable as I have outlined.

Significant unto itself is the report that of those coming here to Washington in their attempt to discredit the Member of Congress, they planned to kidnap, among his colleagues, two of them admittedly officers of the Workers Alliance, were also admittedly unemployed, and we can only wonder "what makes them tick." When an organization such as this takes advantage of the weakness of the unfortunate unemployed, and has its gorillas threaten and coerce them into joining such an alleged union, it is time for this great legislative body to act as I forecast it will act today. The Subcommittee on Appropriations deserves the commendation of the entire membership of this body; they command my respect and esteem. [Applause.] I shall certainly vote with them and follow their recommendations based on the investigation we delegated them to start less than 3 months ago.

The needy poor and unfortunate have my respect and sympathy. My voting record in their interest is as good as any other Member of the House. Others may have excelled me in their ambitions, without success. I have supported every measure designed to accomplish the anticipated result, the same as they have, as each measure passed. My supreme regret is that we are still confronted with the same necessity, and born of this necessity has emerged the regrettable situation I have described.

Perhaps if I had not been a born inquisitor and become a trained investigator, I would not have troubled myself with the added burden and responsibility of fortifying myself with facts to supply the deficiency in the complaints that are poured upon me as a Representative, from constituents praying that I do something for them along the lines of their legitimate protests.

As a boy in the cornfield I received news of the untimely death by assassination of President McKinley. I recall the impression made upon my then youthful mind by the press comments on Czolgosz, the assassin, as a believer in the anarchistic activities of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, believed then to have influenced his radical act. I recall the McNamara trial on the bombing case which made Clarence Darrow famous, whom I was later destined to contact as a defender of those it was my duty to prosecute; as a young man in the Railway Mail Service, working with an aged clerk who wept as he recounted the loss of his brother's life in Knights of Labor riots in the Northwest. As a post-office inspector I had assignments on the DeAutremont brothers case of the bombing of a mail train on the Southern Pacific Railway at Siskiyou, Oreg., killing the engine crew and the railway postal clerks. I remember their reputed connection with the Industrial Workers of the World, also known as the "I Won't Work," "I. W. W.'s," and "Wobblies."

William H. Haywood—"Big Bill" Haywood—a most active advocate of the unnatural philosophies of the "Wobblies," too, became dissatisfied in the same manner as Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, and sought to emigrate to that idealistic Communist state on the other side of the pond. We all know something of their change of heart and desire to return to the freedom and liberties of the United States of America.

These experiences made lasting impressions. Deploring lawlessness and violence and having too long been connected with law enforcement to now change for the possible political expediency of garnering a few possible votes in the next election, to the prejudice of those electing in the fullest confidence and trust, that I come here to perform a duty honestly and conscientiously, it is my full determination to stand solidly for law and order. Having been fired upon and missed, though a bullet passed through my clothing, and being clubbed over the head with the empty revolver in the hands of my would-be assassin, which, wrested from his grasp, was used to club him into submission, before turning him over to prosecuting authorities, coincidentally, Hon. H. Robert Mays, now a judge in my native county, but then a district attorney. No, my colleagues; I have gone too far on one chosen course to now turn and bow to the will of those resorting to lawless tactics. I am for law and order and will stand or fall on that chosen course. [Applause.]

The county and district I have the honor to represent has a long record of outstanding citizenship. Four of its native sons participated in the drafting and signing of the Constitution of the United States, to which I as a successor have taken an oath. This community had an outstanding citizen in the French and Indian War one Conrad Weiser, who gave his services to the mother country as an interpreter and soldier, and who was destined to become the maternal grandfather of the first Speaker of this House of Representatives, Frederick A. Muhlenberg, whose brother, John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg, served with him in the First Congress, but not until after he had served in the Virginia House of Burgesses with Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison; become the friend of George Washington; resigned his pastorate at Woodstock, Va.; and, reading his commission as a colonel, had almost every man in his congregation to join him. He was eulogized as a hero by Thomas Buchanan Read in verse as The Wagoner of the Alleghanies. He did serve with distinction, becoming a general. A nephew of these two distinguished citizens, Pastor Henry A. Muhlenberg, of Trinity Church, Reading, Pa., began his first term in Congress December 1829, and on February 18, 1834, moved the previous question in the House on the United States Bank bill, when Andrew Jackson was President. A cousin, Rev. Clement Z. Weiser, christened my late revered mother.

Daniel Boone was born within a mile of my own birthplace. The grandfather of Abraham Lincoln was reared at the Lincoln homestead about 5 miles distant in the neighboring township. My county has sent Representatives to the Congress who became governors, declined Cabinet posts, and who became ambassadors and ministers to foreign nations.

It is the progeny of people such as these who sent me here to represent them; it is these people who reposed their trust in me, relying upon my doing the correct, proper, and brave deed if necessary, fully dependent on the blood of an ancestry sharing pioneer hardships with their own; to rise in defense of the cause of freedom and liberty; of human rights along with property rights, as written into the Constitution by those ancestors proclaiming their purpose in its preamble, "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Surely, if they had intended it to include the posterity of generations of aliens then and yet unborn, they would have placed it there for deserters from the Loyalist armies of Spain to come to my district and advocate the kidnaping of a Congressman, for disdaining the attempted dictation of a successor's course and action. They were very clear and exact in placing in the Constitution what they wished to leave to posterity, by which it has endured a century and a half. I am one toward whom the finger cannot point from the spirit world to accuse—"Posterity, what hast thou done with thy liberty?"

I challenge those disturbers moaning and groaning in the galleries to watch and record my votes here today and hereafter and report back to their racketeering rowdies, who parasite on the needy poor, sapping a part of the benefits the humanitarianism of this body seeks to provide for, and tell them that I defy them to do their utmost among the god-fearing and law-abiding people who sent me here to represent them. [Applause.]

I thank the Committee for its indulgence.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a post mortem point of order against talks that are out of order. Time on this bill seems to be worth about $100 a minute and some of us have not yet been able to get 1 minute. The talk we have just listened to certainly had no relation to the amendment before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The post mortem point of order made by the gentleman from Colorado is out of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of asking the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] a question. I call attention to section 25 of the proposed bill, which I quote:

> None of the funds made available by this title shall be available—
>
> (a) After June 30, 1939, for the operation of any theater project; or
>
> (b) After August 31, 1939, for the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Works Progress Administration.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia what effect, if any, the proposed committee amendments now offered at page 3, line 6, and page 14, line 11, will have on section 25 of the bill which I have just referred to, particularly with reference to the project known as Federal Project No. 1?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the House should adopt the amendment now pending and the House should subsequently adopt the language to which the gentleman has referred on page 25, of course it would have no effect at all on the inhibition against theater projects.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What effect would it have on the other four divisions of Federal Project No. 1—the writers project, the music project, the arts project, and the historical records project?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The adoption of this amendment would not have any effect on the language on page 25, if the House adopts that subsequently.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The amendments would not allow those projects to function on a nonsponsored basis?

Mr. WOODRUM of Viriginia. They would not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The amendment now pending is preliminary to a later amendment in view of the explanation made by the gentleman from Virginia that section 11 of the bill will be amended so as to permit the allocation of $50,000,000 to other Federal agencies. This item of $50,000,000 would be available for all purposes set forth in section 1 of the bill, such as parks, playgrounds, highways, buildings, conservation projects, and others. Also it includes recreational facilities, electric lines, conservation, insect eradication, white-collar projects, and finally such undescribed projects as set forth in the clause in line 3 on page 4, which uses the language "and miscellaneous projects."

It seems to me that that simply opens up the door for many projects that might be indefensible. Consider what has happened in respect to funds made available in the 1938 act. The Department of Agriculture spent millions of dollars for the eradication of the Dutch elm disease, over which we, the Congress, had no control, in addition to regular appropriations for that purpose. The Soil Conservation Bureau made it possible to complete the so-called Crab Orchard project in southern Illinois, which may become something of a spawning ground for snakes, lizards, turtles, and so forth. The Bureau of Entomology spent $7,655,000 of relief funds for insect eradication. The Bureau of Fisheries spent over $10,000 for a haddock survey and investigation of the pilchard fisheries. The Alaska Railroad had expended upon it $239,000 for ballasting, and $590,000 was expended to carry on a good-will program with Latin-American countries by Mr. Ickes. Over $12,000 was spent in the Virgin Islands for mattress making, a nursery school, and so forth. The National Resources Committee spent $40,000 for land studies, and the Department of Labor spent $981,000 to examine into and collect statistics, including building statistics before the year 1920, which is 19 years ago. The Attorney General spent $50,000 for a general survey of release procedures. If I read this amendment correctly, in connection with the one that will be offered to alter section 11 as it now stands in the bill, it will be possible within the limitation of 15-percent nonrelief labor, to continue to spend that kind of money, and I, for one, am opposed to spending relief money for that purpose. There is only one way in which we can keep the Federal Departments from getting this relief money allocated and spending it without necessary control and sanction and supervision from Congress, and that would be to vote down this amendment, and to vote down also the suggested amendment to section 11, when we come to that part of the bill. I hope, therefore, that the pending amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The list of projects just read by the gentleman from Illinois from page 3 are identical, I am informed, with the projects carried in all past relief bills. I am told that not a single change has been made. It is easy enough for the gentleman from Illinois to stand up here and name certain individual projects, but the purpose of this amendment, as has already been stated earlier in the day, is this: Under the bill as brought in by the committee every Federal project in the United States is abolished as of July 1. Personally I think they are the best form of projects, because you have Federal supervision, and in many cases supervision by capable agencies. Probably in the district of every Member of this House there are projects which are half completed or two-thirds completed, or their completion will be finished within the next year or 2 years. Under the bill as brought in all that is stopped, and they are left suspended in the air, and all work must cease after July 1.

Now, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and his associates at least on the majority side recognized that very serious condition, and they promptly, unanimously, so far as I am informed on the majority side, and readily brought in this amendment that is now pending which, in conjunction with the amendment which the gentleman from Virginia will offer on page 14, will completely cure that situation. That is the purpose of the amendment, and the sole purpose of it. It is one that I am sure will appeal to a large majority of the House on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not mean to leave the impression that all Federal projects are indefensible, but under the language of the amendment now suggested the indefensible projects will come in just the same, and I think the gentleman from North Carolina will admit that fact. There is no way of stopping them.

Mr. WARREN. Yes. If there are any indefensible projects, I concede readily that they would come in; but at the same time the gentleman, as a member of the committee, is setting up a board to pass upon the types of projects to which these allocations may be made.

Now, there is one other purpose of this amendment, and I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] agrees that this is the fact: The Congress has repeatedly at this session authorized projects—Army, Navy, Coast Guard projects, and things of that nature. The hearings before the Appropriations Committee show that various items have already been appropriated for material and that no appropriation has been made for labor. The hearings also disclose that the departments were told to go to the W. P. A. for labor on some of those projects already authorized by Congress. Unless this language is changed, as suggested by the gentleman from Virginia, projects already approved by the Congress, for which money has actually been appropriated, cannot be continued any longer. That, I submit, Mr. Chairman, is the sole purpose of this amendment, and it ought to be adopted. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this subsection close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, a number of rather harsh aspersions of late have been cast upon Federal art projects. I was very much interested in the question propounded by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], and the reply apparently is that the Federal art project is practically done for. It is for all practical purposes dead and buried. That is unfortunate.

It may have been that one or two or more Communists and other despicable characters have been in the Federal arts theater or in the Federal arts music project, but that should not have cast a complete shadow over all Federal art projects. One swallow does not make a summer. It is somewhat unworthy of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], for whom I have a genuine affection, to have said some of the harsh things he did say concerning the drama as produced under the guidance of Mrs. Flannigan, of Vassar College, the director of the theater arts project. I have seen some of the productions of the Federal arts theater. I tell you I was thoroughly amazed at the profundity, the dignity, the great cultural value of the work done by that project. I saw the plays called "Haiti," "One-third of the Nation," "Murder in the Cathedral," "Prologue to Glory."

Broadway, with all its histrionic ability, never offered anything better, as far as the drama is concerned, than these plays produced by these Thespians—all of whom were taken from relief rolls.

The gentleman from Virginia severely criticized the play, Sing for Your Supper. It may never be the equal of Hamlet

or School for Scandal, yet it is a real success. Many like it. It is a "sell-out." One thousand five hundred people see it each night and more than 32,000 have already enjoyed it. It has an advance sale of $15,000. That does not sound like a boondoggling affair.

Life at best is dull and prosaic, particularly to "the one-third of the Nation," but the theater project has brought some light and sunshine into the lives of those persons who could ill afford to go to Chicago, or Philadelphia, or New York, which were the only places where we had drama up to the time of the Federal art project. But the Federal art theater has brought the drama to the hinterland, into every nook and cranny, as it were, of the United States. Thousands and thousands of the audience never had witnessed theretofore any dramatic production.

I have been to Europe. If you go to London, what do you find there? You find the poet laureate. You find actors and actresses knighted. You find annuities and subventions given to the theater. If you go to Paris, you find the National Opera and the National Theater. If you go to Vienna, you find the same thing. Europe, with an older culture than ours, with a vaster experience, has realized that the best way to interpret life to the masses is through the arts, through music, through the ballet, and through the drama. Go to any South American or Central American City and you will invariably find a national theater with native drama interpreting native life. What have we done for those arts all through the years? It was not until the advent of the New Deal that some modicum of attention was paid to those important arts. Now all the good work is to be scuttled. I say, for shame.

In general, I know of no aggregation of officials that are more patriotic, efficient, and hard working than those in control of these works. Here and there you may find exceptions. Some may be Communists or dangerous radicals. Get rid of them by all means. They should have no place in any Government service. If attention is called to such employment and those in charge refuse or fail to respond properly by dismissing such Communists, those thus negligent should be fired, together with such Communists.

But, because of the wrongs or derelictions of a few in the administration of the art projects there is no reason for bringing a wholesale indictment against the entire administration.

The Federal art projects is a wonderful means of interpreting America to Americans in the graphic arts—music, painting, sculpture, murals, mosaics, drama, and so forth.

Life at best is often difficult. Art removes much of life that is dull and drab and unhappy. These art projects have brought much sunshine and happiness into the lives of thousands and thousands of the poor, impoverished, and downtrodden.

We are told that all that is past is but prologue. These art projects interpret for the masses the past of America to enable us in the future to live a better and more useful life.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. At the proper time I intend to offer an amendment to section 25, and I hope the gentleman will support that amendment.

Mr. CELLER. I certainly will support it and I am happy to hear the lady say that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am just informed that the following prominent "Communists" have protested against the elimination of this project:

Brooks Atkinson, of the New York Times; Burns Mantle, of the Daily News; Sidney Whipple, of the New York World-Telegram; John Anderson, of the Journal American, Arthur Pollack, of the Brooklyn Eagle; Herbert Drake, of the Herald Tribune; Richard Watts, of the Herald Tribune; Otis Ferguson, of the New Republic; Louis Kronenberger, of Time magazine; Paul Peters, of Life; Wolcott Gibbs, of the New Yorker; and Mrs. Christian Wyatt, of the Catholic World; and many others.

Mr. CELLER. These same distinguished critics and literary persons said the following:

Open letter to Congressmen:

We the undersigned dramatic critics deny the statement made in Congress on June 14 by Congressman CLIFTON A. WOODRUM to the effect that "every theatrical critic of note has expressed his disapproval of these (Federal theater project) productions" and that "the theater project has never presented any production of distinction except the Swing Mikado." We declare that we have had many occasions to praise productions of the Federal theater in New York, many of which have been distinguished contributions to the art of the theater and others of which have been creditable in many respects. If Mr. WOODRUM had looked up the record, he could not possibly have made this statement concerning critical reaction to Federal theater productions in New York. If a fair and impartial estimate of the work of the theater project had been wanted, we should have been glad to give him our opinion for what is was worth—in consensus, that the theater project in New York, at least where we are most familiar with it, has been on the whole an institution of great value to the life of the community and that apart from its Broadway productions it has performed many less conspicuous services whose value could not be estimated. We believe emphatically that the project should not be abolished.

Brooks Atkinson, dramatic critic, New York Times; Burns Mantle, dramatic critic, New York Daily News; Sidney Whipple, dramatic critic, New York World-Telegram; Allene Talmey, dramatic critic, the Vogue; Wolcott Gibbs, dramatic critic, New Yorker magazine; Otis Ferguson, dramatic critic, New Republic; John Gassner, dramatic critic, Forum magazine; Paul Peters, Life magazine; Joseph Wood Krutch, the Nation magazine; Mrs. Eurphemia Van Rensealer Wyatt, representative, the Catholic World; Kelcey Allen, Daily News Record and Women's Wear; Arthur Pollack, dramatic critic, Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

FEDERAL THEATER COSTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, it was stated before this body that it costs somewhere around $2,000 a year for every person to be carried on the Federal theater project.

This is completely untrue. The present man-year cost of the Federal theater project is $1,248. Remember that 7,900 people supported on this amount an average of three dependents each.

Furthermore, this Federal theater is taking in money. In spite of the fact that 65 percent of its productions are still free for underprivileged groups in schools, hospitals, and social settlements, the admissions on those plays for which admission is charged have amounted to over $3,000,000. These admissions are steadily mounting and during this fiscal year amount to 10 percent of the total cost of the project.

With all the talking going on on this floor about economy we should certainly not destroy a project that is decreasing its cost and that has actually taken in, in hard cash, $3,000,000.

FINE WORK OF MRS. FLANAGAN

May I direct your attention to the splendid work being done by Mrs. Hallie Flanagan, of Vassar College, in developing Federal theater projects. This is giving enjoyment to more than 20,000,000 people, many of whom would otherwise never have the opportunity of going to the theater. Her actors were all taken from the relief rolls, and most of them are now earning their way as thespians in a wholly cooperative effort. The motif of the entire project is well expressed in Mrs. Flanagan's own words:

It is a timid wasting of an unprecedented chance to regard the theater only in terms of what we have hitherto experienced. We must see the relationship between the men at work on Boulder Dam and the Greek chorus; we must study Pavlowa as well as Pavlov, Einstein as well as Eisenstein; must derive not only from ancient Baghdad but from modern Ethiopia.

It was Mrs. Flanagan who caused the Negro unit in Birmingham to produce a comedy of local life, Home in Glory; in Reading, Pa., she produced Feet on the Gound, concerning the life of the Dunkards, early Dutch settlers of that region; in Indianapolis it was a play of Hoosier life, The Campbells Are Coming; in Asheville, N. C., it was Smoky Joe, a portrait of the mountaineers. She has revived and preserved folklore and sagas; she revived for the masses many old successes—The Old Homestead, The Texas Steer, The Octoroon, Secret Service, and Everyman. Her commercial

touring companies penetrated into the Far West and the deep South where the drama was as extinct as the dodo.

Mrs. Flanagan's theater project, which started as a partial succor for the unemployed, has awakened esthetic values in the minds of countless citizens.

SUMMARY OF FEDERAL THEATER ACTIVITIES TO SEPTEMBER 1938

In closing the third year of operation of Federal theater I should like to present to you a brief survey of the present activities of the Federal theater.

EMPLOYMENT

Federal theater now employs 9,170 people, as against a peak of 12,700 in 1936. The decrease is due to the return of many of the personnel to jobs in private industry, to dismissal of incompetents, and to reductions in appropriation. More than 2,000 workers have left the pay roll and returned to private employment.

They have closed a number of projects which, after a fair trial, seemed unable to reach standards appropriate for a Government-operated project, and this leaves us operating 42 Federal theater projects in 20 States, principal among which are—

California: San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles, San Diego.

Colorado: Denver.

Connecticut: Hartford.

Florida: Tampa, Jacksonville, Miami.

Georgia: Atlanta—loan unit from Birmingham, Ala., also operating with this project.

Illinois: Chicago, Peoria.

Indiana: Gary—operations temporarily suspended.

Louisiana: New Orleans.

Maine: Portland.

Massachusetts: Boston, Springfield.

Michigan: Detroit.

New Hampshire: Manchester.

New Jersey: Newark, Camden—also leadership for community drama units operating throughout State.

New York: New York City, Buffalo, Roslyn, Syracuse.

North Carolina: Raleigh—also leadership for community drama units operating throughout State.

Ohio: Cincinnati, Cleveland.

Oklahoma: Oklahoma City—also leadership for community drama units operating throughout State.

Oregon: Portland.

Pennsylvania: Philadelphia.

Washington: Seattle.

City projects operate within themselves a number of theater units, such as dramatic, children's, dance, Negro, marionette, and so forth.

PLAYS

Since its inception, in August 1935, the project has produced 924 different plays, many of which were played in more than one city and State. Performances of these productions totaled 54,960 as of August 1, 1938. Sixty percent of our productions are given free. The remainder charge from 10 cents to $1.10, varying with locality and type of production. Recorded audience figures total 26,532,674. The plays fall into the following categories, some of which are, of course, overlapping: New plays, classical plays, plays formerly produced on Broadway, modern foreign plays, stock plays, children's plays, revues and musical comedies, vaudeville, dance plays, early Americana, American pageants, marionette plays.

Sixty-six of these were Negro plays, 52 were in Jewish, 39 Italian, 10 Spanish, 10 German, and 8 French.

It is interesting to note from this compilation several distinct tendencies:

First. Federal theater stresses, especially in cities which have no other theaters, production of plays by established American dramatists of the past and of the present. Such a list includes the largest number of plays in any one group, 287 in all, from such authors as George Abbott, George Ade, Zoe Akins, Maxwell Anderson, Anthony Armstrong, Frank Bacon, Fred Ballard, Philip Barry, Emjo Basshe, Lewis Beach, David Belasco, Michael Blankfort, Guy Bolton, Ann Preston Bridges, George H. Broadhurst, Porter Emerson Brown, Charlotte Chorpenning, George M. Cohan, Octavus Roy Cohen, E. P. Conkle, Marc Connelly, Barry Connors, Frank Craven, Rachel Crothers, Owen Davis, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Philip Dunning, Frank B. Elser, John Emerson, Edna Ferber, Clyde Fitch, Martin Flavin, Rose Franken, Zona Gale, Virgil Geddes, William Gillette, Susan Glaspell, Montague Glass, James Gleason, Michael Gold, Paul Green, Harry Wagstaff Gribble, James Hagan, Theresa Helburn, Lillian Hellman, James A. Herne, Avery Hopwood, Sidney Howard, Hatcher Hughes, Talbott Jennings, Larry E. Johnson, George Kaufmann, Patrick Kearney, George Kelly, Charles Rann Kennedy, Sidney Kingsley, Charles Klein, Alfred Kreymborg, Lawrence Langner, Ring Lardner, Emmet Lavery, John Howard Lawson, Sinclair Lewis, Anita Loos, Constance D'Arcy Mackaye, Elizabeth McFadden, Albert Maltz, Max Marcin, Don Marquis, Alan Landon Martin, Margaret Mayo, Edna St. Vincent Millay, John Moffett, James Montgomery, Christopher Morley, Kenyon Nicholson, J. C. Nugent, Clifford Odets, Eugene O'Neill, Paul Osborne, John Howard Payne, Paul Peters, Channing Pollock, William W. Pratt, Robert H. Powell, Samson Raphaelson, Daniel Reed, Mark Reed, Elmer Rice, Lynn Riggs, Mary Roberts Rinehart, George Scarborough, Edgar Selwyn, Irwin Shaw, Robert Sherwood, George Sklar, Winchell Smith, Samuel and Bella Spewack, Wilbur Daniel Steele, James A. Sterne, Donald Ogden Stewart, Austin Strong, Barry and Leona Stavis, Booth Tarkington, Sophia Treadwell, Bayard Veiller, Lulu Vollmer, James Warwick, John Wexley, Percival Wilde, Thornton Wilder.

This partial list should be sufficient to indicate the wide diversity of subject matter and style which from the first has characterized Federal theater productions.

A complete list may be secured by writing the National Service Bureau, Federal theater project, 1697 Broadway, New York.

Second. The Federal theater has produced over 100 new plays by American authors, some of whom appear on the previous list, but many of whom were given their first opportunity on the Federal theater project. Some of these authors have since had widespread production on the project; others have sold their plays to the movies or to commercial producers; still others have won fellowships for advanced study in play writing. The list includes Hughes Allison, Arthur Arent, Marcus Bach, Edwin L. and Albert Barker, Lawrence Bernard, William Beyer, William du Bois, John Hunter Booth, Mary Coyle Chase, Harold Clark, Maurice Clark, Maria W. Coxe and Arnold Sundgaard. A complete list of these authors with names of their plays may be secured by writing the National Service Bureau.

In addition to plays by the above authors, Federal theater has produced the following living newspapers written on the project:

Originating in New York but also produced elsewhere: Triple A Plowed Under, 1935, Injunction Granted, Power, One-third of a Nation.

Originating in Oregon: Flax.

Originating in Chicago: Spirochete.

Federal Theater has also produced a number of musical shows, written on the project, as follows: Follow the Parade, Los Angeles; Ready, Aim, Fire, Los Angeles; Revue of Reviews, Los Angeles; O Say Can You Sing, Chicago; Machine Age, New York; Swing It, New Jersey.

It is interesting to note that, contrary to inaccurate statements of the ill-informed, less than 10 percent of the authors named here or in the previous list are concerned primarily with social problems.

Third. Federal theater is developing in many cities a classical series, having produced, in addition to an extensive religious cycle from the Middle Ages, plays by Euripides, Plautus, Marlowe, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, Lope de Vega, Moliere, Sheridan, Goldsmith, Schiller, Labiche, Ibsen, Wilde, Tolstoy, Chekov, Dion Boucicault, Shaw, and O'Neill.

The plan is to build up the classical series on every project, stressing material appropriate to the region, such as French classical in New Orleans, German, and Scandinavian in the Midwest, and so forth.

Fourth. The Federal theater, in its constant desire to supplement, rather than to compete with, the commercial theater, is emphasizing certain lines of activity not usually stressed by the commercial theater, namely, children's theater, dance theater, religious theater, marionette theater, and the celebration of various civic, State, and national holidays.

Lists of each of these types of productions are now being prepared by the National Service Bureau.

Fifth. Federal theater is interested in building an American Negro theater. We have Negro units in Newark, N. J.; Boston, Mass., spot bookings; New York City; Raleigh, N. C.; Seattle, Wash.; Hartford, Conn.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Portland, Maine; Chicago, Ill.

A complete list of all plays so far produced on these units, including 66 Negro plays, is now being prepared in the National Service Bureau.

RADIO

The Federal theater is developing an increasingly strong radio division with projects in New York City; Atlanta, Ga.; Chicago, Ill.; Columbus, Ohio; Boston, Mass.; Hartford, Conn.; San Francisco, Calif.; New Orleans, La.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Portland, Oreg.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.

The above cities during the last year broadcast approximately 3,000 programs, of which approximately 1,000 were over major networks, to survey proven audiences of 15,000,000 weekly. Emphasis was placed on such series as James Truslow Adams' Epic of America and Paul de Kruif's Men Against Death.

This week's list of radio programs is appended to this report. If you wish it sent regularly, please notify the Radio Division, Federal Theater Project, 1697 Broadway, New York.

TECHNICAL RESEARCH

Research in lighting has been undertaken along the following lines:

(1) Experiments as follows: The high wattage water-cooled Mazda lamp; the polarization of light; the use of filters capable of transmitting any given colors of the spectrum; the use of stroboscopic light with the dance; the use of colored motion pictures of a living blood stream; the use of a new vacuum tube capable of sustaining on its grid screen an image of high enough intensity so that it may be magnified by projecting it on a screen.

(2) An experimental laboratory with scale model theater, optical benches, testing and all other necessary apparatus, and so forth, is in the process of being built. A fully equipped electrical workshop will be available for exploration in the fields of (a) low-voltage lamps; (b) new color processes; (c) control of light sources through lens adaptation.

The experiments above are of sufficient importance to have led several universities, including Yale, the University of Washington, and the University of North Carolina, to offer the hospitality of their plants. However, due to the fact that the services of people working on the research must be used part time in actual theater production, it has been found advisable to conduct the research on the project. The results of such research will, of course, be made available to all theaters indicating an interest in such work.

TOURING

Federal theater companies now cover a number of sections of the country where no dramatic productions have been seen for years. For example, the Illinois circuit, with companies from Chicago and Peoria, played 625 performances during the past year in Wisconsin and Illinois.

Another Midwest circuit, operating out of Detroit, played 88 performances in the State of Michigan.

The Cincinnati unit toured Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

The Roslyn, Long Island, unit, after a 3 weeks' engagement in New York City, toured New York State.

Touring in Florida is sponsored and the repertory of plays chosen by school boards throughout the State. Last year, for example, our company toured with Miles Gloriosus, by Plautus, Everyman, Twelfth Night, She Stoops to Conquer, and Girl of the Golden West. In this connection I append a copy of Florida Wheel.

In October we will tour through the East and the South the New York production of Prologue to Glory. This, if successful, will be followed by other tours.

It is our desire to tour especially in regions where no other plays are available or in cities where a Federal-theater play may build up a demand for commercial road companies.

RETRAINING

Federal theater feels a distinct obligation to retrain its personnel. In New York City as soon as an actor finishes an engagement he reports at once to the Provincetown Theater, where, until he is again cast, he takes courses in diction, body work, fencing, reading rehearsals, and voice. The Provincetown Theater is also the center of training for an activity which is rapidly becoming a good avenue of reemployment for professional theater people, namely, professional leadership for community groups. This service is to be extended, with the definite understanding that any of our dramatic leaders so engaged will not be concerned with training amateurs for the stage, but with the building, through community participation, of new outlets for community expression and better audiences for the theater.

UNION RELATIONS

Federal theater has at the present time a clear-cut and satisfactory working agreement with the various theatrical unions. Actors' Equity and its representatives throughout the country confer constantly with the national director, the deputy national director, and the various regional directors throughout the country on unemployment problems.

Agrements recently reached between Federal theater and the Stagehands' Union on the touring plan were eminently satisfactory.

PUBLICATIONS

Random House has recently issued two volumes, one containing Prologue to Glory, One-third of a Nation, and Haiti; the other, Three Living Newspapers, Triple A Plowed Under, Power, and Spirochete.

In addition the National Service Bureau has since its inception issued numerous mimeographed lists of outstanding royalty and nonroyalty plays for all occasions. These lists of recommended plays contain complete analyses, source of information, important director's notes, and suggestions for production. Among these lists are antiwar plays, Catholic plays, children's plays, Christmas plays, Easter plays, Jewish plays, Thanksgiving plays, marionette plays, musical plays, Negro plays, new one-act plays, 90 new plays, religious plays, vaudeville sketches.

While these publications are primarily intended for the use of Federal theater projects throughout the country, they are also available to little theater groups, community and school theaters, and amateur and professional drama organizations.

NEW PLANS

At the National Policy Board meeting, which met in Washington August 11 and in New York August 12 and 13, it was decided to increase the emphasis on classical drama, as indicated above, and on cycles of dramatic material dealing with American history. Each region will have at least one such large celebration next year. These dramatic festivals will be produced in conjunction with State, civic, and educational bodies. Examples are:

First. The Lost Colony, Paul Green's historic play, which has just completed its second successful season on Roanoke Island.

Second. Spanish Grant, a historical cycle, being compiled on the Los Angeles project, dealing with the history and development of California. One play of the series, The Sun

Rises in the West, has already been produced in Los Angeles with critical acclaim; another is to be one of the productions by the Federal theater at the San Francisco Exposition.

Third. Sand in Your Shoes, a historical drama of Florida, to be done on the four-hundredth anniversary of De Soto's landing.

Fourth. A Paul Bunyan Festival, to be done in Oregon at Timberline Lodge, on Mount Hood, in connection with the setting up of a museum of logging and the lumber industry.

Fifth. A Lincoln Festival, possibly to become, like The Lost Colony, an annual event, to be staged at Springfield, Ill., New Salem, and Chicago.

This dramatic material is being evolved from very considerable dramatic research which is under way on various Federal theater units. This research is now taking definite form under the National Service Bureau, and will include history of American stage and costume design.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Page 4, line 25, after the word "worker", insert:

"Except that the Board may authorize an increase in the average in cases where the increased cost of materials would have the effect of raising such average above $6, but in no event shall the increase in such average exceed the amount necessary to meet such increase in material costs, and in no event shall such average exceed $7."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia will recall that when he was explaining this amendment I asked him about the purchases of heavy equipment. I have prepared an amendment, a proviso which should follow the committee amendment, and which perhaps should be considered in connection with it, reading as follows:

Provided, That from the funds appropriated in this section the purchase or lease of any construction equipment or machinery shall not exceed $500 per operating unit.

I think the committee amendment is a good one and should be adopted. I think, however, some restriction should be placed upon the amount which may be expended out of these funds for operating equipment. This bill has for its primary purpose the giving of work relief. To allow the W. P. A. to spend large sums of money for labor-saving equipment is contrary to the spirit of the Works Progress Administration. I am fearful also that there may result from this expenditure of thousands of dollars for heavy machinery a bogging down of the heavy industries, such as followed the World War, when we had to set up a corporation under the supervision of the Federal Government to dispose of the surplus materials which were purchased during the war. That had a bad effect upon the heavy-goods industry. We perhaps have never completely recovered from the excessive buying of heavy goods during the World War and the liquidation of those goods in the market in open competition with those who manufactured them. I am somewhat fearful that if we allow the Works Progress Administration to spend $25,000 or $30,000 for road machinery, or for ditch-digging machinery, or for a fleet of trucks or other heavy machinery, we are undoing much of the good with respect to work relief.

I cannot hope, of course, that the Committee will accept my amendment, but what I am trying to do in this proviso is to guarantee that the money which we appropriate in this bill is to be used for work relief and not to clutter up the country with a great deal of surplus machinery which will affect the heavy-goods industry from now on as did the surplus war materials following the World War.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan is a valuable amendment. I cannot feel that Congress should vote billions of dollars for work relief and then go out and buy heavy machinery costing from $15,000 to $25,000 a unit to do the work. I know of one State that has recently purchased $300,000 worth of heavy machinery, and I understand another State is about to purchase $1,000,000 worth. The use of these machines simply takes labor away from the very people we are passing this legislation to take care of.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to direct the attention of the House to a matter that is already only too apparent. We have heard from the other side of the aisle an objection against almost every single, specific, worth-while kind of work that W. P. A. can do. The Republican Members contend that they are in favor of work relief. But very few kinds of work that are specifically proposed seem to satisfy them.

I merely want to speak a word about the elemental proposition that if you are going to put people to work you have got to put them to work at something worth while. Inasmuch as the committee has a limitation on the total amount that can be spent for material, I see no sense in being alarmed about how much money is spent for materials or equipment. As a matter of fact, one of the principal arguments that has been used against the program by its opponents has been that it was a leaf-raking program, that it did not get anything worth while done; yet the very people who make that criticism come in here now and say we should not buy necessary equipment which would enable them to do worth-while things and make it a worth-while and constructive program. You cannot expect to employ people who are skilled in one respect at some other kind of work and get good results or efficiency. The committee itself proposes in section 16 (c) that the people should be employed on projects they can do properly. I think this is a good provision.

In other words, the whole thing is that you must have a scope of projects which is broad enough to give your unemployed people the opportunity to work and to do worth-while jobs that will improve this Nation and give the people a chance to live.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In connection with the $7 a man a month for material provision, the intention was to buy material, but it was not to buy heavy equipment, steam shovels, and so forth, to compete with contractors who have bought that equipment. Why should they not be required to rent the equipment where it exists in a district?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it would be wise to do that, I may say to the gentleman. But what I object to is the general proposition that we are going to try to keep this program from getting work done. I think it should get as much work done as possible.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the program continues, as it is continuing now, of buying heavy equipment, we will have all the contractors of the Nation on relief.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say to the gentleman I know of no instance where a great amount of heavy equipment has been bought by W. P. A. I know of no such case according to my own personal information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would not have asked for this 5 minutes had the gentleman from Virginia yielded to me. I wanted to ask a particular question. If you listened

to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], who claims this bill ought to be framed so that the needy may be provided for, I think you can sympathize with these remarks.

This matter of sponsorship is not well understood in the House. I rather think there is an attempt to make a more satisfactory allocation of funds by this 45-percent method with a 10-percent leeway for sections where the needy are greater. But I doubt if we understand fully how it will work out. It looks as if we are to give all States some money simply because they are States, with not quite enough consideration of the real needs of the various States. The point I want to bring out is the one I have reiterated and reiterated so many times during the last 5 years. I want to ask the chairman of the committee, whom I thought at one time agreed with me, why should wealthy communities be allowed to dip into this fund? You would need millions upon millions of dollars less if there was an attempt made to regulate the wealthy communities and prevent them from dipping in. We should make them care for their own needy when found amply able to do so.

I have one city that needs a great deal of this money. Their sponsorship must be very little, indeed. They cannot take on useful projects because the material costs are too great. They are forced to think of projects not always satisfactory so far as they may be of permanent value. It is a disappointment to a community to be forced to present foolish projects because of inability to meet sponsorship costs. It seems unfair. Many communities could put up a 50-percent sponsorship. The so-called bedroom towns and cities, with tax rates of less than $20, and less than 3 percent necessary for correctional or relief expenses, are allowed to present projects, and the Federal authorities are helpless. We have not restricted them. They have a perfect right under the act to present a project and get the money. There has been no attempt on the part of the committee by this bill that I can see to pay any attention to that problem. No; pass it out to them all, no matter how wealthy they are. We take away from the needy communities that are badly in need and hand it over to wealthy communities that are fully able to take care of their own. For years I have presented this view, and last year I thought the committee agreed with me, but there is nothing in this bill to change those conditions.

I sympathize with the gentleman from Missouri. I wish the needy people and places could get it. That is what we are trying to do and I desire to vote for everything in this bill that will tend toward that end, no matter if some States do get more than others.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to take this occasion to congratulate the gentleman and all of his colleagues who followed Herbert Hoover in 1932, because this bill is a great monumental vindication of the Hoover relief doctrine.

Mr. GIFFORD. I accept the gentleman's congratulation, even though I do not understand what he is getting at. [Laughter.]

I want to remind the gentleman that around his city of New York there are bedroom towns that are very wealthy. New York City needs this money, but those towns do not need it. I have asked so many times, Why do you not give it to the communities that really need it? Do you not dare tackle that problem? Simply because they contribute, must it be handed to those municipalities amply able to take care of their own relief problem? This is beyond my comprehension, having in my mind the intent of relief legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 5, strike out lines 9 to 11, inclusive, and insert:

"(f) The functions heretofore vested in the Works Progress Administration are authorized to be carried out until June 30, 1940, by the Works Projects Administration subject to the provisions of this joint resolution and such latter Administration is hereby extended until such date to carry out the purposes of this title."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The observation I made at the time the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] was explaining his amendments to the committee is worthy of some real thought. We hear a great deal about the W. P. A. projects which the committee has decided to increase the limit from $25,000 to $40,000. It is my viewpoint that if a community can float bonds to raise 22 or 23 percent of the cost of a project to get in on a W. P. A. project it can also float bonds to raise 45 percent of the cost of the project, thus go under P. W. A. rather than W. P. A. The more money we save on these building projects under W. P. A. the more unfortunate people we are going to be able to take care of out of the amount we are appropriating for relief.

When the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] had the floor I said this was not a bill for the relief of communities or for the relief of private contractors but for the relief of the unfortunate people who cannot secure work in private industry.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] says he sympathizes with me. I reciprocate and sympathize with the gentleman from Massachusetts. Mr. GIFFORD asked a question about why there is not something in this bill to prevent rich communities from benefiting under its provisions. The gentleman does not seem to understand why these rich communities have received these projects. You have heard the gentleman from Massachusetts time and again criticize the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments but there was one investigation that committee did make, a little investigation, that was in relation to W. P. A., and at the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts we had Mr. Hopkins before the committee. I am going to answer the gentleman's question by using the words of Mr. Hopkins when the gentleman asked him the same question. Mr. Hopkins said to him in reply:

Mr. GIFFORD, if you have rich communities in your congressional district do not blame me for any projects they have up there. I do not initiate the projects. Your mayors, your county courts, and your Governors initiate the projects. If they are rich and do not need any W. P. A. assistance, why do they sponsor these projects of which you complain?

There is the answer. A rich community does not have to have a project under W. P. A. unless the authorities of that community file the necessary application, because W. P. A. itself does not initiate projects; it approves projects.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I wish to add to what the gentleman has already said that Mr. Hopkins told us that he had private information from the wealthiest towns of my State that the poor people were not being taken care of and he was going to do it. We asked for that information, but it was never forthcoming. I claim that the wealthy communities are taking care of their poor people. That is why he was doing it, because he heard they were not doing it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Now, to keep the record straight, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] continually complains because the Committee on Expenditures will not make investigations. The committee is limited in its powers. We could not have made the investigation the Subcommittee on Appropriations made because we do not have the power to call any witness before us other than Government officials. We do not have $25,000 at our disposal for investigation; we do not have one cent. No one would be required to appear

before our committee and testify who was not a Government official. We have no investigators. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows, because he was a member of the committee at the time when his party had control of the committee, we appeared before a Republican Rules Committee and asked for additional authority; we asked that the rules be amended. What did we get? Nothing. I appeared with the then chairman of the committee, Mr. Williamson, of South Dakota. When the Democrats secured control of the House I likewise appeared before the Rules Committee, controlled by Democrats, and made the same request. We received the same from the Democratic Rules Committee that we received from the Republicans—nothing. So do not blame the Expenditures Committee for not making such investigations as were made and are being made by the Appropriations Committee, which is acting under a resolution passed by the House, and was given $25,000 for expenses.

Getting back to the rich communities that have W. P. A. projects, I do not know anything about them, but I do hope their mayors, their county courts, and their Governors will refrain from filing any applications for W. P. A. projects in those rich communities. If they do, then there will be more money that can be spent in the communities where they have more people entitled to relief under W. P. A. than they can take care of under the appropriations we make.

Now I want to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] to tell me whether or not I am right in making this observation. Does a local community initiate a project or does the W. P. A. initiate a project?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Under the whole philosophy of W. P. A., the request for a project is made by the local community, and it also selects the type of project.

Mr. COCHRAN. And if the project comes within the law and the policy of W. P. A., it is approved?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is eminently correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. But the projects are initiated by the officials of the community?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. Therefore, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], do not blame W. P. A. when the rich communities of this country have W. P. A. projects, but blame the officials of those communities for taking advantage of W. P. A. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened this morning and yesterday to a great many remarks which seemed to have for their main purpose the development of the idea that the W. P. A. has wasted a great deal of money.

It is not true that W. P. A. is a waste of money insofar as improvements are concerned. Millions have been expended, it is true, but the localities affected have been enriched by the building of roads, schools, recreation centers, airports, sewers, curbs, drains, and a variety of other needed facilities for the benefit of the people.

The W. P. A. is building up the country, making improvements in streets, and so forth, that local authorities never would be able to make.

The total value of these improvements is amazing.

But even if the work done by W. P. A. were negligible, the fact that millions of Americans have been kept from starvation and despair, have had as it were a new lease of life, and in literally hundreds of thousands of cases have been rehabilitated and restored to private jobs means everything to those who think of a nation as the people who make that nation, rather than as a conglomeration of buildings, factories, skyscrapers, and all the other monuments of accumulated wealth.

The resolution before us recognizes the value and necessity of W. P. A. But it fails to provide for even a majority of the unemployed eligible under its provisions. The amount appropriated in the resolution is considered sufficient to employ 2,400,000 in January–February 1940 to 1,500,000 in June 1940.

This is 1,000,000 less than those employed on W. P. A. in 1939. It is estimated that there are now 1,000,000 eligible for W. P. A. but not placed. This means that in 1940 there will be some 2,000,000 persons eligible for W. P. A. but not assigned to work.

It is appalling to think what is to become of the thousands who cannot be placed. That is why I am going to support every amendment to increase the appropriation.

A provision that spells despair for thousands of families is that in section 16, providing for the arbitrary removal of all persons who have been employed on W. P. A. for more than 18 months. It is stated that this is necessary in order to give places to those eligible but not yet placed on W. P. A. The trouble with such a plan is that it fails to take into account the shock and despair of those many families who have learned to depend upon W. P. A. for the necessities of life and who know no other way of getting these necessities. I personally know many workers who have been able to give good service on work projects but who either because of age or of slight physical or other handicaps simply cannot hope to get jobs in private industry. Before the House votes on this resolution it should stop and look at the facts. Between the months of July 1938 and April 1939 an average of 125,000 a month left W. P. A. for private employment. Surely this is an excellent record, proving that the work program has rehabilitated and restored to private employment an enormous number of our people. They are ready to leave voluntarily when they can get jobs. In the name of justice and mercy let us leave this withdrawal on a voluntary basis with added help and encouragement in regard to procuring jobs.

I hope that at least some modification of this drastic provision will be made whereby the extreme needs and the special inability of many of these unfortunates to find jobs will be taken into consideration.

To me these cuts in W. P. A. seem to be a confession of complete failure on the part of this great country of ours to provide opportunity for our people. I believe that all who are willing and able to work should be given work. I believe that this country can afford to do this and that it cannot afford not to do this. I think that the costs to the Nation in destitution, despair, ill health, and all the other evils that spring from unemployment and poverty—that this cost is far greater than would be the cost of providing work for all eligible for W. P. A. We cannot let millions of our people starve; but we can undermine and ruin them by threatening to do so, as this resolution does.

Think of the 280,000 women employed on nonconstruction projects—women responsible for the support of their families. They are now engaged in preparing hot school lunches for undernourished children, acting as housekeeping aides for the needy sick, teaching adult illiterates to read and write, assisting at clinics, confinements, and immunizations, sewing, and performing hundreds of other skilled and unskilled tasks which are just as productive and just as necessary to the Nation as the building of bridges and highways. If one-third of these women are dismissed, what is to become of their children; what gain will be made? All, or nearly all, of these women's needs have been certified. They are in general the most needy of all eligibles. But they will be turned out if this resolution passes unchanged.

Because I think in terms of human beings rather than in dollars, because I know that the dollars can be made available in this rich country, because I cannot accept continued and forced poverty in the midst of plenty. I am unable to go along with the committee. I am supporting the Casey bill.

Another shocking provision of this resolution is eliminating the Federal theater project and the crippling or ruining of the art and music and writers and other similar projects.

The charge has been made that the Federal theater has included too many radicals. Actors and musicians and artists are temperamental people; they are sensitive and impressionable. That is why they have special gifts. They are naturally extremists, else they would not register in their medium. And now we are abolishing the Federal theater because those working on it have had the characteristics that belong to the artist.

To make the provision that no money can be spent on any of the arts projects unless locally sponsored is to curb, cripple, and in most cases to end these projects. If I failed to protest against this totally unfair provision I would feel ashamed to ever again go to the theater, to a concert, to a picture gallery, or even to read an imaginative piece of literature.

As to what is to become of the needy men and women who are to be turned off to starve, there is no answer. I find in the resolution no provision for substituting other projects. These Americans are to become forgotten men and women.

All along the white-collar projects have been too limited in the number of jobs available. In fact, such workers have not had a fair share of the benefits of W. P. A. White-collar and professional workers constitute 17 percent of all male and 35 percent of all female unemployed in communities of over 10,000 population; yet they have constituted only about 11 percent of the total on W. P. A. To further limit the number is to add to the unhappy thousands now vainly seeking jobs.

White-collar projects included an education program that provides instruction to over 1,500,000 people; public-health projects that furnish medical and sanitary services to 300,000 people in any given week; research, scientific, library, Braille, and many other services of the greatest importance to our people.

It is regrettable that the Youth Administration has not been expanded. This has been ably discussed by others who feel as I do that our youth is our greatest asset and that a doubled appropriation is necessary.

Another provision that should be voted out is that limiting construction projects under W. P. A. to those costing less than $25,000.

This simply makes impossible the placing of the 1,500,000 to 2,400,000 persons which this resolution is supposed to provide for.

At this point I wish to place in the RECORD this telegram from Mr. Lloyd Aldrich, city engineer and coordinator for Federal relief projects for the city of Los Angeles:

Reports have been received of contemplated limitation W. P. A. program to projects not exceeding $25,000 maximum. This limitation was originally proposed in 1935 and after being found impractical was abandoned. The number of projects under this limitation which would be required to employ available labor on W. P. A. in this community would be so great as to be impossible of operation. Should this number of projects be found, the overhead cost of operating such a program would be prohibitive. Under proposed limitation present operating program in the city of Los Angeles would be eliminated. We urge W. P. A. program be not limited but recommend that it be retained as now operated. Continuation of P. W. A. program essential to us, and we urge enactment of such or similar legislation as is now proposed in H. R. 4576 (Starnes bill).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEAVY: On page 2, line 4, after "$1,477,000,000", strike out "(of which $125,000,000 is hereby transferred to the Public Works Administration and made available for the purposes of title II and shall not be subject to any other provisions of this section or this title)."

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is of tremendous importance because if the language of this bill is permitted to remain as now written this is what we do: We take from W. P. A. $125,000,000 for a worthy activity, P. W. A., but we are reducing W. P. A. just $125,000,000 below what was requested and is badly needed. To put it another way, we are reducing the amount the President has requested and the Budget has approved.

We transfer by the bill as now written $125,000,000, and thus make just that much less for W. P. A. In other words, the W. P. A. budget is cut that much.

What is the effect of this transfer? The Budget estimate for 1940, as submitted, means a million less families on W. P. A. relief for that year as compared with what we have this year, and there are a million now on the waiting list. If this language remains in the bill as the committee has reported it, it means that we go into the next fiscal year with 2,000,000 American families denied the right to get even the meager existence they get out of W. P. A. If the $125,000,000 provision is permitted to remain as now written in the bill, it means that an additional 200,000 families on the average every month during the next fiscal year will be denied the opportunity of remaining on W. P. A.

I am not here to say that P. W. A. should be discriminated against or that it should be restricted, but the provision of funds for the P. W. A. should be handled in a manner entirely different from the manner in which it is handled here. As here provided for, the P. W. A. is being cared for only to the extent of about 20 percent of the present approved projects, and such appropriation to P. W. A. is further limited by requiring 25 percent W. P. A. labor. P. W. A. ought to have from $400,000,000 to $500,000,000 to care for the projects that have already been submitted and approved, and I understand that an amendment will later be offered along that line. But W. P. A. is reduced 33⅓ percent next year under this year, and certainly it should not stand another reduction of 8 percent.

What I have said I do not say as a reflection on the subcommittee that prepared this bill. I believe they are deserving of commendation for the generosity they have shown in making this a more workable piece of legislation by the amendments offered today. The members of the full Appropriations Committee themselves had little opportunity to see the measure or to read the hearings because of the haste required to get the bill whipped into shape and onto the floor. I am not charging the subcommittee with bad faith in that regard. If we put this issue to the House today in the form of a question as to whether you want now to vote to strike, in addition to the million families a month off of W. P. A., an additional 200,000 families from the rolls, I say, if that issue were put in that form, then I know it would be voted down. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, once again we have the W. P. A. before us. We hear a lot about the projects, but let our minds go back to 1930–33, when Mr. Hoover put America on the block and sold it short.

Let us see what kind of projects they had then. Let us take the project of the Dewey investigating committee in New York, where 100 good mothers, representing 1,000 mothers, testified in front of that committee that they sold their souls to hell that their children might live, and remember what happened when that hit the country through the magazines, the press, and the radio. You remember the results, do you not? Eighty-eight Members on that side of the House failed to come back to Congress for not doing their duty from 1930 to 1933.

I came to this Congress in 1937. I remember that America was then doing business up to 90 percent of 1929. What happened? All the bankers, all the industrial leaders put up another howl that we had to stop spending. Harry Hopkins come in here and told the President that $1,000,000,000 was all that was necessary for relief; that private industry would take up the slack. What happened? During the last 4 months of 1937 and the beginning of 1938 we dropped to 21 percent of 1929 production.

Franklin Roosevelt said on January 22:

I shall give America until March 15 to show that industry cannot stand on its own feet before I put another cent into the breach.

On February 6, 35 Congressmen went down to the President and asked him to spend money immediately. He came in on February 8 and put in $250,000,000. Again he came in before July and asked for $500,000,000. Now we are only at 50 percent of 1929 in business and production, and yet we are here with another relief bill.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. No; I refuse to yield.

One million people are still begging to get on relief or to get on W. P. A., and yet the bill we are asking you to pass today is not nearly enough. What is going to become of the 500,000 tossed out of school this year? What is going to become of the 500,000 that industry has eliminated through modern machinery this year, making 1,000,000, and I again say we are in here for $1,600,000,000 to carry on next year. Last year there were about 75 on my side of the House who failed to come back because they cut it, and we dropped down to 21 percent. I do not know how many will come back in 1940. We may get by our constituents with a little chicanery, but there is one thing I do know: If we drop America back to where she was from 1930 to 1933, we may get by the voters, but we will have a tough time getting by God. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we may have some understanding about the time on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], the purpose of which is to restore the $125,000,000 that has been transferred from W. P. A. to P. W. A.

I have not heard yet any justification or any satisfactory explanation made by anyone why the funds which have been requested by the President and the Budget for W. P. A. next year have been depleted for the purpose of allocating $125,000,000 of the amount to P. W. A.

I think it will be admitted by the chairman of this committee that it costs about three times as much to supply work for one man for 1 year on a P. W. A. project than it does on a W. P. A. project. In other words, three times as many persons may obtain employment on W. P. A. projects for the $125,000,000 than on P. W. A. projects requiring a like expenditure. The Administrator of W. P. A. states 170,000 persons will be separated from W. P. A. rolls if the $125,000,000 is transferred to P. W. A. We know that most of the 3,000,000 people who were on the W. P. A. rolls this winter are still eligible for this employment, and that if the entire amount of this appropriation is left intact for W. P. A. purposes there will still be more than a million needy persons and their families unprovided for. If that is so, what is the justification for further depleting the funds? It seems as though every time an appropriation bill is brought in for W. P. A. there are efforts made to divert a part of it for other purposes. It seems to me that this is an unjust thing to do—to take away from this fund $125,000,000 when it must be conceded that the full amount is not sufficient to take care of the needy persons at present certified for W. P. A. To divert it for another purpose—for other public work—cannot compensate for the loss of employment that will result. I hope the House will vote to restore this money in order that at least two-thirds of the people who need the employment—who need it pitifully—may be able to sustain themselves and their dependents. I urge the House to support this amendment to restore this money to W. P. A., where it will provide for bread and butter and clothing and subsistence for the 170,000 persons and their dependents who will otherwise be denied an opportunity to obtain employment on this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as I recall the President's speech dealing with the question of relief, he stated in substance that $1,477,000,000 was expected and necessary exclusively for relief. This relief bill is shot full of holes. It is riddled. We have circumscribed it with a lot of terms and conditions and impositions that make it next to impossible, so far as workability is concerned. The committee has decided that it ought to transfer $125,000,000 to P. W. A. I think that is a separate matter entirely. This House should vote up the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] and make separate provision pertaining to the Public Works Administration.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. LEAVY. The President in his message on the Budget said that the minimum we could possibly get along with on W. P. A. would be $1,477,000,000.

Mr. DINGELL. I so stated.

Mr. LEAVY. And by permitting the language to remain in the bill we would have only $1,352,000,000.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. LEAVY. In this bill there is further language that absolutely makes this the only appropriation for all of the 12 months of the next year.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right. My purpose in rising at the present time is because I am keenly interested in a public-works program.

Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing the means of life for the millions of men and women who, without adequate Federal aid, would not be able to sustain themselves. I feel that we are losing sight of the fact that we have the means here not only for providing jobs for men who are in direst need of them, but also at the same time stimulating business and improving our whole economic structure.

My own city of Detroit has felt the tremendous impact created by public-works activities. Mills and plants in and around the city have been kept busy providing materials for public-works projects. Structures going up in every section of the country have created a demand for machinery, fabricated steel, and other goods, and this has meant many jobs for the people of Detroit. In addition P. W. A. projects have created jobs and have stimulated business in Detroit through the construction of public works undertaken with P. W. A. assistance by the city of Detroit and by Wayne County. Our $22,000,000 sewage disposal project, not to mention other projects in the city, has provided steady work at regular wages for sometime.

The city of Detroit, Wayne County, and the State of Michigan, just like other cities and States, are in need of further improvements. I do not feel that the $125,000,000 provided in this bill can be sufficient to handle our requests and the thousands of requests of the other gentlemen of the House. The funds provided in the bill should be increased.

Communities everywhere in the country are in need of adequate facilities for education, health, recreation, transportation, and the ordinary business of government. At the present time there are pending before the Public Works Administration requests for aid in financing almost 6,000 projects. The State of Michigan alone has pending applications for 105 projects, estimated to cost more than $25,000,000. These projects can be undertaken only with P. W. A. aid. The Public Works Administration should be given adequate funds not only to take care of requests which are already on hand but which will enable it also to examine and handle other requests which local governments will most assuredly continue to make.

The money which the Congress provides to help cities and towns to construct useful public works and to carry on relief work not only puts money in the pockets of the workers but also places orders for materials and thereby aids industry and business in practically every manufacturing area.

The Public Works Administration during the past 6 years has provided jobs for men, through the normal channels of private industry, in almost every county in the United States, by helping cities and towns from cost to coast to build schools, hospitals, courthouses, water systems, roads, and hundreds of other kinds of useful and necessary public works.

P. W. A. has created about 2,000,000,000 man-hours of work at the sites of construction. The vast army of bricklayers, carpenters, plumbers, hod carriers, steamfitters, and other workers in over 300 trades that make up the backbone of our construction industry have obtained work at normal wages and at normal hours. Through P. W. A. they have worked, not for the Government but through private contractors. This is not all. To build these public works the contractors have to buy steel, cement, brick and tile, machinery, sand and gravel, and every conceivable other type of construction material and had to have them hauled to the construction sites. They gave other millions of men jobs—jobs in mills, plants, factories, and other private enterprises, and on the truck and railroad lines. Altogether, P. W. A. has provided a total of 5,000,000,000 man-hours of primary employment at regular wages.

The amount of money which was paid out by private contractors on public-works jobs at the sites of construction totaled one and one-fourth billion dollars. The workers received an average hourly earning of between 80 and 95 cents. How much additional was paid out by manufacturing, wholesalers, distributors, and transportation companies and others who handle two and one-half billion dollars' worth of materials is impossible to estimate. But the total wages paid out as a result of public works is a figure that goes into the billions.

What happened to this money? It did not stay in the pockets of the workers. It went to the butcher, the baker, the landlord, the clothing dealer, the automobile and tire dealers, and to all other types of businessmen who sell goods to the public.

According to a study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, on the distribution of wage earners' incomes, about 43 percent of all this money went to local stores for food and clothing and a good part of those dollars, in turn, went to the farmers who produced the raw materials. About 10 percent of the P. W. A. dollars went for transportation, which means that workers on P. W. A. projects were able to buy automobiles and automobile parts.

Part of the wages paid directly or indirectly out of Public Works funds in California, in Maine, in Florida, in Montana, or in any other State of the Union, finds its way eventually to Detroit, the greatest automobile manufacturing center in the world. Other communities in other sections of the country also feel the effects of public-works program no matter where the projects are undertaken.

The jobs that have been provided directly and indirectly through the public-works program were a stimulus not only to industry but the consumer-goods business cost the Federal Government relatively few dollars. According to an analysis of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of completed P. W. A. Federal projects, it cost the Federal Government only $61.24 to keep each man regularly employed 1 month under the P. W. A. program.

American business and industry and workers are still dependent upon the economic stimulus that flows from the public-works program. This does not mean, in my opinion, that Federal funds should be spent helter-skelter on any kind of structure merely to increase the amount of money in circulation. Public Works Administration has used the funds provided it in the past to see to it that the public works constructed are sound, useful, and necessary. My own city of Detroit has constructed projects which are absolutely essential to the welfare of our citizens. With P. W. A. assistance, the city has made vital improvements to its school system, its streets, its power plant, its waterworks, its garbage- and refuse-disposal plants, and its sewerage system, now nearing completion, one of the world's largest and finest sewage-disposal plants.

Thousands of other cities, as well as villages, towns, counties, and other local governments have built, with P. W. A. help, public works which have long been neglected, and which are essential to the welfare of the people.

Funds provided through the P. W. A. are investments—investments in proper living. They are part of our national wealth.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman feel that in supporting this amendment he is doing the best thing that he can for the Public Works Administration?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Because if this language stands in the bill, we will be told that provision has been made for the Public Works Administration and we will not be able to have a real program.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right. The only thing I can do is to act fairly so as to square with my conscience, then I can face my constituents.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If this $125,000,000 is set aside to P. W. A., and sponsors put 55 percent to it, it would make a total of $270,000,000; how would the relief employed in connection with the expenditure of that money compare with the relief employed, assuming we had only $125,000,000 placed in the bill where it is now?

Mr. DINGELL. I think we would still be about $730,000,000 short of what we ought to have for needed public improvements which might be had under the Public Works Administration. I say that in answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is aware of Colonel Harrington's statement this morning, to the effect that a reduction of 170,000, in addition to the reduction caused by the appropriation, will be made as the result of this earmarking of $125,000,000?

Mr. DINGELL. I think that is quite generally understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, every Member who is interested in the welfare of the needy, and who believes in fair play and justice, should support and vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] to strike out that provision of the bill which allots $125,000,000 of W. P. A. funds to the P. W. A.

The sum of $1,477,000,000 has been asked for by the President, and is approved by the Bureau of the Budget. No individual, no agency, has asked for nor explained why $125,000,000 should be diverted to P. W. A. No one questions the fact that $1,477,000,000 is actually needed to care for the unemployed. But the subcommittee, in a clever subterfuge which I can only interpret as a means of further hamstringing W. P. A. activities, steps in and takes $125,000,000 from W. P. A. and hands it over to P. W. A. I do not deny that money should be given to P. W. A., but I do object very strongly indeed to taking it from W. P. A. It is up to this Congress to appropriate money for each of those agencies; neither should suffer diversions of money to the other.

The gentleman from Virginia, when he concludes the debate, may say, "Well, this will all work out satisfactorily, and if there is any shortage we can make a deficiency appropriation." And it may be that some of you are of the same opinion. So let me call your attention to section 10 of the bill. You will notice that it prohibits future appropriations to either W. P. A. or P. W. A.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] should be voted for. If I had known nothing whatever of this matter and had only listened to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], who addressed the Committee a few moments ago, his persuasive and clear speech would have convinced me that it is my duty, as one who is interested in the welfare of the needy, to vote for this amendment.

I hope that the appeal made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and by others will be given the very serious consideration of the Members, and that the amendment offered by Mr. LEAVY will be passed. The P. W. A. can be taken care of later if that is necessary. Right now let us concentrate on bringing forth a bill under which the W. P. A. can really operate, not one to tie the hands of those who administer it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, there are two or three points that I hope to start toward consideration at the present moment and to complete at a little later date.

The first one is that we ought to be appropriating very much larger amounts than we are appropriating at the present time, for three reasons: The first one is—as now written this is a bill to promote starvation instead of a bill to prevent starvation.

The second one is that this bill does not reach out even toward the accomplishment of the things that must be accomplished before a real solution is possible. We must first prevent that greatest of misfortunes in America—injury to the health and welfare of the people of the United States of America through long-continued semistarvation.

On that point I want to suggest to you gentlemen that the starvation, semistarvation, dead-line starvation that we are indulging in during the past few years has already had an effect that only our students of medicine apparently are taking note of; that is, that the children of the poor, who are denied sufficient food, raiment, and shelter to make the best physical development possible, are falling 2¼ inches short of the stature which they would have made if they had been given the right amount and the right kind of food, shelter, and raiment. That the loss of 2¼ inches in stature to the American children is a greater loss and a greater comment on our lack of understanding of the subject in hand than we have ever been guilty of before.

I want to call attention to the fact that the terrible Napoleonic wars, extending over many years, reduced the height of the Frenchmen 2 inches. But our lack of appreciation, our lack of understanding, our lack of sympathy and common sense is already reducing one-quarter of an inch more the stature of our children than the French wars brought upon the French people.

I am going to submit to this body a complete and entire statement of facts and figures upholding the plea that I am making at the present moment for sufficient appropriations to prevent further starvation among the children of this country. There are 10 doctors in this body. I call on them to use their great training, knowledge, and experience to bring to this body the terrible suffering and economic loss which is resulting from these years of starvation in America.

The greatest thing we could do at this time is to so increase the appropriations as to allow our American boys and girls to grow to their full stature, full manhood, and full womanhood, not only for the mercy of the youth but for the uneconomic result of it that must come if we fail to see and do our duty.

Now I want to call attention to this fact: That if you take this $125,000,000 away from W. P. A. we will take it from the poorest class in America. You will put 170,000 on starvation. That is exactly what you will do, and you cannot get away from the facts and figures in the case. I am for a much larger amount than $125,000,000 for W. P. A.; but I am not for taking that amount out of the already entirely inadequate appropriation for the W. P. A.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I should like for the Committee very thoroughly to understand the import of the present amendment.

I will say frankly that as far as I am personally concerned it does not make a great deal of difference. Let us look for just a moment now how we stand on the amount requested for W. P. A. I wish to remind some of my colleagues of the point where you picked up $50,000,000 on us. I wonder if you have forgotten a few weeks ago when the House put $50,000,000 into the War Department civil-functions bill for flood control and river and harbor improvements, with the understanding that it was coming out of relief money. That is what was done. That amendment was carried here. Some of my good friends from areas requiring heavy relief expenditures voted for that. Why did they do it? Because our friends from the river and harbor districts had been told at the White House that they would be allocated $50,000,000 out of relief money for river and harbor improvements. They said, "Oh, no. We appreciate those kind words, but we would feel a little better if you would just write it into the law now and then take it off of the relief estimate when it comes up."

We did not take that off; you have that $50,000,000 extra—that is here. Now, what about this $125,000,000? The speeches of my friends indicate that it has been taken away from the relief people—that it has taken that much money from giving people jobs. That is not true. We relieve W. P. A. of its heavy construction above $50,000, and we are moving that program over to the P. W. A. That gives jobs to people. It is the same as W. P. A., for we are providing that 25 percent of the labor on every one of those jobs must come from the relief rolls. Instead of having $125,000,000 for W. P. A. jobs, you will have $125,000,000, plus the sponsors' contribution, which will give a gross amount of $288,000,000 for projects, of which 25 percent must be relief labor. Not only will this give as much employment to people from the relief rolls—just as many jobs, in my opinion, as the $125,000,000 would give if used by W. P. A.—but also you give some help to the heavy industries which employ the skilled mechanics, the processors; and it gives incidental aid to the railroads. It is, after all, a real contribution to recovery.

Just one other thing, if you please. Pass this amendment and, of course, title II of the bill must go out. Title II is the Public Works Administration section providing the $125,000,000 for projects. If you strike this out by adopting the amendment, title II will have to go out because there will be no money to go to the Public Works Administration.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I cannot yield. I am sure my friend will appreciate that gentlemen favoring the amendment took 20 minutes and I asked for only 5. That is the import of it. If this amendment carries, there is nothing in the bill for the Public Works Administration. I am perfectly confident the House is not going to adopt an amendment for $125,000,000 over and above the Budget estimate; so I say to you that this bill as drawn, with these committee amendments which the committee will offer today, will give just as many relief jobs, will give a better type of construction, and in addition to that will give incidental and indirect employment in the heavy industries.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have only a minute left. I hope my friend will permit me to continue.

I do hope now that the Committee will stand by us in our effort to give relief to people who need jobs; and I want to repeat what my friend from Missouri said. Let us quit thinking about this bill in the light of nothing but projects, projects, projects. Our committee heard witness after witness stating that W. P. A. had been wonderful, because we have gotten streets, we have gotten parkways, we have gotten schools. I say the part of W. P. A. that is wonderful—and much of it is wonderful—but the part of it that is wonderful to me is that it has clothed and fed needy people. That is the part of it I want you to consider today. We are trying to write a bill here that will spread this money so that the people who need jobs will get jobs, letting the projects be incidental. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 67, noes 75.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. LEAVY and Mr. WOODRUM of Virgina.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 84, noes 194.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts: Page 1, line 6, after the word "Administration", strike out all of section 1 and insert the following:

"SEC. 1. The Works Projects Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration") in the Federal Works Agency is hereby made an agency of the Government for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Administration (1) to provide opportunities for the employment upon a program of public works of employable persons who are unable to find employment in private industry and who are eligible for employment under the provisions of this act, (2) to aid self-help and cooperative associations for the benefit of needy persons, and (3) to provide emergency direct relief for needy persons in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 3. Funds made available to the Administration for the purpose of enabling it to carry on such program of public works may be expended for (1) the prosecution of projects approved for such Administration under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937, the joint resolution of March 2, 1938, and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938; and (2) the following types of public projects, Federal and non-Federal, subject to the approval of the President: (A) highways, roads, and streets; (B) public buildings (including schools, hospitals, and public-housing projects), parks, and other recreational facilities (including buildings therein); (C) public utilities, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems to serve persons in rural areas (including projects sponsored by and for the benefit of nonprofit and cooperative associations); (D) sewer systems and water supply and purification systems; (E) airports and other transportation facilities; (F) flood control, drainage, irrigation, and conservation; (G) eradication of insect pests; (H) miscellaneous construction projects; and (I) educational, professional, clerical, cultural, recreational, production, service (including training for domestic service), and miscellaneous nonconstruction projects.

"SEC. 4. Federal agencies having supervision of projects prosecuted under this act are authorized to receive from sponsors of non-Federal projects contributions in services, materials, or money, such money to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the wages or salaries paid by any such sponsor to any person employed in an administrative or supervisory capacity shall be deemed to be a part of such sponsor's contribution. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the sponsor and the Federal agency.

"SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner of Work Projects is authorized and directed to make such upward revisions in the monthly wage rates payable to persons employed on the public-works program provided for by this act as may be necessary to enable such persons to maintain a standard of living compatible with decency and good health.

"(b) The hourly rate of wages paid to persons employed upon projects under this act shall be not less than the greatest of the following:

"(1) The prevailing hourly rate of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Commissioner of Works Projects.

"(2) Thirty cents.

"(3) In the case of employment in any occupation for which minimum rates of pay for persons employed by private employers are established under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, such minimum rates.

"(c) The monthly rate of wages paid to persons employed upon projects under this act shall be not less than $36.

"SEC. 6. (a) Any person who is employable, who is unemployed, and who is unable to find suitable employment in private industry at wages not less than the prevailing rate of wages in his locality for work for which he is reasonably fitted by training and experience shall be deemed to be eligible for employment on projects authorized by this act. The Commissioner is authorized to employ not less than 3,000,000 persons upon such projects as long as that number of persons are eligible for employment upon such projects.

"(b) For the purposes of this act, employment in any establishment at which there is a labor dispute shall not be deemed suitable employment.

"(c) In the employment of persons upon such projects the Commissioner shall give preference to persons the income (other than public relief) of whose family units is less than the wages payable to such persons for employment upon such projects.

"(d) The fact that a person is entitled to, or has received, either adjusted-service bonds or a Treasury check in payment of an adjusted-compensation certificate shall not be considered in determining eligibility for such employment.

"SEC. 7. (a) All persons employed on projects established under the provisions of this act shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to deal collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in joint activities for the purpose of mutual aid and protection.

"(b) No contract with respect to any such project, including the purchase of materials for such projects, shall be awarded to any person, firm, association, or corporation who, at the time of such award, is found to be interfering with, restraining, or coercing his employees in the exercise of their rights provided for in subsection (a). Any such contract shall contain a stipulation that in the performance of such contract the contractor will not interfere with, restrain, or coerce his employees in the exercise of such rights. Any violation of any such stipulation shall render the party responsible therefor liable to the United States for liquidated damages in the sum of $100 for each day during which any such violation shall have occurred.

"SEC. 8. There shall be established within the Work Projects Administration a Bureau of Labor Relations, which shall be responsible directly to the Commissioner of Work Projects. The Bureau of Labor Relations shall be responsible for the development of proper labor relations procedures and practices. It shall have power to hire investigators and maintain offices in local and State Work Projects Administration districts. It shall have power to make decisions on all matters affecting conduct of labor relations, subject to final decision by the Commissioner.

"SEC. 9. No person employed on work projects prosecuted under this act who refuses a bona fide offer of suitable employment in private industry under reasonable working conditions which pays as much or more in compensation for the same length of service as such person receives for such employment and who is capable of performing such work shall be retained in employment for the period such private employment would be available: *Provided*, That any person who takes such private employment shall at the expiration thereof be entitled to immediate resumption of his previous employment status if he is still eligible and if he has lost the private employment through no fault of his own.

"SEC. 10. (a) Appointments under the provisions of this act to administrative and supervisory positions shall be made upon the basis of (1) competitive tests of a character similar to civil-service tests.

"(b) Appointments under the provisions of this act to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity in any State shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

"(c) No part of any appropriation made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person in a supervisory or administrative position who is a candidate for any State, district, county, or municipal office (such office requiring full time of such person and to which office a salary or per diem attaches) in any primary, general, or special election, or who is serving as a campaign manager or assistant thereto for any such candidate.

"SEC. 11. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits shall apply to persons (except administrative employees qualifying as civil employees of the United States) employed under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That the monthly compensation in any individual case heretofore or hereafter coming within the purview of such act of February 15, 1934, shall not exceed the rate of $50, and the aggregate payments shall not exceed $4,000, exclusive of medical costs: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State or Territory, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

"SEC. 12. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase made or service procured under the provisions of this act when the aggregate amount involved is less than $300.

"SEC. 13. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any project, employment, or relief aid under the provisions of this act, or diverts, or attempts to divert or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of any appropriation made for this purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership or activity in a labor organization of his own choice, deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under this act, or attempts so to do, or assists in so doing, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 14. The Commissioner of Work Projects is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from any appropriation made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, any claim arising out of operations hereunder on account of damage to or loss of property caused by the negligence of any employee of the Work Projects Administration while acting within the scope of his employment: *Provided*, That no claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of $500, or which is not presented in writing to the Administration within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof: *Provided further*, That acceptance by any

claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action of the Commissioner upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

"SEC. 15. Reports of the operations under the appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, including a statement of the expenditures made and obligations incurred by classes, projects, and amounts shall be submitted by the President to Congress on or before the 15th of January in each year.

"SEC. 16. There is hereby appropriated $2,250,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act."

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as read but printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment.

Mr. TERRY (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been popularly known as the Casey bill. You have all received from me a statement as to what it contains and what it purposes to do. It is a planned and integrated program for relief. I consider it a much better bill than the one brought out by the committee. When I consider, however, the fate of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington to restore the amount asked by the Budget and the President of the United States to W. P. A., when I consider the treatment of that amendment by an almost solid Republican bloc combining with a reactionary Democratic bloc, I am not insensible of the fact that this amendment does not stand any great chance of adoption. [Applause.] I say to you Members on the Republican side of the aisle that the question of relief is just as much in your laps as it is in ours, and before the next election the country is going to note that you combined with the reactionary Democrats to forestall adequate relief to the needy. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin and Mr. TABER rose.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

I am merely telling you that the responsibility is yours as a party responsibility, because almost to a man you Republicans have voted against the needy. Now, I consider that the American citizen in this country has a right to work. Under the Hoover regime, through noninterference with private business, millions of men and women were thrown out of work.

Mr. Chairman, my bill provides merely that we shall not cut the W. P. A. In contrast with the committee bill it provides that we, on the other hand, strengthen the W. P. A. rather than weaken it at this time. Let us consider the facts. There are just as many people out of work and unemployed today as there were during the current year. During the current year we appropriated enough money to take care of 3,000,000 people. Under the pending bill we have reduced that number by one-third, and in addition to that third reduction, by a combined Republican action with a small block of Democrats, we have further reduced it 200,000 more by earmarking $125,000,000 from W. P. A. appropriation.

Under the committee bill which has been brought before you, on August 31 at the doors of the Republicans as well as at the doors of the Democrats will be 750,000 men and women who will be thrown out of work en masse at one time. How are they going to get work in private employment? You answer that for me, you gentlemen who talk about private employment. How are 750,000 needy men and women, who will be thrown out of W. P. A. employment at one time on August 31, who will compete against each other for jobs, going to be taken care of? You are saying to them: "Starve. It is a case of the survival of the fittest. We will not do anything for you. We turn our backs upon you."

This bill is a test whereby Republicans and Democrats who really feel that American citizens who are in need, who have been certified for relief, who want work, and who are able to work can get some modicum of relief from this Government, which they do not get under the committee bill.

Let us consider the facts. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] have combined to bring forth a W. P. A. bill. I say this bill that has been presented for W. P. A. has been brought forth by the enemies of W. P. A. The bill which I offer is a bill to strengthen the W. P. A., one which will give assistance when and where assistance is needed, one which will put 3,000,000 men on the W. P. A. rolls and keep them there as long as there are 3,000,000 certified needy in this country who want to work and cannot get it in private industry. That is the object of my bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not interrupt the gentleman except for the statement that he has made several times that the pending bill is brought forth by the enemies of W. P. A. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us who prepared the bill he has introduced.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I will tell the gentleman who has prepared his bill. No matter who prepared my bill, it is a good American bill. [Laughter.] You can laugh. But consider it on its merits. It is a bill that had no chance before the committee. The bill that has been brought in here by the committee is a bill that the Republican gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] agrees with. He wants you to swallow this bill which has been brought forth by the committee, whether it be a good bill or bad bill for the W. P. A.—and I say it is a bad bill. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. Chairman, the amount carried in the pending bill reflects the whole Budget estimate of the President and, with restrictions, carries the whole Budget estimate.

With the restrictions that have been placed in it and the opportunities that have been given the Administrator to save money, especially by the provision which permits him to formulate regulations which will pay less money to those without dependents than to those with dependents, as has been the practice in the past, there will be opportunity for more employment under W. P. A. than there was in the estimate that came in here as the bill was originally presented to the committee by the White House. Personally I do not go along with the bill. I have never said I would support it. I have said on the floor that I did not expect to; but I do believe if we are going to have this sort of handling of relief we should make it come as near relief as possible instead of having it spread out so as to take just as much money out of the Treasury as possible and pay more money to people than is needed to take care of them, thereby increasing the President's Budget 50 percent. I am opposed to that kind of increase, and anyone who sincerely believes that the money to be appropriated should be spent only for relief would have to vote against this kind of amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will fail of adoption.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, and I shall ask for the last 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, there is only one big question that confronts the House in connec-

tion with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]. The central fact before us today—and it is not a partisan fact, it is just a plain, ordinary, human fact—is that the unemployment problem is still with us. The gentleman from Massachusetts stated that we still have today virtually as many people unemployed as we had a year ago.

There are some of us who believe sincerely that there are measures pending before the Congress at the present time which, if enacted into law, would solve that problem. There are other people on the left side of the aisle who I imagine by and large will say that this problem will not be solved until there is a Republican administration. [Applause.] If that be true, then those gentlemen must answer the unemployed people of their districts when this question is asked them: "You yourself say this problem will not get better; yet you refused to support a measure which would have given the unemployed people of your district an opportunity to work instead of having to accept local charity relief." [Applause.]

To those people who believe that steps can be taken which will help solve this problem—a thing which I certainly believe myself—I say that we have to take as our principle the thought that so long as we are engaged in that task we will have to do justice to the people upon whom the burden of our failure to solve that problem falls most heavily. If we are to be honest about this matter we must admit that, Budget estimate or no Budget estimate, the fact remains that we need at least 3,000,000 W. P. A. jobs in this country today if each unemployed family is to have a chance to have the breadwinner at work.

This is the main thing. I recognize this is not the only problem we have to face and know all the arguments against it, but I cannot believe that anything is more fundamental. I certainly stand ready to cast my vote for constructive measures in the committee's bill that will improve this program. I am for such measures; I have always been for them, but that has nothing to do with the scope of the program or the question whether you are going to continue with a program that answers only a portion of the problem, or whether you are going to insist upon having a program that will come closer to really meeting it.

For these reasons, which I believe are clear, I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I believe there are lots of people 45 years of age and over who have not much chance, no matter how much business improves and no matter how much production increases, of getting back into private industry. I should like to see those men have a chance to do a job. I hate to see them have to take a dole. That is the reason I am taking this position here on a measure that I feel is justified in view of all the circumstances.

May I remind the Committee of the kind of psychological frame of mind that people on and off W. P. A. have had to live in during the last few years, never knowing from one month's end to the next what Congress was going to do about the appropriations upon which their very livelihood has come unfortunately to depend. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Casey bill, which has been offered as an amendment to the resolution under consideration.

I have never made a political speech from the floor of this House, and that is not because I do not like to make them. I would like to make a political speech, but realizing that I am a one-man party here I find myself at a terrific disadvantage to make a political speech. However, in view of the Roman holiday which is being had here this afternoon at the expense of the unemployed of this country, I want to serve notice on both political parties, first of all on the Republican Party, that you cannot dodge your responsibility toward the unemployed of this country by simply saying that you are not in control of this House. The fact that you have lent your almost solid support, with the exception of five or six Members, to the position taken by the gentleman from Virginia in support of this bill means that you must accept your share of the responsibility for the consequent lay-offs and for the harm that is being inflicted on the unemployed of this country.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I cannot yield; I am sorry.

Now, as to the Democratic Party, may I say to you gentlemen of the majority that the argument that will be made in October of 1940 to the unemployed by the Republicans will be that they were not in control and that you are in control, and that therefore you must accept responsibility for the damage that is being done to the cause of the unemployed. To this charge a substantial number of you will have to plead guilty. The Democratic leadership must accept its share of the responsibility for the sacrifice of the unemployed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I cannot yield; I have only 5 minutes.

Now let me say this——

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield. I am sorry. I do not mean to be discourteous, but I have just a few minutes left.

May I say to the Democrats that those of you who are supporting this resolution are giving ammunition to the opponents of your party in 1940. You are making it very difficult for those Democrats on the floor of this House who stood up this afternoon and stood by the unemployed, and I want to take this occasion to make note that a fair portion of them did stand by the unemployed. However, almost solidly from certain sections of this country we received a Democratic vote against the unemployed on the previous amendment, and I am certain we will receive it on this amendment.

What is the argument that is being advanced to justify, or rather, to alibi the cuts that are being made? The gentleman from Virginia, as well as the gentleman from New York, states that by the provisions of the bill that they are trying to spread this money as far as possible and to put as many people to work as possible. It is high time that we explode this myth. Let me show you what is going to happen in only one town, a typical W. P. A. city, New York City.

Yes; you may snicker, but let me tell you that the unemployed in New York City are just as good Americans as any Member of this House or as any person in any other part of this country. [Applause.] Seventy thousand people are going to be cut off the W. P. A. rolls in New York City alone. If you say you are spreading the money to give as much work as possible to as many people as possible, then explain why it is that Colonel Somervell, administrator of W. P. A. in New York City, notified the mayor of New York City yesterday that under the provisions put into this bill 70,000 W. P. A. workers will be thrown off the rolls. What are we going to do with these men? Do you want us to put them in cold storage? They are human beings; they have families; they are men who are patriotic, good Americans, willing to die for their country.

I say, let us drop this fake economy. It is not economy when you take it out of the unemployed. I say that not only is it not economy, but it is a stab at the very heart of American progress, because American civilization depends on the standard of living of the American unemployed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is pretty hard for a fellow these days to keep his bearings. My good friend from Massachusetts charges the Republicans and many Democrats with being reactionary, with working against the

unemployed. Well, the bill that has been brought in here provides every dollar that the Democratic President has asked for relief. [Applause.] The bill that has been brought in here will be supported by the gentleman from Texas, the Democratic leader. The bill that has been brought in here will be supported by the distinguished Speaker of the House. I believe the committee is to be congratulated if we can bring in here a bill for relief that is supported by the Democratic leadership, with every dollar in it that a Democratic President recommends for relief, and at the same time get the support of the gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle. [Laughter and applause.]

I am not much of a politician [laughter] and I do not know what these gentlemen are going to chide us with in 1940 with respect to relief when they vote for our bill today. That is for them to answer, but I wish to congratulate them upon the fact that they are willing to come in here and try to make a good, workable bill for a relief program. The gentleman from New York did not write this bill. It was written by the committee, unanimously reported by the committee, including every Democrat on it with the exception of one of the Democratic members who did not agree to one of the provisions in it. It is quite unusual to have a more unanimous vote than that.

My good friend from New York sheds a few tears about the 70,000 who are going to be cut off in New York City.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is not referring to me.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I wonder how much concern was shown for the long line of unemployed who could not get jobs on W. P. A. when New York City got this building for the park up there, and instead of giving it to relief labor gave 85 percent of it to nonrelief labor and worked them full time, permitting them to get from $250 to $275 a month out of relief funds.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I only have 5 minutes.

The bill brought here today will give more jobs to project workers who need jobs to support their families per dollar appropriated than any relief bill the Congress has ever passed. This is what should be the object of every one of us. It seeks, however, to take out of the relief program some of its abuses. It seeks to get back to our main objective, which is to give temporary relief to unemployed people and to encourage them to rehabilitate themselves and if and when it is possible to do so, to get back to private employment.

That is the purpose of the bill and, of course, I know what is going to happen. The Appropriations Committee wrote the bill you are considering. My good friend from Massachusetts has a bill, and I am not going to embarrass him, if it would embarrass him, by asking who prepared that bill. There is nothing improper about any of us introducing bills that are handed to us, but his bill does have the enthusiastic endorsement of the Workers Alliance and of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The bill you have here today is the W. P. A. program of the Democratic administration dressed up, checked up, and improved upon by the Congress of the United States, whose duty it is, after all, to do the legislating. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASEY), there were—ayes 86, noes 205.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CASEY and Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82, noes 201.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: On page 2, after line 25, add the following:

"*Provided further*, That $100,000,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be used in obtaining a site or sites and the erection of a public building thereon for the accommodation of second- and third-class post offices in the various States including accommodations for other Federal activities where needed, such as county agents, home demonstration agents, etc.

(a) That the Administrator of the Works Progress Administration be and is hereby authorized and directed in cooperation with the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, to acquire by purchase or otherwise, title to such sites in the name of the United States and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building for the use and purposes hereinabove provided, such buildings to be erected without regard to cost of materials notwithstanding any other provisions of the law.

(b) That the plans, specifications, and full estimates of such buildings shall be made and approved according to law, the cost of any such building not to exceed $100,000, preference to be given offices located at county seats.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not germane. It provides for a project that calls for the purchase of land, which does not furnish employment of people. It is not within the purpose of the concepts of the bill; it is not germane to the general principles of the bill.

Mr. TABER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for the construction of post offices in the Procurement Division. The only object of the resolution is making appropriations for work relief. There is nothing of the character contained in the amendment, in the bill as it is presented to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair is of opinion that the present bill covers a very broad field. For example, paragraph (b) of section 1 relates to highways, roads, streets, public buildings, parks, and other recreational facilities, including buildings thereon, public utilities, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems to serve persons in rural areas, and so forth, and in another section of the bill it provides for the allocation of funds for public-works purposes. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] provides for further allocations, the administration to be carried on through the agency provided for in the pending bill. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment is germane to the bill and to this particular section of the bill. The Chair overrules the point of order, and the gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, it will be observed that this amendment does not in any way increase the appropriations, nor does it decrease them. It does, in a way, increase the intended W. P. A. activities. It endeavors to couple with the relief work an investment that will be of some value to the people and to the Government at the same time. That is, it provides for the erection of a public building first at county seats, where they have a second- or third-class post office, such buildings to be constructed so as to accommodate the post-office facilities, county agents, home demonstration agents, and soil-conservation agents by furnishing them ample space and opportunity to perform their work. It in no way decreases the opportunity for W. P. A., because it will be constructed by W. P. A. labor, and at the end of the year W. P. A. laborers will all be able to point with pride and satisfaction to the structures that they have been able to build, as it is now, in some places, they are not able to point to anything definite and certain. It carries with it the other idea that the Government will save in the way of rent for post offices, buildings, and offices for its county agents, and home-demonstration agents, something like $40,000,000 annually. The Post Office Department itself spends between $15,000,000 and $20,000,000 for rent of quarters.

If we assume that county agents, home demonstration agents, and the other agencies named cost as much, the rent paid in 2 or 3 years' time will equal the amount asked to be allocated for the purposes mentioned. At the same time we will be furnishing W. P. A. labor the same opportunity that it has today. A man can carry a brick as easy as he can a pick, and in doing so he will be constructing a building that will be a monument to his labor and at the same time prove to be of enormous value to the Government. For the last 5 years we have been asking industry to increase their plants and their activities in order that they might give employment to people. The Government today has its post offices housed in buildings that in many cases are nothing more or less than fire traps. Hardly a year passes but what Congress is asked to appropriate money to reimburse the Post Office Department for losses sustained by fire. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may receive the same fate as all the others so far today, but if it does, we want to give notice that if nothing prevents we will be here next year with a similar proposal, unless these buildings should be provided for in some other way in the meantime.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARE) there were—ayes 31, noes 137.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire: On page 4, after line 25, add *"And provided further,* That all unskilled labor certified from the relief rolls shall hereafter be paid weekly."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that if the amendment is germane at all it certainly is not germane at this point in the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Virginia raises the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this particular section?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there is another section of the bill dealing with wages, section 15 on page 16.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the amendment at this time and offer it at the point referred to by the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman from New Hampshire withdraws the amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr KELLER: On page 2, line 4, strike out "$1,477,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,574,000,000."

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of this House at the present time to an idea that I thought had soaked through the heads of most of the men of this body, but which, from the speeches and votes here today, I doubt it has done so. That is this: We are going on following the fatal idea that this is a temporary condition, and that we can meet it by emergency laws. Neither one is true. Eight years ago on the floor of this House I set out the reasons why it was at that time a permanent condition and could not be met by emergency measures. Two years before that I wrote it in a book and I have had the pleasure of giving it to as many Members of this House as have asked for it. I do not know how many have read it, but I do know that I pointed out the fact at that time that this condition was a permanent condition, 10 years ago, 8 years ago, and it is today, and it is going to continue to be a permanent condition. When this body assumes anything else, this body has a lot to learn.

I am not lecturing you. I am just calling attention to the facts in the case. Because the things that have happened during these intervening years prove conclusively that it is not a temporary condition and it cannot be met by emergency legislation.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I am sorry. I do not have time. I am sure the gentleman would ask a good question and I would answer it well, but I do not have the time. [Laughter.]

However, the facts are these: We have scrimped and pinched from the very start. Beginning in the Seventy-second Congress we set out to solve this whole thing by passing emergency legislation. It did not solve the difficulty because of several things.

We thought we could do it in 3 months, but it did not work. It could not be done in 3 years, nor 6 years, nor has it done so in 8 years. We ought to have learned in the 3 years or 5 years or 8 years that you could not solve it until you looked at it as a permanent matter and go at it and solve it as a permanent matter. You cannot solve a permanent condition with temporary legislation, Mr. Chairman. A matter that has remained historically as it is today for 10 years can no longer be considered a temporary matter. We are failing of our duty because we are failing to understand the underlying facts of this case. I am calling your attention to it. I am telling you the least we can do until we are ready to look at it as a permanent matter and set about solving it as such; the least we can do is to provide a job for 3,000,000 men on W. P. A. The minimum for which you can do that on a rational basis is the amount I have set out in this amendment; that is, for a total appropriation of $2,574,000,000. I will give you the reasons: In the year ending June 30, 1939, we will have spent $773,000,000 more than we are going to spend for the next fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1939, and ending on June 30, 1940.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Seven hundred and seventy-three million dollars additional would employ another million men. In other words, when you vote for the appropriation which is recommended by this committee today you are voting to take a million men away from employment who have had employment during the present year ending the 30th of this month. That is your vote, and when you vote for it that is exactly what you are voting for.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. KELLER. I am sorry. The 2 minutes do not permit. The reason I am asking for this amount is this: We have heard a lot about the inefficiency of the W. P. A. The reason it is inefficient is because we treat it as a temporary matter, and we deal with it from 3 months to 3 months, and you cannot get efficiency through that sort of thing. Also we command these men to give us efficiency when we refuse to give them the tools to work with. The average at the present time in the industries covering the same class of work that the W. P. A. is doing, requires for material and equipment $17 per man-month. Now we have provided $6 per man-month, with a possible $7 for materials and equipment for our W. P. A. workers.

We cannot get efficiency under such an arrangement. You must give our W. P. A. workers the same equipment and the same materials if you expect them to do the same work. It is foolish not to see this. It is unfair to condemn a W. P. A. worker for failure to meet standards of efficiency unless you give him standard equipment with sufficient materials equal to other men doing the same class of work.

I have seen it all tried out in the Twenty-fifth District of Illinois. When W. P. A. workers have had sufficient materials and proper equipment they have done as efficient work as any men can do. When they have been denied the proper equipment and materials to work with, of course, they have not done efficient work. Neither does any other worker do differently. It is nonsense to expect a different result. The Congress provides $6 per man-month and compels inefficiency.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 minute, that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SATTERFIELD: Page 3, line 20, after the word "marl", strike out the word "in", and in line 21, strike out the word "Wisconsin."

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the funds provided in this section of the bill will be available for the administration and the prosecution within the States of certain projects approved by the President.

You will observe that the bill enumerates many projects, such as highways, roads, streets, public buildings, airports, sewer systems, and all the rest of them. Political subdivisions of each of the States have the right to apply and to qualify for the use of the funds set up in this section of the bill to cover any of these projects. But there is one exception in the bill as now drawn. It is an exception which I submit to the committee ought not to be included in the bill.

The production of lime and marl is set up as one of the projects. But when you read the bill and come to the subject of lime and marl you will find that only the State of Wisconsin may become an applicant for and eligible for this relief.

The purport of my amendment is not to interfere in any way with the splendid work which is being carried on by the W. P. A. in the State of Wisconsin. In striking out the word "in", on line 20, and, on line 21, the word "Wisconsin", the bill will continue to provide as an accepted project the production of lime and marl in any of the States of the Union under such conditions as may be determined by the sponsors of such projects under the provisions of State law. The administrator of the W. P. A. in Wisconsin advises me that the production of lime and marl is unquestionably the greatest single method of soil conservation which can be prosecuted in that State. He states that this type of program is particularly desirable for W. P. A. projects because it can be prosecuted advantageously during winter months when many other jobs cannot be operated economically.

There are other States in the Union producing marl, notably West Virginia, Virginia, and Nevada. It is a fact that large deposits of marl are to be found in the Middle Atlantic and South Atlantic States along tidewater.

In Virginia, and particularly within my own district, there are deposits of marl, ranging from 25 to 30 feet in depth, lying just beneath the surface. It is not often that Nature is kind enough to deposit so near to the earth's surface the wealth of which that surface has been denuded by the wanton carelessness of man. However, this is a situation which prevails in Virginia and other States of the Union. It will interest you to know that owners of small farms in my district where these shell-marl deposits are to be found are eager and anxious to deed that part of their farms to the Federal Government without cost in order that these deposits may be used for the general benefit of the people of that county. It was Edmund Ruffin who won a real claim as one of the greatest of Virginians who discovered the proper scientific use of marl. It is a fact that the discovery of the use of marl by this man and its subsequent use by plantation owners in Tidewater Virginia raised the value of land in that area $30,000,000 between 1820 and 1850.

Farmers in Virginia and in other States have petitioned and have been largely responsible for the passage of State legislation paralleling the Agricultural Act and the establishment of soil-conservation districts that they might select sponsors for projects such as this bill makes possible for the citizens of Wisconsin and to provide for the distribution of marl to farmers under provisions of State law.

I congratulate my colleagues from Wisconsin for having been the leaders and the originators of congressional recognition of this plan. The purpose of my amendment is but to extend that same privilege to my own State and other States to apply and to qualify for the same relief.

I feel that the Committee on Appropriations in the consideration of larger problems which this measure provides have perhaps overlooked the very apparent unfairness in singling out one State for this benefit and excluding all the rest. I hope the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the committee is willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Will the gentleman explain the purport of the amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it is perfectly obvious on its face.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 4, line 25, after the last word, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That from the funds appropriated in this section the purchase or lease of any construction equipment or machinery shall not exceed $500 per operating unit."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying to us and should be gratifying to the country to know that so much concern has been had here today for the unemployed; and I believe that this House is making an honest endeavor to spread the moneys made available under this bill to the largest number of those in need of employment. This is not a partisan measure. No political party and no individual has a monopoly on humanitarianism or upon a desire to solve this problem. We want to spread these moneys around just as far as they will go. We think we should not subsidize the heavy industries to the prejudice of those in need of employment.

The primary purpose of this bill is to give jobs to those in need of employment, it is not to sell machinery. If it were the purpose of this Congress to subsidize the heavy goods industry, we could very easily write a provision into this bill authorizing the expenditure of a certain amount of these funds for the purchase of machinery. The whole theory and philosophy of the Works Projects Administration, however, is against that; it is to create jobs. We do not create jobs when we buy labor-saving devices, when we buy steam shovels, when we buy tractors, when we buy cement mixers, when we buy ditch-digging machinery; we take jobs away from the people to whom we want to give them, we take money for that purpose which should be made available to pay salaries and give direct work relief.

The gentleman from California, the gentleman from Ohio, and so many other gentlemen here today in their concern for the unemployed I am sure would, if they were asked, denounce the practice of industry, of business, of commercialized agriculture in putting into these places of employment and onto these farms machinery each unit of which supplants 50 to 60 people. There are many who think we should give more attention to the fundamentals of unemployment, whether the use of labor-saving devices in our factories has not caused this unemployment for the relief of which we are appropriating today. In keeping with the belief that labor-saving devices have partially been responsible for this condition which makes advisable this bill, I say we ought not to take money which should be used to give employment and buy labor-saving devices which keep men out of employment. I have, therefore, offered this amendment to limit the expenditure of this money in such manner that no more than $500 can be spent for one operating unit of machinery. This will not

prevent the purchase of drags and drag lines, it will not prevent the purchase of small equipment, it will not prevent the purchase or lease of any machinery, for that matter, which is needed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment brings into the forefront for consideration a matter we ought to have been thinking about a long time ago. In my judgment, it is not a question of creating jobs without efficiency but of creating jobs with efficiency. If we wanted the most jobs only, we would adopt what has been kicked around so much in this country. That is, we would give men shovels, wheelbarrows, and picks and tell them to go out and move mountains of dirt. There is no sense to that at all. If there was only a certain amount of work to be done and we had to distribute it around for a certain amount of money, the gentleman's amendment might have some sense to it; but the amount of work available in this country is so great that no man can foresee the time when we can catch up on the work that ought to be done for the public in the United States. Our great commission investigating that has shown conclusively that there is now available ready to be done enough work to take up every idle man in the United States for 50 years to come, working as efficiently as he can.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Would the adoption of this amendment interfere with the two-and-a-half-million-dollar lake in the gentleman's district?

Mr. KELLER. I shall answer the gentleman, and I shall also answer the other gentleman from Illinois in due course of time for the misstatements and wrong implications which you are seeking to give; but I do not want to be turned away from the thought I am trying to get over to the House now.

You have heard the W. P. A. stood up as being leaf rakers. Why? Because this Congress has limited them from the very start to $6 or $7 per man-month when it ought to be $17 per man a month. If you will give them the tools to work with and give them the proper direction, they are as good workers as we have in this country, on the W. P. A., P. W. A., or any place else. They are American men. They want to do a good job. When they do not do it, it is the fault of this body because we cut them down to nothing to start with. You cannot take a shovel and move a mountain of dirt.

I want to repeat for the gentleman's benefit if there was only a limited amount of work and a limited amount of money, then the gentleman might be entirely right, but neither is true. The amount of work available is unlimited and the amount of money is unlimited also.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman answer this question: Does he think that the Works Progress Administration or the Work Projects Administration is primarily a building program or a job-creating program?

Mr. KELLER. It is a service program, primarily to create jobs, yes; but to create them efficiently, to do the work right as American men have a right to do it. It is not a program to deny American workmen the right to work efficiently and work well. It is not a program to deny this country the saving of labor. We are trying, as a matter of fact, broadly speaking, to save for the hereafter the labor that is now going to waste. Idleness is the most expensive thing in the world. Work is the cheapest thing in the world. Labor cannot be put on ice and kept for future use. There is only one way to keep it—put it to use when it is ready, convert it into permanent improvements.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the general purposes of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan, but I call attention, however, to the fact that because of the amendment just adopted for the production of lime and marl for fertilizing soil the present amendment should be beaten, because lime cannot be pulverized into powder by hand. That kind of work must be done by machinery. If you are in favor of the lime amendment just adopted, you cannot allow this amendment of the gentleman from Michigan to be written into the bill, because it will strike out the chance to use any lime-crushing machinery. Lime cannot be made ready for agricultural use for the amount limited in the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan.

I am in sympathy with almost everything he stated about this bill being for the employment of labor and laborers, but no laborer can produce powdered lime by hand; therefore I hope that the amendment may be changed or that it be voted down in its present form.

Mr. HAWKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HAWKS. Is not the purpose of this amendment to stop the investment of W. P. A. funds in machinery that may be rented for a very small amount?

Mr. GILCHRIST. You cannot rent such lime machinery for $500 a year. A lime crusher cannot be rented that cheaply.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Is it not a fact that you can produce lime by hand, as a matter of fact, but it would be foolish to do so?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not think it is possible to powder lime by hand.

Mr. KELLER. Yes; they can. We have done it always.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Not so that it can be used on the farm for fertilizer.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I have before me a letter from my State which has the following paragraph:

> Laborers pleading with local contractors for jobs have stated that they were no longer on W. P. A. because the local funds were being conserved to afford the purchase of a $1,900 concrete mixer.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I agree that kind of thing may be done under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, but the amendment does not take into view the whole situation. There is a specific thing that cannot be done under his amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. They can rent the machinery?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not believe so.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is it not a fact there are thousands of relief jobs that are entirely dependent on the use of machinery?

Mr. GILCHRIST. There are thousands of people and thousands of laborers who are dependent upon the use of lime for agriculture use as a fertilizer, and we should not kill the purposes of this bill by the adoption of the amendment unless the gentleman will except such machinery as I have stated.

Mr. HAWKS. In Wisconsin—and I know this has happened in many other States—up until the time the W. P. A. started to buy trucks, they were renting these trucks from various individuals.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Do not strike down the chance to get pulverized lime.

Mr. HAWKS. Now, those fellows are on relief, their trucks are lying idle, and the W. P. A. owns its trucks and has a tremendous investment in them.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I may say to the gentleman there may be abuses that way, but do not kill the very thing you have recommended for it. I would be willing to go with the gentleman and the gentleman from Michigan if he will make exceptions such as I have suggested. I hope this amendment in its present form will not carry. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say there are many of these projects that could not be prosecuted unless the W. P. A. had authority to purchase needed and adequate machinery. While I am sympathetic with the idea that they should not use an unreasonable amount of heavy machinery, it seems to me the amendment of the gentleman would almost preclude many projects where it is necessary to get machinery that could not be purchased or even rented for the small amount the gentleman's amendment provides. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, not for the purpose of offering an amendment but more for the purpose of raising a point that has not been raised heretofore during the time amendments have been considered. I am not going to offer an amendment, let me repeat, because I do not feel that that is exactly my business, but I do want to say that although this bill has in it provisions I would not have written myself—probably if I had had the information the committee has had I would have written them—and although there are some provisions in it that with the information before me now I would eliminate, yet all in all I must acknowledge that I believe the committee has done a pretty good job.

A while ago we passed a reorganization bill with the understanding and with the hope that we would do away with some boards and commissions and jobs. The Works Progress Administration will go under a new agency. Colonel Harrington, or whoever will administer this act will not be independent. I am wondering why, after this action has been taken and the Works Progress Administration has gone under an administrator of public works, the creation of a board is necessary at all. I am wondering if it would not be easier for the head of all the various works to get along better and more expeditiously and probably more efficiently if he had to deal with one head of this Works Progress Administration rather than with three.

I understand the gentleman from Kentucky has evidenced very great interest in this matter. When I yield the floor I should like to hear his side of the question. I am just wondering whether, since we passed a reorganization bill by such an overwhelming vote in order to do away with some bureaus and boards, we are not by such a provision going to bring about some duplication when this independent agency goes under a new administrator, and whether we are not going to make the administration of this activity more inefficient than it would be if it were under one administrator, he to be under the head of the works program. I simply claim this time in order to raise that question. [Applause.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is the most important part of the entire bill. I can well understand the questions in the mind of the majority leader, but I believe if he would give a little further consideration to this matter he, too, would agree that it is the most important feature of the bill.

Under the reorganization plan the head of the new bureau under which the Works Progress Administration will go is not only in charge of W. P. A. theoretically but he has under his control the Bureau of Public Roads, the Procurement Division, the Housing Authority, and the Public Works Administration. Surely any one of these activities is enough for one man to have charge of, so it simply means that W. P. A. will be a job in itself. If the new Administrator under the new reorganization plan is able merely to supervise a few or all of these bureaus, his time will be sufficiently taken, and he will have very little time to give to close administration of the W. P. A.

There is an excellent precedent for this proposal. The Social Security Board goes under the Federal Security Agency in the reorganization plan. The Social Security Board is a board such as we are creating in this bill. Certainly there would be no desire to change that board for a one-man administration simply because there was another man a little higher up.

Those are not the most important considerations, however. Do you realize there are very few corporations in America with assets of a billion and a half dollars? You could count on one hand the corporations of America that spend a billion and a half a year. There are very few businesses in this country that think in terms of a billion dollars. The job is too much for one finite mind even to grasp thoroughly. Half or more of the trouble we have found in W. P. A. is due to administration.

I do not say this in criticism of the present Administrator, because he is a competent man in his field. I am not debating the quality of his work, and he has been on the job only a few months. But I say that the American people have a right to have a board composed of several persons, a board composed of the best character and brains in America, to spend their billion and a half dollars. I do not believe we should leave it to one man to have charge of the spending of a billion and a half dollars of the taxpayers' money and let him be a czar in that field. We need the best administrative skill, the best organizing skill, and the best engineering skill, and we cannot have them all in one man. I believe the only way we can start is by setting up a board where we will have the best brains and character we can find in America in an attempt to see that our public moneys are spent intelligently, carefully, and in the public interest.

In closing, I should like to say just one thing more. There is no use denying that there has been politics in W. P. A. Whether it has been by members of one party or the other party is not the real issue, for it has occurred in both cases. As long as human nature is what it is, I am sorry to say, any group like W. P. A. will offer a fair opportunity for exploitation. We want to see that politics is kept out of it, and I say that a better way to do this is with a board of three men. Give the minority party representation so they can watch their interests and see that the job is done as all of us, I believe, want it to be done, without bringing politics into it. In order to have more efficient administration, in order to stop politics in W. P. A., I believe we should stand by this provision of a three-man board, for I believe, as I said in the beginning, that it is the best part of this bill and a great forward step. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: On page 2, after the comma in line 4, strike out "$1,477,000,000" and insert "$1,602,000,000."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, once more I mention the fact that in the President's speech dealing with the question of relief, the President asked for $1,477,000,000—no more no less. The committee saw fit to take $125,000,000 of this amount and transfer it to the Public Works Administration. I am not denying the fact a certain amount of that money will go for relief purposes. However, that does not square with the idea that the President had in mind. My distinguished friend from Virginia said that the committee is giving the President all that he asked for, and I agree with that statement, minus the discount of $125,000,000, which you were asked to transfer to the Public Works Administration.

All this amendment seeks to do is to give the President the amount he originally asked for his particular purpose, and I ask you to accept on your own responsibility the

transfer of $125,000,000 for the Public Works Administration. If it is to remain, it should be separate and apart from the relief amount asked for by the President.

The amendment is plain and readily understood. It merely restores the original amount by raising the total now contained in the bill which includes the Public Works Administration provision of $125,000,000 to $1,602,000,000.

I think it is essential that the program be not abridged one iota below what the President requested. This is a test of the sincerity of the Members on this side as to whether they actually stand behind what the President has asked for or whether they are out to emasculate the bill, or rather, the program which the President outlined, by reducing the appropriation in the amount of $125,000,000.

I hope the House will see its way clear to sustain this amendment. There need be no further argument about it, so far as I am concerned, because it is self-evident that the committee cut $125,000,000 from the original amount requested by the President and this amendment simply restores it.

I hope the Committee will sustain the President at this time.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is not the bill as it stands now with reference to that amount a "yes, but"?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter we have passed on directly before when the motion of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] was voted on by the committee by a vote of one hundred and eighty some to eighty. The gentleman's motion was to strike out the $125,000,000 that is allocated to P. W. A. The matter was debated and the committee voted on it, and therefore it seems to me useless to take further time, and I hope the committee will sustain its former action.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: On page 4, line 8, after the word "basis (1)", strike out the words "forty-five and thirty-five" and in line 11, after the word "Census (2)", strike out the word "forty-five" and insert the word "fifty-five."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment that I have offered is to change the basis for the allocation of the jobs on the W. P. A. in the various States of the Union. If we understand one thing, we understand, above all else, that this appropriation that we are making here today is for the purpose of relieving the distress among the unemployed of the Nation. In the bill as reported by the committee on page 4, which I am attempting to amend, the basis for the allocation of the jobs is going to be made partly on the basis of the local population as it bears in ratio to the total population of the Nation. Then on the basis of the same 45 percent, the allocation of the jobs is to be made to the ratio of the total unemployed in the States as it bears to the total unemployed in the Nation. If this is to be a relief program, it seems to me that the basis for the allocation of the jobs should be primarily on an unemployed basis in order that we should reach a greater number of unemployed in the country. A larger percentage than 45 percent should apply on the unemployment basis. My amendment provides that the apportionment of jobs in the various States shall be made 55 percent, on the basis of unemployed in the States, as compared with the total of unemployed in the Nation, and 35 percent instead of 45 percent to be allocated on the basis of the population in the States as it bears to the total population of the Nation. I need not tell you that we have a really serious condition in many of the States of this Union. This is especially true in my own State, and so it is in many other States of the Nation, particularly the New England States and the North Atlantic States, from which have migrated down through a period of 10 years many of the industries to other parts of the country. The records show this to be so also in other parts of the country.

In the case of California, in the month of March over 140,000 people were on relief; in Illinois, the number on relief was 199,000; in Indiana, 60,000; in Michigan, 86,000; Massachusetts, 73,000; Missouri, 40,000; New York, 313,000; New Jersey, 76,000, and so forth. I mention those figures only to show what the relief loads in these States are in comparison with many of the other States in the Union which have only 2,000 on the relief load; another with 2,000, 3,000, 1,000, 7,000, 6,000, and a number of others, ranging from 2,000 to 5,000, who are on direct relief rolls in those various States. It seems to me that when we stop to consider the large number of industries that have migrated from the New England States, from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and many of the other industrial States of the Union, where the great problem of unemployment is more acute than in any other part of the country, we ought to consider the appointment of these jobs primarily on the basis of unemployment and not on the basis of population. I hope my amendment will prevail.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania rose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I do not appear to give the thought of too much bitterness in my remarks, but it is exceedingly difficult to be without bitterness when you realize that hundreds of people whom you know personally are going to be relegated to the ranks of the unemployed, due to the inadequacy of this appropriation. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], for whom I have genuine admiration, and I say that sincerely, yesterday stood on the floor of the House and spoke of all these people who have communistic tendencies. He tried to make an issue before this body with regard to your vote as to whether or not you approve of these things done by those who possibly had communistic tendencies. I asked the gentleman and he admitted to me that under the provisions of this bill 1,000,000 people would be immediately wiped off the W. P. A. rolls, and the RECORD will show that the gentleman replied in that manner to my question. He stated yesterday that he had read an article in a publication which gave him great concern, an article which spoke of people identified and unidentified who were tainted with the philosophy of or were in sympathy with communism. I am just as much opposed to communism as the gentleman is. I have every reason that the gentleman has to be opposed to communism, just as vigorously as he is opposed to it, and perhaps I have reasons that to me are stronger than the reasons he has are to him. He quoted from that article that communism and agitators thrive on trouble. I read that article, and I was much concerned about it, but I wish to do something to prevent the possibility of communistic agitators influencing the American people. The gentleman from Virginia stated in his remarks that these agitators thrive on trouble and discontent, but he apparently does not realize that in curtailing employment and throwing people on the relief rolls that it likewise creates favorable conditions for these agitators.

What does he think these people are going to do? Does he think these millions of people are going to give a vote of thanks to the Congress of the United States for driving them into the bread lines? Or does he think they are going to

possibly be prey for the agitators? There is no better way of inculcating the doctrines of communism, no better way of making them susceptible to the appeals of the agitators, than depriving them of all hope and saying that the Congress of the United States denies them the right to work.

The gentleman admitted that 1,000,000 people would be laid off immediately, and that, I submit, is a serious matter. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who is holding love feasts back and forth with the gentleman on this side of the aisle, started his remarks about the W. P. A. by demanding repeal of the Wagner Labor Relations Act and of the wage-and-hour law. There you have his philosophy. He does not even believe in the $11 minimum-wage guaranty for the head of an American family. He demanded repeal of that.

No matter how cleverly the gentleman from Virginia constructs his language, no matter how plausible he makes it appear, this bill represents the philosophy of the Republican Party in dealing with the unemployed in this country. When the gentleman from Virginia asks us to believe that this is a Democratic Party measure he knows that is not so. I think he knows that perhaps the President was overconservative, because the President realized from previous experience if he came in with the amount he thought might be necessary it would probably be slashed more than it has been. He asks you to believe that this is a party measure. He knows that if the Republicans did not vote for the provisions in this bill it could never pass this House, because a majority of the members of the Democratic Party do not believe in it. The responsibility rests upon the minority on this side and the Republicans on that side. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, nothing I have said could by the slightest stretch of the imagination imply that I was attributing to the great ranks of the unemployed of this country communistic tendencies. My objection is seeing an organization representing a minute fraction of the unemployed that is under communistic leadership undertaking to wage a great influence in the administration of relief. That is my objection to it. [Applause.] I am trying to protect the unemployed people of this country from being delivered into the power of an organization that is under communistic leadership. [Applause.]

Now, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] says this is not supported by the Democrats and that an overwhelming majority of Democrats are against this, I call attention to the fact that at no time today has an amendment offered against this bill received more than 80 votes. There are some 260 Democrats here. That does not look like an overwhelming majority of the Democrats of this House are against the provisions of this bill. If they are, why are they not voting against it?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to call attention to the fact that the votes defeating the amendments were in the neighborhood of 190 and 200, and there are probably 170 Republicans on that side of the aisle.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; but my friend has got every vote here today that would support his contention. Every one of them is here. He knows that as I know it. The most he has been able to muster today against any substantial amendment to this bill was something less than 100 votes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] undertakes to change the formula. This formula was worked out by the W. P. A. It is for the purpose of trying more equally to distribute unemployment benefits. It is not a committee amendment. It is a provision that was worked out by the W. P. A. designed to help them more equally to distribute the benefits of this amendment.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how many amendments are at the desk with respect to section 1?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman there are pending seven amendments.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I wonder if we may have unanimous consent to fix the debate on just this section and all amendments to the section? We have had liberal debate today on it. There is no effort to cut anybody off, but we would like to make progress.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes. That will give sufficient time for each amendment to be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest that the Chair ascertain how many Members are going to ask for recognition and see what kind of division of time we will get.

The CHAIRMAN. If the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, the Chair would naturally recognize Members who have amendments pending, and the Chair would then feel constrained to recognize any member of the committee who rose in opposition to any one of the pending amendments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time would that give the author of an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the unanimous-consent request is agreed to without further limitation, the Chair would recognize each Member offering an amendment for 5 minutes. There are seven amendments pending.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman whether he will not amend his request and leave out paragraph (g)?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I want to complete consideration of this section, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois. We have been very liberal in debate on this section.

Mr. SABATH. I believe not much time will be taken on any paragraph with the exception of paragraph (g).

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I stand on the request as submitted.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 10 minutes be allowed on paragraph (g).

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia accept the modification of his amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes.

Mr. SIROVICH. Did I understand the Chair to say that this would give each Member 5 minutes for his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. There are seven amendments pending, and the Chair stated that the Chair would recognize the author of each amendment for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Under that arrangement the Chair could recognize the proponent of an amendment for 5 minutes and the opposition for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of any other provision in the unanimous-consent request the Chair will recognize the proponent of the amendment for 5 minutes and a member of the committee requesting recognition in opposition thereto will be recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make that request now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes; that the Chair, in yielding time, recognize the proponents of an amendment for

5 minutes and a member of the committee requesting recognition in opposition for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think the Chair will make difficulty for himself if he announces that limitation. I think control of the time might as well be left to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. It might under other circumstances, but there are seven amendments pending.

Mr. MAPES. Other amendments may be offered, however. I hope the gentleman from Virginia will withdraw his second request.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am willing to leave it to the judgment of the Chair how the time is handled.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SWEENEY: Page 3, line 24, strike out the colon following the word "work" and insert the following: "provided that books necessary to carry out educational projects shall be purchased from American book-publishing concerns whose ownership is exclusively in the hands of American citizens."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in behalf of the International Allied Printing Trades Association of America, an association made up of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union, the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, the International Typographical Union, the International Stereotypers-Electrotypers Union, and the International Photo-Engravers Union. I read the Committee the argument for the amendment in the form of a communication received by me today from the chairman of the board of governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association. The letter reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 16, 1939.*

Hon. MARTIN L. SWEENEY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We appreciate very much your presentation of an amendment to the pending Works Progress Administration appropriation bill, which amendment would specifically provide that books purchased under this appropriation shall be limited to those which are produced and published by concerns which are 100-percent American-owned.

It is our understanding that at the present time one large book publisher, or better said, book distributor, credited with the sale and distribution of 10 percent of the school text and reference books annually sold in the United States is owned, controlled, and dominated by persons living in Great Britain.

We deeply appreciate your friendly attitude to the organized printing-trades workers and wish to thank you for your ever-ready support.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. HAGGERTY,
Chairman, Board of Governors.

Mr. Chairman, I have made a check-up of the facts submitted, and I found from Dr. Alderman, one of the directors of the W. P. A. educational activities, that the books are used in what they call adult-school activities. The W. P. A. is doing a very fine job in education, and have taught 1,500,000 adults to read and write, people who were ignorant and in a low state of literacy before the inauguration of the W. P. A. The point I am coming to is that we are legislating here for Americans. We provide that none but Americans shall be recipients of this work relief, and in my opinion the House should go along with the amendment to assist American industry. I presented the amendment to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in charge of the bill, and presented this letter to him. I think we need not anticipate any opposition from the committee.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does the gentleman understand that under the copyright law there cannot be distributed in this country books published in England or any other country?

Mr. SWEENEY. I can only say to my distinguished friend from New York that here is an organization which on its own responsibility says these reference books used in this country are printed by concerns owned, controlled, and dominated by persons living in Great Britain. That is not Congressman SWEENEY's statement; that is the statement of 150,000 artisans in the printing trades.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. The Committee on Patents, of which I am chairman, deals with the copyright law. A copyright will not be granted for any book that is not printed in the United States. As the gentleman says, British interests may own the books, but they are printed by American citizens.

Mr. SWEENEY. They are printed by concerns dominated by those organizations.

Mr. SIROVICH. But the books are printed by American citizens who work for the companies.

Mr. SWEENEY. I appreciate the gentleman's observation with respect to the copyright law, but we should strengthen it so far as the operations of the W. P. A. educational activities are concerned. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the idea that W. P. A. ought to buy American books as far as it can possibly do so. Frankly, I do not know what the far-reaching consequences of an amendment of this kind may be. The amendment ties them down to buying books from 100-percent American companies. I do not know what books the W. P. A. has to use in their educational program.

Mr. SWEENEY. The gentleman says he does not know.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know.

Mr. SWEENEY. It is a lot of primer spelling books, and books on mathematics, and on history.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it is the kind of an amendment that ought to have some committee consideration. It is a dangerous amendment to put in here. The educational program of the W. P. A. is very large and reaches out into all parts of the country.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. Our copyright law provides that no book published in English in any foreign country may be imported into this country and any books printed in this country, under our copyright law, must be published by American citizens working as American citizens.

Mr. GEYER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEYER of California. May I ask the gentleman this question: If a single share of stock is owned by some foreigner, that would prohibit the purchase of that company's books?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think that is what it would mean, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. We can look into the matter some and see what the situation is.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: On page 4, line 3, after the period, insert *"Provided, however,* That all persons employed on work projects shall, so far as practicable, be employed on projects nearest their respective homes."

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the occasion for this amendment is information which I have received from my State to the effect that people on relief are required to go from their homes in one section of a county, in some cases

clear across the county, 25 to 30 miles, in order to work on a project there while other people living in the neighborhood of that project are compelled to go to the other end of the county to their place of work. The matter has developed into a sort of racket because I am informed that foremen and bosses on these W. P. A. projects are hauling the workers and compelling them to pay out of their meager wages a daily transportation fee.

I submit that such action is not only contrary to common sense but it is criminal, in view of the meager wage which these people receive, every cent of which ought to be conserved for the families of the workers. I believe that this sort of provision should be written into the law in order to prevent the abuses of which I have just spoken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say that I agree with the purposes I think the gentleman has in mind. If it were written into the law, however, would it not have the effect of hamstringing the officials of the W. P. A. in certain instances? For example, suppose there might be one county in the gentleman's district where there were very few W. P. A. projects and then let us suppose that adjacent to that county, several miles distant, there might be several important W. P. A. projects that needed men. Would not his amendment have the effect of interfering with and the prevention of W. P. A. workers who happen to reside in an area where there are few, if any, W. P. A. projects from crossing into the adjoining county and securing work that is very much needed and which at the same time put people to work who are in desperate need of it?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I may say to the gentleman that, in my opinion, that would not be the effect. I have very carefully drawn the amendment to make this a requirement to be followed "so far as is practicable." After all, I realize there has to be a measure of discretion lodged in the management of these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman I think there is very much merit in his suggestion, and I feel that so far as practicable that ought to be done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEWIS of Ohio) there were—ayes 86, noes 74.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOOK: Page 5, line 11, after the word "title", insert:

"(g) Any Administrator or other officer named to have general supervision at the seat of government over the program and work contemplated under the foregoing appropriation and receiving a salary of $5,000 or more per annum from such appropriation, and any State or regional administrator receiving a salary of $5,000 or more per annum from such appropriation shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1761 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any such appointee and the salary of any person so appointed shall not be increased for a period of 6 months after confirmation."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, this is simply an amendment requiring confirmation by the Senate of all administrators of the W. P. A. I think the Republicans should go along with this amendment because they have been continually criticizing the fact that we give up too much of our power. I am asking that the Congress be recognized just a little in this program and that the Senate have the right at least to confirm the appointees.

I have here a letter from the Comptroller General in which he states that this very amendment was included as a part of Public Resolution 47, approved on June 29, 1937.

That was the relief bill of that time. The provision was contained in that act.

The appropriation made by the above resolution was available only to June 30, 1938. The act of June 21, 1938, making an emergency relief appropriation for the fiscal year 1939 did not contain the above requirement as to appointment and confirmation. In the audit of pay rolls prior to July 1, 1938, this office required that there be shown the appointment and confirmation of State and regional administrators receiving $5,000 or more, but since the new Emergency Relief Act did not impose such requirement, this office has not required such a showing with respect to appointments subsequent to June 30, 1938.

I do not know whether the committee deliberately left the provision out of the last bill, but it was contained in the previous bill. I believe we should put it into this bill. I believe we ought to have some little control over those who administer the program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan would certainly throw the W. P. A. right square into the middle of local politics in every State in the Union. It would aggravate all the difficulties we now have where there is political interference with the W. P. A. program. Requiring these administrative officials of high rank to go to some Senator or to some political organization for their right to have an office under the W. P. A. would carry with it political subservience.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. The same thing would apply even to Federal judges.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I do not believe that would apply to Federal judges.

Mr. HOOK. Does the gentleman mean to say they are thrown into politics?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not believe that is a parallel case.

There is considerable opinion to the effect that when we require State W. P. A. administrators to have political endorsements for appointment we aggravate the political interference with the program. I certainly think that. I am sure the gentleman has fine intentions and that his objective is good, but I just believe it certainly would aggravate the difficulties we now have.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 2, line 7, after the colon following the word "law", insert "*Provided*, That no part of the funds hereby made available shall be paid or contributed to any individual or organization which engages in lobbying for an increase in relief appropriations."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, from time to time we have heard condemnation of the practice of lobbying. No one seems to approve of it. Frequently we speak about doing something about it, but it always ends in about the same way; we forget about it.

The situation here is a little different than in any other case. Ordinarily some great organization or some wicked industrialist hires someone to lobby. A few moments ago the gentleman from Virginia was talking about that small group that seems to be under the control of the Communists, some of whom have been present in the galleries the last few days lobbying so that we might know what to do. We have lice that live on plants, we have lice that live on human beings, and we have people that, so 'tis said, put emaciated children out on the streets to solicit money for their support, part of which is taken by those who send the children on their begging mission. Sometimes we learn about the crippled, the blind, the unfortunate being used for the same purpose. We see them sometimes sitting on the streets, and we learn that those for whom they are soliciting, begging, divide the money they collect.

Here we appropriate money to buy the necessities of life, money to provide jobs so that men, women, children may eat, may have shelter, clothing, and here is an organization,

many of the officers of which are Communists, which takes a part of the money we take out of the taxpayers' pocketbook to buy necessities, appropriating a part of that money so they can come here to tell us how to represent our constituents.

There is not a woman or a man in the House but who should know what his people want, and there is no reason on earth why those to whom we furnish money so that they may work, or provide jobs so that they may work, should have a portion of that money taken from them by intimidation or by fraud in order that someone may sit here in the gallery or live over in New York and, when occasion arises and one of these bills comes up, come down here and tell us what to do, threaten us with defeat at the next election, especially if that lobbyist is a Communist, someone who teaches that this Government should be overthrown by force and with the aid of a part of the money we provide teach, as the Communists do, that we have no need of church, that there is no God.

It is to prohibit that kind of thing, to prevent the activities of those human parasites, the lousiest of whom are those who live on the money we are induced here to appropriate for the unfortunate, that I offer this amendment. Money appropriated to make jobs should not be diverted to lobbyists. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I believe the Committee knows how I feel about some of the matters mentioned by the gentleman in his remarks, as well as about the objectives of his amendment. I do not see how you could administer an amendment which states that none of the funds should be used for any organization that asks Congress to increase an appropriation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have only 2 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They go around on the job. They did in my district.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I know what they do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They go around and insist that these men working on jobs pay from 25 to 35 cents a month to the organization, and they tell them, "We will get you more money and will keep your jobs for you."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; but, after all, this is a country in which citizens have a great deal of latitude in the matter of assembly, of speech, of organization, and of asserting their views and presenting their views. I believe you would be going pretty far to undertake by legislative edict to put a penalty on a person if he wanted to come up to Congress and ask that an appropriation be increased.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not mean to interfere at all with the constitutional right of free speech, or of free assembly, or the right to petition the Congress. What I object to is the use of relief money to hire some lobbyist to come here and tell us, who ought to know, what our people want.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I object to it just as much as does the gentleman, but I do not believe the amendment the gentleman offers would accomplish that purpose, and I think it would make confusion worse confounded to try to do it by that route. I think the way we can do it is the way we are doing it now—by getting the thing out and turning the sunlight on it and letting the country see what it is, letting the country see what influences are at work, so that the great unemployed population of America in the far-flung States will know what is happening in the congested centers. Then we can rely upon their patriotism and their intelligence to remedy the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Maybe so. I hope the gentleman is right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what I hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: On page 4, line 4, strike out subsection (c), beginning in line 4 and ending in line 18.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a very drastic overhauling of the work-relief program. Under the heading of Principle features of the joint resolution, the committee report accompanying the bill, on pages 9 and 10 of the report, sets out 19 changes made in the existing law. What some of these changes are and how they affect the work-relief program will be found in the several speeches above referred to.

Mr. Chairman, I knew the morning after the 1938 election—and I predicted in my home papers when I left for Washington on December 1—that work relief would be the major issue of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress. The election returns showed that the Republican Party had almost doubled its membership in the House of Representatives, and I knew that that party was opposed to the work-relief method of dealing with unemployment. This was made clear in the last Congress, in which, when work-relief bills passed the House, they offered motions to recommit the bills to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back with legislation turning unemployment and relief over to the States on a dollar-matching basis, just as in the case of old-age pensions in the Social Security Act. This meant the death of work relief. This meant the dole.

I knew also that in the farming areas of the country and in the South there was opposition to the work-relief program, which made the attitude of their Representatives in Congress, and especially from the South, closely akin to that of the Republican Party. And I knew the joinder of these groups boded no good for the work-relief program.

I was not wrong in saying that when these groups got through with W. P. A., Harry Hopkins and Aubrey Williams would not know it. House Joint Resolution 326 shows that I had underestimated what would be done to W. P. A. My thoughts were only general. The joint resolution furnishes a bill of particulars—a 19-point bill of particulars. Woodrow Wilson's famous 14 points have made more or less trouble in Europe, and the Appropriation Committee's 19 points will do the same thing to W. P. A.

The report shows that by September 1, 1939, 36.3 percent of the present load of 2,700,000 workers are slated to go off the rolls. Nine hundred thousand will go off under the rotating system, cutting off all workers who have been on the job for 18 months or more, and those who, or any member of whose family is getting any other type of public benefits. Earmarking $125,000,000 for P. W. A. will take off 200,000 more. Only a few of the points are used up in effecting the foregoing economy.

This bill should be known as the Economy Act of 1939. It does for the unemployed what the Economy Act of 1933 did for the veterans. What that act did for the veterans actually made Congress a chamber of horrors. It became a nightmare.

I have never experienced, and will never forget, the psychology which pervaded Congress when it became known what the Economy Act of 1933 had done to the veterans. A lot of it was quickly undone. I believe most of the Members who voted for the Economy Act, myself among them, had a good alibi. They did not know it was loaded, although I had my misgivings. The same may be said about the Economy Act of 1939. I think many of them do not know that it is loaded. But when the 1,100,000 begin to unload from the job, and the remainder of the 19 restrictive points go into action, it may be the reaction to the Economy Act of 1933 all over again. But let me be honest about it, in a milder form. It could not be that bad.

In one of my speeches I discussed the new formula for the distribution of employment among the States—the 45-45-10 formula. What will come out of this only time can tell; that is, except one thing—trouble. Trouble will be certain to come out of it.

Another speech discusses the more stringent and higher requirements of sponsor contribution for the types of projects sponsored by States, counties, cities and towns, school districts, and so forth. If it is rigidly carried out it will wipe States, counties, cities, towns, and districts from the W. P. A. map. In that speech I also discussed the limitations of cost of W. P. A. projects. To reverse a line of an old popular song, "Every little bit taken from what you've got leaves a little bit less." This is really the underlying philosophy of the new work-relief program.

What the architects of the new work-relief program would like to do would be to substitute direct for work relief. In England they call it the dole. Naturally, this attitude influenced many of the new provisions in House Joint Resolution 326. This bill is transitional. The Republican motion to recommit the bill tells the rest of the story. It reads as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 326 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the resolution back to the House with the following changes in those parts of the joint resolution relating to relief and its administration by Works Progress Administration: Provide for allocation of funds to States, Territories, and the District of Columbia by grants-in-aid to enable them to carry out the relief programs determined and administered by them, and in which they participate through reasonable financial and other contributions.

The way the relief program would be carried out under the Republican formula would be feet first, just as many of the States have carried out the provisions of the Social Security Act for old-age pensions. Some States pay pensions of $6 to $8, the Federal Government putting up half of this.

However, I want to say this for the Republicans: While they voted solidly for every motion to cut down relief and hog-tie the rest, all present and standing in solid phalanx, and marching up the aisle to a man on a teller count of votes, when the roll was called only 13 of the 160 had the courage of their convictions—less than 10 percent. The others all voted for the bill on the roll call. Now they can go back home with the roll call and show it to the boys with the strong backs and weak heads and come back to Congress again.

It is a great game if you know how to play it. When I was a boy down on a Kansas "claim," living in a sod house, the railroad came through, and a small town sprang up. The town brought a smart but unscrupulous young lawyer, who shocked my youthful concept of the profession by a cynical remark: "John, there are tricks in all trades but ours, and ours is all tricks." I have since acquired a bit of cynicism myself, and when the mood is on I say that politics is a game, and all games are crooked, but politics is the crookedest of all games. The people play this game and expect to get honest government out of it, and they get fooled to the top of their bent.

There is a current saying in politics that the people get what they want. Maybe so. But they either want very little or are a long time getting it. But patience brings its reward. They are going to get the Economy Act of 1939.

ON A MOTION TO STRIKE OUT A PARAGRAPH WHICH ALLOCATES 45 PERCENT OF EACH STATE'S RELIEF MONEY IN THE PROPORTION OF ITS POPULATION TO THE TOTAL POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I am not offering this amendment to strike out the paragraph because I expect it to be adopted, and I am not offering it because I understand the paragraph and am able to put up a convincing argument against it. I am offering it because I do not understand it and because I know there are not 5 percent of the Members of the House who understand this formula with respect to the apportionment of relief employment among the States; and what they do not know about this paragraph applies to a good many other paragraphs in this complex bill.

I have studied this bill very carefully. I have studied it with a lead pencil, and in my opinion it is a very skillfully constructed piece of legislation. This is a bill of formulas, and intricate formulas. This bill really makes W. P. A. somewhat of an aristocrat. It has lifted it from the sphere of simple arithmetic into the realm of higher mathematics. There is not any use for a Congressman to read this bill to find out how it will affect the unemployed in his district; he will have to go to an expert in the W. P. A. to find that out.

In my opinion, there are more headaches in this bill than in any piece of legislation enacted since Roosevelt was elected President, with the exception of the Economy Act of 1933. This is an economy act for the unemployed. It will do to them what the first Economy Act did to the veterans.

This bill is loaded, but many gentlemen will not find it out until it explodes in their faces. It will not simply throw 1,100,000 workers out in the streets between now and Christmas, but it is so wound up in formulas that it is not any wonder that the Works Progress Administration states that it will virtually wreck the works-progress program. If it were especially designed for that purpose, it could not be more effectively constructed than it is.

I want to make this one statement if I do not have time to say anything more about this paragraph: It is absolutely in violation not only of the whole philosophy of relief but of the need basis of relief, which was the original and sole basis for setting up a relief program, beginning with C. W. A. and continuing through F. E. R. A. and W. P. A.

Under this formula employment is not based on need and unemployment. The first 45 percent is based on population, the proportion of State to National population, and that might absorb all the unemployed in some of the States, whereas it would not absorb half of the unemployed in other States.

Conditions are very dissimilar. I happen to have a county in my congressional district that has never had a person on relief in the last 10 years. They never had any W. P. A. projects because they had nobody to work on them. I have another county in my district in which at one time as high as 60 percent of the population were on relief. A State like New York has an unemployment load of about 13 percent of the unemployed of the Nation, but it has not 13 percent of the population.

It is the same with Pennsylvania. Under this formula both of these States would sustain heavy reductions, whereas a State like Virginia would get a large increase in W. P. A. employment.

The next 45 percent is based on unemployment, the proportion of the unemployed in the State to the national total. The remaining 10 percent is at the discretion of the Administrator to meet emergencies. The whole 90 percent ought to be allocated on the basis of unemployment and need. Not only has the very basis and reason for relief been need and unemployment from the start, but in this bill it is sought to make it as mandatory as language can upon the administration of relief to employ numerous new needs tests laid down in the legislation before a person can get on W. P. A. or stay on after he gets on.

This population quota is in contradiction of the basic theory of this whole bill. Here is a formula which says that a State must be allotted 45 percent of its Federal relief money on its population basis, even if it has to scrape up every person in the State who could possibly qualify for relief, while another State might have such an unemployed relief roll that its population and unemployed quotas combined would not take care of it. I have already cited the cases of New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

This inequality runs more or less through all the States. It seems to have been in the mind of the committee framing this bill that it must be upon an entirely new theory in all respects.

In my judgment, even though I understood the gentleman from Virginia to say a while ago that the Administrator favored this formula, I do not believe anyone can tell how it will work. Why should we have a population basis of nearly half for the distribution of relief regardless of unemployment and financial conditions in the State? The answer to that question alone would be sufficient justification for striking this paragraph out of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado suggests there is something vaguely insidious about this provision and that it is a veiled attempt to wreck the works program and that it is loaded with various and numerous headaches. I am willing to admit the latter part of his allegation, because I have had some of those headaches and the committee has had them and we have been studying that question since the first day the Congress met.

The paradoxical part of this thing, however, is that the provision to which the gentleman objects is verbatim, 100 percent, the recommendation of the Works Progress Administration and the President. So certainly no one can lay at the hands of the committee an attempt to wreck the program, because here we have taken the formula that the Budget sent up and that the President recommended, and one that they say will enable them more equitably to distribute the benefits of unemployment relief.

So I do not see the force of the argument that my friend makes and, certainly, if this provision wrecks the program, then those gentlemen have pulled the house down on their own heads.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLER: On page 4, line 25, strike out "$6" and insert in lieu thereof "$17."

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING: Page 4, line 6, after the word "States", insert a comma and the following: "Territories, possessions."

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered, which the Clerk has just read, would apply to the Territories and possessions the formula contained in subsection c of section I of the pending joint resolution making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940. As this section reads now, the formula is limited to the 48 States and the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions are excluded from its provisions.

I took this matter up with the ranking minority leader and the distinguished gentleman who has charge of the bill on the floor, and neither had any objection to my amendment. But the W. P. A. officials advised the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that they object to my proposal and that they prefer to take care of the employment needs of the Territories and possessions under the provisions of subparagraph 3, which states that 10 percent of the total number employed shall be at the discretion of the Works Projects Board. This is exactly what I do not want to happen. The formula, as has been stated by previous speakers, has been carefully worked out by the Bureau of the Budget and by the W. P. A. administrators as being a fair and equitable method of apportioning W. P. A. employment over the several States. And if that is so, then it is equally fair and equitable for the Territories and possessions.

The only argument raised against applying the same rule to the Territories and possessions as will be used in providing relief employment in the several States is that our conditions are different. There are no grounds for this argument. Unemployment conditions in the Territories are similar to the situation in the several States, and if the number of persons who will be afforded relief employment on the mainland is to be determined by a fixed formula, the same principle should apply to Territories and possessions.

I sincerely hope that the committee will adopt the amendment I have offered in order that not only the territory I represent—Hawaii—but also Alaska and Puerto Rico may come under the same ruling as the 48 States. Those of us who represent here in Congress communities that are not sovereign States have this recurrent difficulty. We have had a hard time in the past to convince the membership of Congress that the United States is not restricted to the continental area comprising the 48 States, but also extends to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Perhaps the 29 States that were Territories at one time, before they were admitted into the Union, had the same experience in the past, but they are now full-fledged members of the Union and there is no longer any Territory on the mainland. But I feel certain that if there were an incorporated Territory on the mainland there would not be any question of leaving its unemployment-relief problem to the discretion of the W. P. A. officials. The same formula that is to be used as a basis for employment for the several States would undoubtedly extend to any mainland Territory if such existed. By the same token, if Hawaii were situated on the mainland, there would not be any doubt at all that the provision in subparagraphs 1 and 2 of subsection c would be applicable to Hawaii and its people. The provision contained in subparagraph 1 that 45 percent of the total number employed would be determined by the ratio which the population of Hawaii bears to the total population of the United States as shown by the latest available Federal census would undoubtedly apply to the Territory if it were located within a mainland area. The other provision in subparagraph 2 that 45 percent of the total number employed would be determined by the ratio which the number of unemployed persons in each State bears to the total number of unemployed in all States would likewise apply. This would leave to the discretion of the W. P. A. only 10 percent of the total number employed, as provided in subparagraph 3.

Because of our insular position the argument is made that our conditions are different. But our geographical location does not affect the unemployment situation. Our complaint in the past has been based on the very fact that the W. P. A. had treated us differently from the mainland.

I would like to quote a concurrent resolution adopted by our legislature, recently in session, which I have here, which protests that the administration of the W. P. A. in Hawaii is not satisfactory to the people of the Territory, and which asks that the W. P. A. activities in Hawaii be returned to civilian jurisdiction, which was the case prior to 1938:

Whereas the Congress and the national administration have repeatedly recognized the status of the Territory of Hawaii as an integral part of the United States and entitled to treatment by the Federal Government in all respects on equality with the several States; and

Whereas the said Territory has ever since its voluntary annexation in 1898 more than paid its way as said integral part of the United States, having contributed in the 1938 fiscal year to the Federal Treasury internal-revenue collections of over $14,000,000, or more than any 1 of 15 of the States; and

Whereas the control of the Works Progress Administration in Hawaii, after having been efficiently and honestly handled by civilian control, has been transferred to the United States Army, as has been done in no other State or Territory; and

Whereas said transfer is regarded by the civil population of Hawaii as not constituting treatment of the Territory on a basis of equality with the States but as constituting discrimination against the Territory and its 400,000 civil population, and as a virtual repudiation of the heretofore recognized status of the Territory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That a vigorous protest be entered on behalf of the people of Hawaii against said transfer of control of the Works Progress Administration in the Territory to the United States Army and that the officials responsible for said transfer be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to rescind said transfer order and return said administration in Hawaii to civil control.

Resolved, That properly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America; Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; Col. F. C. Harrington, National Administrator of the Works Progress Administration; Hon. WILLIAM H. KING, Senator from Utah, chairman of the Joint Committee on Hawaii; Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Senator from Maryland, chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs; Hon. LEX GREEN, Congressman from Florida, chairman of the House Committee on Territories, and to Hon. SAMUEL WILDER KING, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

It has been difficult to convince W. P. A. officials that we have an unemployment problem in Hawaii. Unfortunately, too many people consider that Hawaii, because on the whole it has been a prosperous community, has no one in need of relief employment. Such an assumption is entirely untrue. We have a serious unemployment problem. The W. P. A. has been a great help in solving this situation in the past, but we have been entirely dependent upon executive discretion and have had to accept from the W. P. A. officials their decision on the projects approved and the allocation of funds, with practically no voice in determining what is suitable to our needs. I would like Congress to include Hawaii in its supervision over the apportionment of W. P. A. relief to the Territory in the same manner as Congress is prescribing how relief employment shall be apportioned to the several States, and leave to Executive discretion no greater latitude in Hawaii than it has in the several States. I feel, having been elected to Congress for three successive terms, that I am better able to speak for the people of my Territory than the W. P. A. Administrator is, and I know I voice their sentiments when I urge that Congress extend the formula prescribed in subsection c to my community.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. DIMOND. If this formula set forth in subsection (c) is good for the States, is there any conceivable reason under the sun why it should not apply to the Territories, inasmuch as the residents of the Territories are citizens of the United States just as much as are the residents of the States?

Mr. KING. Absolutely.

Mr. DIMOND. If anybody is going to be helped out, can the gentleman conceive of any reason why the citizens of the Territories should be put off from work relief, when the committee has extended it to the people of the States?

Mr. KING. None whatever. One can starve just as easily in Alaska and Hawaii and Puerto Rico as one can in any one of the States of the Union.

May I point out that Hawaii has had lower per capita expenditures through W. P. A. allocations than any one of the 48 States, Puerto Rico being the only community with a lower per capita cost for W. P. A. activities? It is also true that a smaller percentage of our population has been furnished with relief employment than any one of the several States. Unfortunately the W. P. A. makes this an argument to support the contention that our unemployment problem is less than on the mainland. This is true in regard to some communities, but the reason we have had a smaller number on the relief rolls and a lower per capita cost is because the W. P. A. has not granted us as full a measure of relief employment as they have elsewhere.

It is also true that the wages paid by the W. P. A. in Hawaii in comparison with our prevailing rates are lower than in any mainland community. I feel that these circumstances justify my asking Congress to limit the discretion of the W. P. A. executives, just as it is limiting it in the States.

I have a concurrent resolution from our legislature, which I would like to quote at this point:

Whereas since the change of control of the Works Progress Administration in the Territory of Hawaii from civilian to Army administration, the number of persons employed on civilian projects has been consistently reduced until there are now only 2,747 persons, or 0.715 percent of the population of the Territory, consisting of 384,400 persons, employed by said Works Progress Administration upon such projects; and

Whereas if the 1,245 additional persons employed by said Administration upon Army and Navy projects in the Territory be added, still only 1.04 percent of the population of the Territory are employed by such Administration; and

Whereas in no State of the Union is so small a percentage of population employed by the Works Progress Administration; and

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is an integral part of the United States of America and its people are entitled to enjoy the benefits of Government equally with their fellow citizens who are residents of the several States; and

Whereas owing to the low prices received for sugar and pineapples, the Territory's major sources of income, and the accelerated cost of producing such sugar and pineapples, unemployment is increasing in the Territory at an alarming rate; and

Whereas the finances of the public-welfare organizations have been strained to the uttermost and the list of applicants for relief has grown to such proportions that even minimum relief must be denied to hundreds of persons; and

Whereas the Territory, through the great reduction of its revenue, is having difficulty in balancing its budget and making even minimum provisions for the relief of the unemployed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Works Progress Administration be, and it is hereby, urgently requested promptly to increase the number of persons employed by it within the Territory of Hawaii, commensurate with the need existing here and with the relief furnished in the several States of the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii is requested to use his best efforts to secure such increased employment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Works Progress Administrator in Washington, D. C., to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

The Territories are never overlooked when national legislation is passed, levying various taxes and burdens on the people of the United States as a whole. We in Hawaii meet all of the Federal taxes which our fellow citizens on the mainland are required to meet; we obey all of the national laws, such as the wage and hour law, and the various phases of the Social Security Act; we meet every obligation of our American citizenship and our status as an incorporated Territory of the United States. We share with the rest of the country every responsibility and burden of American citizenship. However, when benefits are being granted to the various States we are often—perhaps inadvertently—overlooked. I have had to appeal to the leadership of Congress to rectify these oversights and I do want to say that I have always received a sympathetic hearing when I have called attention to these omissions. In the bill now pending I feel that Congress should place the Territories on the same basis as the mainland because of the fundamental principle for which we have continuously worked—that nothing in our system of government justifies treating a Territory differently from the rest of the country.

May I also call attention to the special situation in Puerto Rico where unemployment is a tragic problem? Congress recently adopted in the amendments to the Social Security Act special provisions for the people of Puerto Rico. The committee report accompanying the pending resolution also calls attention to the great distress in Puerto Rico. I am sure the application of this formula to that island would be a great help to the people of Puerto Rico and I ask that my amendment extending the provisions of subsection c to the Territories and possessions be adopted by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Hawaii has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the Delegate from Alaska for 2 minutes.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, when I first read the provisions of subsection (c), which sets up this formula for the distribution of relief money as applied to the States, and makes no provision with respect to the Territories, for the moment I was under the illusion that it was not George VI but the shade of George III who recently visited us, because this is discrimination against the Territories and possessions in the worst sense of the word on the theory that they are mere colonies and not entitled to equal treatment. George III had some such idea.

Now, it will be said that we can be taken care of as a matter of gift, or grace, or bounty, out of the 10 percent of the money that is left within the discretion of the Works Progress Administration or its successor, to pay out as it pleases; but I know and you know that on account of the burden of relief in many sections of the country there is hardly a chance in the world that the Territories can be adequately provided for or will be sufficiently taken care of out of that 10 percent. I say to you, as the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KING] has said, if this formula is good for the States, with all the divergency of population, with all the differences in relief loads—one of which was stated by the gen-

tleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN], showing that in one county there was none on relief and in another county 80 percent were on relief—I say, if this formula is good and suitable for the people of the States, where one State has an overwhelming relief load and another has little, then it is just as good for the people of the Territories and possessions, the citizens of which are citizens of the United States just the same as are the citizens of the States.

We of the Territories did not ask for this formula whereby of the employment that may be given under the appropriation carried in the bill now under consideration 45 percent will be based on the population ratio, 45 percent on the unemployment ratio, and the remaining 10 percent be allocated by the Administrator, or the Board, at his or their discretion. It is my understanding that the formula was devised by some of the officials of the Works Progress Administration. We would have been content to proceed under the system heretofore in force wherein allocations of relief funds have been made upon need as shown to the Administrator. But the committee has placed before us the formula contained in subsection (c), which is to be applied only to the States and to the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions have been excluded. That exclusion cannot be justified by any sound theory of law or administration or relief assistance. For it must have occurred to every Member that there are the same differences and divergencies among the States themselves as to population and as to unemployment as exist between the States on the one hand and the Territories and possessions on the other. If the Territories and possessions are to be excluded from the coverage of subsection (c), then some of the States similarly situated with respect to population and to unemployment should be also excluded. But no one thinks of excluding any of the States from the benefits or provisions of this subsection. No one would dare to suggest any such thing. The Members in the House from the States have votes. And each State is represented by two Members in the Senate who would see to it that no legislation is passed which discriminates against that State.

Unfortunately, the Territories, although States in embryo, have no votes in this body and no representation in the Senate. So I have seen in my service here a long succession of bills brought in, applying in benefits only to the States, and excluding the Territories, and frequently it has been only after arduous and difficult labor and effort that the Territories and possessions are embraced in such legislation by amendment. However, there is one class of legislation in which the Territories and possessions are always included in the first instance, and that is legislation which imposes taxation of any kind. There is not the slightest danger that the Territories will ever be omitted or excluded from a tax bill.

Even if the amendment now proposed by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KING] to have the Territories and possessions embraced in the formula for distribution of relief employment set out in subsection (c) would result in the grant of less in the way of relief to Alaska than we would otherwise receive, I should still favor the amendment, for the principle that the citizens of the Territories should be in all respects treated as the citizens of the States is of great consequence to me and to the people of Alaska. We ardently wish to share in all things—the benefits and the burdens, the grants and the taxes, the good fortune and the evil fortune, the dangers, the hazards, the responsibilities, and, at the same time, the advantages, the gains, and the measure of security—with the citizens of the States. We not only wish this equal treatment but we demand it, and our demand is supported by the fundamental principles of good administration, of right, and of justice.

Therefore, I say to you that this amendment by all means ought to be adopted in order to extend full justice to the citizens of the Territories. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am very grateful for the words that have been expressed by the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING] and the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

Puerto Rico is more needy than any Territory in the United States. The chairman of the committee says in his report, referring to Puerto Rico:

> The economic situation in Puerto Rico continues to be serious, the island economy being dependent on three crops; namely, sugar, coffee, and tobacco. The income from these crops and the business supplemental thereto is not sufficient to support the burdens of the island. Existing bad conditions have been greatly aggravated during the present fiscal year.
>
> To say that the situation in Puerto Rico is distressing is putting it mildly, and it is further complicated by an annual increase in population of approximately 40,000 in a small area where 1,800,000 persons already reside.
>
> The program recommended contemplates a continuation of the program of rural rehabilitation which has been carried on during the current and preceding fiscal years.

Mr. Chairman, we are seeking, asking, and requesting the Congress of the United States to pass this amendment proposed by the Delegate from Hawaii in behalf of the Territories and possessions.

I thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there certainly is no thought other than to be perfectly fair and liberal with the Territories and possessions. So far as Puerto Rico is concerned, we have a separate item of $7,000,000 in this bill, in addition to the W. P. A. program.

With reference to the formula as it might affect the Territories, we are told by the W. P. A. that because of the entirely different economic situation and because of the entirely different unemployment situation, that formula would not be applicable to the Territories and possessions.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KING. I would like to say that I disagree with the W. P. A. entirely. The economic situation and the unemployment situation in Hawaii is exactly the same as in any other agricultural State of the Union.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I appreciate my friend's statement about that. I am sure of his very deep interest in Hawaii.

Mr. DIMOND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. I want to assure the gentleman that the situation in Alaska is just the same as it is in many, many of the States. Our unemployment is about 20 percent. It is not so much in the summertime, but in winter it is so. If this formula does not apply to Alaska, I am very apprehensive that we will have no adequate relief.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This is the formula worked out by the W. P. A. They tell us that under the 10 percent discretionary part of the formula they can and will take care of the Territories and possessions.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the gentleman that the Territory is entirely dissatisfied with the manner in which W. P. A. has been taking care of the unemployment problem in the past 2 years. That was a great issue in the campaign of last fall on which I was elected. So I can assure the gentleman that I would much prefer to have it written into the bill, using the same argument that the gentleman himself made on the matter of the $50,000,000 river and harbor item. I would like to see it in the law.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is very persuasive. All I know about it is what the W. P. A. has told the committee, and we have handed that to the House. I bring that information to the House. They feel strongly that the Territories and possessions should not be included.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Delegate from Hawaii.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia) there were ayes 114 and noes 42.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 8, after the figure "1", strike out "forty-five" and insert "thirty"; in line 11, after the figure "2", strike out "forty-five" and insert 'fifty"; and in line 14, after the figure "3", strike out "ten" and insert "twenty."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I am not so wanting in practical knowledge and experience to think that in the limited time that has been given me to discuss this amendment, the time having already been spoken for, as to believe that I can override this committee who are advocating the present formula. But I cannot sit idly by and see this, another injustice, done to the needy of my section, as well as to other sections of the country.

Now let us see what we have here. When I first read this appropriation bill, which was not available until yesterday, I scanned it to see if there was any provision made to correct the present injustice in distribution of these funds, in the first place; and whether there was any provision made for correcting the injustice in the rate of pay to the workers whereby my section has always suffered. I found the formula in the bill providing that the money was to be distributed upon a ratio basis of 45 percent according to population, 45 percent according to need and unemployment, and giving the other 10 percent to the discretionary power of the Works Progress Administration. My first inclination was that this might remedy the situation and give my State and other States similarly situated, particularly in the South, a fairer and more equitable distribution of the funds to be made available. But, being inquisitive, I got in touch with an assistant administrator of the W. P. A. and its statistician and found to my amazement and disgust that rather than helping that situation the proposed formula but aggravated it. For instance, States like Pennsylvania and New York, which have been getting the lion's share of these appropriations in the past both on a basis of population and need, would increase their rolls under the formula of 45-45-10; and States like Mississippi would have to decrease their rolls.

To be specific, Pennsylvania, which in 1937 received more money from the W. P. A. than 11 Southern States with a total population of approximately three times as many as Pennsylvania, would get an increase of 7,000 additional W. P. A. workers on the present basis under this formula. New York would gain 48,000 recipients of relief under this formula over its present quota, while some of the poorer States like Mississippi would lose 5,800 workers from the rolls and New Mexico would lose 2,900. So instead of helping our situation, so far as those of us who represent the less densely populated States are concerned, we again lose.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I propose of 30 percent on population, 50 percent on needy, giving 20 percent to the W. P. A. to be used in their discretion to equalize the ratio, would, in my opinion—with the brief opportunity I have had to study it—materially remedy the situation. I am informed by the W. P. A. officials that this amendment would be more equitable and give them a better opportunity to do the job than the present formula in the bill. So I submit this amendment for your consideration, and I here and now predict that if this amendment is not adopted either the whole formula will be stricken out when the bill is considered at the other end of the Capitol or a new formula will be substituted. Certainly almost anything would be an improvement over the present formula.

And in this connection, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of this body to some very pertinent facts. In doing so I want to disavow any intention or desire to appear sectional or selfish in my remarks. But as one who has repeatedly voted for these gigantic appropriations, running into the billions of dollars, that have been sponsored by this Democratic administration, I am getting wearied of being continuously asked to support these programs with their billions of dollars of expenditures when always my section is discriminated against in the distribution of these funds. I should dislike very much to charge that there had been politics on a national scale in this matter, but the fact remains that our section, which has always been the bulwark, in season and out of season, of the party now in power, does not receive the same generous treatment at the hands of this administration as do some of the States who are not so uniform in their adherence to a particular party. For instance, it has been repeatedly called to the attention of the Congress that the 11 Southern States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, with a total population of 28,761,024, had expended within their boundaries by the W. P. A. during the fiscal year 1937, $210,750,000. While Pennsylvania, with a population of 9,631,350, received in the same period $214,565,000.

In other words, Pennsylvania with a population of practically one-third as many as these 11 Southern States received approximately $4,000,000 more from this fund for relief purposes in 1937 than did these 11 Southern States. And these illustrations of disparagement might be carried on indefinitely.

WAGE DIFFERENTIALS

But this is only one phase of the matter. The President about a year ago held the South up as economic problem No. 1 of the Nation. Following that he called upon the Congress to enact a wage and hour law with a minimum-hour scale and a minimum-wage scale that would apply throughout the country. I voted for this wage and hour law. While that bill to increase the wages and limit the hours was under consideration by the committee last year we were called upon to enact another $2,000,000,000 relief bill. During the consideration of that relief bill on the floor I offered an amendment to the bill which would have eliminated all wage differentials in the relief set-up between the various classes of workers in the various sections of the country. I called the attention of the House to the fact then in the consideration of my amendment that we would in a period of a few days consider the wage and hour bill, and that that bill provided that there should be no differential paid between workers in the South and other parts of the country. I argued to this House that if there should be no differential in private employment then the Federal Government, which was sponsoring the wage and hour bill, should certainly not establish differentials in the scale of wages to be paid by the W. P. A. My amendment failed and the wage-and-hour bill was passed. Then the same Government that said that private industry had to pay a uniform minimum wage throughout the country also said that there should be differentials paid in various sections of the country under the W. P. A.

Mr. Chairman, we will again be faced with that proposition in a few hours when we consider the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] seeking to equalize these wage scales throughout the country. Of course, I expect to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Georgia, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I hope that my colleagues will do likewise. The amendment of the gentleman from Georgia does not seek to do away entirely with differentials, as I should like to see done, but which I know from past experience this House will not do, but it does provide that these differentials should not be as broad and drastic as they have been under past administration of the appropriation acts for the W. P. A. How can anyone who desires to be fair, justify a wage scale of from 20 to 30 cents an hour for unskilled labor in Georgia and 20 to 40 cents in Mississippi, with a scale of 31 cents to $1.02½ in Illinois and 46½ cents to 93 cents in New York for the same type of labor?

Mr. Chairman, only a few days ago I tried to remedy a similar situation with reference to pensions for our needy

aged when we had under consideration the social-security bill. I made the best fight I knew how to make to equalize the pensions that are being paid as a result of Federal funds contributed for our aged needy. But that too was defeated.

I have no desire, as I said in the beginning, to appear sectional, but it would appear that some other people are practicing sectionalism. I do not know how far we who represent these less favored sections can be expected to continue to go along with this unjust, unreasonable, and illogical set-up of proration and distribution of Federal funds. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to find out something from which my native State will get a little benefit. I did not know it was here, if the gentleman's statement be correct. I am frank to say that I cannot exactly figure this formula; I did not attempt to do so; but from the way the gentleman interprets it, we could only figure, with a factor of 30 assigned to total population, that the State of Mississippi would get less out of it instead of more.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I do not see how we could get any less; we have only 5,800 under the present set-up.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the gentleman's formula would cut it down.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I merely give the W. P. A. more discretion in the matter. I will say to the gentleman, frankly, that I do not know whether it will work out or not, but they tell me down there that it will work out better than the formula in the bill, and I am relying upon their statement.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This is a formula they brought to the committee, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The great advantage of this is that it reduces the number that would go to Mississippi. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think that would be the effect of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does it increase the number going to Massachusetts? [Laughter.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I hope so, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 35, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this section having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. (a) In order to provide assistance to needy young persons, there is hereby appropriated to the National Youth Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, $81,000,000, and such sum shall be available for (1) administration; (2) the prosecution of projects approved by the President for the National Youth Administration under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938; and (3) to provide, subject to the approval of the President, on projects, Federal and non-Federal, of the types specified under section 1 hereof for the Works Progress Administration, part-time work and training to needy young persons who are no longer in regular attendance at school and who have been unable to obtain employment, and to enable needy young persons to continue their education at schools, colleges, and universities.

(b) The Administrator of the National Youth Administration shall fix the monthly earnings and hours of work for youth workers engaged on work projects of such administration financed in whole or in part from the appropriation in this section, but such determination shall not have the effect of establishing a national average labor cost per youth worker on such projects during the fiscal year 1940 substantially different from the national average labor cost per such worker on such projects prevailing at the close of the fiscal year 1939.

(c) Not to exceed 4 percent of the amount made available in this section may be used for administration.

(d) The National Youth Administration is hereby extended until June 30, 1940, to carry out the purposes of this title.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Page 8, line 3, strike out the figure "4" and insert "5."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to make available a greater amount of money for administrative expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS: Page 7, line 6, strike out "$81,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$123,000,000."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely carries the amount recommended by the President and the Budget. The committee reduced the Budget estimate from $123,000,000 to $81,000,000.

The committee contend that this is $6,000,000 more than N. Y. A. had for the fiscal year which will end the 30th of this month. Let us see if this squares with the facts. Seventy-five million dollars was allotted for N. Y. A.

Approximately five and a half million dollars more were allotted by the W. P. A. for administrative expenses. In addition there was an unexpended balance of $760,000. All of which totals $81,260,000. In other words, the amount recommended by the committee is substantially the same as the N. Y. A. had at its disposal for the fiscal year that ends on the 30th of this month.

With reference to the necessity for the increase, one-third of the unemployed persons of this country are between the ages of 16 and 24 years. I have gone along with the committee's recommendations and all recommendations in the past for W. P. A. appropriations. In this bill approximately one and one-half billion dollars is recommended for the W. P. A. for two-thirds of the unemployed people in this country. What is being proposed with regard to the other one-third? They are given $81,000,000, the two-thirds to be given 20 times as much as the unemployed one-third.

Mr. Chairman, bear in mind that this pitiful sum of $81,000,000 is not to be spent for relief but is to be spent in qualifying these young men and women to pursue a vocation in life so that they will not become relief workers but instead will have a vocation which will enable them to earn a living for themselves and their families. I submit that the increase of $42,000,000 proposed by my amendment, which is the amount recommended by the President of the United States, should certainly be granted to the unemployed one-third of the people of this country.

The type of work that these boys are doing is of the highest. I submit to you that the work that each one of these youngsters turns out is larger in amount and more valuable in dollars and cents than that done by any W. P. A. worker. Ask anyone who knows if this is not a fact; and they receive only about one-sixth as much as a W. P. A. worker and one-tenth as much as a C. C. C. employee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, we have in this House, sitting in the front row, a young man from Texas. At the age of 25 years he has gained membership in this honorable body. That young man was an N. Y. A. student. Statistics will show, not only from my State but from all the States of the Union, that N. Y. A. students are more than average in

scholarship and ability. Ninety percent of those who have the opportunity to graduate from college are honor graduates. They are workers, not drones.

Some of you may think it is a brave act to fight relatively small appropriations to aid young men and women to go to school and by your vote keep them in idleness. Gentlemen, it is not an act of courage to vote against youngsters in the high schools and colleges, young men and women who yet cannot vote. I warn the Members of the House if they cut the pitiful sum recommended by the President of the United States, they are striking at a crowd of young people in this country who ought to be aided in their desire to go to school or to learn a vocation.

If the flag that flies on the dome of this building is ever torn down and another form of government supplants ours, it is not going to be done by W. P. A. workers, it is not going to be done by old men; it is going to be done by the youth of the country, by young men and women who believe they have been neglected or have been denied a square deal.

I appeal to you as a lifelong, conservative Democrat, as one who has labored nearly 20 years in this Congress, as one who has always been on the side of reduction in appropriations, to grant this pitiful increase so that worthy American boys and girls may be given the opportunity to live and learn. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. RABAUT and Mr. MARTIN of Colorado objected.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that several other gentlemen have risen since I propounded the original request, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour. I would like to have the last 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will all the Members who have amendments at the Clerk's desk be given an opportunity to present their amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will, insofar as the Chair is able, try to meet the situation as fairly and as equitably as possible. The Chair will feel constrained, however, to divide the time among the Members seeking recognition and will endeavor to recognize Members who have pending amendments.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want the chairman to note I was on my feet asking for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is aware of the fact that the gentleman is on his feet and is also aware of the fact that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] consulted the Chair some time ago.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I certainly would like to get 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that he will not be able to recognize any Member for the full 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, then I object.

Mr. RABAUT. I object.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEALEY. May I ask how many Members have requested time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has a list of 29 names of Members who desire time, and there are three amendments at the desk. The Chair will recognize each Member for 1¾ minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 1¾ minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the farce that is involved in trying to discuss the welfare of the young men and young women of our districts in a minute and three-fourths; nevertheless, I simply make this appeal in all earnestness, that the best investment this Congress can make is an investment in the welfare of the young men and young women of our country. The very welfare of our country depends on them. They are the generation that is going to carry on after we are gone. Let us forget party politics, let us forget the false economy-minded proposition we have had before us all day, let us forget the bitterness of the debate we have had this afternoon, and let us just do some thinking of our young men and women. Let us give them a break. They need it. By all means they deserve it. [Applause.]

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from New York and the House to the fact that if we agree to the amendment increasing the appropriation to $123,000,000 we can take care of only one out of every six deserving cases that have been certified; and we Members of Congress are given only a minute and a half to discuss the welfare of the youth of the Nation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is mistaken. It is a minute and three-quarters. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to make a few remarks in support of the amendment restoring the National Youth Administration appropriation to the President's original figure of $123,000,000 in order to provide for needy boys and girls who have no means of completing their education without Government assistance.

The ideal of universal education has always prevailed in this country, and I believe that any boy or girl who is willing to work for an education deserves to get one, but it is not just the problem of educating our poorer young men and women which confronts us now; it is also the problem of keeping them off of the unemployment roles.

The $42,000,000 cut in the N. Y. A. appropriation will mean thousands of deserving boys and girls will never complete their education, but it means more than that. It means that thousands of boys and girls will be walking the streets looking for jobs which do not exist; will fall prey to idleness and discouragement before they have even started on their careers. Many will, perhaps, find work at very low salaries and thus throw men with families and dependents out of jobs. There is no surer way of increasing our present relief roles, of increasing our crime problem, and of lowering the morale of the Nation as a whole than by turning these thousands of young people with good minds and great energy out on the streets to do nothing when they might be increasing their opportunities in life by receiving a sound and complete education.

The testimony of educators in my district and throughout my State bears out what I am saying to you here today. The heads of colleges in my district and State know what fine work the N. Y. A. is doing, because they see the tangible results of that work in successful students with fine scholastic records who are able to attend school only because the Government helps them to do so by providing them with jobs.

I believe that no one will hurl the charge of extravagance at the National Youth Administration. The salaries paid to boys and girls who work for the N. Y. A. are small, and proportionately they do perhaps more good than any other money expended by the Government.

The importance of this question is borne out by the great public interest which is being displayed. Letters and telegrams are pouring into the congressional offices urging that the work of the N. Y. A. not be curtailed. Only a few moments ago several telegrams were handed to me from public-spirited citizens of Alexandria, La., who were urging that the

$123,000,000 appropriation be passed. Among these interested citizens are Messrs. J. I. Barron, L. M. Lewis, Rollo C. Lawrence, D. L. Glasscock, C. P. Derveloy, and Joe W. Pitts.

Several civic leaders of Farmerville, La., have wired in interest of the full amount requested by the President, namely, Messrs. L. A. Byrom, Carl Miller, Charles Gulley, H. C. Malone, and J. W. Gilliam. Messrs T. I. Head, R. V. Reeves, O. E. Huey, and Oscar Albritton, interested citizens of Oak Grove, La., have wired in behalf of the N. Y. A., as have Messrs. E. G. Brown and J. B. Thompson, of Rayville, La., and Mr. John L. McDuff, of Winnsboro, La.

Interest has also been displayed in this bill in wires from Mr. Fred G. Thatcher, vice president of the Ouachita Parish School Board; Mr. S. D. McBride, president of the Jackson Parish School Board; Mr. J. U. Douciere, president of the Richland Parish School Board; and Mr. R. L. Reese, a professor at Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston, La.

I further have received requests by wire from citizens of Jonesville, La., Messrs. L. Yancey, J. H. Kitchens, H. C. Owen, Henry Uttinger, W. P. Foster, I. R. Wurster, A. M. Beard, J. H. Young, E. Young, and Roy Brown, that the full amount asked by the President be appropriated for the N. Y. A.

Mr. Chairman, each and every one of the boys and girls who are attending school on N. Y. A. jobs is a potential asset to this great country. These boys and girls who are working for and receiving educations today will be tomorrow enlightened citizens with habits of industry and with skills which will enable them to earn a respectable place for themselves in society. If we take these jobs away from these young people, if we deny them the education so necessary in this highly competitive age, will they be assets to their Nation without training, without jobs, without that sense of accomplishment with which they are now endowed? The future of these boys and girls, their characters, their careers, is in part the future of our country, and we must not let the opportunity pass to make their future a greater and a better one.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me urge that adequate funds be appropriated in order that the National Youth Administration may continue unhampered in its worthy program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have received many telegrams, but I do not rely solely upon them for what I have to say favoring this amendment. For thirty years I have worked with the young people of this country and I think I know whereof I speak. I do know that hundreds of our young people in Arizona have been permitted to go into the high schools and into the colleges during the last few years who never could have been able to take advantage of these means of higher education without such assistance from the Government. I have said on this floor several times that my own office force is made up largely of young men and young women who have paid their way through college with N. Y. A. assistance, and a finer group you cannot find anywhere.

Out of all the large amounts we have spent in the past 10 years, I wish we might have spent a larger proportion in this manner. As I indicated in the Appendix of yesterday's RECORD, I have as a school man been forced to turn away many alert, capable, and splendid young people who came seeking admission to the college over which I had some charge, because we did not have adequate relief funds.

The President of the United States at one time said to our young people, "You have a rendezvous with destiny." What kind of a rendezvous? We can allow these young people to grow up in ignorance, we can starve both their minds and their bodies, and see what we get as the result, but I beg you to pursue a wiser course of statesmanship. I have often, in speaking to graduates, congratulated young persons on being young in these momentous times and in young communities. If we are duly considerate of our young folk, theirs may be a brilliant destiny beyond compare. If we are niggardly in providing for the oncoming generation, theirs may be a destiny of despair. The solicitude of parents for their offspring ought not be greater than that of national lawmakers for the youth of our Nation at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN].

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no particular quarrel with the majority or the minority party in this House, especially with the committee in charge of this bill and its chairman. I hold him in profound respect. I believe he is sincere in his belief in this bill today. But really, I honestly believe that we in this House are faced with the question of our philosophical approach to the matter of relief. We have had major panics before, especially the panics of 1837, 1873, 1893, and 1929. It is very significant that these four major panics in two instances came during the administrations presided over by Democratic Presidents and in the other two instances by Republican Presidents. It is significant to recall to your minds the philosophical approach of the President in office during the panic of 1837, President Martin Van Buren.

In a message to the Congress, President Van Buren, speaking of government aid and assistance, said:

> All communities are apt to look to government for too much. Even in our own country, where its powers and duties are all so strictly limited, we are prone to do so, especially at periods of sudden embarrassment and distress. This ought not to be. The framers of our excellent Constitution and the people who approved it with calm and sagacious deliberation, acted at the time on a sounder principle. They wisely judged that the less government interferes with private pursuits the better for the general prosperity. Its real duty is to enact and enforce a system of general laws commensurate with, but not exceeding, the objects of its establishment and to leave every citizen and every interest to reap under its benign protection the rewards of virtue, industry, and prudence.

This was indeed a laissez faire doctrine of government and persisted during the administrations of Presidents Grant, Cleveland, and Hoover. Fortunately time and history changed our practical as well as our philosophical approach to government. We became aware, as it were, of the famous Queen of France, who, when informed by her distinguished chancelor "that the people demanded bread," flippantly suggested "they eat cake." Today our Government recognizes its responsibility to assist a bankrupt and floundering economic system. In my judgment, no finer assistance could be rendered to the youth of today, the citizens and leaders of tomorrow. We should not attempt economy at the expense of our youth. So long as industry and business meet them at the high school and college door with despair instead of hope in the future, it is our responsibility to step in and lead them to the pathway of confidence in and hope of the future.

Mr. Chairman, I have said before and say again that no President in all our history has done more to aid our sad economic plight than our great leader, President Roosevelt. Verily may it be said that Lincoln strove to bequeath to us political and civil liberty. Roosevelt strives to bequeath to posterity economic freedom. I trust and hope that this House today shall follow the leadership of our leader and vote for the increase of the appropriation for the National Youth Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me I shall endeavor to present a few statistics relating to the National Youth Administration. There are some 6,000,000 unemployed youths in this country between the ages of 16 and 24. Of this number it is estimated that at least 2,000,000 meet the eligibility requirements for N. Y. A. aid. Last year 270,000 of those who were certified were denied the benefits of this program because of inadequate funds. If the full amount that has been requested by the President is voted by Congress, provision can be made for assistance to over 200,000 more young men and women than were aided by this program last year, making a total of 800,000 young people who could be assisted. At an extremely low cost per person, the N. Y. A. has enabled many thousands of our youths to obtain the benefits of education and training and equip themselves for the battle of life.

The maximum amounts that may be earned by recipients of this aid are $6 per month for high-school students, $15 for college students, and graduate students may earn up to $40 per month, although the average payment may not exceed $30 per month during the academic year. It is obvious that an industrialist who permitted his machinery to rust and deteriorate would be wasteful and negligent. By the same token it should be clear that the cutting of this appropriation by one-third of the amount recommended would be expensive economy indeed, for we would thus abandon many thousands of the youth of the Nation—the most important of all our resources—to the stultifying effects of idleness and unproductivity. [Applause.]

Under leave to extend my remarks I am appending two telegrams received from Bishop Bernard J. Shiel by my colleague, Congressman McCORMACK, in support of the full appropriation for this vital program.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1939.*

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, M. C.,
House of Representatives Office Building:

The Catholic Youth Organization numbering several hundred thousand nationally is vitally concerned with the works project program of the National Youth Administration and would like to see this program continued, and if possible extended. The material assistance which this program has rendered to thousands of unemployed Chicago youths alone warrants its continuance. May I personally and on behalf of the Catholic Youth Organization urge the enactment of the full appropriation of $123,000,000 for the continuance of this worth-while work.

Bishop BERNARD J. SHEIL,
Director General, Catholic Youth Organization.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1939.*

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, M. C.,
House Office Building:

We of the Catholic Church in Chicago are intensely concerned in the continuance and enlargement of the splendid program of the National Youth Administration which has made such a splendid contribution to the welfare of our unemployed young people. We join in respectfully urging the approval by your committee of the full appropriation of $123,000,000 for the continuance of this welfare work.

BERNARD J. SHEIL,
Auxiliary Bishop and Vicar General, Archdiocese of Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, to me this is one of the most important items in this bill. The youth of this country today are looking to us for help. If we were going to have the Federal aid that is to come in the educational bill, I would not think this so important, because the matter would be taken care of in that way, but I want to tell you that the youth of today needs this money and I am afraid we are not going to pass that bill, and I think we should put it in here so we may take care of these young people.

I am speaking from practical experience. I had to work my way through school and I had an opportunity at that time to get a job. Although it did not bring me very much money, I was glad to work my way through both high school and college. I know there are boys and girls today who are seeking an education who cannot find a job, and I think we ought to raise this amount so they can be taken care of. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY].

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, I am not vain enough to believe that my voice could be heard to say anything on behalf of the Youth Administration in a minute and three-quarters. I am going to take the time to say that it is a very sad commentary on the business of the House that will allocate only 1 hour of its time to the most important subject matter that we have before us. In my opinion, the totalitarian states have gone forward in a large measure because of their attention to the new youth movement.

I think the House could well take the time to go into this very thoroughly when you consider that we have 4,000,000 unemployed, out-of-school youth—one of the Members said 2,000,000, but the figure is 4,000,000 unemployed youths out of school in America. Our Government cannot afford to ignore the challenge that we have failed our youth.

I can say for my State of Pennsylvania that we have in the past year given employment to 4,000 rehabilitated youth, all in private industry and made possible because of the N. Y. A. of my State. To my mind, this is something that is deserving of the attention of the House. We could well afford to put back this $42,000,000 in the program and let the National Youth Administration go forward.

As the gentleman from New York well said, this will only take care of one of six deserving youths.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, within the past 2 days I have received a great many telegrams from responsible, generally well-informed and well-meaning citizens in my congressional district. With one accord these telegrams have requested my opposition "to any attempt to reduce the appropriation for the N. Y. A." Realizing the obvious good intention of the citizens who telegraphed me, the thought occurred to me that undoubtedly these citizens were acting upon some misinformation which must have reached them from some source. Consequently, last evening I telephoned to several of these responsible citizens and in some cases public officials back in my district in northern Michigan to find out where they got the information that this Congress "intended to reduce the N. Y. A. appropriation," and to find out whether or not they had been told that the committee had actually recommended an increase of approximately $6,000,000 over last year's appropriation.

To my surprise, Mr. Chairman, I learned that without exception these various individuals had been approached by responsible N. Y. A. employees, project directors, and so forth, and given to understand that this Congress was cutting last year's appropriation in half, and that if we did not grant the President's Budget request their local program would be materially and drastically reduced during the coming year. Every Member of this House knows nothing could be further from the truth, and I charge, Mr. Chairman, that the dissemination of such misinformation on the part of any Government organization is malicious.

We hear a great deal down here about the pressure groups in this country, but I want to ask this House, Mr. Chairman, what right governmental departments or governmental organizations have to create, let alone assist, pressure groups in trying to get legislation through this Congress? I believe that it is about time that this Congress let the country know that we intend to do our own legislating in this body without pressure and influence of Government departments. On the floor of the House the other day we heard the statement repeatedly made that if this House passed a certain piece of legislation it would never become the law because, presumably, it did not meet with the approval of another body or the President. In a committee the other day we heard a similar statement made that the legislation we were considering would not become a part of the law of the land because it did not meet with the approval of a certain department of this Government. Here again we have another case where a department of this Government is deliberately initiating pressure upon Members of Congress to serve its own ends and permit it to expand its functions and probably to employ many more bureaucrats for its own selfish aims.

As long as I am a Member of this body, Mr. Chairman, I intend to oppose such tactics. It is time for this House to stand on its own feet and legislate according to the dictates of its own conscience under the Constitution of the United States. It is time for us to legislate for the benefit of the people of the United States and not for the selfish benefit of governmental bureaucracy. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH].

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, the barometer of the civilization of any nation can be measured by the manner in which it treats its youth. Upon the youth depends the future of our Nation.

Before the Democratic steering committee several days ago appeared Mr. Aubrey Williams, the eminent, brilliant, and distinguished Administrator of the National Youth Administration, who presented the following figures to us:

In the high schools of the Nation aid is given to about 265,000 boys and girls over 16 years of age, who are unable to continue their studies due to economic distress. The cost for each is approximately $50 per year. In the colleges of the United States are 125,000 boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 25 years, who receive the munificent salary of $110 a year, and for vocational guidance there are 235,000 who receive $240 a year.

Mr. Chairman, the most tragic spectacle I have seen before the House today is the inability of Members to speak on this most important subject. A minute and three-quarters was given to Members of the House to express their ideals and their convictions upon the flower of our youth of the Nation. As a lover of my country, and as one who would love to extend to every boy and girl in our country between the ages of 16 and 24 an opportunity for culture, for education, and for receiving the refining influence that comes from civilization, I heartily support the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] for $123,000,000 instead of $81,000,000 to help the youth of our Nation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the Director of the United States Employment Service in southern California told me on one occasion that if all of its applicants for jobs in the age group served by N. Y. A. had had N. Y. A. project training, he could immediately have placed 33⅓ percent more of those young people than he could place under the circumstances. It seems to me that speaks volumes for the value of this program. Furthermore, we have no other program that I know of that is doing a real job of fitting our young people into places they can reasonably hope to get into industry; neither do we have any other one by which we can make the idea of equality of educational opportunity, which is the very foundation of democracy, effective, except the N. Y. A. program. What better use of money could be found than making it possible for poor boys and girls to earn $6 a month to aid them get their year's schooling when otherwise they would not be able to afford to stay in school. The N. Y. A. cost throughout the country amounts to about $115 per year per young person. There are 269,000 young people at present certified, ready to go on the program, and the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi will not be enough to even take care of that number.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a mistake not to follow the recommendation of the Budget in providing an adequate sum for the N. Y. A. In my State the N. Y. A. program has been very successful. In my State we are giving boys a chance to learn trades. We are taking these boys and putting them into schools and camps and teaching them how to be carpenters, teaching them how to be electricians, how to be mechanics. If we do not give the youth of this country an opportunity to learn trades by the small sum which the Government is providing for each youth, then we will turn these young people loose at this trying period in the history of our country when "isms" are abroad in the land, and I say that the way for us to avoid foreign "isms" and to teach Americanism is for us to be square with our youth, who are the hope of the future. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I am in full support of this amendment. I think the most important thing that our Government can do is to prepare the rising generation to take up the responsibility of citizenship and management of our Government. The N. Y. A. program has been a wonderful success in the State of Idaho, and if we cut down the amount as proposed in the bill, we will absolutely cripple the present institutions that have been set up, and the program which is being extended to the underprivileged and undereducated in the Northwest and all through this country. I am heartily in support of this amendment, and in support of it I want to read some telegrams which I have received. The following is a telegram which I have received from State superintendent of public instruction, dated at Boise:

N. Y. A. should be expanded, not cut. Hold to President's recommendation.

Also the following telegram addressed to me signed by the Weiser Commercial Club, of Weiser, Idaho:

People of Weiser strongly oppose any reduction N. Y. A. appropriation.

Also a telegram from R. J. Wood, as follows:

Understand Senate subcommittee proposes cut 30 percent on N. Y. A. appropriations of one hundred and twenty thousand. Weiser Vocational School requests three hundred thousand. Cut would mean two hundred thousand. Would ruin the project. Can you help?

Also the following:

N. Y. A. has considerable popular support. Hope you will report President's request for N. Y. A. appropriation.

B. W. DAVIS, *State Chairman.*

And the following:

People of Weiser strongly oppose any reduction N. Y. A. appropriation.

GEO. DONART.

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. WHITE, we will be very glad to hear you, briefly.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you, gentlemen.

I come to you in the interest of the appropriations in support of the National Youth Administration. You no doubt realize that in Idaho we have rugged country. We have great distances between our communities, and the educational advantages out there are more or less limited.

I happen to have been a director of a school board for a number of years in my community, and I know that our effort there was to give the young people of that community the best we could with the money available, and at best we could only have very limited facilities in the way of junior high schools and many of the young folks could not even avail themselves of this schooling.

I know as a general proposition, that the National Youth Administration is doing wonderful work in the State of Idaho, especially in giving boys and girls who are somewhat deficient in their training—and I refer to those approaching maturity—an opportunity to get an education or to equip themselves to do something useful.

They have taken over an old institution at Weiser—I do not recall what it was, but it was abandoned, and the National Youth Administration took it over and established a school devoted largely to manual and agricultural training and things of that kind. As I said, they are doing wonderful work and are going a long ways toward making good citizens as well as practical men and women of those people who are trained.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. In Weiser do they not have vocational work in the high school?

Mr. WHITE. They have in a limited way, but they do not have the organization in each little individual high school that they have in this particular institution that can take these boys right out on the land and train them to do the things required.

I was only able to visit that institution a very short time, but from the reports that I get from all over the State and from other places I can tell you gentlemen of this committee what the National Youth Administration is doing and what it is capable of doing in the Western States. I do not know about your Eastern States, but I can speak for the mountainous sections of the West and say that it is doing a work that has not been done elsewhere. It is doing great things for the rising generation, and I earnestly urge that you give the subject of an adequate appropriation for this agency your most favorable consideration.

I have several letters here that I should like to file for the record. One is from Mr. R. J. Wood, a very practical man, a reclamation engineer, who is now postmaster in the town of Weiser, and who is very much interested in helping to promote this particular institution that I have referred to, as well as the National Youth Administration in general.

Then I have a letter from the mayor of Nampa, Mr. R. Lewis Ord, and a letter from Mr. William W. Gartin, State director of the National Youth Administration in Idaho.

Mr. WOODRUM. Thank you very much for coming here, Mr. WHITE. Those letters will be made a part of the record.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

Weiser, Idaho, April 12, 1939.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congressman from Idaho, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMPTON: You will remember that I invited you to come down to Weiser before you went east last fall, to go out and go through the new Weiser Vocational School (National Youth Administration) and get acquainted with the set-up, but you got word that Jonesy had had a break-down and you went directly to Washington to look after the offices there.

I had Mac take me up there yesterday to see what was happening and how things were going.

About the time you went east the National Youth Administration set up a project to use the old Idaho Industrial Institute buildings, consisting of 800 acres of fine irrigated land with concrete buildings (sufficient to house 300 boys and girls), farm buildings, shops, library, etc., which will make an ideal youth program for the youth who cannot get a college education. The students will be picked from families of moderate income and preferably high-school graduates to receive 1 year's training in vocational work—farming, poultry raising, dairying, building trades, etc.

The grounds are under lease to the Government for from 5 to 25 years for a nominal sum.

At present they have 3 dormitories, executive and class building, large gymnasium, library, dairy barns for 100 head of cows, machine shop, chicken house for 2,500 chickens, and other farm buildings.

They have enrolled at the present time 200 boys and 100 girls, with a faculty and employees amounting to 40 people.

The grounds are 1 mile from what was Weiser city limits, but the city has extended their limits to take in 120 acres of the plat, furnishing police protection, city water and electric lights, fire protection, etc.

They have reconditioned the old buildings, painted, plastered, plumbing, etc., all done by the boys, and are now starting on a 500-capacity concrete dining room, 3 dormitories to hold 160 students each, 2 machine shops, and other necessary buildings to make it an ideal set-up. All of the building is done by the boys. They have a master carpenter, painter, plasterer, etc., each taking a group of the boys for a period necessary to take them through the time necessary for apprenticeship for a trade. Again, they have the farm groups working under masters in farming and kindred work.

Their dairy herd is among the best in the State. They are all registered Holsteins, some of which are to go to San Francisco to show in the contest at the fair.

I am afraid I am making a long letter of this, but want to say the objective of this project is to give from 700 to 1,000 boys and girls out of high school a chance to know a trade and be able to find a job when they are ready to leave school.

The grounds are exceptionally located in a bunch, from which a view of the valley and mountains is wonderful; as fine soil conditions as obtain in the State. New roads are being cut through the grounds, and in every way the project is being made inviting to the students and to outsiders. The best part of it is that all the work is being done by the students themselves.

We are to have a Civilian Conservation Corps soil-conservation camp here in July. I have been out with the men in charge to get them acquainted with the people of the community and the problems we have.

Let me convey the thanks of the people of Washington County for your share in this camp.

Did you get my little note relative to the census? Charley Peacock would appreciate this work.

Kindest regards.

R. J. WOOD.

CITY OF NAMPA,
Nampa, Idaho, April 13, 1939.

COMPTON I. WHITE,
608 North Carolina Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: During the past 2 years I have been considerably interested in the national youth program, and especially the good that it is accomplishing with our boys and girls.

We have carried on a program here in the city of Nampa that has not only helped the girls and boys, but the work that they have done has been very beneficial to the city of Nampa. If it was not for this program there would be many here in our city that could not continue on with their education owing to the fact that their parents are financially unable to keep them in school.

I feel, Mr. WHITE, that anything that is done to continue this program will be highly commendable, and I know as far as the city of Nampa is concerned that there can be no criticism of the national youth program.

Expressing my desire to help wherever I may be of service, I am,

Very respectfully yours,

R. LEWIS ORD, *Mayor.*

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION, STATE OF IDAHO,
Boise, Idaho, April 27, 1939.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
United States Congressman, First District, Idaho,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: I am sending you under separate cover several bulletins describing the program of the National Youth Administration in Idaho. I am sending these to you at this time so that you may be properly informed when reorganization or appropriation bills are before you for consideration. I would also say that I would be very willing to answer any questions that you may have on the conduct of the program and to send you any other materials that you might desire and ask for.

During the past 2 or 3 weeks I have suggested to certain persons that they write to you in general concerning their reactions to the National Youth Administration program. I have not done this with the idea of exerting any pressure upon you but with the purpose of keeping you informed concerning the success of the work in your State. I trust that you will appreciate receiving these letters from interested people in Idaho.

I truly believe that the work is worth while and that it is being conducted with a reasonable amount of efficiency. I have talked with a great many schoolmen the past few days, and we held a meeting with certain educators at the recent session of the Inland Empire Association in Spokane. I believe that I am not overstating the case to say that they nearly all wish the National Youth Administration program to continue. They are particularly anxious to have the program continued in the present way so that the administration of the program of each school or college will be left largely to them, with only normal supervision from this office concerning the minimum regulations which have to be made for the expenditure of the funds.

I also want to call your attention to the fact that the appropriation for the regional resident school at Weiser is over and above the appropriation for the out-of-school youth on work projects in the State of Idaho. This appropriation for the continuance of the school and work experience project at Weiser for the next fiscal year, if approved, would be sufficient to handle a number of approximately 500 youths in all phases of work experience and training, as well, in agriculture, construction work, wood- and metal-shop work, electricity, plumbing, etc.; and courses in homemaking, cooking, sewing, etc., for the girls. This would amount to something in excess of $250,000 for the year. The cost of this operation is only about one-half as much per person as operating a Civilian Conservation Corps camp. From one-third to one-half of the enrollees would come from the neighboring States of Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington. The eight hundred and forty-odd acres of land and the buildings are now owned by the independent school district of Weiser, which is the local sponsor. The general supervision of the instructional program is under the State board for vocational education, which also employs several of the supervisors and instructors. Considerable cooperation has also been received from the Idaho Department of Public Assistance, the division of public health, and other agencies.

I would appreciate any comments that you care to make concerning your attitude toward the continuation of the National Youth Administration on a permanent basis, and will be glad to answer any questions that you may have concerning the program in Idaho. I am also sure that Mr. Aubrey Williams, Administrator, or Mr. Tom L. Popejoy, Deputy Administrator, at Washington, D. C., would be glad to supply you with any information from that source.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM W. GARTIN, *State Director.*

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SACKS].

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, today we have before us a resolution brought here by the Appropriations Committee, which might well be described by using the title of a famous book, Les Miserables. A bill that is supposed to prevent suffering and starvation but in reality one which will throw off of W. P. A. over 1,000,000 men and women, created by an economy bloc composed of the Republican Members of this House coalitioned with conservative Democrats. Today they finish the job they started to "burn" from our governmental policies the humane principles of the New Deal, headed by our great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt. They have hamstrung and sabotaged this project by their various prohibitions and restrictions until, as was stated by the W. P. A. Administrator, Colonel Harrington, it is not a relief bill but a starvation bill. Debate has raged all day, and yet this great deliberative body allows me only 1¾ minutes to speak on

behalf of the amendment to increase the N. Y. A. allotment by $42,000,000. Imagine, my friends, a problem involving the very heart of our Nation, our youths, has only an hour of debate. Political scientists inform us that in those nations of Europe that have become the puppets of dictators, such as Russia, Germany, and many others, it was the misguided and idle youth of those nations that were propagandized and led into these insidious forces. Today we can insure to our children and grandchildren security from those "isms." We can help educate them and fit them for later life. We can save their souls and minds as well as their bodies in a period of their life when they form the basis for their future character.

Although this bill is a monstrosity of reactionism, yet let us save at least a bit of our self-respect and take care of those helpless youths for the benefit not of their personal beings but for the preservation of America, our democratic institutions, and ideals.

W. P. A. has taken its place in America as an agency that has helped us on the path to continued glory. Although maligned and maliciously pictured, it, in my opinion, has done much to save America and its institutions. This bill, although, as stated before, is reactionary, yet in view of the fact that if it is defeated 2,000,000 people will be thrown on the street and into the bread lines, I must vote for it, hoping it may be amended in the Senate and made more humane.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SACKS. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. I call the attention of the House to the fact that Aubrey Williams stated to us 2 days ago that about 265,000 youths who were working in vocational guidance were placed in employment in the year 1938. This is a most constructive amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi, and we ought to rise above party politics and agree to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I know little about how this matter is working out throughout the United States generally but in the State of Montana it has taken the youth off of the streets, out of the alleys, out of the pool halls and other sorts of hell holes, and is making mighty good citizens out of them. It is up to us to treat the youth of the country properly, because if we do not, my friends, some of these youths, as our distinguished young man from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], will be taking our places in the House of Representatives.

There are two classes of people in this country we should look after. That is, the aged people, with whom we were not very generous a week or so ago, and the other is the youth of the country. Let us not repeat that mistake here today, but let us be a little more liberal with the youth of the country, because the youth of today will be the men and women of tomorrow.

I want to say to our distinguished and able chairman of the committee, knowing him as I do know him, I believe he cannot get up here and seriously object to the adoption of this amendment. I know that his sympathy is with the youth of the country, though, of course, he has a heavy obligation resting upon him to also think of the taxpayer. I know that his sympathy lies with the purpose of this amendment. I hope that he will not ask this House to reject the amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there has frequently been a great deal said about the closing of the door of opportunity and hope to our boys and girls in this day. In sonorous tones are heard the words of some of our boys and girls, "What have I to look forward to? Am I to have an opportunity?" In my opinion, the work of the National Youth Administration is swinging wide open the door of hope and opportunity to boys and girls who would otherwise be completely devoid of both. The National Youth Administration affords a passport of entry to educational opportunities for boys and girls who otherwise would be turned away, and, of course, these educational opportunities will elicit and bring into being vocational opportunities.

To what does this agency afford an entrance? Annually laws are being enacted, rules and regulations are being promulgated, which make certain stipulations relative to many vocations which are preclusive in nature. To illustrate, in Texas we have practically reached the point where a person in Texas, if he is not a graduate of a 4-year college, cannot teach school—even in the rural communities. A person in Texas now cannot even file his intentions to take the State bar examinations unless he can present a high-school diploma and 2 years of college credit. No more can a person become a pharmacist in Texas until and unless he can present a certificate showing he is a college graduate.

Regulatory legislation is being proposed, some of which is being enacted, each session of the Texas Legislature which is decreeing that a person cannot qualify as an architect or an engineer if he has not graduated from a recognized college carrying standard work in these fields. This situation I am constrained to believe is not dissimilar in other States. Observe, if you please, the rules of the Civil Service Commission along this line. It is astounding to observe the numerous announcements of examinations which contain as conditions precedent to taking the examinations, the proviso that a person must present 2 to 4 years of college work or more. In most of the governmental work without the scope of civil service, these same requirements are set up. You gentlemen read letters every day which definitely say "I cannot qualify for the work because I do not have the college work needed." Unquestionably the N. Y. A. is definitely providing an entrance to these phases of employment and others.

Personally, I have believed for a long time we are going too fast, if not too far, in this direction. I believe in educational qualifications and I have done the best for myself I have been able to do, but I conceive and fancy that many rules and regulations are being set up and prescribed by people, who if they themselves had been compelled to adhere to and conform with them, could never have advanced far from the cotton patch or the corn field. It is, indeed, unconscionable to shut the door of opportunity to our boys and girls.

In a first-hand way and through personal experience I am aware of some of the virtues of the N. Y. A. You will recall that in the spring of 1934 there was economic chaos and pandemonium. At that time I was a student in the University of Texas. During the first semester of the school term of 1933 I had managed to go to school because I was earning my board waiting tables and I had a little cash which I had earned teaching a 6-month school the year before, but after Christmas my cash became nil and I could not see my way clear to continue, but the inception of the N. Y. A. policies saved me, for I then was given a job which paid me $15 per month—not enough to defray all my expenses, but in conjunction with the board I was already earning, I finished the year.

What type of work did I do? In Texas we have an extension loan library, an adjunct library to the University of Texas library, which supplies information to schools and individuals. We also have interscholastic league contests, among which is debate. In high school I had debated, and having made known this fact, I was assigned to the work of assembling subject matter pertaining to the debate subject that year which was to be sent to those individuals and schools requesting information on the subject. Still later I had occasion to observe the N. Y. A. functioning in our public schools as a teacher in them and as one who has been closely identified with public schools in Texas. Permit me to pause here to pay tribute to our school men and all our teachers, those identified with not only public schools but with colleges and universities. Not one of them would ever be guilty of wishing to deny even the poorest boy or girl any community might have an equal chance to receive the benefit

of that which is almost indispensable—education and training. Wholeheartedly and in unison they work together to disseminate enlightenment, for they know the truth of the statement, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Of every phase of social security we have brought into being I would not rank a single phase as surpassing and exceeding in merit the merit of our N. Y. A. program. Much has been said about old-age assistance. As a member of the Texas Legislature and as a Member of Congress I have supported and shall always liberally support it. Mathematically, when we asssist our old people we are merely adding to, we are simply hoping and desiring that the sums spent will lend happiness and contentment to lives the major number of years of which have been spent, but in giving the ambitious boy or girl the benefits accruing from the N. Y. A. program we are multiplying to a degree beyond approximation the potentialities and probable accomplishments of the beneficiaries of the N. Y. A.

Our young people are depending on this aid and assistance. Strangely enough, in the last 2 weeks I have received from a rural community, the Mings Chapel community, where I attended the Mings Chapel School, two letters, both from boys 17 or 18 years of age, boys who have ridden a school bus to finish high school this very spring. Both of these boys are the sons of mothers whose husbands died several years ago and who on the farm have managed to eke out a living, and both boys urged me in their letters to assist them to get N. Y. A. jobs. Certainly I am endeavoring to assist them, and I positively know that the availability of N. Y. A. money is the factor which will determine whether or not these boys will go to college. Let us not run the risk of denying them this privilege and cherished hope by voting against the Collins amendment.

The term "value received" is too limited, too nonembracive, in its meaning as applicable to money spent for purposes for which N. Y. A. money is expended. You should, rather, mention it as multiplied value and magnified value, not only received but to be received, not merely at this time for security of our boys and girls, but for the future social security of this country because resulting from its being expended is equality of opportunity, the basis or mudsill of democracy. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the House Appropriations Committee in bringing to the House the tragic gesture of economy, denying the President's request and the Budget estimate for the National Youth Administration, is designed to doom these young people to not a rendezvous with destiny but to a rendezvous with desperation, frustration, and discouragement. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I hope that every man in this House who looks with hope to the future and with confidence in the youth who are coming up for the protection and upbuilding of this Nation, will vote for this amendment granting to the National Youth Administration the sum of $123,000,000 that is suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

To me any curtailment of the funds for the development of a youth program is not economy in a sense of the word. It is a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy destined to deprive thousands of deserving boys and girls an opportunity to enter the struggle for existence with the modicum of advantage that this program affords.

Let me ask, in the words of that fine old hymn, How Firm a Foundation, will this give them. Be it great or small, I want them to have it.

I am for the Collins amendment. It is to me a worthwhile amendment. It should be adopted and I hope it will be. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

ON A MOTION TO INCREASE THE NATIONAL YOUTH APPROPRIATION FROM $81,000,000 TO $123,000,000. IT GOT $100,000,000

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard from the youngest head in the House [Mr. BECKWORTH], and in my judgment he rang the bell. National Youth Administration put him through college, and now he is in Congress. He is a fine exhibit A for National Youth Administration.

Now, a word from one of the oldest heads. I am for this amendment, not because of any line I ever read or any word that anyone ever said to me. I am for it because I have learned by experience and observation that our educational system teaches the youth of this country everything but how to make a living. The National Youth Administration is teaching them that. If I could say but one thing to the National Youth Administration, it would be to stress the activity of vocational training of the youth of this country.

I raised a volunteer battalion in the World War of over 400 men and put them in a camp, and I have never forgotten the shock I received on discovering that there were few of them who knew how to do the simplest thing. They could not drive a nail or saw a plank, or even handle a pick and shovel.

A man who knew how to do anything simply stood out. I promoted a man from sergeant to lieutenant on the spot because he knew how to set up and install a mess tent. I recall a very expressive incident, when one day a sergeant in charge of a work squad, who had many years' service in the Navy, came to my quarters with his sergeant's chevrons in his fingers, having ripped them from his sleeves, and laying them down on top of a tent peg with the remark: "I have demoted myself to the ranks." I asked him what was the matter, and he said, "These men do not know anything."

They did not know anything, but they were typical of hundreds of thousands turned out of the schools of this country every year. What I learned then has been in my mind ever since. I have thought of it more than any one thing in a year of service.

I have found out since coming to Congress that there are high-school students, even college graduates with degrees, who have not been taught how to make a living. They have to go to a business school to learn that. The N. Y. A. is filling a part of that need.

Some people say it will injure the morale of the young people to get Government aid, but everybody knows that every school institution in the country and the colleges are filled with youths who are being educated by societies and all sorts of endowments, and it has not injured their morale.

My final word to you is, you save the youth of this Nation and they will save the Nation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE].

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] because I want to. I believe there is not a single man or woman in this Congress who wants to go back to the days of Herbert Hoover and fill the roads and the highways of this country with young men and women going along thumbing every automobile that passed them in order to get to some place where they were not known where they might get a little more bread and meat. We do not want that to come again in America.

I hope the coalition that is evident to me in this House for the purpose of beating down the aims of the President of the United States will take in its stinger long enough not to include the youth of America in the range of their purpose. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, in a minute and three-quarters there is but little one can say on any subject.

There is always an appeal, of course, to follow the trail of the rising star of the youth of the Nation; but, dollar for dollar, this is a sound proposition because if ever bread was cast upon the waters it is done by things such as this. Do you remember how a few years ago the roads were filled with hitchhikers? Do you remember how every boxcar, it seemed, was covered with the young men and boys of our land? Our motion pictures still hold a valuable record of those tragic days. This work is administered by our teachers, our instructors, and under the very best influences. We have never been offered more character per dollar.

It is true, as the committee representatives will state, that this present bill does not represent an actual dropping off of the amount involved, but the Director of the Budget has estimated that to carry on the program as it has already shaped itself will require $123,000,000. To veer away from that is not to pass a constructive measure. The average felon is only 24 years of age, and one-third of the unemployed in the country are under that same age. Let us go the last mile on this if we do not do so on anything else this year in the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to drop just a few words, now that we are having a field day for the youth of the land. I am very much in sympathy with the youth of America. I am not going to rehearse my own history, for probably it is very similar to that of many of the rest of you. We must, however, take a long lock into the future in regard to this matter.

Dr. Jacobs, representing 528 independent American colleges, came before our committee when the tax bill was before us in 1938 and made the statement that the annual contributions to endowments of our American colleges had dropped during the past few years from $70,000,000 to $33,000,000. I wrote to him within the last few weeks, and find that contributions have now dropped 44 percent, and that most of the contributions to endowments have been going to four or five of the largest universities. Many of our colleges, the type of colleges to which we hope to send our young people, face bankruptcy.

We are piling debt upon debt. There is a substantial increase in the committee's program, not a reduction, as propaganda has led the country to believe. I shall to the best of my ability join with the effort of the committee to bring out a sane, sensible bill and not unnecessarily add to the national debt which has now reached the alarming total of more than $41,000,000,000. I believe that a solvent nation, a free nation, and a prosperous nation is, after all, the hope of the youth of America. There must be a stop to this spending somewhere, and unless we take measures that will encourage philanthropic persons to again make liberal contributions to our independent colleges of liberal arts and sciences, we will destroy the very institutions to which we desire to send the youth of our land. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I think the historian of the future looking back and undertaking to appraise the work of this Congress and this period will write that the N. Y. A. was perhaps the greatest achievement of the Roosevelt administration. Our acts which will be held greatest will perhaps be those which helped to preserve the soul and will of a great people. In the years to come we shall look back to this hour and rejoice most because of the hope, courage, and faith, we helped to rekindle in the hearts of young men and women facing cruel disappointment and despair.

The N. Y. A. has been in existence 4 years. During that time they have enabled approximately 900,000 young people to remain in secondary schools or colleges. Some of the things we do serve a single purpose, but this program has served a twofold purpose, yes, even threefold. It has taken this vast throng of young people off the labor market and has thus given more jobs to older people with families. We have still about 12,000,000 unemployed, we are told, and if you suddenly turn our youth out of school, the scarcity of jobs will be accentuated that much more, and the result will be more confusion, more want, and more destitution.

But this program has also given our boys and girls an opportunity to get an education, an opportunity to learn some useful occupation, that chance in life that we owe them; and this opportunity has been given to the poorest, to the ones who needed it most. A chance has come to multiplied thousands to whom the door was shut without N. Y. A.

And along with these benefits there has come as a natural result a greater spirit of Americanism, a greater love and respect for our country. A great deal has been said in the past year or so about making democracy work. We are engaged in furthering the democratic processes in this great country. We have heard equality of opportunity preached. It is the business of democracy to see that it is an actuality and not a theory. We shall be wise in this country to make an increasing investment in manhood and womanhood. The greatest asset this country has is the youth of the land. Let us pursue a policy that will take that mighty force and mold it into the greatest citizenship this world has ever seen. Mr. Chairman, to me this means an investment. We expect to get returns. What greater returns, what greater dividends can we expect than the perpetuation of democracy, than the preservation of high American ideals?

We are this evening facing a crisis. We dare not turn our backs upon the youth of the land. We have heard a great deal said about un-American "isms" in this country. The best bulwark we can put up against such is to make it possible for our boys and girls growing up to find something to do, to give them a job, to give them a chance in life. That is your obligation and my obligation. As one who has had a great deal to do with youth I do not propose to go back home to my boys and girls and have them say of me that I refused to give them a chance in life. I shall vote to give them that chance. I am for the full $123,000,000 appropriation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, there is very little one can say about an important subject of this kind in 1¾ minutes. I think this abridgement of time on a very important subject is a disgraceful reflection upon the membership of the House. To be perfectly blunt about it, I would say that you might just as well be in hell without a fan as to try to cover the subject properly and as it should be in that time.

Mr. Chairman, everyone in this House knows that the youth program is the closest to the President's heart of anything he has undertaken in the last 6 or 7 years. The committee has cut the amount allowed by the Budget from $123,000,000 to $82,000,000, and I hope that the original amount will be restored.

If we can only hold our forces on this side and if we can get no more votes on the Republican side than just that number who rushed forth to make a speech on the subject, we can override the committee and restore the amount to $123,000,000. I believe that should be our objective and I hope we may be successful.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States recommended to the House Committee on Appropriations that $123,000,000 be appropriated for the National Youth Administration for the fiscal year 1940. In his Budget message, he stated:

> The greatest single resource of this country is its youth, and no progressive government can afford to ignore the needs of its future citizens for adequate schooling and for that useful work which establishes them as a part of its economy. To ignore this need is to undermine the basis of democracy which requires the constant renewal of its vitality through the absorption of its young people.

The Members of the House must keep in mind the fact that the youth of the United States between the ages of 16 and 24 years constitute one-third of the total unemployment problem. These youth are drifting on the fringe of a no man's land with energies dissipated and talents latent. They are forgotten by the educational system, by the industrial system, by their Government. Crime and false ideologies are haunting their footsteps. The needs of these young people are not those of the older unemployed person. As the President said:

It is my belief that we should now give official recognition to the fact that the needs of youth are different from those of unemployed older workers. I further believe that, based on the demonstrated ability of the National Youth Administration program to meet these needs at low cost, and our knowledge of the wide and still unmet need among young people for its services, Congress should provide for an expansion of its activities.

The President had complete justification for the request of $123,000,000 for the National Youth Administration in view of the excruciating need which exists among the youth for its services and in view of the fine service of the N. Y. A. to youth during the past 4 years.

For several years the young people in this Nation have been finding that jobs are exceedingly difficult to get. In the good old days of 20 and 25 years ago there were jobs for everybody, young and old. Now the pressure of increasing unemployment has left millions of young people caught in a vicious vacuum where there is neither the money to stay in school nor a job which gives them the kind of experience which equips them for employment of either a temporary or permanent character. Very few of the millions of young people know many, if any, of the simple skills which make them resourceful. Their energies and talents are being wasted, dammed up, and destroyed.

On an appropriation of $75,000,000 this year the N. Y. A. has given part-time employment to 378,000 school and college students and has given another 235,000 out-of-school unemployed young people work experience and training on every possible type of public project. A total of 613,000 youth 16 to 24 years of age have been kept busy on a job while learning in school or in training work connected with the project activity. At a cost of $58 a year a boy or girl has been kept in school or college and for $233 a year an unemployed out-of-school youth has been enabled to use his capacities for public benefit while earning a wage and acquiring the work experience so essential to future effective employment.

With an appropriation of $123,000,000, as recommended by the President, the National Youth Administration will be enabled to assist 460,000 needy young people to continue in schools, colleges, and universities and another 350,000 out-of-school unemployed young people will receive jobs and a wage which will equip them for future employment. If the $81,000,000 recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is passed by this House of Representatives over 200,000 young men and women will be deprived of the educational and work opportunities so essential to their future effectiveness in this democracy. Can we permit this injustice to prevail? Can we refuse 200,000 youth work and educational opportunities? I am sure that the Congress will recognize the validity of the $123,000,000 for the National Youth Administration, and consequently will provide 800,000 youth with their legitimate opportunities of education and work in this great democracy.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Youths 16 to 24 years of age in the United States

Total population in this age group is 21,000,000; 5,000,000 are in schools and colleges; 7,000,000 are employed; 3,000,000 are in the home or not available for gainful work; 4,300,000 are totally unemployed. Thus, 6,000,000 young people are totally unemployed or partially unemployed.

Each year 200,000 more rural youths are coming of age than there are farm jobs available, and another 250,000 more urban youths are coming of age than there are jobs available—a net increase of 450,000 youths each year are adding pressure on the labor market.

The N. Y. A. by employing youths on public projects and extending educational opportunities to the underprivileged has materially helped to reduce pressure on the labor market and competition for adult jobs.

Programs of the National Youth Administration

The National Youth Administration provides educational opportunities, work experience and training, and placement services through three major programs:

A works program, whereby work experience and training on public projects is provided to out-of-school, unemployed youths between 18 and 24 years, inclusive.

A student-aid program, whereby financial assistance through part-time employment is provided to needy youths between 16 and 24 years of age, inclusive, in regular attendance at schools, colleges, and universities.

A guidance and placement program to assist young people to secure jobs in private industry.

Facts on the N. Y. A. program

(1) Since the establishment of the N. Y. A. on June 26, 1935, estimates indicate that 950,000 school and college students have been assisted in continuing their studies in schools and colleges; 750,000 out-of-school, unemployed young people have received work experience and training under the works program. This makes a total of 1,700,000 young persons.

(2) Currently 378,000 are employed on the student-aid program in 25,898 schools and 1,651 colleges; 235,000 out-of-school, unemployed youths are on the works program, or a total of 613,000.

(3) The payment to young people is on the basis of actual work performed and averages $6.45 a month in the student-aid program and $18.89 a month on the works program.

(4) The annual cost per youth to the N. Y. A. is extremely low. It averages $58.50 on the student-aid program to keep a young person in school or college—an average of about $38 a year for high-school students, and an average of $108 a year for college students. On the works program, the average annual cost is $233 per youth to bring him through actual work and training to the possession of a background of work experience and subsequent skills which enable him to obtain employment. For the annual cost of approximately $123, over 600,000 young people have been given educational and work experience which otherwise would have been in a large part denied them.

(5) Ten percent of N. Y. A. project youth leave each month for private employment or to some other form of self-support, to go back to school, and so forth. In the course of a year, project turn-over approximates 100 percent.

(6) Through the placement services of the N. Y. A. and from the work projects, well over a quarter of a million youth have gone into private employment.

(7) The student-aid program reaches into all but 17 of the 3,071 counties in the United States; the works program operates projects in 2,777 counties, a complete integration into the urban and rural life of the Nation.

(8) The N. Y. A. reaches young people from the low-income families as is shown by the fact that N. Y. A. students come from families with a median income of $667. The N. Y. A. project workers come from relief families. More than half have never had jobs before, and only one-fourth of them have had the opportunity to finish high school.

(9) In the student-aid program—N. Y. A. students have demonstrated that they can work for an education and at the same time maintain satisfactory scholarship. They are on the whole equal, if not superior, to the average student in scholastic achievement. Therefore, the N. Y. A. has not only extended educational opportunities but has uncovered a reservoir of competent youth.

(10) Local sponsorship of N. Y. A. work projects has resulted in $18,000,000 of contributions, or 13 percent of all funds expended on work projects for youth.

(11) The N. Y. A. and its 3,000 advisory committees have shown the advantage of united effort. Concerted action has

convinced many local communities that it is possible to employ, train, and direct their youth.

(12) The N. Y. A. has placed the responsibility of administration of the student-aid program into the hands of the school and college officials. Educators select needy students eligible to receive N. Y. A. aid, plan and supervise the types of work which N. Y. A. students perform to earn student-aid payment.

(13) High-school students may not earn more than a maximum of $6 a month; college students may not average more than $15 a month for the academic year; graduate students may earn up to $40, but the average payment may not exceed $30 during the academic year.

(14) The N. Y. A. has also decentralized the operation of the works program into the States and the State youth directors have the responsibility of operating work projects suitable to the community, its resources, and the opportunities for employment in specific occupations. Youth to be eligible for work projects must be certified as in need by the local welfare agency.

Plans for the N. Y. A. program next year

The President has recommended that $123,000,000 be appropriated for the operations of the N. Y. A. during the fiscal year 1940. At the present time there are 270,000 youths who have been certified as eligible for N. Y. A. employment and who are awaiting assignment to work projects. These young people cannot be employed on the N. Y. A. program due to the fact that the limited funds available this year restricted the number who can receive work experience and training under this program.

Conservative estimates indicate that approximately 2,000,000 other youths are needy and want work under the N. Y. A. program.

With an appropriation of $123,000,000, the N. Y. A. can more adequately serve the out-of-school, unemployed youth who are unable to secure employment of any kind. The N. Y. A. can provide part-time employment and educational opportunities to 460,000 needy young people to assist them to continue in schools, colleges, and universities, an increase of 83,000 over this year. The N. Y. A. can provide work experience and training on public projects to 350,000 out-of-school and unemployed young people, an increase of 120,000 over this year's average employment.

This sum of money will provide the benefits of education and work to 800,000 young people, and consequently their capacity to do constructive work will not be allowed to degenerate. The N. Y. A. through its job-placement facilities can reasonably place 200,000 in jobs next year. Thus, a total of approximately 1,000,000 young people will receive the normal experience of work and education rather than to be left in discouraging idleness.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. FLANNERY].

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, I bring a particular message from the youth of Hazleton, Pa., but it is a message as well from the youth of all Luzerne County and the youth of America.

It seems to me, in the debate that has been conducted on this section of the bill and amendments so far, there has not been a single reason which would justify the Committee ignoring the recommendation of the President and the Budget. Every argument that has been presented here would amply justify us in going along.

You talk about economy. I say, Mr. Chairman, this is an investment in morality; this is an investment in decency; this is an investment in citizenship; this is an investment in Americanism; and it is an investment in the America of tomorrow. As the leaders of today pass on, others will come forward to take their places, and unless they are equipped under the educational system we boast of with great pride, not only will Americans as individuals suffer but America as a Nation will suffer. This amendment will make available to them that educational system.

Mr. Chairman, I plead with the Members to restore this amount.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNERY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I am in complete accord with everything the gentleman has said and will support the amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the full amount of $123,000,000 recommended by the President for the National Youth Administration. Here is a great and enduring work that we must not curtail or weaken.

The National Youth Administration is giving part-time employment to over 600,000 young people at a yearly cost of but $125 a person. Last year 84 cents out of every dollar went for wages for youth; 11 cents for project supervision; and 5 cents was expended for equipment, materials, and other nonlabor costs.

If they can take a young fellow off the streets and put him back into school or college or on a work project for this sum of money, I, for one, believe that it is hard to imagine a better expenditure of public funds.

I think the increase asked for by this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is more than justified by the need which exists. As has been stated here four or five youths apply for every job N. Y. A. has to offer. I am thinking of these four youths who come up willing and anxious to get work and earn something who are denied this chance. I wish for my part that we could include them all.

As I understand it, with this money it will be possible to put something like 500,000 students back into high school, 200,000 into colleges, and from 250,000 to 300,000 on out-of-school work projects. If anything approximating this can be achieved I believe that we should adopt this amendment and make it possible.

Not only has the N. Y. A. given work, but it has been of great service to the youth of America in finding employment for them. During the existence of N. Y. A. it has placed in private employment 265,000 young people. It has held interviews with over a million young folks and has made hundreds of thousands of visits to factories, stores, restaurants, mills, and so forth, seeking to help the unemployed young people of America find employment in private industry.

The President has recommended $123,000,000 and the Budget has set up that as its estimate of the needs of this agency. I can find no good reason why the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has cut this agency down, Mr. Chairman. It does not deny that the work is good, Mr. Chairman, it does not deny that the need is here, Mr. Chairman, and yet it arbitrarily cuts down the Budget estimate and the recommendation of the Chief Executive. I am at an utter loss to know why this is done and I see no good reason why this House should concur in the position taken by the subcommittee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the administrative expense of the National Youth Administration has totaled about $4,000,000 and not one breath of suspicion has been raised against it. It stands on a par with the Civilian Conservation Corps camps and both have the full support and enthusiastic backing of the press and all of our people.

Although I have a particular interest in the entire N. Y. A. program, I have a special interest in the student-aid program of N. Y. A. There is no greater problem facing this Nation than unemployment, and the N. Y. A. makes a direct contribution to the decrease of that problem. Through direct aid to the students in secondary schools, colleges, and to those doing graduate work in our universities, the student-aid program permits the completion of educational schedules, and keeps our youth off the relief rolls and the unemployment rolls.

In California we have 800,000 persons on relief, and were it not for the "pauper's oath" type of regulations necessary to

qualify, there could, in justice, be a public relief roll twice that great. Add 300,000 nonresident, indigent migrants from the Dust Bowl, and from other Midwestern States, and you have a picture of the need for Federal assistance in California. In our agricultural areas we have four workers standing by for every place in our fields in the harvesting of our crops. Throughout our industrial areas we have long lines of patient men waiting outside the factory gates.

Now we seek to curtail a program of proven worth, a program which enables our youth to prepare itself for the more difficult years ahead where education, and a special mental skill, will be absolutely necessary to cope with the technological occupation essential to livelihood in our modern age. And not only do we attempt to curtail the educational program of the student who needs both assistance and training the most, because of his financial handicaps at the present time, but we turn these boys and girls out of the classrooms and into the streets, to stand along the highways in our farm areas, and to line up at the gates of our factories in competition with men of experience with heavy family responsibilities.

In California we have the largest university in the world. The N. Y. A. granted $247,899 to the University of California in the last school year—about 25 percent of the total cost of the student-aid program for the entire State. In the Statewide program there are 520 schools. Last year it cost $897,990 to assist an average of 16,500 students a month for the year. The total average payment to the student was $8.47 a month and the total number of students receiving help in the 520 schools is less than two-thirds of the enrollment of 1 school, the University of California. No one can say that such a program is excessive.

In 435 secondary schools we are now giving 8,438 students an average of $4.63 a month. In 81 universities and colleges we are now giving 7,863 students an average of $12.10 a month. And for the students doing valuable graduate work in those 81 colleges and universities, we are granting an average of $20.84 a month to 317—students who will soon be eligible for higher degrees and prepared for teaching positions.

It is well to remember, Mr. Chairman, that one-third of our unemployed are between 16 and 24 years of age. The youth of today are the citizens of tomorrow and when we adults are all gone, our children must carry on with confidence and fortitude, and this never can be done if we permit them to wander the streets in idleness and despair.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation for the National Youth Administration is a real challenge for us today. The full amount of $123,000,000 has been carefully thought out, carefully estimated, and now is the time for the Congress to do its part. It may not mean much to your children but it means a great deal to the children of good American fathers and mothers whose lives and future welfare are at stake. Certainly we must not, by our votes, throw thousands of our youth out of employment and educational opportunity.

I sincerely hope that every friend of youth will take this opportunity to aid the several hundred thousands that this additional money will help. I appeal to you not to cut this appropriation one penny from the recommended amount of $123,000,000, and I shall vote for this amendment restoring the full amount, for I cannot take the terrible responsibility of undermining the very foundation of our Government by not taking care of our fine American boys and girls. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted me today I plead for absolute democracy in education. Over 100 years ago Thomas Jefferson made the statement in his plea that every boy "from the richest to the poorest" was entitled to the opportunity of an education. I think that statement is just as true today as it was 100 years ago when made by Thomas Jefferson, that outstanding patriot of this Nation. We have magnificent plants dedicated to education; we have magnificent school buildings; we have instructors, professors, desks for children, all the facilities necessary for education; yet, Mr. Chairman, there are some three or four hundred thousand boys and girls in this country who today plead for an opportunity to finish their education and cannot have that opportunity. Why? They do not have the money.

Until the time comes when they will have an opportunity, until the N. Y. A. is able to go out and give them jobs or part-time employment to finish their education, we shall not in this country have absolute democracy in education. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have this opportunity of even 1¾ minutes to add to what has already been said in favor of the pending amendment. In other words, of placing back in the bill what was originally written there by the Budget on the recommendation of the President of the United States, full $123,000,000 for N. Y. A.

I agree with everything that has been said in behalf of this amendment, and I am going to disagree also with everything that has been said against it or which may be said against it hereafter, because it is the one thing of all other things that gives us our chance in America today to do the most for the coming generation with the least money and with the greatest certainty of security. It seems to me the amendment ought to have the support of every man here. I do not understand, and I will have difficulty in ever understanding, how any man here who has thought the subject through will be able to justify a vote against the amendment when he goes back to his people who sent him here. I certainly could not think of doing it.

Mr. GEYER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEYER of California. May I say that I agree with what the gentleman has stated, and as one who has had practical experience in operating this I certainly shall support it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, in the National Youth Administration there are in high school 265,000, in college 125,000, and in out-of-school projects 235,000. Those in high school receive an average of $4.50 per month, top payments are $6. In college $12 per month, top payments are $20, and in out-of-school projects $18 per month, top payments are $25. In the out-of-school projects among the boys, 50 to 60 percent perform some type of manual work. Among the girls in the out-of-school projects, 60 percent are employed at housekeeping, sewing, and homemaking. But above this entire statement of mine I want to bring evidence of the fact that every one of these youngsters in each of the three subdivision—high school, college, and out-of-school—are receiving some form of actual training, because under the system they must work a certain number of hours for the money they receive.

What is the average cost per youth under this program? The gentleman from Mississippi, member of the committee, has placed the cost at approximately $10 per month, or roughly $125 per year. Bear in mind that these boys and girls, by their retention in this program, in addition to receiving a training, are held apart from the already overloaded field of unemployment in this Nation. The program is sound. Let us approach it from the angle of the Federal penitentiaries where, from the testimony of no less a person than J. Edgar Hoover, we have the maximum of arrests between the ages of 16 and 24, and this year an astonished committee heard from the lips of the supervisor of the Federal prisons the request for a new Federal prison program calling for the erection of a new prison every year. Eleven hundred additional prisoners in the Federal penitentiaries over the grand total of a year ago is the record that stands at the door of this Congress to face this day in considering this legislation. Yes, the young group has something to do with it, and I defy you to deny your responsibility.

What is the cost? The cost, considering the prison projects, is $2,750 for each lad who finds his way to the prison gate; not for his maintenance and upkeep, but just the cost of housing him in the institution. Yes, $2,750; and we debate the annual sum of $125 to protect the respected youth of the land susceptible to the "isms" that we hear so much about today and of which very properly this Congress takes cognizance. Is it the mature man of experience, the father of a household 40 or over who has felt the lash of the mechanized system, that we fear will become susceptible to the false theories of government? No; he has had the snows of the winters upon his brow. He knows the deceits and the cunnings of man, and while deep in my heart I have a sympathy for him and will champion his cause to the last milestone of his course, nevertheless I can say to you in all sincerity that I know he stands as a bulwark, for the most part, against the "isms" that would make inroads upon our fair Nation. But with the youth of the land the picture is entirely different. If you do not believe me, make a study of the regimentation of youth of some of the nations of Europe and read your answer in their activities.

Today, as a champion of those needing the assistance of a nation, as the father of nine children, I appeal to you for the entire appropriation as approved by the Budget and requested by the administration. Join me in a recitation that will echo from this Chamber to the most remote part of the Nation—"I am my brother's keeper."

To signify the splendid caliber of the institutions endorsing the National Youth movement, in communications to me, I quote the following endorsees: University of Detroit; Polish Activities League; American College Personnel Association; the Salvation Army (eastern Michigan division); Detroit public schools, by C. L. Thiele, director of exact science; Detroit Young Men's Christian Association; Community Colleges for Wayne University, Harley L. Gibb, director; the Council of Social Agencies, Metropolitan Detroit, by E. S. Guckert, managing director; the Detroit Community Fund, by Percival Dodge, managing director; City of Detroit, traffic engineering bureau, by M. W. Cochran, traffic engineer; City of Detroit, department of public welfare, by E. R. Harrison; Detroit Young Men's Christian Association (northeastern branch); St. Mary's College, Orchard Lake; St. David School; St. Charles School; St. Philip Neri School; St. Rose School; St. Anthony School; St. Ambrose School; Nativity Commercial High School; Lawrence Institute of Technology, by Richard Frederick; Wayne County Welfare Relief Commission, by G. R. Harris, administrator; Detroit Institute of Technology, by Paul Hickey, director; Marygrove College; and the Detroit Board of Education. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I have attempted, insofar as possible, to cooperate with those who have charge of this appropriation bill because I believe they have labored diligently to bring in the fairest measure possible. On this amendment, however, I must vote with the gentleman from Mississippi. I believe that by voting to help the boys and girls on N. Y. A. we will be voting to keep the men and women off W. P. A. in future years. [Applause.]

The National Youth Administration has paid real dividends, and I feel strongly that an even more adequate amount is vital to the proper aid to our youth. In my district in West Virginia and throughout the Nation the splendid work of encouragement and help to young men and young women has commended itself. By extending aid to youth we try in our generation to stimulate these citizens of tomorrow and the investment is a wise one.

Youth and age can properly join hands in this matter. Let us look at what youth has done. It is to be recalled at this point that at 15 years of age Victor Hugo presented a poem to the Royal Academy in Paris and Leigh Hunt was a prolific writer of verses. At 16 Michelangelo's ability as a sculptor and painter had been discovered and Mozart had captivated the court of Germany. At 17 Alexander Hamilton commanded the attention of his country and Washington Irving delighted the readers of the Morning Chronicle. At 18 Spurgeon was the pastor of a congregation and Stephenson was carrying within his brain an improved steam engine. At 19 George Washington was a major in the Army and William Cullen Bryant had given Thanatopsis to the world.

At 20 Bach was organist at Armstadt and Beethoven had added another great name to music. At 21 Galileo was awake to the secret of the vibrations of the bronze lamp of Pisa Cathedral and Wilberforce was a member of the British Parliament and fearlessly introduced a bill against slavery in Africa. At 22 Alfred began one of the most magnificent reigns which England had ever seen and Savonarola was robed with a splendid name. At 23 David Hume had written his treatise on Human Nature and Richard Wagner had composed Lohengrin. At 24 Alexander the Great had taken Thebes and had crossed the Hellespont and John Ruskin had written Modern Painters.

At 25 Aeschylus was the greatest tragic poet of Greece and Coleridge had written the Ancient Mariner, and at 25 Charles A. Lindbergh, the apostle of good will to the nations of Europe, had piloted his frail craft, *The Spirit of St. Louis*, from New York to Paris, was acclaimed by millions and added a second story to the world. At 26 Mark Anthony was the hero of the Roman Empire and Benjamin Franklin had written the wisdom of Poor Richard. At 27 Correggio had the commission to execute the frescoes on the cupola of San Giovanni in Parma and Francis Bacon was already counsel extraordinary to the Queen. At 28 Hannibal took Sagantum while Rome deliberated on its rescue and William Wordsworth had written some of his greatest poems. At 29 Cromwell had begun his work as a mighty religious figure and Sir Joshua Reynolds was the most noted portrait painter in England.

Let us not forget to help the youth of this critical time that they may, through work and education, be ready even in youthful years to contribute to America as did those persons whom I have just listed. We cannot let them down.

With your permission I turn to poetry from prose and repeat a few lines from memory, somewhat as follows:

How like the game of football is the game of life we play,
Except that in life's game we keep on when we're gray.
We take the kick-off at youth's line and start with heart and soul
Across the field by millions trod, to reach ambition's goal.
At first the crowds along the sides give but a passing glance
To see how firm a grip we take upon life's ball of chance.
The chalk lines are the passing years, and the foes we meet are strong,
And ever stiffer in defense they fight as we move along.
And often down there near the goal, success arm's length away,
We make one little fumble and we've lost our whole life's play.

I trust that Members at this late hour will assist the youth of this country in fighting straight down the field toward a successful goal through action of this body in providing a larger fund than the committee brings in for N. Y. A. Let us not cause a fumble for these youthful citizens as they start to play the game of life. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the reasons I am in favor of keeping this appropriation down to what the committee has reported are these:

In the first place, this is not a relief program. Boys and girls, young people under 25, are carried on these rolls regardless of whether or not they are certified as being in need. The question is whether the Government can afford at this time to do that sort of thing.

The second question is this: The argument that has been presented here in favor of this increase in the appropriation is that it will help the boys and girls to go through high school and college. Let me say to you that just about 10 percent of this entire appropriation is used for that purpose.

On page 173 of the hearings you will find a break-down that proves this, put in the record by Mr. Williams, the Administrator, himself. This break-down shows that almost all this money is used not for helping the boys and girls in high school and college but for projects of the same type the W. P. A. operates. Less than $5,000,000 of the proposed increase would go for those boys and girls. That is Mr. Williams' own statement on page 110 of the hearings. There is absolutely no justification for the statements that have been made here on the floor with reference to this part of the bill. They have been made without looking into the hearings or the facts. Propaganda has gone forth all over this country representing that this money is to be used for boys and girls in the high schools and colleges, but that is not the fact. I do not see why this House should be carried off its feet and attempt to set up another program in competition with the W. P. A.

The committee has reported a bill carrying on the face of it $6,000,000 more than was carried for the N. Y. A. last year. This will enable them to do everything they are doing this year and more besides. Is it not time now that we begin to take stock of ourselves and be honest with the boys and girls and keep enough of our country together so that in the future when they come along and want regular jobs they can have them? We are destroying their future by appropriating money for things that do not absolutely have to be appropriated for. I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. The gentleman's criticism that so much of this money is used for work is just the reason I am supporting the amendment, because this work is training these boys to make a living, and is doing it at a cost of a third of what it costs in a C. C. C. camp.

Mr. TABER. It costs a good deal more than one-third of what it costs in the C. C. C. camps; but all those things pile up and tend to demoralize the set-up and prevent the employment of the boys instead of giving them jobs. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Collins amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAYBURN to the amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS: Strike out "$123,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000,000."

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, for the past hour and a half I have been going from one side of this House to the other and from one group to another trying to compose this matter, and with the mover of the amendment and other Members of the House in high position on the committee, I thought we had agreed to a compromise of $100,000,000, which insures those who want more—nineteen million more dollars—and insures to those who are opposed to any increase the probability of $23,000,000 more being added. I thought this was a fair compromise, and I still think it is a fair compromise, and I trust that those who were in favor of the $123,000,000 and those who were in favor of leaving the amount at $81,000,000 will accept what I believe is a fair, middle-of-the-road compromise that will take care of many more thousands of boys and girls than would the $81,000,000 and add at least 21,000,000 more dollars to the Youth Administration than it had for the fiscal year of 1939.

Let me repeat, I believe this is fair, I believe it is just, and I trust the Committee will adopt my substitute amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: On page 7, line 6, after the figures "1940", strike out "$81,000,000" and insert "$122,500,000."

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure the sentiment of this House as expressed by those who took the floor was overwhelmingly in favor of the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS]. However, for some reason a sudden spirit of compromise has developed. I think all of you who favor adequate appropriation for the National Youth Administration know, in view of other things that have taken place here today, that there would be no compromise if they thought they could vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. [Applause.] They are striving to sidestep a vote upon his amendment, and I do not believe it is fair to the membership of the House that we should be asked to vote upon a compromise of $100,000,000, as introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. For that reason, despite all the respect I have for the majority leader, I have been forced, because I know the sentiment of many in the Chamber with regard to the National Youth Administration, to introduce this substitute amendment providing $122,500,000 in order to get an expression from the Members of the House as to whether or not they favor adequate appropriations or whether they are simply grudgingly granting a small and insufficient increase because of the receipt of telegrams which express the interest of the educators of the country. Voting for an increase to only $100,000,000 will not be in line with the recommendations contained in those telegrams and in other communications they received.

I ask you to support this amendment and, later, to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] providing for $123,000,000. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are two amendments pending, one offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], which, of course, is involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and one offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]. The Chair has been reserving 1¾ minutes of time for each of those gentlemen. Therefore the Chair, in recognizing the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], desires to state that upon termination of the gentleman's time and a vote upon the pending motions, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], to offer his amendment for a period of 1¾ minutes, and likewise the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may the amendments be reported for the information of the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the pending motions for the information of the Committee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: Page 7, line 17, after the word "universities", strike out the period and insert *"Provided,* That the parent, parents, guardian, or other person charged with the support of such needy young people, swear or affirm that they do not own real or personal property valued in excess of $1,500 and do not have an income of more than $100 per month: *Provided further,* That anyone falsifying such statements as to value of property or income shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be fined $1,000 or imprisoned for 3 months, or both."

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Page 7, line 6, after the figures "1940", strike out "$81,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DINGELL. Is that what might be termed "a pauper oath," applied to students?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia. As I understood the reading of the two last amendments, one related to a measure other than the total amount to be appropriated. I presume that will be separately considered as a separate amendment and not as a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman from Illinois that at the request of the gentleman from Virginia

[Mr. WOODRUM] the pending amendments on the Clerk's desk were read simply for information. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the good offices of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], our Democratic leader, in assisting to work out the solution of a problem upon which there was a rather wide and somewhat persistent difference of opinion in the House. So far as I am concerned, I shall support the gentleman's amendment, as I believe every member of the committee will do. I am sure the majority leader was doing what he thought was a service in the interest of harmony, and I know he is doing what he thought was agreeable to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], who introduced the amendment. So I hope the House will support that amendment. However, I have not changed my mind about whether it is wise to increase this amount. I have made just as many high-school addresses, I suspect, as most Members of the House of my age. I have stood before the youth of the country and pointed to the future and told them how they could go into the world and win their spurs. I have talked to them and told them how Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln and other great men of the country had waded through snow and mud, had studied late by candlelight at night and worked in the daytime to try to obtain a little education, and I have told them the great advantages of an education. But I have always told them that it is not an absolute necessity for success in the world, and I could point to Members upon the floor of this House today who never had the opportunity that we are giving to the youth of America today.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I cannot yield. I think as much of the youth as any man in this House, and I still say that the same argument that induced the administration and our President to curtail W. P. A. employment one-third, and to curtail farm security one-third, would apply to the temporary assistance that we have been giving under the auspices of the National Youth Administration. I still say that it is not the province of the Federal Government to give a college education to the young people of this country. [Applause.] And I deny that you are doing any accommodation or favor to the American boy or the American girl to put him or her in a mental or psychological attitude of waiting for the postman to bring their little pittance from Uncle Sam the first of the month. [Applause.] We have built schools, we have built roads, and have done everything to help our youth as we should. How many of you gentlemen had school busses call for you and take you to school? How many of you rode over fine highways and had the wonderful streets that you and I are giving to the youth today? Of course, we appreciate them, and our committee appreciated them, and for that reason we made no curtailment in the program.

Information has been broadcast throughout the country that we were curtailing the program of the N. Y. A. That is not true. No one has so suggested. We have shown a decided preference for the N. Y. A. by not curtailing the program. I am glad to go along with the $100,000,000 amendment, but I still think it will be hard for us to explain, and I appreciate what has been done by the gentleman from Texas. Most of the things we do here are done by compromise. I am not so sure as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] as to how this final vote would have gone, but there was a wide difference of opinion, and I am always willing to carry my part and do the wishes of the House in the matter. But I say, please let us not give the youth of America the idea that we are going to make them the special objects of favor in this regard, because while we are thinking of them today let us remember that these same youths are going to have to pay back the national debt that we are piling up today to give these benefits to the unemployed and to the youth of the country. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Texas will be adopted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question first occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I offered a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute will be voted upon after the amendment to the amendment. Perfecting amendments are always voted upon prior to the substitute motion being voted upon.

The question first occurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN), there were ayes 207 and noes 65.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania) there were ayes 90 and noes 203.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Those who favor taking this vote by tellers will rise and remain standing until counted. [After counting.] Seventeen Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

Tellers were refused.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The question was taken, and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Ohio: On page 7, line 17, after the word "universities", strike out the period and insert *"Provided,* That the parent, parents, guardian, or other person charged with the support of such needy young people swear or affirm that they do not own real or personal property valued in excess of $1,500 and do not have an income of more than $100 per month: *Provided further,* That anyone falsifying such statement as to value of property or income shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be fined $1,000 or imprisoned for 3 months, or both."

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because I believe it is a necessity for the protection of the boys and girls for whom the law was originally intended. This year there will be approximately 1,110,000 young men and young women graduating from our high schools. Many have not the faintest hope of a chance to start college because their fathers are unemployed and their mothers are taking in washings or the family is on the relief rolls. I address myself to the boys and girls that come from this kind of homes that, if given a chance, will be able to complete a college course. They may belong to the group of people that have been characterized frequently in the last 6 years as the "underprivileged one-third," ill-clad, ill-housed, and ill-fed. They come out of the high schools while their mothers and fathers, with lumps in their throats, listen to the echo of their voices, "W. P. A., here we come."

I speak in behalf of the boys and girls who do not need a Federal agency to show them that democracy will work, but who have been grounded enough in the principles of a free democracy that they have been convinced ever since they have been able to reason things out for themselves that democracy does work, and, if given an opportunity, they will work in a democracy. Many of similar groups last year and the year before and the year before that have had despair upon their

faces because of the insidious practice of naming the beneficiaries of the N. Y. A. program.

I call to your attention the method of naming those that will get on the N. Y. A. educational work facilities. All that a young man or young woman has to do is get two citizens in the neighborhood to sign a letter already drafted for them that the boy or girl is entitled to receive an N. Y. A. contribution. In many instances children of people that could well afford to send their sons and daughters to colleges are receiving $15 a month. I know of instances where parents have had a steady job ever since the child was born, a white-collar position, if you please, parents who own fine homes and who have been able to send older children to college, who are still employed and in a gainful occupation, and who have had a lapse of moral consciousness to allow their children to apply for the benefits of this program. [Applause.]

I have no fault to find with the objectives of the National Youth Administration program. I think it is a fine thing, a worthy program, if it gives the boys and girls who otherwise would be deprived of an opportunity for an education a chance to go on; but the lapse of moral consciousness on the part of parents who are able to pay the full fare for their children in college should be stopped with this amendment.

All of this social legislation has been brought to the front with the poor people of the country being eulogized by orators on both sides of the aisle, but in the years that the N. Y. A. has been on the statute books there never has been one law to my knowledge that has safeguarded the poor boys and girls from the racketeers and chiselers.

My amendment, some folks may say, is harsh; but if this is to be a worthy program it should be a program for those for whom it was intended. Is there anyone here that can raise an objection against this amendment? I have set these limits arbitrarily, because I know boys and girls whose parents are in no better circumstances than the limitation of this amendment who have been able to pay, and with a little thrift and cooperation and hard work on the part of the children doing odd jobs, they have been able to continue their education. They may have patches on the seat of their trousers, and they may not have as many clothes as other young men and young women, but they complete their education.

Kindle the spark of hope in the heart of an underprivileged boy or an underprivileged girl, and you will find a successful man or woman tomorrow. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Ohio) there were ayes 116 and noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SEC. 3. (a) In order to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and relief to needy farmers and relief to other needy persons in the United States, its Territories and possessions, there is hereby appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, $123,000,000, together with the balance of the appropriation under subsection (3) of section 1 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938 which remains unobligated on June 30, 1939.

(b) The funds provided in this section shall be available for (1) administration (not to exceed the amount obligated for administration in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939); (2) farm debt adjustment service and making and servicing of loans under this section and prior law; (3) loans; (4) relief; (5) the prosecution of projects approved by the President for the Farm Security Administration under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938; and (6) the following types of useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, subject to the approval of the President: (a) Projects involving provision of additional water facilities, (b) projects involving construction and operation of migratory labor camps, and (c) projects involving land development to provide work relief for homesteaders on rural rehabilitation projects.

(c) In making any relief payments under this section, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to accept from the recipients thereof voluntary agreements for the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of section 24 of this title, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits, shall apply to such recipients while performing work pursuant to such agreements.

(d) The Farm Security Administration within the Department of Agriculture is hereby extended until June 30, 1940, to carry out the purposes of this title.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEAVY: On page 8, line 18, after "1939", insert a comma in lieu of the period and add the following: "and all collections received during such fiscal year on rural rehabilitation loans made under this and prior acts."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment that I propose affects that part of the bill as found on page 8 in reference to farm security, as that applies to the distressed farmer.

Let me first make clear a distinction that should be made, because I think there is a great misunderstanding between the activity of Farm Security as an agency. The Farm Security Administrators care for funds from the Jones-Bankhead Act in reference to farm tenancy. For that purpose they have $25,000,000. This is in no sense a part of the relief activities.

This amendment that I propose and this appropriation that is granted by the committee takes care of those unfortunate farmers that we find either on relief or on the verge of becoming relief clients, and until it came into the picture the farmer had but one place to go when he found himself in financial distress, that was to become a W. P. A. worker, move into a city or town, and take such W. P. A. relief as he could get. This agency operating 2 years now has touched the lives and the fortunes of 750,000 American farm families, and it has rehabilitated them to a degree sufficient that they have been able to repay 65 percent of every dollar that the Government has lent them.

Last year for this purpose there was appropriated $175,000,000. It is all loan money handled by the relief agency, lent to the needy farmers, and it is paid back by them when they can. They are independent and free from the limitations of W. P. A. clients.

This year the bill carries $123,000,000. According to the hearings, the Budget Bureau cut the Department from $175,000,000 in this worthy undertaking down to $123,000,000.

My amendment does not ask that we give one dollar over Budget estimates—does not require that we raise the amount here by a single penny; it merely provides that the dollars collected from the farmer who has paid the loan shall be lent to another one who needs them. It creates a revolving fund.

There are 400,000 farm families now in America who have qualified for this type of assistance. Unless we do this we cannot possibly reach over 20 percent of them, probably not even that high a percentage, and we force them into a group where they do not want to go and where we do not want them to go; that is, to become W. P. A. recipients. They are trained for farm work and they should be given an opportunity there; they know only such work; they love it; and they soon become self-sufficient.

I have been in accord with everything that has been said about the National Youth Administration and the youth of the country, but it affords me a pleasure, indeed, to stand in the well of this House this afternoon and be the spokesman for the unfortunate American farmer. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I submit a privileged motion. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from New York offers a privileged motion, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO moves that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can reach an agreement as to time on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, and of that I would like 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 15 minutes, with the understanding that he have the last 3 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE) there were—ayes 186, noes 43.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, the farm-security program as it has been carried out is, I believe, one of the greatest and most successful efforts the Government has made in connection with trying to reduce the relief rolls. The rehabilitation of what you might call the poor farmers, particularly in my own State, has done more to cut down relief rolls in my State than any other program the Federal Government has adopted.

I dare say that it would have been virtually impossible for a great many of these farmers to continue their operations had it not been for the Farm Security Administration, which not only came to their rescue but provided them with a foothold on the future.

We have a great need in Montana for the rehabilitation of needy and low-income farm families whose desire for adequate credit on reasonable terms cannot be fulfilled through any other agency than such an organization as the Farm Security Administration.

In the Second Congressional District of Montana, which I have the honor of representing, the Farm Security Administration has made loans to 4,913 farmers since the inception of the F. S. A. program in July of 1935. The loans from emergency relief funds have totaled $5,123,828, an average of $1,042 per family, according to statistics announced by the Department of Agriculture.

It is highly important in our consideration of an appropriation for the Farm Security Administration to note that the farmers in my congressional district repaid $916,134 up to January 1 of this year, although much of the money will not be due for 4 or 5 years.

The Farm Security Administration, through its program of rehabilitation, has accomplished admirable results throughout the State of Montana and it would contribute a great hardship over the entire West if sufficient funds were not appropriated for the coming fiscal year.

As a part of the rehabilitation program, hundreds of farm families have raised their own food supplies and livestock feed, thereby making them less dependent on cash crops.

Relief through rehabilitation is the soundest program that can be carried on by any Government agency. We cannot give relief from day to day and expect the recipients to better their own economic welfare at the same time. It is my thought that the rehabilitation efforts through the Farm Security Administration will prove to be one of our most valuable projects in future years. Through the program, farm families are taught methods and provided funds to protect them in future years. They have remained off the relief rolls and if they are allowed to continue along these lines of progress, they will become independent and self-supporting farm families in the future. The Farm Security Administration is merely serving as a social agency which tides the farm families through their most desperate crises and gives them a new start for the future.

Farmers, businessmen, organized labor, and every farm organization in Montana are united in the belief that the Farm Security Administration has done splendid work and it would impose a dire hardship on Montana to have their funds curtailed.

It has been estimated that there are approximately 3,000 additional farm families in my congressional district who are eligible and in need of rehabilitation loans, but have been unable to obtain them owing to lack of funds.

As a Representative from a State which is in great need of additional assistance from the Farm Security Administration, I make an urgent plea to the membership of this House to permit the repayments under the farm security program to be placed in a revolving fund. Through that procedure, hundreds of additional farmers will be benefited materially. I consider the revolving fund as a necessity in the future activities of the F. S. A.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And this organization is battling to maintain individual farm ownership in the hands of American farmers, and it is the only organization doing that job that we have at this time. Further it is the only organization that is doing much of anything for the homeless migrants roaming this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is correct.

This money has been used by farmers to supply food, cows, chickens, work horses, and such things, and the people who have secured this aid are not on the relief rolls of the State but are now making a living for themselves.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington is very meritorious because it permits this fund of $123,000,000 to remain practically intact, allowing it to be lent to others as it is paid in.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. Would the gentleman be willing to have an amendment offered for another $123,000,000 to take lawyers off the relief rolls of this country and subsidize them 100 percent in the law business?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That has nothing to do with the farm situation.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I want to ask just this one question: If we had a farm program such as the cost of production bill would give, we would not have these difficulties?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It would solve all of our problems. I am for cost of production just as much as my friend from Oklahoma.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to announce that the names of the gentlemen who were on their feet at the time limitation on time was fixed were noted and the time to be apportioned among them will allow but 1 minute each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] for 1 minute.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, it is obviously impossible to go into the merits of this amendment in 1 minute. I do want to call attention, however, to the fact that this provision is the only one in the relief bill which is of any benefit to farmers. I think the farm-security program is sound and practical in every way, because it enables people who otherwise would be relief charges to take care of themselves. It sets them up on a basis where they can become self-supporting. It is not

theoretical or experimental but has been demonstrated by experience to be successful.

This program is not one in which the money is paid out and is gone forever. It is estimated, and the figures to date bear it out, that at least 80 percent of the money loaned under this program will be repaid. Even the comparatively small percentage which is paid out in grants affords the least expensive and more effective relief of that type of which I am familiar. If we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Washington, it will enable this effective program to be carried to many thousands of farm families who need it and who otherwise may be compelled to leave the farm and be cast adrift as thousands of others have been during the last few years. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, may I take this brief time to say that being familiar with the present program of Farm Security Administration, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY]. If adopted, this amendment will prove to be a godsend to thousands of needy farmers. It is one of the most meritorious amendments that has been offered today.

This amendment does not propose to increase the total sum in this bill. But on the other hand, it proposes a practical way of handling these funds for the benefit of needy farmers. The record shows that these farmers are paying back a large percent of their loans. As such loans are paid, it is thus proposed to create a revolving fund to assist other needy farmers rehabilitate themselves, what objectives could there be to this proposal to assist other farmers who are unable to get loans elsewhere?

In the district I have the honor to represent in Oklahoma, nearly 3,000 desperately needy farmers who were hanging on the ragged edge and unable to secure assistance elsewhere, have been saved and placed on their feet by the Farm Security Administration. There has been over $500,000 in new wealth created in that one district because of such loans. In the State of Oklahoma there have been some 25,000 farmers who were down and out, through no fault of their own, who can thank the Farm Security Administration for saving their very existence. The amendment ought to be adopted. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that after spending some 7 hours in the consideration of this bill, the pending amendment, concerning as it does the lives and welfare of at least 450,000 farmers, can only have 15 minutes for consideration. I would like to ask some of you who will be out among the farmers next year pointing with pride to what you did for the farmers, to remember these particular 15 minutes.

There are about 25,000 farms in the United States in the ownership of Federal land banks under foreclosure proceedings. There are 8,700 of those farms in the State of Wisconsin, where the farm land bank now owns practically 5 percent of all the farms in the State. The only recourse farmers have after being forced out of their homes, after having them sold under foreclosure, is to go to the city and get on relief or get some aid from the Farm Security Administration.

The Farm Security Administration has made loans for rehabilitation to 7,733 farmers in our district in the total amount of $1,382,179, and up to January 1, 1939, those farmers had repaid $401,227. They are continuing to pay under adverse conditions.

This amendment will enable more farmers who have lost their homes to the Federal land banks and insurance companies by foreclosure to have another opportunity. The cost to the Government is small—much smaller than forcing such farmers to move to town and obtain W. P. A. employment. It should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] for 1 minute.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY]. A few days ago I received from a farmer in my district a letter, as follows:

> DEAR MR. TERRY: Just a few lines to advise you of my opinion and the benefits I have received as a client from the Farm Security Administration.
>
> I put in my application for a loan in the fall of 1935 and received a loan to purchase a mule, plow tools, and food in the amount of $182.16. My 1937 loan was for $25 for food and $6 for veterinary service project. In 1938 I borrowed $105 to buy three milk cows and $12 to participate in a medical project. In 1936 it was possible for me to repay $53.64 on my account, $53 in 1937, $111.38 in 1938, and I have repaid this year already $110.62 from the sale of the mule that I bought in 1936 and my soil-conservation check for 1938. This year I borrowed $304 to purchase additional tools and livestock to make me self-supporting, and my annual repayments are broken down now so that I can easily meet them and still have a surplus to operate on.
>
> To me the farm-security program is one of the best policies out to help the low-income farmer who can't get assistance elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, this letter was written to me on May 25, 1939, by Mr. Hugh Patton, a friend of mine who lives at Oark, in my district, and is a good example of what this program means to the small farmers of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is a travesty upon justice to agriculture in America to permit only 15 minutes for the consideration of this most important amendment. We will be here for 10 hours today in debate, but when it comes to considering something in this bill on behalf of the farmers, 15 minutes is the limit. I consider it a farce and a rank injustice, and I want to tell you I do. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I urge upon the Members, if they want to do something for 35 percent of the people of America, vote for the pending amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, there have been many times when I have felt constrained to criticize the management of the Farm Security Administration. They have made mistakes, just as has everybody else who has had to handle large sums of money, but they have done a splendid work for the people in the rural sections who need aid the most. They have actually accomplished things. They have not simply given us promises, as have many of the other agencies. This has been the only agency that has gone out from the towns way out up the head of the creeks and actually carried some species of relief to the people out there who were not able to get down to the courthouse and go to some relief office. Last fall W. P. A. certified a number of needy farmers in my section, but they were never assigned to work. The Farm Security Administration has not dispensed charity; it has made loans, which are being repaid. If they are not being repaid, why object to the amendment. It does not appropriate any additional new money. It only allows this agency to use the money that is collected from the farmers who were aided last year. The Farm Security Administration has been the only agency, and it is today the only agency, that carries relief out to the people who need it most. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am for this amendment because it will take care of the farmers in distress and keep them on the farms in place of swelling the present oversupply of unemployables in the cities and towns. May I ask which is the best way to take care of the farmer, to keep him on his own farm or let him go into the cities and towns and go on W. P. A. or on direct relief? I feel that it is ordinary common sense to support this amendment, which simply states that we will not increase the appropriation but will permit it to be used as a revolving fund. In other words, if I get a loan

this year and am able to pay back part of it, then that part will be used to keep another farmer on his farm instead of compelling him to become an unemployed in the cities and towns. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, the major task of the Farm Security Administration is the rehabilitation of needy and low-income farm families through small loans, accompanied by guidance in sound farming methods to insure the best possible use of the money.

Most of these families are extremely poor credit risks, judged by normal standards. None of them can obtain adequate credit on reasonable terms elsewhere. Many have been on relief. Our program is designed to make them independent of further assistance by providing them with the equipment and the training necessary for successful farming.

From the beginning of the program in 1935 until January 1, 1939, a total of $232,410,369 had been loaned to approximately 650,000 farm families in the United States. These borrowers already have repaid approximately $72,000,000 into the Federal Treasury.

The Farm Security Administration has made such loans to 20,216 farmers in Georgia since the inception of the program in July 1935. The loans from emergency relief funds have totaled $7,827,399.51, an average of $387.19 per family.

These farmers had repaid $3,624,653.55 up to January 1, 1939, although much of the money will not be due for 4 or 5 years.

We have just completed a survey of the progress made by a group of typical rehabilitation borrowers as of January 1. This survey, covering 10,053 families in Georgia, showed they had increased their total net worth since coming onto the program from $1,318,560 to $4,005,600 at the end of the 1938 crop year over and above all debts.

These families, therefore, had added a total of $2,687,040 to the wealth of their communities, or an average of $267.28 per family. We consider these net-worth figures, which reflect the difference between total assets and total liabilities of each family, an even better indication of progress than repayment figures, because they show the actual progress made by the family.

During the past crop year alone, these families increased their total net worth by $662,000, or an average of $65.85 for each family.

One of the primary aims of the rehabilitation program is to enable borrowers to raise their own food supplies and livestock feed, so they will be less dependent upon cash crops. Their progress is indicated by the fact that the 10,053 typical F. S. A. families who reported in Georgia had stored away 1,543,600 quarts of fruits and vegetables last year to tide them through the winter. The average family has increased its annual production of home-canned food by 133 quarts since it first received an F. S. A. loan.

Moreover, the production of meat for home use has risen a total of 4,486,599 pounds annually, or 445 pounds per family; and the average increase in egg production for home consumption was 83 dozen per family.

Relatively few families owned milk cows when they first sought F. S. A. aid, and this lack often was reflected in the health of their children. By the end of the 1938 crop year, however, the borrowers in Georgia reported that they had increased their milk production by an average of 401 gallons annually, or a total of 4,028,869 gallons.

This increase in the production of foodstuffs does not mean additional competition with farmers in other areas, since virtually the entire output was consumed at home. It represents improved diet, based on foodstuffs which previously were not available, usually accompanied by a marked improvement in health.

One of the most frequent causes of distress among farmers is the fact that they are overburdened with debts. Consequently the Farm Security Administration has set up local farm debt adjustment committees, to bring the debtor and his creditors together for a friendly discussion of their mutual problems. These committees have no legal authority to compel adjustments, but usually they find it possible to reach agreements for extending the time of payment, reducing interest rates, or scaling down the obligations. As a result, the farmer is saved from foreclosure, and his creditors obtain substantial payments on what might otherwise have been uncollectible debts.

In Georgia 2,043 farm families had been helped through such debt adjustments up to January 1939. Their obligations were scaled down from $3,283,339 to $2,817,377, a total reduction of $465,962, or 14.2 percent. As a direct result of these adjustments, a total of $71,161 in back taxes was paid to local governmental agencies.

Another main object of the rehabilitation program is to get better land tenure for borrowers who are tenants or sharecroppers. While many of the borrowing families are owners, the report showed that among the tenants, 8,373 had obtained written instead of oral leases. Moreover, 1,647 had advanced from a sharecropper to a tenant status during the year.

There are three other measures of the progress made by these rehabilitation borrowers. The report showed that 1,025 families were getting medical attention, through participation in group medical care programs; 2,415 were practicing erosion-control measures; and 13,357 children of school age were enabled to attend school as a direct result of the rehabilitation program.

Our field workers reported that they knew personally of 19,923 families in Georgia who were eligible and in need of rehabilitation loans, but were unable to obtain them because of lack of funds.

JUNE 13, 1939.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RAMSPECK: In accordance with our recent telephone conversation, we are sending you herewith a brief outline of the work of the Farm Security Administration in Georgia.

I want especially to call your attention to the fact that this agency has made loans to about 1 out of every 12 farm families in the State. Moreover, the average rehabilitation borrower in Georgia has more than tripled his net worth since he first received Farm Security Administration help. If all farm families in Georgia had been able to make the same financial gains as our borrowers have, they would have increased the farm wealth of the State by about $66,750,000. This would be considerably more than the cash income from all the lint cotton raised in Georgia in 1937, and nearly 80 percent of all the wages earned by the State's industrial workers in 1935.

Since the rehabilitation program started 4 years ago we have helped more than 650,000 needy farm families to get a new start toward independence and self-support. The annual cost has been extremely low—about $75 per family, including all expenses of administration and losses on loans. I have no doubt that if the rehabilitation program is curtailed, many thousands of destitute farm families will be forced to seek some kind of relief in the cities. Obviously it would be far more economical to help these people support themselves on the land than to let them become an added burden to the urban relief rolls.

Sincerely,

WILL W. ALEXANDER, *Administrator.*

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, the spectacle we are witnessing here this evening leads me to believe that if the people who wrote the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States were doing it again they would say, "In this country, we will have free speech if the new dealers do not clamp on a gag rule when anyone wants to talk in defense of the farmers of America."

Fifteen minutes to discuss a problem vital to the interests of a third of the people of America. Fifteen minutes for the people who are trying to do their best to come back and rehabilitate themselves to be heard here as to the reasons why they ought to be given consideration by this body. I have heard of laughing bills to death and I have heard of being kidded out of court, but this is the first time I have seen a bill killed by dividing the time of its supporters into so many pieces you destroy it by the fine art of mathematical division. [Applause.]

This amendment which has been worked out by those of us especially interested in rehabilitating the farmer of

America on his own farm is a vital piece of legislation. It is in the strictest harmony with the type of philosophy which I think should dominate all of our thinking in the matter of giving preference among different types of relief projects or relief programs. This amendment provides additional funds for helping the farmer to equip himself on his own farm so he can build himself up to the point of becoming independent again. With the money he borrows in these rural rehabilitation loans the farmer can buy a few cows or some farm equipment or a little seed or whatever he happens to need the most in the important business of staying on the farm, getting another start, and keeping himself and his family off the W. P. A. rolls. Without such helpful loans which average in size from $100 to $1,500 per individual case, according to the evidence put into the hearings by Acting Director C. B. Baldwin, of the Farm Security Administration, many of our farmers would have to leave the farm and move into town; with these loans to help them, they can support themselves on their own farms, lessen our W. P. A. loads, and reduce potential relief rolls by building themselves back to self-sufficiency.

This amendment does not call for an extra dime of appropriations. We merely ask that this money which is now being appropriated be earmarked for a revolving fund so that as money is paid back by these honest and hard-working farmers it may again be loaned to other farmers so that they, too, may be given the friendly boost of a rehabilitation loan to help them get back on their feet. I urge all of you to support this amendment as a type of relief which is economically sound and philosophically honest, because it is a program which combines relief of today's distress with recovery steps leading to tomorrow's recovery.

If this amendment is stifled by the gangster tactics so increasingly being imposed by the majority party of this House, it will have the unenviable responsibility of answering to the farmers of America why it is that they deny them their day in court and limit to the ridiculous period of 15 minutes the discussion on this important measure of farm relief and general recovery.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD].

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in my 3 years of service in this House that I have risen to speak on a piece of legislation or an amendment thereto. I wish to say that I live out in a rural area in Illinois, where I have had occasion to see how this program works. I say to you that this is one of the most germane amendments that could be offered to this bill, because the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration has kept thousands and thousands of families off relief. We have farmers in this Nation who in good times can get along without much difficulty, but during the depression they were "washed up," as you might say, and they have to be rehabilitated. There are thousands and thousands of farmers who need such rehabilitation. By giving it to them they are kept off the rolls of relief and off the rolls of W. P. A. This is the most worthy amendment to this bill that could be voted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there is a sound reason for adopting this amendment to the bill. We have a perfect precedent in the revolving fund that was set up for the emergency crop loan fund of the Farm Credit Administration. This amendment merely provides that the collections of the Farm Security Administration can be used for a revolving fund. The Farm Security Administration in its rural rehabilitation loans program has made a good record, and this amendment deserves your support. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, increases the expenditures and increases the Budget estimate for the Farm Security Administration by something between $50,000,000 and $70,000,000. The loans under the Farm Security Administration when repaid go back into the Public Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I cannot yield.

The Budget for the next fiscal year has an expected receipt of $60,000,000 from these loans. When you take these receipts away from the Treasury and give the money back to the farmers to make new loans you have increased the Budget estimate $60,000,000.

Is there no limit to what Congress will do in pouring out receipts of the Public Treasury into the lap of agriculture? The sum of $383,000,000, over and above the Budget estimate, was added onto the agricultural bill, now in conference, by the Senate a few weeks ago. Our committee gave to the Farm Security Administration every penny the President asked us to give them for that program this year. The Farm Security Administration felt that they could carry the program on with that sum very well and very satisfactorily. The President in his wisdom reduced the Farm Security Administration's program by the same proportion as he reduced the program for W. P. A. This House has ratified the action of the Budget and the action of the President in reducing the program 33⅓ percent. Certainly, it will not now override all that action and add another $60,000,000 over and above Budget estimates to the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. These loans go back into the Public Treasury.

Look at the hearings, if you please. Of course, the Farm Security Administration does good work among the farmers, and they are provided for. No one is more interested in trying to carry that program forward than the President. He has taken as decided an interest in it as any of you gentlemen who are so much interested in agriculture and in trying to help the farmer.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I only have 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. LEAVY. I just want to challenge that statement.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Twelve minutes for and three minutes against is not an unfair division of the time. We have been debating these things for more than 2 days and these gentlemen have not discussed this question at all. No one ever heard of this amendment until it was brought on the floor this afternoon. How can you gentlemen say you did not have a hearing? Why did you not come before the committee and ask for this provision? Why did you not bring it up in general debate so someone could find out what it really meant? It is offered here in the closing hours for an emotional appeal to the Congress to add it onto this bill. Do not blame the committee for cutting you off now with only 15 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I would like to yield to my friend. I know of his great interest in agriculture, insect control, National Youth, Indians, and irrigation projects. [Laughter.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEAVY), there were—ayes 78, noes 157.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. LEAVY and Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUERTO RICO RECONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) In order to continue rural rehabilitation for needy persons in Puerto Rico, there is hereby appropriated to the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, Department of the Interior, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, $7,000,000, together with the balance of the appropriation under subsection (4) of section 1 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938, as supplemented by the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1939, which remains unobligated on June 30, 1939.

(b) The funds provided in this section shall be available for (1) administration; (2) loans; (3) the prosecution of projects approved by the President for the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938; and (4) subject to the approval of the President, for projects involving rural rehabilitation of needy persons.

INDIAN SERVICE

SEC. 5. (a) In order to continue to provide relief and rural rehabilitation for needy Indians in the United States, there is hereby appropriated to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, $1,350,000.

(b) The funds provided in this section shall be available for (1) administration, not to exceed $67,500; (2) loans; (3) relief; (4) the prosecution of projects approved by the President for the Farm Security Administration for the benefit of Indians under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938; and (5) subject to the approval of the President, for projects involving rural rehabilitation of needy Indians.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: On page 11, line 4, after the period, insert a new section to be known as section 5½, reading:

"HISTORICAL RESEARCH WORK

"In order that the historical research work now in progress under the Works Progress Administration may be continued for the next fiscal year, there is hereby appropriated to the Works Progress Administration out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, $6,304,800."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, as we have passed the section of the bill dealing with W. P. A.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BURDICK. No; I simply desire to say that this amendment has been on the desk all the afternoon, and if you have discussed it in connection with any other part of the bill I did not hear it. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not want to stop the gentleman from making a brief statement.

Mr. BURDICK. I want to state briefly what the amendment is.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I have not the least idea this House will pass this amendment, because I think we know just about as much about handling relief as an inmate of a foolish asylum knows about the hereafter. [Laughter.]

There is only one man who has presented any argument here today on the question of how to handle relief and that was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

This relief problem is not temporary, this problem is going to be permanent, and just as long as we think it is not permanent and make it a temporary affair, just so long we are going to have poor administration of relief.

The amendment I propose here is to let the historical research work go ahead. They are doing the greatest work of any educational institution in this country. There is no university now operating in America that has turned out the work this institution has turned out and I want to say there are not many Members of Congress who really understand what this historical organization has done. They have prepared imprints of the various States of the Union, and I do not suppose there is a Member of Congress who knows anything about the imprints of his own State, and you could not obtain one anywhere no matter how much money you may have. There are 7,100 people engaged in that work today, looking up the historical records of the various States of the Union and they are paid the meager sum of $74 per month, and this is work that is necessary.

By imprints I mean publications published within the area of the State and most of them dating back at the very beginning of the exploration of that territory. These documents are historical in nature. They consist of books, pamphlets, newspapers, reports, sermons, all or many of which have already been forgotten. These rare documents are being brought to light and listed and their whereabouts definitely located for the future use of all of the citizens of that State and this Nation. For example, the list of imprints of Chicago from 1850 to 1871 are particularly scarce, not because none were ever printed but because of the great Chicago fire. These documents are being located, which were printed in Chicago during that period, by the historical section of the W. P. A. administration. These documents are found at places, in many instances, thousands of miles from Chicago, some in the possession of libraries but more in the possession of private individuals who have realized the value to future history of these scarce and interesting documents of the past. No such contribution has ever been attempted in this country and the value of the work will always remain commensurate with our love and devotion to the recorded history of our own Nation, State, and local community. To abandon this work now as a Federal project will be a serious blow, not only to those worthy workers in this field of history, but more of a blow to our own education and intelligence. That is work that will return many times the amount of the expense to the people of the United States, and if we are looking for a chance to put people to work, why in the name of common sense do we not let them work when they have a job? But under the terms of this bill, I understand that force of men and women who were furnishing the people of the United States this valuable information are going to be cut off, and that work suspended. As the work is now in operation today, about $6,000,000 is expended annually upon it. What is the difference between planned work and emergency work? A lot of you people complain about the inefficiency of the W. P. A., and it is our own fault that it is inefficient.

Here is a chance where we know the work to be done is valuable work, and will always remain a monument to the intelligence of the American people, and yet when we have a branch of work of that kind which is necessary for the people of this country, you come along and destroy it, and then you wonder what you will put the people to work at, and if the administrator makes a mistake, then it is the fault of the administration in charge of the Government at that time. The time is going to come, whether you believe it or not—and I do not care what you believe, and I am concerned about what I believe—and from the evidence to me it is indisputable that the employment situation is not going to disappear of itself. Unemployment will continue, and a new day in government is at hand right now, a new responsibility of government, and that responsibility is to let men and women work who want to work, and if private business cannot employ them, it is our duty to furnish that employment. I know you do not like that doctrine, but just as surely as I stand here it will be proved by the history of this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia insist upon his point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from North Dakota offers an amendment to page 11, line 5, to which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] makes the point of order upon the ground that the gentleman's amendment comes too late, and that it is not germane to the part of the bill to which it is offered. The Chair has considered the amendment, and invites attention to the language appearing on the bottom of page 3 in section 1 of the pending bill:

Educational, professional, clerical, cultural, and recreational work—

And so forth. The Chair is of opinion that, if germane at all to the pending bill, the gentleman's amendment would be germane to section 1 and that the amendment comes too late. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a privileged motion. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOOK) there were—ayes 52, noes 128.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan demands tellers. Those favoring tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Eleven Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

So the Committee refused to rise.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to that section of the bill where the Chair thinks this amendment would be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to return to section 1 of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

SEC. 6. In order to provide for administrative expenses incidental to carrying out the purposes of this title, there is hereby appropriated to the following agencies, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940: (1) General Accounting Office, $5,225,000; (2) Treasury Department: (a) Procurement Division, Branch of Supply, $5,200,000; (b) Division of Disbursement, $2,500,000; (c) Office of the Treasurer, $675,000; (d) Secret Service Division, $250,000; (e) Office of Commissioner of Accounts and Deposits and Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants, $5,973,825, for administrative accounting; total, Treasury Department, $14,598,825; (3) Bureau of the Budget, $26,175; (4) Public Health Service, $300,000; and (5) Civil Aeronautics Authority, $250,000.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) In order to carry out the provisions of section 24 hereof, there is hereby appropriated to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, $5,250,000: *Provided*, That so much of the appropriation in this section, as the Commission, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, estimates and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury will be necessary for the payment of such compensation and administrative expenses, shall be set aside in a special fund to be available and to be administered by the Commission during the fiscal year 1940 for such purposes; and after June 30, 1940, such special fund shall be added to and become part of the "Employees' Compensation Fund, Emergency Relief", set up in accordance with the provisions of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1939: *Provided further*, That the special fund herein authorized shall not be limited in its use to the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

(b) The funds appropriated in this section, together with the balance of funds heretofore appropriated or allocated to such Commission under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938 or prior emergency relief appropriation acts, shall be available for payments to Federal agencies for medical and hospital services supplied by such departments and establishments in accordance with regulations of the Commission for injured persons entitled to benefits under section 24 hereof.

(c) Not to exceed $75,000 of the amount appropriated in this section shall be available during the fiscal year 1940 for the purposes specified in the appropriation for salaries and expenses of such Commission in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 8. There is hereby appropriated to the Executive Office of the President, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, $850,000. Such sum shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out the functions heretofore vested in the National Emergency Council and transferred to the Executive Office of the President and the functions of the Radio Division of the Federal Security Agency. Such functions are authorized to be carried out until June 30, 1940. Of the sum appropriated in this section not to exceed $20,000 may be transferred to such Radio Division.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 13, line 7, strike out all of section 8.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in November 1933 the President, by Executive order, created the National Emergency Council. In September of 1937 he issued another order to abolish that council. Two months later he modified that order to continue its existence at his discretion. In the Emergency Relief Act of 1938 it was continued until June 30, 1939. Now we have a provision in this bill to give it $850,000 for 1940.

You will remember that in reorganization plan No. II the council as such was abolished and the functions were vested in the President or in the Executive Office. At the time that reorganization bill was on the floor you may recall I said if I had breath in this body of mine I intended to offer an amendment to strike out the provision for the National Emergency Council, and that is the amendment that is now at the desk.

If anything was ever an indefensible propaganda agency, it is this. It has a corps of newspaper clippers down there to clip some 400 newspapers and to send those clippings to Members of Congress and department heads. It has a corps of scissors artists down there to clip magazines and send them to the heads of departments and to Members of Congress. Last year it got out 2,847 films, some large, some small; propaganda films, if you please, like The Plow That Broke the Plains, which was shown in theaters; or like the so-called film known as The River, which was propaganda work in behalf of flood control. Now they have other films in preparation. One, according to the testimony of Mr. Mellett, which dramatizes the unemployment problem and shows man in the machine age.

There is another one centering around the program of motion pictures to somehow dramatize the theme of the good-neighbor policy with South America. Those are the things that are being done by the radio division, by the film division, and by the National Emergency Council. In addition to that, they have a picture now based on a health program, dramatized from the book known as The Fight for Life, which is already in the script stage. In addition, they are dramatizing and getting ready for the picture theaters of the country a film centering around rural electrification. It would be infinitely better for the administration to do something about these problems insead of dramatizing them in motion pictures.

It is a propaganda agency pure and simple. Instead of reducing expenditures, it is reaching out for more money and more authority in order to carry on because we are up against an election year.

On page 345 of the hearings, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative WIGGLESWORTH, asked this question:

Have you made any reduction in your estimates, in the light of reorganization?

And Mr. Mellett said:

No, sir.

The N. E. C. operates through State directors and seeks to pressure the legislatures of the country. They testified that they offered 254 bills to the legislatures and 62 of them were passed in the last fiscal year, showing the tremendous pressure that a centralized bureaucracy in Washington is exerting upon the legislatures of the States.

On page 612 of the 1938 hearings, it is indicated that when the former director was before the committee, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked him why his request was for an increase in money, and the director said this:

The first half of the fiscal year 1938 and the fiscal year 1939 are not comparable. So far as fiscal years are concerned that period is comparable with 1936 because of the fact that the demands for information during an election year are tremendous as compared with the demands in an off year.

There you have a fair indication of the activities of the National Emergency Council.

What is this item doing in a relief bill? It has no business there. Ostensibly, of course, it is to coordinate relief activities in the country, but mainly for propaganda purposes, and it should be stricken from this bill. It has no business there. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes, 1 minute for the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, is it not a "terrible" thing that the people of this country should be informed about flood control, unemployment, and the problems of rural electrification, and all those things? And is it not just "awful" for any government to give the people information on those important subjects? It seems almost impossible for me to see how such things could happen. And now

seriously, gentlemen, I do not see why we should not have films informing the people of the problems of flood control and things of that kind. Of course, I was speaking sarcastically a moment ago.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman think that information ought to be accurate and not misrepresent the true facts?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I certainly do think it should be accurate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think that it may be possible that our Republican brethren, who are so deeply concerned about the dramatization of soil conservation and other activities of the Federal Government, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, might be fearful lest someone might think of dramatizing those terrible, dark, never-to-be-forgotten days of the last Republican administration when prosperity "Hoovered" too long around the corner?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Perhaps they may be fearful of that. But, speaking seriously, I think that on these more important problems of conservation and the like the country should have information, and the more the better. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the National Emergency Council was carried at $1,500,000 in the Budget estimate. The committee cut them back to $850,000 because it felt that some of the things of which the gentleman from Illinois complains had been overexpanded a bit.

The gentleman spoke about the informational service. I think he should have gone a step further and stated that Mr. Mellett said that many Members on the minority side of the House called upon the National Emergency Council for statistical information and for information that they had to furnish.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe the United States Information Service, if it furnishes useful service, could be placed in the Budget Bureau, where it belongs, instead of being set up as a propaganda agency.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I appreciate the way the gentleman feels, but it has been cut down. I do not know how many Members saw the picture, The River, if that is its correct name, a dramatization of what erosion does to land. I am not a farmer, and I am frank to say that I had never before realized its effect until I saw it graphically set forth in that picture. That picture has done a great deal of good.

The Committee has cut this activity below the Budget estimate, and I hope very much that the gentleman's amendment will not prevail, but that this agency will be permitted to go ahead.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 83, noes 111.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

SEC. 9. There is hereby appropriated to the National Resources Planning Board, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, $750,000. Such sum shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out the functions heretofore vested in the National Resources Committee, and such functions are authorized to be carried out until June 30, 1940.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 13, line 18, to line 2, on page 14, strike out all of section 9.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to strike $750,000 for the National Resources Committee, that propaganda organization to increase the expenses of the Federal Government, of which Secretary Ickes is one of the major factors. I am not going to spend any time on it, I am just going to hope that we will return to some sort of sanity in government and get rid of propaganda organizations designed to promote expenditure of money.

I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 97, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total appropriations, title I, $1,716,600,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 3, strike out "$1,716,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,735,600,000."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this merely corrects the total in accordance with the amendment adopted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise now because of the invocation of the cloture rule for I probably otherwise would not get an opportunity to speak on the subject matter of section 12 at the appropriate time.

Section 12 as now written in the bill, but which will be amended or attempted to be amended by the gentleman from Virginia—as he announced a short while ago—with reference to projects under $40,000 and projects that have now been approved by the President or which are now under construction, will cause tremendous havoc throughout the length and breadth of the land.

I have prepared a substitute amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia. My substitute provides that in any project above $25,000 the excess shall be defrayed to the extent of 50 percent thereof by Federal funds and the balance by local sponsors and local communities.

One of the Appropriations Committee members was to offer an amendment to strike out section 12. If the gentleman is not going to offer the motion to strike I will then offer my substitute amendment which will provide that in all projects above $25,000, one-half of the funds may be appropriated from Federal funds and the balance supplied by local sponsors or local communities.

We know that the local communities and the cities are practically bankrupt. Section 12, as written and as it will be amended or attempted to be amended by the gentleman from Virginia, will not give any relief whatsoever. Regardless of the cost of a project, such as a building, in section 12, if the building is to be erected, all that the W. P. A. can contribute is a limit of $40,000. If local sponsors cannot raise the balance, the building will not be erected. You are taking practically all the local benefits from the W. P. A.; and, so far as my own city of New York is concerned, where most of these projects are in excess of $25,000 and $50,000, the lay-off will be very great, and it would simply be a running broad jump back to leaf raking. Under the Woodrum amendment, if, for example, a building cost, say, $340,000, all that the Government would contribute would be $40,000, and unless the local community could now yield $300,000 the building could not be erected as a W. P. A. building project. Under my amendment the W. P. A. could contribute $40,000 plus one-half of the balance, or $150,000, provided the local sponsors contributed $150,000.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman spoke about the local communities and the States being bankrupt. I would like to know

how much longer you are going to keep on the way you are going before you bankrupt the Nation.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman had his way, I am afraid there would be far more bankruptcies than there are at the present time.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The mayor of New York told us that the building projects were not the prize projects of W. P. A. in New York.

Mr. CELLER. I may say to the gentleman from New York that there were 29,000 W. P. A. workers on building projects, and all but 2,000 were engaged on or have been engaged generally on projects far in excess of $25,000. That means you are going to put on the relief rolls 27,000 of the 29,000 present W. P. A. workers on buildings in New York City. We are going to have a total of 70,000 workers laid off in New York as a result of the earmarking to the extent of $125,000,000 to P. W. A. and the other restrictions of the bill. It is a very serious situation.

You are wrecking most W. P. A. plans. You will cause intense suffering and misery. You will drive many into the ranks of communism, for communism feeds upon the very misery, penury, want, and distress you are creating by this bill.

I herewith insert some factual information furnished by the W. P. A.:

LIMITATION ON THE SIZE OF W. P. A. BUILDING PROJECTS

Section 12 of the committee draft of the appropriation bill (p. 15) provides that: "None of the funds made available by this title shall be expended on the construction of any building the estimated total cost of which exceeds $25,000, unless the building is one upon which construction is in progress on June 14, 1939."

If this provision is enacted into law, it will wipe out practically all of the W. P. A. public-building projects. Over 80 percent of W. P. A. public-building work is provided by projects costing over $25,000.

Size of project:	*Percent of total*
Under $25,000	18.1
$25,000–$49,999	15.6
	33.7
$50,000–$99,999	14.6
$100,000–$249,999	19.8
$250,000 and over	31.9
	66.3

These projects are currently providing employment for about 237,000 persons and 95 percent of them are from the local relief rolls. Public buildings supply from 8 to 10 percent of all the employment on the entire W. P. A. program. If the W. P. A. is compelled to discontinue public-building projects, thousands of unemployed building-trades workers in need of relief will either be dependent on direct relief or be forced to take unskilled work with consequent deterioration of their skills and waste of their training and experience.

Public buildings are among the most worth-while and needed projects in both rural and urban communities made possible by the W. P. A. program. The 17,500 new public buildings constructed by the W. P. A. program, together with 46,000 rehabilitated buildings and 1,660 additions to existing structures, include schools, libraries, hospitals, county courthouses, aircraft hangars, armories, and other structures in every State. A brief summary of some of the more important accomplishments on W. P. A. public-building projects follows:

	New buildings	Rehabilitated structures	Additions to existing structures
All public buildings	17,562	46,318	1,663
Schools	2,289	21,540	758
Libraries	73	622	32
Recreational buildings (gymnasiums, auditoriums, pavilions, etc.)	5,486	3,546	296
Hospitals	101	1,422	38
Penal institutions	92	321	17
Courthouses and other administrative buildings	792	2,999	126
Aircraft hangars	102	96	5
Other	8,627	15,772	391

A larger proportion of the total cost of public-building projects can be secured from sponsors than on any other major type of work. Consequently if the public buildings are eliminated the amount of funds sponsors put into the whole program would be reduced. During the first 9 months of the current fiscal year sponsors' funds amounted to 23.6 percent of the total cost of W. P. A. public-building projects, as compared with 18 percent for all other types of work.

Elimination of large public-building projects would not reduce the Federal cost of the W. P. A. program. It is important to remember that W. P. A. expenditures are limited by law to the labor cost plus $7 per man per month in each State. If a sponsoring community needs a large public-building project involving high material costs, it is necessary for the sponsor to furnish the additional material required. If a sponsor wishes to pay for the material and equipment cost of a large public-building project over the Federal allowance, there seems to be no logical reason for not doing such work, inasmuch as the W. P. A. costs are not affected at all. Actually, the Federal nonlabor cost per man per month on W. P. A. public-building projects has averaged $6.10, less than the $7 allowed by law for all projects, while the wage cost, determined by the security earnings schedule, as is the case in all other types of work, has averaged about $61.80 per man per month.

At a Federal cost of $61.80 per man per month for labor and $6.10 for nonlabor costs, it is possible to provide work for one man for 1 year for every $815 in Federal funds expended. The man-year cost of employment provided under private contract through W. P. A. grants is much higher than under the W. P. A. program. For public-building contract construction the average man-year cost is about $4,600. If only $815 of this, or the equivalent W. P. A. cost, were allowed from Federal funds, the sponsor of the contract job would have to supply the remainder, or over 80 percent of the total cost of the job. It is obvious to anyone acquainted with the realities of local governments' financial resources that the project could not be undertaken on this basis at all. If the Federal allowance per man employed were greatly increased in order to secure local sponsorship, the amount of employment which could be provided would be correspondingly reduced and the purpose of the work-relief appropriation defeated.

Limiting the size of W. P. A. building projects would, therefore, mean that many much needed public improvements possible only through the W. P. A. program would not be secured. The proposed restrictions would place a needless obstacle in the way of the attainment of a useful work program and would yield no benefit to the Federal Government in return.

Employment on Works Progress Administration public-building projects by certification status and by months, January 1939 through March 1939

[Subject to revision]

Month	Number of persons employed			Percent certified
	Total	Certified	Not certified	
January	249,897	239,786	10,111	96.0
February	248,474	238,396	10,078	95.9
March	236,948	226,905	10,043	95.8

Number of persons employed on W. P. A. public-building projects, by States, continental United States, week ending Mar. 25, 1939

[Subject to revision]

Continental United States	236,948
Alabama	3,647
Arizona	1,092
Arkansas	3,637
California	13,822
Colorado	4,024
Connecticut	2,736
Delaware	258
District of Columbia	3,373
Florida	6,767
Georgia	4,938
Idaho	1,137
Illinois	13,044
Indiana	4,148
Iowa	1,913
Kansas	1,993
Kentucky	6,266
Louisiana	2,819
Maine	781
Maryland	1,236
Massachusetts	12,747
Michigan	8,016
Minnesota	6,374
Mississippi	2,946
Missouri	11,054
Montana	1,148
Nebraska	1,986
Nevada	135
New Hampshire	153
New Jersey	8,436

Number of persons employed on W. P. A. public-building projects, by States, continental United States, week ending Mar. 25, 1939—Continued

New Mexico	2,641
New York (including New York City)	30,903
North Carolina	4,181
North Dakota	1,764
Ohio	12,328
Oklahoma	8,136
Oregon	1,498
Pennsylvania	9,221
Rhode Island	1,568
South Carolina	6,829
South Dakota	1,158
Tennessee	1,490
Texas	9,982
Utah	1,529
Vermont	35
Virginia	2,026
Washington	4,590
West Virginia	1,722
Wisconsin	4,354
Wyoming	367

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL AND SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. Funds appropriated in this title to the various agencies shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending June 30, 1940, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished to such agencies during such period for the purposes herein set forth.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: On page 14, line 10, after the words "set forth", insert the following: "Of the funds appropriated in this title to the various agencies not more than 22 percent of said funds shall be expended prior to September 30, 1939, and not more than 50 percent of said funds shall be expended prior to December 31, 1939, and not more than 78 percent of said funds shall be expended prior to March 31, 1940."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering this amendment is not so much to move toward economy, although I believe it will save millions of dollars. The amendment is offered in fairness to the unemployed and people on relief. This assures that the supply of relief money will be constant throughout the winter months. It will prevent the cruel practice of increasing the rolls during a period for political expediency, only to be turned out in the time of greatest need.

It provides for the months of July, August, September, 22 percent of the appropriation; for the next 3 months when winter sets in 28 percent, and 28 percent for the third quarter, leaving 22 percent when summer comes again.

Section 10 already provides that this money shall last all year. What I am trying to do by the amendment I have offered is prevent people from being turned out in the dead of winter.

There is another thought I would like to leave with you. Ours is a dual Government. Part of this responsibility falls on local and State governments. They have a right to know how this money is going to be spread out and whether or not they will have to increase their contributions in the middle of the winter or in the middle of any one month.

I hope the committee will agree to the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER. In view of the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] that section 10 would not prevent coming back to Congress and asking for a deficiency appropriation for relief, may I ask the Chairman if that is true?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that is not the subject of a parliamentary inquiry. The question the gentleman addressed in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry is properly to be directed to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER. I am afraid I did not make my question clear. Will the adoption of section 10 prevent the Congress enacting a future deficiency bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not within the province of the Chair to interpret future results.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as having been read and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BOEHNE]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

SEC. 11. (a) Except as permitted by subsection (b) of section 25 no Federal project shall be prosecuted under the appropriation made in section 1. Federal construction projects undertaken under prior relief appropriation acts may be prosecuted under such appropriation if there have been allocated and irrevocably set aside under such acts Federal funds sufficient for their completion.

(b) No Federal construction project except flood-control and water-conservation projects authorized under other law, shall be undertaken or prosecuted under the appropriations in this title unless and until there shall have been allocated and irrevocably set aside Federal funds sufficient for its completion.

(c) No non-Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted under appropriations under this title unless and until the sponsor has made a written agreement to finance such part of the entire cost thereof as the head of the agency, if the agency administers sponsored projects, determines under the circumstances is an adequate contribution taking into consideration the financial ability of the sponsor. The head of the agency shall prescribe rules and regulations relating to the valuation of contributions in kind by sponsor of projects through furnishing the use of their own facilities and equipment and the services of their own employees, which shall also allow credit only to the extent that the furnishing of such contributions represents a financial burden which is undertaken by the spsonsor on account of Works Progress Administration projects, or other sponsored projects.

SEC. 12. None of the funds made available by this title shall be expended on the construction of any building the estimated total cost of which exceeds $25,000, unless the building is one upon which construction is in progress on June 14, 1939.

SEC. 13. (a) The various agencies for which appropriations are made in this title are authorized to receive from sponsors of non-Federal projects contributions in services, materials, or money, such money to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the sponsor and such agencies.

(b) All receipts and collections of Federal agencies by reason of operations in consequence of appropriations made in this title, except cash contributions of sponsors of projects and amounts credited to revolving funds authorized by this title, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) Except as authorized in this title, no allocation of funds shall be made to any other Federal agency from the appropriation in this title for any Federal agency.

SEC. 14. Agencies receiving appropriations in this title are authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes for which such appropriations are made.

SEC. 15. (a) The Board shall fix a monthly earning schedule for persons engaged upon work projects financed in whole or in part from funds appropriated by section 1 which shall not substantially affect the current national average labor cost per person of the Work Projects Administration. The Board shall require that the hours of work for all persons engaged upon work projects financed in whole or in part by funds appropriated by section 1 shall (1) be 130 hours per month except that, in the discretion of the Board, it may require a lesser number of hours of work per month in the case of relief workers with no dependents and the earnings of such workers shall be correspondingly reduced, and (2) not exceed 8 hours in any day and shall not exceed 40 hours in any week.

(b) The Board may authorize exemptions from the above limitations of monthly earnings and hours of work in the case of an emergency involving the public welfare and in the case of supervisory personnel employed on work projects.

SEC. 16. (a) In employing or retaining for employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be determined on the basis of relative needs and shall, where the relative needs are the same, be given in the following order: (1) Veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration) who are in need and are American citizens; (2) other American citizens, Indians and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need.

(b) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers who have been continuously employed on such projects for more than 18 months, and any relief worker so removed shall be ineligible to be restored to employment on such projects until after (a) the expiration of 60 days after the date of his removal, and (b) recertification of his

eligibility for restoration to employment on such projects. In the case of relief workers whose period of 18 months of continuous employment expires before September 1, 1939, this section shall apply to require their removal not later than August 31, 1939, rather than on such expiration date.

(c) In considering employment of persons upon work projects prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this title, the agency providing the employment shall determine whether such persons are able to perform the work on work projects to which they can be assigned and no person shall be employed or retained for employment on any such project whose work habits are such or work record shows that he is incapable of performing satisfactorily the work to which he may be assigned on the project.

(d) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers whose needs for employment have not been certified by, and, except as provided in section 17 (b), no relief worker shall be employed on such projects until after his need for employment has been certified by (a) a local public certifying agency or (b) the Works Projects Administration where no such agency exists or where the Work Projects Administration certifies by reason of its refusal to accept certification by local public agencies.

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

(f) No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this title and no part of the money appropriated in this title shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit as to United States citizenship, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship.

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

SEC. 17. (a) No person in need who refuses a bona fide offer of private employment under reasonable working conditions which pays the prevailing wage for such work in the community where he resides and who is capable of performing such work shall be employed or retained in employment on work projects under the funds appropriated in this title for the period such private employment would be available.

(b) Any person who takes such private employment shall at the expiration thereof be entitled to immediate resumption of his previous employment status with the Work Projects Administration if he is still in need and if he has lost the private employment through no fault of his own.

(c) In order to insure the fulfillment of the purposes for which such appropriations are made and to avoid competition between the Work Projects Administration and other Federal or non-Federal agencies in the employment of labor on projects of any nature whatsoever, financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, no person in need shall be eligible for employment on any work project of the Work Projects Administration who has refused to accept employment on any other Federal or non-Federal project at earnings comparable with or higher than the earnings established for similar work on work projects of the Work Projects Administration: *Provided further*, That any person in need who has been engaged on any Federal or non-Federal project and whose service has been regularly terminated through no fault of his own shall not lose his eligibility for reemployment on any other Federal or non-Federal work project on account of such previous employment.

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

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

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

SEC. 19. In carrying out the purpose of the appropriations in this title, the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of special funds for any agency receiving an appropriation under this title, in the nature of revolving funds for use, until June 30, 1940, in the purchase, repair, distribution, or rental of materials, supplies, equipment, and tools.

SEC. 20. The provision of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase made or service procured in connection with the appropriations in this title when the aggregate amount involved is less than $300.

SEC. 21. The appropriations in this title for administrative expenses and such portions of other appropriations in this title as are available for administrative expenses may be obligated in the amounts which the agency, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall have certified to the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary for personal services, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for contract stenographic reporting services, supplies and equipment; purchase and exchange of law-books, books of reference, directories, and periodicals, newspapers and press clippings; travel expenses, including expenses (not to exceed $500 for any one agency) of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized; rental at the seat of government and elsewhere; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding and such other expenses as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the objectives of this title.

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

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

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

(d) Appointments to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriations in this title in any State shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

SEC. 23. In making separations from the Federal service, or furloughs without pay to last as long as 3 months, of persons employed within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of this title, the appointing power shall give preference, as nearly as good administration will warrant, in retention to appointees from States that have not received their share of appointments according to population: *Provided, however*, That soldiers, sailors, and marines, the widows of such, or the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines, who themselves are not qualified, but whose wives are qualified to hold a position in the Government service, shall be given preference in retention, in their several grades and classes, where their ratings are good or better.

SEC. 24. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits shall apply to persons (except administrative employees qualifying as civil employees of the United States) receiving compensation from the appropriations in this title for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

SEC. 25. None of the funds made available by this title shall be available—

(a) After June 30, 1939, for the operation of any theater project; or

(b) After August 31, 1939, for the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Work Projects Administration.

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

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

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

SEC. 28. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any work project, employment, or relief aid under the appropriations in this title, or diverts, or attempts to divert or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or per-

sons not entitled thereto, any portion of such appropriations, or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under any such appropriations, or attempts so to do, or assists in so doing, or who disposes of, or assists in disposing of, except for the account of the United States, any property upon which there exists a lien securing a loan made under the provisions of this title or the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, not in substitution for, any other sections of existing law, or of this title.

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

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

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

(b) Except as may be required by the provisions of subsection (b) of section 31 hereof, it shall be unlawful for any person to deprive, attempt to deprive, or threaten to deprive, by any means, any person of any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible by this title, on account of race, creed, color, or any political activity, support of, or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election.

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

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

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

SEC. 32. No part of any appropriation in this title shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person in a supervisory or administrative position who is a candidate for any State, district, county, or municipal office (such office requiring full time of such person and to which office a salary or per diem attaches), in any primary, general, or special election, or who is serving as a campaign manager or assistant thereto for any such candidate.

SEC. 33. Reports of the operations under the appropriations in this title and the appropriations contained in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938, as supplemented by Public Resolution No. 1 and Public Resolution No. 10 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, including a statement of the expenditures made and obligations incurred by classes of projects and amounts, shall be submitted to Congress by the President on or before the 15th of January in each of the next two regular sessions of Congress: *Provided*, That such reports shall be in lieu of the report required by section 21 of said act of 1938 as amended by said Public Resolution No. 1.

SEC. 34. This title may be cited as the "Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 14, strike out lines 11 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 11. (a) The Board is authorized to allocate not to exceed $50,000,000 to other Federal agencies for the operation, under such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe, of projects of the type specified in subsection (b) of section 1 which are within the scope of the functions usually carried out by such agency, including administrative expenses of such agency incident to such operation: *Provided*, That not to exceed 4 percent of the total amount so allotted to any such agency shall be used for such administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That no project shall be prosecuted under any allotment under this subsection upon which the percentage of nonrelief persons employed exceeds 15 percent of the total number of persons employed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 15, strike out lines 14 to 18, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 12. None of the funds made available by this title shall be expended on the construction of any building (1) the total estimated cost of which, in the case of a Federal building, exceeds $50,000; or (2) the portion of the total estimated cost of which payable from Federal funds, in the case of a non-Federal building, exceeds $40,000, unless the building is one (a) upon which construction is in progress on June 14, 1939, or for which the project has been approved by the President, or for which an issue of bonds has been approved at an election held, on or prior to such date, or (b) for the completion of which funds have been allocated and irrevocably set aside under prior relief appropriation acts."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I explained this amendment very thoroughly early in the day. Unless there is some question to be asked about it, I ask for a vote.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I see that the restriction is made "up to June 14." Today is the 16th of June. Does not the gentleman believe this provision should be changed, we will say, to July 1, before the bill becomes law?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The exception in there of June 14 removes projects from the $50,000 restriction and was intended to let in projects that had been approved before the date of introduction of the resolution. I believe you could not relax the restriction after that date.

Mr. SABATH. I know, but you have in the bill "June 14." This bill will not go into effect for several weeks.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is an exception which permits the consideration of projects of more than $50,000 if they had been approved before that date.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER as a substitute for the committee amendment: Page 15, line 18, strike out the period and insert a colon and add: "*Provided*, That buildings with a total cost in excess of $25,000 may be constructed if the Federal funds used on such projects are restricted to half of such excess and the balance of such excess is defrayed and paid by local sponsors and local authorities."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say briefly, as I have stated before, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will not remedy the situation to any great extent, because 66 percent of all the W. P. A. building projects are above $50,000. There are employed on W. P. A. at the present time 237,000 persons. You are going to take off the W. P. A., therefore, probably 66 percent of all these workers and you will have a very serious and dangerous condition throughout the country. For that reason I am asking the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is defeating the very purpose he has in mind. The provision offered by the committee will give you $40,000 on a non-Federal project of Federal contribution, which may be supplemented by any amount of money on the part of local sponsors, making the total amount a very great deal more.

Mr. CELLER. That is the trouble. My amendment would permit far more W. P. A. funds to be advanced. It would permit as contribution of Federal funds $40,000 plus one-half of the balance of the cost of the building project.

Mr. O'NEAL. Let me explain this. If you require matching on the part of local funds, then you are getting right back to where P. W. A. is.

Mr. CELLER. If you have, for example, a project that costs, say, $325,000, under this substitute amendment, if the

local authorities would come forward with half of $300,000, or $150,000, the Government then would come forward with $150,000 plus $25,000; but under the committee amendment the Government would not come forward with anything more than $40,000. The local communities do not have money enough to come forward with those vast sums; but if you can match dollar for dollar between the Federal funds and the local funds, I believe you will get somewhere. Unless you do so you are going to have serious difficulties, and there will be really no building construction under W. P. A. beyond $40,000 whatever.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would apply to every project.

Mr. CELLER. Every W. P. A. building project. It only applies to section 12, which involves only buildings such as courthouses, schools, libraries, and so forth.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The section applies restrictions only on building projects, whereas the gentleman's amendment would apply to every project.

Mr. CELLER. This is not correct. It only applies, I repeat, to section 12; that is, buildings.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And it would make the restriction much worse than the restriction contained in this section.

Mr. CELLER. Indeed, it would not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that under his amendment the gross amount of Federal expenditure under the W. P. A. on one of these building projects would be $25,000. Under the committee amendment which he is seeking to amend it would be $40,000, so he is trying to restrict the amount of W. P. A expenditure rather than increase it. I believe if the gentleman will read his amendment he will see that is just what he is doing.

Mr. CELLER. I disagree with the gentleman. I believe he might read the amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. A great many men in the building trades in my State of Indiana have been much disturbed because of the activities of the W. P. A. in building construction. They have contended that the construction of buildings of considerable size by W. P. A. tends to tear down their wage scales and their standards. What is the opinion of the gentleman as to the effect on that situation of the adoption of the committee amendment as against the provision originally written into the bill? Personally, I have been much impressed with the arguments of these men who have spent their lives in the building trades. I want to protect their interests as far as we reasonably can.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe there will be very much difference in the effect as between the committee amendment and the original proposition. At the same time, it will let the W. P. A. go on and finish a few projects that are uncompleted. It will not open the field wide for those large building construction projects upon which W. P. A. has been such an acknowledged failure.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Did the gentleman ever tell this House that for 50 years the city of New York has been paying for 83 percent of the public improvements in the gentleman's part of the State?

Mr. TABER. They have not, of course.

Mr. O'TOOLE. But they have.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Does not the committee amendment place the restriction only upon building construction?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Is it not true that the gentleman from New York has offered an amendment which would go beyond that limitation and make a further restriction upon highways and road projects as well?

Mr. TABER. I did not know that it related to anything but buildings, but it reduces the amount of Federal expenditures and contracts so that his own situation is worse than it was before.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And is it not also true that if the sponsor were in position to put up 50 percent of the cost of these larger projects that they had better use P. W. A. and use contract and skilled labor?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Celler amendment and in favor of the Woodrum amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the committee amendment which has just been presented to the House by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and against the substitute of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

In the first place please bear in mind that the limitation imposed in the committee amendment on W. P. A. construction work applies only to building construction. It does not place any limitation, whatever, on any other type of construction, such as sewers, streets, and so forth. Unless it is the construction of a building that is proposed the limitation does not apply in any way, shape, or form.

Furthermore, this limitation applies only to the amount of Federal money that shall be devoted to a building construction project. It simply says to the local sponsor: "The Federal Government will contribute $40,000 and no more toward the construction of your building. You may add as much more as you like."

Testimony before our subcommittee shows that building construction by the W. P. A. costs from 40 to 100 percent more than the same construction would cost if done by private contractors. The hearings are full of such testimony. Here are some examples:

Queen's School, New York: Cost under W. P. A., $782,000; cost by private contractors, $441,000.

Laundry and fire station, Great Lakes, Ill.: Cost under W. P. A., $375,000; cost by private contractors, $218,000.

Recreation center, Des Plaines, Ill.: Cost under W. P. A., $353,000; cost by private contractors, $202,000.

And so on, all along the line.

It was the belief of our committee that the W. P. A. is not equipped to perform these larger building operations without frightful waste and we have made available $125,000,000 for building construction by the P. W. A., which is the better building organization. This means that, including local sponsors' contributions, a fund of about $280,000,000 will be available to give employment to building mechanics and workmen employed in producing building materials. This, we believe, will give more jobs to more people who need work than if the $125,000,000 which we propose to transfer to P. W. A. were spent for building construction under the W. P. A.

When I plead with you to adopt the committee amendment limiting Federal W. P. A. building-construction allotments I do not speak for myself alone. I speak for organized labor of the United States and for every element of organized labor that has any connection with the building-construction industry. This is a very vital matter with organized labor. The complaint that organized labor has against the W. P. A. is that the infiltration of unskilled, inexperienced W. P. A. labor into building operations is demoralizing, breaking down and

destroying the regular crafts and is driving thousands upon thousands of skilled craftsmen into the bread lines. Skilled mechanics who have given their lives to training for efficient service are supplanted by persons of no training and experience, all of which is utterly demoralizing to organized labor and frightfully hard on the taxpayers.

In asking you to approve the committee amendment I speak for William Green and the American Federation of Labor. I hold in my hand a letter that was delivered to me personally yesterday by an official of the American Federation of Labor in order that I might use it in the debate to show exactly where the American Federation of Labor stands on this proposition. The letter is signed by Herbert Rivers, secretary-treasurer of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor and is dated at Washington, D. C., June 15, 1939, and it says:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: The building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor is opposed to construction of buildings and other construction projects by relief labor.

House Joint Resolution 326 has been reported out of the committee and is being considered by the United States House of Representatives. Section 12, on page 15, of this joint resolution restricts the Works Progress Administration from the construction of any building of which the estimated total cost exceeds $25,000.

It is the opinion of this department that the Works Progress Administration should be restricted from the construction of any buildings. However, if the provisions of section 12 are the only limitations that Congress can place upon construction of buildings and other construction by relief labor, the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor approves the provisions of section 12 of House Joint Resolution 326.

We trust that Members of Congress will act favorably on the above-mentioned provision and thank you for the efforts put forth in our behalf.

Carl H. Mullen, president, and Adolph J. Fritz, secretary-treasurer of the Indiana State Federation of Labor, both nationally known leaders of organized labor, are in complete harmony with President Green and the American Federation in this matter. Mr. Mullen in a letter to me dated June 14, 1939, says:

We are unalterably opposed to the Works Progress Administration entering the construction industry. We take the position that it has been the means of lowering the standards of our people engaged in construction work and has been responsible for driving many of them onto the relief rolls thereby reducing their incomes from a decent wage to a purely subsistence level.

If we vote down this committee amendment, we will strike a heavy blow at organized labor. I plead with you not to do that. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. I know that what the gentleman states with regard to the attitude of the American Federation of Labor is absolutely correct with respect to section 12 as it stood originally. Do they also approve of the Woodrum amendment?

Mr. LUDLOW. I would answer that they most positively do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, many of the abuses that have developed under the administration of W. P. A. are the inevitable results of the establishment of a colossal machine here in Washington. Centralization of power is the ambition of the New Deal; it is the very heart of its philosophy. State lines are destroyed.

In recent years there has been a decided trend toward centralization of power in the hands of the National Government in Washington. This trend has been brought about largely by the increasing unity of our economy. A good deal of the centralization has been justified and is probably necessary. But the acceleration has been so great recently that if it is not checked soon our system of government will be destroyed. The dangers of a centralized unitary system of government are often overlooked in attempting to meet temporary or pressing problems.

In the first place, the centralization of power in the hands of the National Government is sapping at the foundations of the American principle of local self-government. Local self-government is essential to the preservation of representative democracy. It is only where the citizens can govern themselves as to the matters which are closest to them, decide their own policies, and elect their own officers that the democratic tradition can flourish. When the decision on such matters is transferred to a central government, the people lose interest in government and are more susceptible to regimentation and exploitation.

In the second place, our country is too large and has too many diverse interests to be governed from one place. A certain amount of centralization of power may result in more efficiency in government, but it is physically impossible to maintain efficiency in a unitary government over a large area with diverse interests. National policies must be uniform in their operation. They are highly inflexible and cannot be adjusted to fit local and sectional needs.

Thirdly, centralization builds up a national bureaucracy that tends to become slow and rigid. If it operates as a temporary organization like the W. P. A., without the checks and safeguards that characterize our regular governmental process, there is danger that private rights will be violated and public funds wasted. When the organizations become permanent, then the evils of a slow, grasping, and bumbling bureaucracy develop.

Fourthly, a highly centralized government is inimical to the preservation of popular government. The paths of the dictator and the totalitarian state are much easier when only one government has to be seized. The preservation of our federal system of government, with division of powers, separation of powers, and checks and balances, is the best barrier to dictatorship and arbitrary government.

How does this discussion apply to the relief problem? Providing relief has always been the function of our local governments. During the depression the local units of government were no longer able to carry the financial burden with the present tax structure. Federal aid was necessary. With Federal aid under the F. E. R. A. the States and localities handled the problem fairly adequately. Standards of administration were improved and competent staffs were being developed. But since the advent of W. P. A. the picture is changed. The Federal Government administers a work-relief system directly and the localities are subordinated. Since their responsibility has been lessened they try to shift as much of the burden as possible to the Federal Government. It is high time that a better balance be effected. Responsibility for administration and decisions should be placed directly upon the States and local governments and the power and resources of the Federal Government used to encourage them to assume more and more of the administrative and financial burdens. The present policy of the Federal Government is undermining the basic principle of local self-government.

The present administration has made an all-time high record for the creation of new agencies. Alphabetical agencies have sprung up like mushrooms since March 4, 1933. The National Emergency Council is one of the many New Deal creations.

For the second time the National Emergency Council has come to Congress asking for a direct appropriation in the relief appropriation act to carry on its work. Prior to last year the N. E. C. was financed by Executive allotments from the lump-sum relief appropriations. For the current fiscal year, 1938–39, Congress made a direct appropriation to the N. E. C. of $850,000. It also received allocations from other agencies for its Film Service to the extent of $265,000. For 1940 the N. E. C. is asking for $1,500,000 in a direct appropriation. In addition, the program of promoting cooperation with other American republics calls for the further sum of $176,500 for the Film Service. In all, then, the requests for the N. E. C. for 1940 represent an increase of 50 percent over the funds it has had this year. This, indeed, is an

anomalous situation when we recall that in Reorganization Plan No. II, May 9, 1939, President Roosevelt abolished the N. E. C. and transferred its functions to the Executive Office of the President with the exception that the Radio and Film Services go to the Office of Education in the new Federal Security Administration.

The N. E. C. was established by Executive order in 1933 and is composed of the President, the Vice President, the Members of the Cabinet, and the heads of some 23 independent establishments. It was designed primarily for the purpose of helping coordinate the various relief and recovery activities of the New Deal. It has also developed as a clearing house of information about the Federal Government and as an information service agency for the various departments and establishments. For some time Frank Walker was the executive secretary, and Donald Richberg later served in the same capacity.

It probably accomplished some good in the way of coordination in the early days of the New Deal, when the brain trusters were falling all over each other in trying to get their pet ideas and theories put into practice. But the council itself has ceased to meet and function as a coordinating agency, and the President has now decided to abolish it. The functions will be continued in the Executive office of the White House. This is desirable in some respects, but we should not close our eyes to the great political potentialities of the organization. It has a director in nearly every State who is the personal appointee of the President. Although the nominal function of the State N. E. C. director is to help coordinate the various Federal agencies in his State, actually most of his time is spent in extolling the virtues of the New Deal administration. The Informational, Radio, and Film Services are capable of being used for a very subtle type of propaganda for the New Deal, particularly in an election year. Whatever the virtues of the N. E. C. may be, it seems all wrong to finance its services from a relief appropriation; this is particularly so with the complete merger with the White House staff.

During the past 6 years the National Emergency Council and its affiliates have spent approximately $5,427,796.40. The story by fiscal years is as follows:

1934	[1] $127,435.81
1935	[2] 931,865.14
1936	1,481,362.83
1937	1,092,132.62
1938	780,000.00
1939	[3] 1,015,000.00
Total	5,427,796.40

[1] Includes $29,912.60 expenditures of Executive Council.

[2] Includes $13,595.61 expenditures of Executive Council and $290,911.33 by Better Housing Division.

[3] Includes $265,000 allocated to the N. E. C. by the Department of Agriculture, Works Progress Administration, and the Public Works Administration for producing moving-picture films.

The following table gives a general picture of the present activities and expenditures of the National Emergency Council:

	Estimate, 1940	Estimate, 1939	Actual, 1938
1. Report and Coordinating Division	$860,690	$607,426	$551,250
2. Press Intelligence	162,220	117,616	98,231
3. U. S. Information Service	70,040	50,161	31,997
4. U. S. Government Manual	46,160	15,266	12,285
5. Radio Division	25,050	19,531	
6. U. S. Film Service	[1] 335,840	[2] 265,000	
(a) Total	[1] 1,500,000	1,075,000	693,763
(b) Estimated savings and unobligated balance			86,237
(c) Administrative reserve		40,000	
(d) Allotted from Emergency Relief Administration, 1937			780,000
(e) Total, estimate or appropriation	[1] 1,500,000	1,115,000	

[1] The program for cooperation with other American republics proposes an additional $176,500 for the Film Service. This would make a total of $512,340 for the Film Service, and a total appropriation for the National Emergency Council of $1,675,500.

[2] National Emergency Council received $265,000 in allotments from other agencies.

The Report and Coordinating Division is the largest and most expensive unit of the N. E. C. It is the division which is supposed to coordinate and make more efficient the various Federal agencies both in Washington and in the field. The greater share of the expenditures of this type of work goes for salaries of the State directors and field force. During the present year there have been 87 employees in this Division in the Washington office at a cost of $178,996 for salaries and 106 employees in the field at an expense of $236,400; for 1940 it is proposed to have 117 employees in Washington at a cost of $236,400 and 160 field employees at $474,120. This represents an increase of 32 percent in expenditures for personal service of this Division in Washington and 57 percent increase in the field. The total increase for all services, personal and otherwise, is 42 percent. The justification for this increase is that several State offices which have been closed are to be reopened and maintained. If the services performed by the State offices are worth while, then it may be justifiable to treat all States alike. But it does not appear that the work of the State offices is worth the expenditure. A study made of them in 1936–37 for the President's Committee on Administrative Management found that their coordinating and informational activities were largely unsatisfactory and recommended their abolition—Fesler, James W., Executive Management and the Federal Field Service, Part IV, Problems of Administrative Management, pp. 27, 34–39. Mr. Fesler writes:

> It is recommended that the State offices of the National Emergency Council be abolished. The basis for this recommendation is the conviction that conflicts in the field occur much less frequently than is generally imagined, that two-thirds of the conflicts that do occur are caused by lack of coordination at Washington, and that fully half of the conflicts in the field must be settled at Washington. If these statements are correct, it would appear that coordination in the field is far less important than coordination at Washington. It is true that administration comes into contact with the public in the field, but the point of contact is not necessarily the point for treatment of the disease of lack of coordination. The majority of instances in the field are merely symptoms of diseases whose source, and hence point for treatment, lies in Washington. It would appear, therefore, that the elaborate field service of the National Emergency Council will not be necessary once the Works Program is abandoned or is administered through a different structural scheme (p. 44).

The section also provides a channel through which federally suggested State legislation is cleared to the States. This seems largely unnecessary for most Federal agencies have direct contacts with State agencies and prefer to handle their own negotiations of this type. A saving of better than $500,000 a year could be made by abolishing the State offices of the N. E. C. and there certainly would be no appreciable loss in the services of the Federal Government by so doing.

The Division of Press Intelligence provides a comprehensive press clipping service on Federal activities; 450 papers are clipped daily, and a Daily Bulletin providing a summary of news items and editorials on national affairs is distributed each morning to 508 Government officials and Members of Congress. The Division also publishes a weekly, Magazine Abstracts, which is likewise distributed to Members of Congress and Government officials. A file of approximately 4,500,000 clippings is maintained at the N. E. C. This type of activity has been done by Government agencies for many years and is probably desirable and worth while. Moreover, it is better that it be done centrally. But it appears from the various appropriation hearings that some agencies continue their own clipping services in addition to that of the N. E. C. On the whole, there seems to be no justification for adding 21 new employees and increasing expenditures from $117,616 to $162,220, or 38 percent.

The United States Information Service furnishes on request to the public as well as Government employees information on the structure, functions, and activities of the various Federal agencies, and serves as a central office directing general inquiries into proper channels. Again this type of work is useful and desirable, although there is a danger that subtle propaganda will be carried on through it. An increase of about $20,000 or about 40 percent is asked for the Infor-

mation Service for 1940. The expansion in personnel planned is mostly in the field. It is contemplated to provide a trained personnel to disseminate information about the Federal Government at the fairs and other places where Federal exhibits are being shown.

The publication of the Government Manual is another worth-while service. However, it is difficult to justify the increase in appropriation from $15,266 in 1939 to $46,160 in 1940, an increase of over 200 percent. It is planned to spend $36,000 for printing and engraving in 1940 as compared to $6,302 in 1939. The reason for the increase is that new loose-leaf binders for the manual will be provided next year. The name "National Emergency Council" appears on the old one, and since that organization has been abolished we must have new binders. A saving from reorganization.

The Radio Division was established in 1938 to coordinate in a general way the use of radio by the Government departments. The Radio Division acts as liaison between the broadcasting companies and Federal agencies and officials. It also acts in an advisory capacity to all Federal agencies and is making a survey of all broadcasting activities of the Government. The Radio Division also presents weekly broadcasts on local stations, the purpose of which is the dissemination of "factual information" concerning Government operations. The State N. E. C. directors supervise these programs and generally participate in them. It appears that the N. E. C. does not purchase time on the radio; the time for the programs is donated. The division is small with only four employees. The expenditure for this year will be $19,531 and $25,050 is proposed for 1940.

But the picture from now on is going to be different. Under reorganization plan No. II, the Radio Division of the N. E. C. goes to the Office of Education which has been carrying on a radio program, also with relief money. President Roosevelt reasons that the radio and film functions "are clearly a part of the educational activities of the Government and should be consolidated with similar activities already carried on in the Office of Education." On the other hand, there is another way of viewing the program. The dissemination of factual information by radio has its values and probably should be considered as a legitimate part of the informational activities of the Government. But as such it should be supported by regular and not by relief funds as a part of the normal activities of each agency. The problem of coordinating the radio activities of the Government is a staff function and should be performed by a staff agency. The Budget Bureau is the proper place to locate such coordinating work. The Office of Education is primarily a promotional agency; its chief job is to lobby for more Federal funds for education. In any case, the use of relief funds for radio broadcasting should be stopped except where practically all relief labor is used.

The United States Film Service is a new item for the N. E. C. It was set up on August 13, 1938, upon the order of the President, and the Film Division of the Farm Security Administration was transferred to the N. E. C. The purpose was to provide a central agency in the Government to produce films for the Government agencies, to give them advice about film problems, maintain an index of Government films, and serve as a booking agency and general Government clearing house of information about motion pictures. It has not resulted in the centralization of all film activities of the Government by any means, and the transfer to the Office of Education will not bring about the elimination of duplication and the centralization of all activities in one place.

There was no appropriation for the Film Service of the N. E. C. for this year, and it has been financed by allotments of $265,000 from other agencies. The Department of Agriculture allocated $35,000; the W. P. A., $120,000; and the P. W. A., $110,000. For 1940 the Film Service is asking for $335,840; $211,140 of the amount is for personal services and $124,700 for other obligations. Included in the latter is a travel item of $40,600, or 12 percent of whole appropriation for the Division. A glance at the Budget estimates shows that the average salary of the Film Service employees is very high—about $2,745 each. The number of high salaries is rather impressive. The chief ones are as follows:

Film Service Director	$10,000
Chief of Production	9,000
Motion-picture Director	9,000
Director of Photography	9,000
Assistant Director	7,500
General counsel	6,500
Business manager	5,600
Chief of distribution	5,600

In addition to the regular Budget item, it has been proposed by the President that the Film Service be given $176,500 to dramatize the activities of the Government of the United States through motion pictures for the purpose of promoting cooperation with the other American republics. This would involve producing films with Spanish and Portuguese narration and other services in the program to build up our trade and political relations with Latin America.

Specially, just what has the Film Service been doing during this fiscal year? It has been distributing directly several films which seem to have attracted considerable attention. This group includes The River and The Plow That Broke the Plains. At present the Film Service is producing a documentary film designed to dramatize certain aspects of our industrial life and the unemployment problem. This has been financed by allocations from other agencies at a cost of about $165,000. The Service is also producing a health picture based upon the book The Fight for Life, by Dr. Paul de Kruif, which will cost between $50,000 and $75,000. They plan on producing a film for the Rural Electrification Administration with a grant of $20,000, and also a film about the farm problem for the A. A. A. at a cost of $40,000. All told, over half a million dollars is proposed for the Film Service for 1940.

The most vicious thing about the program is the character of the documentary films. Most of them have been very definitely of a propaganda nature. The Plow That Broke the Plains was obviously designed to promote the soil-conservation program of the A. A. A. And it is easy enough to surmise that the film that is soon to be made for the A. A. A. will point out the glories of the Wallace farm program. Motion pictures may have a limited place in the work of the Federal Government, but it seems certain that they have expanded beyond reasonable limits. Before any additional funds are appropriated for such work a thorough survey of the present use of motion pictures by the Government should be made and a definite policy decided upon.

The National Resources Committee is another New Deal favorite child.

The National Resources Committee asked for an appropriation of $990,000 for the fiscal year 1940. During the last 5 years this organization has received allocations of appropriations varying from $1,011,000 in 1935 to $775,000 in 1939. Supposedly the National Resources Committee set out to be a planning agency in the field of public works. From public works it drifted into planning national resources, primarily land and water resources, with some interest in mineral and power resources. From this it has drifted into the sphere of economic planning of the most socialistic type. It still operates under the cloak of planning public works and national resources, but the real heart of the work of the National Resources Committee is in long-range economic planning.

Its work in this field has been most visionary. In 1937, it published a report on technology and technological change. The real ideological basis behind this report was the Government control of invention and the rate of the discovery of invention. Certain persons connected with this report would like to see the rate of discovery and invention slowed down so as to prevent technological unemployment. These people do not realize that what this country needs is more and more labor-saving devices so as to secure the maximum utilization of human resources with the minimum expenditure of human effort in order to produce the maximum amount of goods at the lowest possible cost.

In 1938, the National Resources Committee published a detailed report on the distribution of national income. The material for this report was so collected and so analyzed as to prove the President's allegation that a third of the people of this country are ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed. Any good economist or statistician can pick unlimited holes in the preconception on which this report is founded.

Within the last few months a report on patterns of resources' use was published. This report was written in order to show what resources we may need at any given time in order that we can socialize industry and determine the amount of capital that must flow to any given activity to supply the necessary demands. This report definitely lays the basis of state socialism in this country.

A report is shortly to be published on the consuming habits of the American public. This is to show what the American consumer in different income levels does with his income. Here once again the purpose of the National Resources Committee is to show the need for state socialism. It is to demonstrate that one-third of the Nation is ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed. This report will just be more propaganda to buttress the President's claim that we need a redistribution of income.

The crowning achievement of the work of the so-called industrial committee of the National Resources Committee will be a detailed report entitled, "The Structure of the American Economy." This report is being written largely by Dr. Gardiner C. Means and David Cushman Coyle, two of the most visionary new dealers. This report has for its purpose to prove that American capitalism is not designed to function efficiently, that it is monopolistic, or that there is too much competition. The report is to demonstrate that the control of American industry is concentrated in the hands of a few grasping persons in New York City.

From the Budget statement of the National Resources Committee, the industrial section, listed on the Budget sheets as "employment stabilization and production," receives but small sums of money, but on this point we should not be deluded. In 1935 it spent but $9,800; in 1936, $85,100; in 1937, $70,100; in 1938, $189,600; in 1939, $100,000; and the request for 1940 is another $100,000. However, a large part of the funds that this industrial section utilizes comes from W. P. A. appropriations to other bureaus and establishments. It has spent in excess of $3,000,000 through W. P. A. grants to the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor and to the Bureau of Home Economics in the Department of Agriculture. The persons employed directly on the pay roll of the National Resources Committee are but the general staff of this vast and far-reaching organization planning for state socialism in the United States.

Another sphere of activity of the National Resources Committee has been in public-works planning. For this activity the National Resources Committee received $45,000 in 1939 and this year they request $55,000. They have employed economists during the last 5 years to prove the glories of pump priming and to demonstrate that public works could be used to smooth out the business cycle. In 1935 and 1936 they spent approximately $47,000 on a visionary report on the allocation of cost and responsibility for public works as between the Federal Government, the State, and the locality. This report was visionary in the extreme and has had absolutely no utility. Right now the National Resources Committee has underway a number of studies in the field of public-works planning. It is attempting to carry out a study of the Federal need for public works during the next 6 years. Such a study has some utility but it can best be carried on by the Bureau of the Budget, which is the fiscal planning agency of the Government. Under sections 209 and 211 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, this Bureau has all the necessary powers to carry on such an undertaking. Studies are also under way in the National Resources Committee to demonstrate that the pump-priming program of the Government has been a roaring success.

The National Resources Committee is asking for $65,000 for land-use planning; during the current fiscal year it received but $25,000 for this purpose. The National Resources Committee does but little constructive work in this field. Much useful and valuable work has been done in land-use planning by various agencies of the Department of Agriculture. The only function that the National Resources Committee serves in this field is one of propaganda. Its task is the popularization and the dissemination of propaganda in the field for Government control over land utilization.

In the field of water resources $65,000 is requested this year. Approximately the same sum was received in 1939. Here again the only function served by the Natural Resources Committee is to propagandize and disseminate those aspects of the constructive work of the Biological Survey in the Department of Agriculture that the New Deal believes will support its socialistic end.

In the current budget of the National Resources Committee we find an item of $50,000 for city and local planning. From 1936 to 1938 the National Resources Committee spent $200,000 on a report on the supposed problems of urbanism in the United States. This report yielded nothing new in the field of information. It was merely a propaganda device to prove that the American cities should receive more grants-in-aid and other types of assistance from the Federal Government. Here again the only motive was New Deal propaganda.

The budget of the National Resources Committee requests $150,000 for State planning and $175,000 for regional and State field offices. These two items could be considered together as the regional and State field offices are only adjuncts of State planning. In 1939, $105,000 was received for State planning and $180,000 for regional and field offices. Since 1933, the National Resources Committee, then entitled the National Planning Board, has been engaged in attempting to stimulate and encourage the States to set up State planning boards. It has loaned consultants to the States to direct the activity of such State planning boards. These consultants have lobbied before the State legislatures to get them to pass legislation creating such State planning boards. The one and only function of such State planning boards is to incite the people of the State to seek larger and larger grants from the P. W. A. The function of such State planning boards is to point out to the people of the States the need for the expenditure of the public money on various phases of public works and thus to keep a constant pressure on the P. W. A. for additional funds from the Public Treasury.

Of the $990,000 requested by the National Resources Committee for 1940 approximately $770,000 would be used for personal services. The staff of the National Resources Committee is continually on the increase. In 1938 its headquarters employed 111 persons; in 1939, 120 persons; and in 1940 they are requesting 137 persons. The field staff in 1938 was 29 persons; in 1939, 39 persons; and in 1940, 57 are requested. The requested increases for personnel, both for increases in salaries and for additional personnel, amount to approximately $190,000. The director or executive officer, Mr. Charles W. Eliot, II, is requesting an increase in salary from $8,000 to $10,000, although he received an increase in 1939 from $7,250 to $8,000. Three new positions at salaries varying from $6,500 to $7,000 are requested, and one increase in salary from $6,000 to $6,500 is also desired. Three new positions as technician—EO 13—are requested at $3,760. Similarly, two additional positions at $3,000—EO 11—are requested. A number of minor increases are also sought.

A very large proportion of the expenditures for salaries of the National Resources Committee is made for the hiring of per diem employees on a consulting basis. In 1935 this amounted to $235,000; in 1937 it was $315,000; in 1938, $208,000; and the total estimate for 1939 is $167,000. They have a large number of employees at high salaries. There are 34 who have a salary between $21 and $25 a day; 49 between $26 and $35 a day; and 23 between $36 and $50 a day.

It is interesting to note that the great spender, David Cushman Coyle, received $1,850 from the National Resources

Committee directly for services rendered solely to that organization. From a footnote relative to per diem employees it appears that he received additional sums from the National Resources Committee for services rendered for them on behalf of the W. P. A.

In reality it would be logical to assert that practically all of the money expended by the National Resources Committee can be classed as propaganda or publicity. The Budget statement of the National Resources Committee admits that they have on their staff one editor at a salary of $4,500 and one junior editor at a salary of $2,000 a year. They request an appropriation of $75,000 for printing and binding, but these figures fail to reveal the entire picture. Practically all of the staff is engaged in publicizing work of other New Deal agencies who demonstrate the need for continuation of the New Deal and for further State intervention. The reports of the National Resources Committee on various subjects reveal practically no original reasons; they are merely syntheses or analyses of work done in other agencies in a more popular form.

Much has been said on the subject of the National Youth Administration. In part, the assertions have been sound. In great part, however, statements have been made which have no foundation in fact whatever. Only a very small part of the increase requested for this activity is intended for student aid. It should be noted that the administrative expenses planned by the N. Y. A. for 1940 were to be double those for this year. Expansion beyond all reason was requested. At present there are 1,129 administrative employees, which was to be expanded to 2,579.

N. Y. A. has undoubtedly done a lot of good as an emergency agency. But before giving the agency an increase such as requested it would seem wise to take stock and see where the Administrator would lead us. It leads to one thing—the surrender of educational control by the States to a Federal agency. Reasonable Federal aid may at times be necessary for education, but the primary obligation for this work rests on the States.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that every dollar requested by the President for relief is provided by the bill now before us. It is hoped that the benefits will go to those in need, that neither diversion nor other changes will reduce relief to the needy and that the funds provided by this bill will reach those intended to be aided.

The request for the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration for the fiscal year 1940 is $123,000,000 as against $175,000,000 last year. The money is to come from relief funds. There is nothing in the justifications presented to the committee to indicate clearly why any sums are necessary for direct-relief payments during the coming year. In fact, the justification indicates that the fund for direct grants is to be used for any emergency that might arise. This is certainly making a request on a suppositional basis.

In the past it has always been considered the proper procedure for Congress to appropriate funds to meet an emergency caused by drought or other catastrophies in the agricultural field. When such emergencies have arisen funds have been provided but the administration is taking an entirely new course by suggesting the appropriation of money to meet possible catastrophies, whether such catastrophies occur or not. It is difficult to reconcile a procedure of this kind with common sense and with established practices. The testimony presented to the Appropriations Committee on Farm Security Administration was vague and indefinite in many respects.

There was no direct and clear statement at any time presented to us as to the total number of persons receiving grants or loans from the Farm Security Administration. There were tables submitted showing the total number of persons who have received grants from 1935 on, there were tables showing the total number of persons receiving loans from 1935 on, but there was no table which showed an unduplicated total of persons with loans or grants to be serviced during the fiscal year of 1940. As a result, it has been most difficult to make an estimate of the actual administrative costs per case under the Farm Security Administration. The representation is made that the administrative costs of losses per case were $75 a year, but an analysis of administrative expenses would seem to indicate that this is a gross understatement and it appears that this figure of $75 per case per year is as vague as much of the other testimony presented to the committee. It appears to be nothing more at best than a guess.

The representation was made that the administrative expenses of the Farm Security Administration are but $7,173,000; but to this figure there should be added $11,736,000 for farm and home management assistance; $7,143,000 for investigation of applicants; and $1,946,000 for debt adjustment administration; making a grand total administrative expense of $27,998,000. That administrative expense is to be used to administer a total outstanding debt of $272,000,000, which represents a 10-percent change of the total debt to date.

It was admitted in the hearings that 34 percent of the loans that have been made and matured are delinquent. This appears to be an exceedingly high percentage of delinquency, when consideration is given to the extended benefits that have been afforded through the Agriculture Department.

In passing, it might be interesting to note that in Texas only 54 percent of the matured obligations have been paid. This would seem to indicate that the so-called loans as a practical matter really have been grants or outright gifts.

The Farm Security Administration proposes to spend during the fiscal year of 1940, $5,000,000 for the construction of camps for migratory labor. This expenditure cannot be justified in any way. The Federal Government owes no responsibility to that type of citizens which refuses by its inaptitude or inefficiency to establish and maintain a home. The idea of migratory camps—camps where nomads may find sustenance—is repulsive to those who believe that the American home is the foundation of the Nation. That home may be humble, but so long as it is home it represents the influence which the home alone can exercise. That type of citizen which refuses to assume the responsibility of contributing a part to the maintenance of a home merits no support from the Federal Government. The only exceptions are in those instances where a degree of farm labor is necessary for harvest purposes; however, it is a known fact that in many localities trouble has arisen as a result of the excess supply of migrant agricultural labor.

I believe the establishment of camps on a scale such as contemplated by the Farm Security Administration will only encourage a further increase in this type of labor. Certainly we should not encourage the spirit of wanderlust which is so tempting to many. I believe the creation of additional camps will contribute nothing to the alleviation of the situation which presently exists. It will only accentuate it, because it will stimulate other people to resort to this type of work and avail themselves of the wanderlust privileges. The fact of the matter is the maintenance of these camps by the Federal Government can be looked upon as a form of subsidy, for it certainly permits the employment of labor at a lower cost than could otherwise be secured.

For an organization the size of the Farm Security Administration a staff of publicity experts is provided which is out of all proportion for the type of the work carried on. The hearings disclosed that the publicity staff is an unnecessary expense. It is pertinent to note that originally the Assistant Administrator only admitted the employment of 4 persons for this purpose; however, under the pressure of further examination he reluctantly admitted that 14 additional persons were employed here in Washington on the publicity program in addition to the 4 which he originally stated constituted the Farm Security Administration's publicity staff.

The hearings disclosed that the 4 persons of professional grade received salaries ranging from $2,600 to $5,600 a year, and that the Farm Security Administration employed at least 1 informational adviser for publicity in each of the 12 field offices, and in at least half of the cases that the informational adviser has an assistant. This is publicity with

a vengeance, paid for by the taxpayers, supported out of relief funds, performing no service other than the maintenance of a propaganda machine. The publicity staff includes information advisers, assistant information advisers, assistant information specialists, junior information specialists, and a further variety and collection of propaganda specialists, for which neither rhyme nor reason can be found.

The Farm Security Administration needs an overhauling, a house cleaning, a dressing down. The appropriation presently requested, instead of being a deterrent will be an encouragement to further wastefulness, extravagance, and profligacy.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Colorado to the committee amendment: Strike out the figures "40,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "50,000."

ON A MOTION TO INCREASE FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION ON LOCAL PROJECTS FROM $40,000 TO $50,000. THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, you understand that the Woodrum amendment raises the cost limit on Federal projects from $25,000 to $50,000 and raises the Federal grant on non-Federal projects from $25,000 to $40,000.

This afternoon when the gentleman from Virginia first presented this matter I asked him if the great majority of W. P. A. projects were not non-Federal. Later, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was discussing the same proposition I asked him the same question, and both of those gentlemen answered that the great majority of the projects that would be aided by these funds were non-Federal projects; that is, they would be school buildings, auditoriums, gymnasiums, and buildings of that kind erected by counties, cities, and school districts.

While this is a very small amendment, I think it is an important one. I stated this afternoon, and I state now, that I do not believe I have had in my congressional district a single Federal project as small as $50,000, and this is general throughout the country; but I have many non-Federal projects in my district—school buildings, gymnasiums, auditoriums—little county and city and district buildings that would come within that classification; and if you will adopt this amendment, you simply place the non-Federal projects in the same class as you do the Federal projects. Why should you give the Federal projects $50,000 and the non-Federal projects only $40,000, when, in order to get the non-Federal project, the municipality will have to make a contribution of, maybe, $10,000 or $15,000, thereby getting a larger building for the money you put out on the non-Federal projects, and furnishing more employment?

This $50,000 for Federal projects is simply a gesture, and little of it will be expended. It is not even enough to build the smaller post offices. It will be like the $20 on pensions we voted the other day, which not one State in the Union is qualified to get, but all the money you grant on these non-Federal projects will be used on thousands of them all over the country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I heard the amendment correctly, it raises the limit to $50,000 on both Federal and non-Federal projects, but on non-Federal projects the Federal contribution can be only $40,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. That is right; on non-Federal projects it can be only $40,000, and my amendment simply strikes out "40" and writes in "50." My amendment does not affect Federal projects, which the Woodrum amendment raises from $25,000 to $50,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I understood the amendment correctly, it lets a project be constructed as a non-Federal project if $40,000 is the Federal contribution and $10,000 is the sponsor's contribution making a total of $50,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. No; that is not the way that reads. There is nothing about a $50,000 cost limit on the non-Federal project. There is only the $40,000 limit and nothing else.

The Woodrum amendment is as follows:

SEC. 12. None of the funds made available by this title shall be expended on the construction of any building (1) the total estimated cost of which, in the case of a Federal building, exceeds $50,000, or (2) the portion of the total estimated cost of which payable from Federal funds, in the case of non-Federal building, exceeds $40,000, unless the building is one (a) upon which construction is in progress on June 14, 1939, or for which the project has been approved by the President on or prior to such date, or (b) for the completion of which funds have been allocated and irrevocably set aside under prior relief appropriation acts.

It will be seen from this language that in no event will the Federal grant for non-Federal projects exceed $40,000. My amendment would raise this limit to $50,000, which, of course, would have to be matched by the local sponsor by whatever amount the Federal Administrator might fix. Understand, I am not in favor of this limitation. I am in favor of the existing law. Many of the best W. P. A. projects in my district could not have been built even under the $50,000 grant I am proposing. I am simply trying to make the best of a bad bargain. We have sprung the Appropriations Committee from $25,000 to $40,000, and I am trying to get $10,000 more. Every little bit helps. There was a line in an old popular song, "Every little bit added to what you've got makes a little bit more." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a privileged motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COFFEE of Washington) there were—ayes 40, noes 184.

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the substitute amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The question was taken, and the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 27, line 3, strike out the word "misdemeanor" and insert the word "felony"; and in line 4, strike out the words "1 year" and insert the words "2 years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Page 16, at the end of line 18, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following words: "and which shall not be varied for workers of the same type in different geographical areas to any greater extent than may be justified by available statistics relating to differences in the cost of living."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the attention of the House notwithstanding the lateness of the hour. This is an important amendment, in my opinion

and in the opinion of many other Members of the House. It is an effort to correct the unjustified differences which exist as between wages paid in different geographical areas in the country by W. P. A. When the deficiency W. P. A. bill was before the House in January, an amendment was offered and adopted by this House limiting those differentials to not more than 25 percent. That amendment was eliminated in the Senate. The present bill does not attempt to make any specific limitation, but it does undertake to provide that the Works Progress Administration shall take into consideration in fixing all differentials in wages, only the differences in the cost of living in the various localities, where the W. P. A. workers reside. In January it was pointed out, and statistics furnished by the W. P. A. appear in the RECORD of January 10, 1939, sustaining the contention that wide differences exist. That is, the pay received by the different classes of W. P. A. workers range from 18 cents an hour for unskilled labor in the State of Tennessee to $1.02½ an hour in the State of Illinois, and so far as technical and professional labor is concerned wage scales range from 34 cents per hour in the State of Alabama to $3.03 per hour in the State of Pennsylvania. There are many other differences that are almost as discriminatory to which I have not the time to direct attention, a large portion of which are discriminatory against the South. Eleven Southern States with a population of approximately 28,000,000 received, in W. P. A. funds in 1937, approximately $210,000,000 while the single State of Pennsylvania with a population of approximately 9,000,000 received $214,000,000. The purpose I have in mind now is to talk not so much of differences between States and sections, because, after all, this is not altogether a sectional problem, but to point out the differences that exist within the States.

I call attention to some figures relative to these differences which were furnished me by the W. P. A. yesterday and which will be included in the RECORD as an addition to these remarks under permission previously granted, showing 24 different categories of W. P. A. workers, and differences made within the several States of the Union in the compensation of workers engaged in doing identically the same sort of work. These figures show only subdivisions of the first three general classes included in the statistics published in the RECORD of January 10, 1939—unskilled, intermediate, and skilled workers. They do not include professional and technical workers. As to these the differences are even more startling. I here insert under the permission granted me in the House the statistics appearing in the RECORD of January 10, 1939, followed by the break-down of part of these statistics just furnished me by the W. P. A. and in addition a survey of comparative living costs in five northern and five southern cities released on May 28, 1939, by the Wage-Hour Division of the Department of Labor.

	Unskilled		Intermediate		Skilled		Professional and technical	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
United States:								
Alabama	$0.40	$0.19	$0.60	$0.24	$1.50	$0.31	$1.11	$0.34
Arizona	.50	.36	.75	.41	1.00	.56	1.25	.62
Arkansas	.28	.20	.55	.25	1.25	.33	.70	.36
California	.81	.33	1.45	.38	1.75	.46	1.67	.51
Colorado	.72	.30	1.00	.41	1.50	.50	1.07	.56
Connecticut	.50	.40	1.05	.45	1.65	.57	1.30	.63
Delaware	.41¼	.24	.90	.28	1.50	.34	1.36	.60
Florida	.30	.19	.73	.24	1.75	.32	1.05	.35
Georgia	.30	.20	.43	.25	1.25	.33	1.50	.36
Idaho	.55	.28½	.62½	.32	.78½	.39	.86	.43½
Illinois	1.02½	.31	1.37½	.33	1.95	.39½	1.50	.44
Indiana	.95	.40	1.10	.41	1.50	.46	1.66	.50
Iowa	.67½	.31	1.20	.35	1.50	.43	1.50	.47
Kansas	.50	.27	.85	.32	1.37	.37	.81	.41
Kentucky	.50	.25	1.37½	.35	1.75	.31	1.17½	.34
Louisiana	.35	.20	1.00	.25	1.38	.32	1.50	.35
Maine	.40	.31	.70	.35	1.35	.45	1.60	.49
Maryland	.44	.25	.55	.32	1.50	.38	1.10	.48
Massachusetts	.85	.35	1.50	.39	1.66⅔	.48	1.60	.53
Michigan	.60	.33	1.00	.37½	1.58½	.45½	1.47	.50½
Minnesota	.68¾	.32	1.15	.41	1.50	.46	1.79	.55½
Mississippi	.40	.19	.90	.25	1.50	.31½	2.50	.40
Missouri	.50	.25	.68	.30	.88	.34	.82	.38
Montana	.75½	.45½	1.12	.41	1.77½	.50	.96	.55½
Nebraska	.47	.30	.70	.33	1.37½	.40	1.00	.46
Nevada	.62½	.48½	1.50	.55	2.00	.67	2.00	.74½
New Hampshire	.45	.35	.66	.43	1.30	.53	1.00	.51
New Jersey	.50	.25	1.30⅝	.35	2.25	.39	1.50	.44
New Mexico	.40	.29	1.00	.35	1.50	.43	.86	.68
New York [1]	.62½	.26	1.25	.33	2.00	.39½	1.41	.43¾
North Carolina	.29	.20	.64	.25	1.00	.34	.91	.60
North Dakota	.48	.40	.55	.45	1.35	.55	.77	.61
Ohio	.679	.31	1.25	.35	2.00	.43	2.50	.47½
Oklahoma	.41	.25	.73	.35	1.50	.43	1.00	.47
Oregon	.50	.34	.80	.38	1.50	.46	1.25	.51
Pennsylvania	.65	.50	1.24½	.57	2.00	.65½	3.03	.71½
Rhode Island	.50	.40	.59½	.46½	1.50	.61	.78½	.67½
South Carolina	.27½	.19	.48	.24	1.25	.32	.52½	.34½
South Dakota	.40	.37	.42	.38	1.37½	.46	.58	.55
Tennessee	.30	.18	.43	.23	1.62	.31	.64	.35
Texas	.35	.20	.55	.26	1.50	.32	1.22	.35
Utah	.50	.41	.75	.50	1.50	.63	1.00	.70
Vermont	.40	.32	.50	.35	1.25	.43	1.10	.48
Virginia	.40	.19	.57	.24	1.50	.31	1.50	.34
Washington	.58	.34	.99	.38	1.67	.46	1.44	.44
West Virginia	.45	.40	.58	.47	.84	.54	.90	.84
Wisconsin	1.00	.33½	1.22	.37½	1.66	.39½	1.51	.43½
Wyoming	.42	.42	.48	.47½	.61½	.58	.66	.64
New York City	.93	.46½	1.57	.48	2.21	.589	1.518	.70
District of Columbia	.50	.33	1.15	.43	2.00	.67	1.22	.76

[1] Exclusive of New York City.

Hourly wage rates for Works Progress Administration selected occupations, February 1939 [1]

State and county	City	Laborer			Bricklayers	Carpenters	Cement finishers	Cement finishers' helpers	Concrete mixer operator	Electrician	Electrician helper	Hod carrier	Hoisting engineer	Lather	Painter	Plasterer	Plumber	Plumber helper	Reinforced steel workers	Roofers (composition)	Sheet metal worker	Sheet metal worker's helper	Steamfitters	Structural iron workers	Truck drivers (under 5 tons)
		Common	Construction	Seamstress																					
Alabama:																									
Jefferson	Birmingham	$0.30	$0.40	$0.30	$1.50	$1.00	$1.25	$0.60	$1.00	$1.25	$0.60	$0.60	$1.25	$1.00	$1.00	$1.25	$1.50	$0.60	$1.00	$1.00	$1.00	$0.50	$1.50	$1.25	$0.50
Mobile	Mobile	.28	.28	.28	1.25	.82	1.25	.38	.71	1.00	.38	.38	.75	.82	.75	1.25	1.00	.38	1.00	.75	1.00	.38	1.00	1.00	.38
Montgomery	Montgomery	.28	.28	.28	1.00	.75	1.00	.38	.62	1.00	.38	.38	.62	.75	.62	1.00	1.00	.38	.62	.75	1.00	.38	1.00	.62	.38
Tuscaloosa	Tuscaloosa	.30	.30	.30	1.25	1.00	1.00	.40	.60	1.00	.50	.50	1.00	1.00	.90	.60	1.25	.50	.60	1.00	.75	.45	1.25	1.00	.50
Tallapoosa	Alexander City.	.19	.19	.19	.40	.40	.40	.24	.40	.40	.24	.24	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.24	.40	.40	.40	.24	.40	.40	.24
Arizona:																									
Maricopa	Phoenix	.36	.50	.36	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	----	----	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	.75
Pima	Tucson	.36	.50	.36	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	----	----	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	.75
Yuma	Yuma	.36	.50	.36	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	----	----	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	.75
Cochise	Douglas	.36	.50	.36	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	.75	1.00	----	----	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	1.00	----	1.00	1.00	.75
Arkansas:																									
Pulaski	Little Rock	.28	----	.28	1.00 / 1.25	.75 / 1.00	1.00	.40	.50	1.00	.55	.40	.75	1.00	.87	1.00	1.00	.40	----	1.00	1.00	.40	1.00	1.00	.40
Sebastian	Fort Smith	.27	----	.27	1.00 / 1.25	.75 / 1.00	1.00	.35	.50	1.00	.55	.40	.75	1.00	.87	1.00	1.00	.40	----	1.00	1.00	.40	1.00	1.00	.40
Garland	Hot Springs	.25	----	.25	1.00 / 1.25	1.00	.85	.35	.50	.85	.55	.40	.75	.85	1.00	1.00	.85	.40	----	.65	.85	.40	.85	.85	.40
St. Francis	Forest City	.20	----	.20	1.00 / 1.25	.75	.75	.35	.50	.75	.50	.35	.50	.75	.75	.75	.75	.35	----	.60	.75	.35	.85	.75	.35

[1] All fractions of cents dropped.

Hourly wage rates for Works Progress Administration selected occupations, February 1939 [1]—Continued

State and county	City	Laborer			Bricklayers	Carpenters	Cement finishers	Cement finishers' helpers	Concrete mixer operator	Electrician	Electrician helper	Hod carrier	Hoisting engineer	Lather	Painter	Plasterer	Plumber	Plumber helper	Reinforced steel workers	Roofers (composition)	Sheet metal worker	Sheet metal worker's helper	Steamfitters	Structural iron workers	Truck drivers (under 5 tons)
		Common	Construction	Seamstress																					
Northern California:																									
San Francisco	San Francisco	$0.81	$0.88	$0.46	$1.75	$1.25	$1.25	-----	$1.15	$1.37	-----	$1.25	$1.50	$1.60	$1.25	$1.67	$1.37	-----	$1.25	$1.15	$1.25	-----	$1.37	$1.50	$1.15
Alameda	Alameda	.75	.81	.46	1.75	1.25	1.25	$0.81	1.25	1.37	$0.75	1.35	1.37	1.60	1.25	1.60	1.37	$0.75	-----	1.25	1.25	$0.75	1.37	1.50	1.09
Sacramento	Sacramento	.62	.88	.43	1.25	1.10	1.10	.88	.88	1.25	.88	1.10	1.10	1.25	1.10	1.25	1.25	.88	-----	1.10	1.10	.88	1.25	1.25	.83
Humboldt	Eureka	.55	.63	.37	1.05	.99	.99	.63	.63	1.05	.63	.81	-----	1.05	.99	1.05	1.05	.63	-----	.81	.81	.63	-----	-----	.81
Mendocino	Fort Bragg	.45	.61	.35	.84	.79	.79	.61	.61	.84	.61	.69	-----	-----	.79	.84	.84	.61	-----	.69	.69	.61	-----	-----	.72
Southern California:																									
Los Angeles	Los Angeles	.50	.62	.45	1.25	1.10	1.25	-----	1.12	1.12	.75	.75	1.25	1.50	1.10	1.50	1.25	.87	-----	1.00	1.12	.75	1.25	1.37	.75
San Diego	San Diego	.50	.62	.45	1.50	1.00	1.25	-----	1.12	1.25	.75	.87	1.25	1.50	1.00	1.50	1.25	.87	-----	.87	1.12	.75	1.25	1.37	.68
San Bernardino	San Bernardino.	.50	.62	.40	1.25	1.12	1.10	-----	1.12	1.12	.70	.75	1.25	1.50	1.12	1.50	1.25	.87	-----	1.00	1.12	.75	1.25	1.37	.75
Colorado:																									
Denver	Denver	.50	.62	.50	1.50	1.43	1.43	.74	1.43	1.43	.74	-----	1.43	1.50	1.25	1.50	1.43	.74	1.43	1.35	1.43	.74	1.43	1.43	.74
Pueblo	Pueblo	.48	.60	.48	.86	.86	.86	.69	.86	.86	.69	-----	.86	.86	.86	.86	.86	.69	.86	.86	.86	.69	.86	.86	.69
El Paso	Colorado Springs.	.44	.55	.44	.80	.80	.80	.63	.80	.80	.63	-----	.80	.80	.80	.80	.80	.63	.80	.80	.80	.63	.80	.80	.63
Boulder	Boulder	.40	.50	.40	.72	.72	.72	.57	.72	.72	.57	-----	.72	.72	.72	.72	.72	.57	.72	.72	.72	.57	.72	.72	.57
Lake	Leadville	.37	.46	.37	.63	.63	.63	.52	.63	.63	.52	-----	.63	.63	.63	.63	.63	.52	.63	.63	.63	.52	.63	.63	.52
Connecticut:																									
Fairfield	Bridgeport	.50	.78	.50	1.37	1.25	1.37	-----	.85	1.37	.65	.78	1.50	1.25	1.12	1.37	1.37	.65	1.65	1.12	1.25	.65	1.37	1.65	.75
Hartford	Hartford	.50	.65	.50	1.25	1.12	1.25	-----	.85	1.12	.65	.75	1.50	1.50	1.00	1.25	1.20	.65	1.65	1.00	1.25	.65	1.20	1.65	.65
New Haven	New Haven	.50	.75	.50	1.37	1.15	1.37	-----	.85	1.12	.65	.75	1.50	1.50	1.06	1.37	1.12	.65	1.65	1.00	1.25	.65	1.12	1.65	.65
New London	New London	.44	.65	.44	1.25	1.00	1.25	-----	.85	1.12	.60	.65	1.50	1.50	.80	1.25	1.00	.60	1.65	1.00	1.25	.65	1.00	1.65	.65
Windham	Putman	.40	.65	.40	1.25	.80	1.25	-----	.85	1.12	.60	65	1.50	1.50	.80	1.25	1.00	.60	1.65	1.00	1.25	.65	1.00	1.65	.65
Delaware:																									
New Castle	Wilmington	.41	-----	.35	1.50	1.00	1.10	.53	.53	1.00	.53	.90	1.50	1.25	1.00	1.37	1.10	.53	.85	1.00	1.00	.53	-----	-----	.53
Kent	Dover	.25	-----	.24	.75	.75	.75	.45	.45	.75	.45	.45	-----	-----	.75	.75	.75	.45	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Dist. of Coumbia	Washington	.40	.60	.33	1.75	1.50	1.50	.60	.60	1.80	.60	-----	1.75	1.62	1.57	2.00	1.50	.62	2.00	1.10	1.50	-----	1.65	2.00	.75
Florida:																									
Duval	Jacksonville	.30	-----	.30	1.25	.85	.74	.50	.44	1.25	.50	-----	1.00	1.00	.80	1.25	1.25	.50	-----	.75	1.00	.50	1.25	1.25	.44
Hillsborough	Tampa	.30	-----	.30	1.25	.85	.74	.50	.44	1.25	.50	-----	1.00	1.25	.80	1.25	1.25	.50	-----	.75	1.00	.50	1.00	1.25	.44
Dade	Miami	.30	-----	.30	1.50	1.14	1.50	.60	.50	1.50	.60	-----	1.26	1.26	1.14	1.50	1.50	.60	-----	1.14	1.26	.60	1.26	1.63	.50
Escambia	Pensacola	.30	-----	.30	1.00	.80	.80	.50	.38	1.00	.50	-----	1.00	1.00	.80	1.00	1.00	.50	-----	.80	1.00	.50	1.00	1.00	.38
Alachua	Gainesville	.25	-----	.25	1.00	.75	.60	.35	.30	1.00	.35	-----	.71	.71	.75	1.00	1.00	.35	-----	.75	1.00	.35	.71	.71	.30
Madison	Madison	.19	-----	.19	.60	.48	.48	.32	.27	.60	.32	-----	.60	.60	.48	.60	.60	.32	-----	.48	.60	.32	.60	.60	.27
Georgia:																									
Fulton	Atlanta	.30	-----	.30	1.25	.90	1.00	.43	.43	1.12	.43	-----	1.25	1.00	.85	1.00	1.25	.43	.90	1.00	1.00	.43	1.25	1.25	.43
Chatham	Savannah	.29	-----	.29	1.00	.90	1.00	.40	.40	1.00	.40	-----	.70	.75	.75	1.00	1.00	.40	.70	.80	.80	.40	1.00	.90	.40
Muscogee	Columbus	.27	-----	.27	1.25	.75	1.00	.36	.36	1.00	.36	-----	.70	.90	.75	1.25	1.25	.36	.90	.75	.85	.36	1.25	1.25	.36
Troup	La Grange	.23	-----	.23	.75	.60	.60	.30	.30	.60	.30	-----	.60	.60	.60	.75	.75	.30	.60	.60	.75	.30	.75	.60	.30
Brooks	Quitman	.20	-----	.20	.50	.50	.50	.25	.25	.50	.25	-----	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50	.25	.50	.50	.50	.25	.50	.50	.25
Idaho:																									
Ada	Boise	.44	-----	.31	.63	.63	.63	.50	.50	.63	.50	.50	.63	.63	.63	.63	.63	.50	.63	.63	-----	-----	-----	-----	.63
Shoshone	Kellogg	.50	-----	.28	.68	.68	.68	.56	.56	.68	.56	.56	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.56	.68	.68	-----	-----	-----	-----	.68
Illinois:																									
Cook	Chicago	.50	1.02	.43	1.70	1.62	1.62	1.02	-----	1.70	.95	-----	1.62	1.70	1.66	1.70	1.70	1.02	-----	1.75	1.70	1.02	1.70	1.70	.78
Peoria	Peoria	.50	.82	.43	1.62	1.37	1.37	.82	1.00	-----	-----	.82	1.50	-----	1.12	-----	1.25	.82	-----	1.25	-----	-----	-----	1.37	.80
St. Clair	East St. Louis	.50	.90	.40	1.75	1.75	1.50	1.00	1.00	1.65	1.00	1.25	-----	-----	1.50	-----	1.75	1.00	-----	-----	1.50	1.00	-----	1.75	.82
Madison	Alton	.50	.90	.37	1.75	1.25	1.50	.90	1.30	-----	-----	-----	1.50	-----	1.25	-----	-----	.90	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.90
Stephenson	Freeport	.50	-----	.34	1.00	1.00	.80	-----	.50	1.25	-----	-----	-----	-----	.75	1.00	1.40	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.50
Clay	Flora	.31	-----	.31	.61	.61	.61	.35	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.61	.61	.61	.35	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.35
Indiana:																									
Marion	Indianapolis	.50	-----	.50	1.43	1.25	1.10	.62	.75	1.25	.80	.80	1.30	1.33	1.15	1.33	1.25	.65	1.43	.71	1.15	.60	1.25	1.43	.54
Lake	Gary	.50	.95	.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	.95	.85	1.70	.85	1.10	1.37	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	.85	-----	1.25	1.50	-----	1.38	1.62	.70
Vigo	Terre Haute	.50	.75	.50	1.50	1.10	1.25	-----	1.00	1.25	.60	.90	-----	1.25	1.15	1.50	1.31	.60	1.25	-----	1.00	-----	1.31	1.50	.55
Delaware	Muncie	.50	.60	.50	1.50	1.00	1.00	-----	.60	1.00	.60	.87	.80	-----	1.00	1.00	1.00	.60	-----	.90	1.00	-----	1.00	1.00	.55
Grant	Marion	.50	.60	.50	1.50	.85	.85	-----	.60	.85	.60	.60	-----	-----	.85	1.00	1.00	.60	-----	-----	.75	-----	.90	.84	.52
Warrick	Boonville	.40	-----	.40	.75	.75	.75	.60	.50	.75	.60	.50	-----	-----	.80	.75	.90	.50	-----	.75	-----	-----	.90	-----	.45
Iowa:																									
Polk	Des Moines	.67	-----	.43	1.60	1.15	1.12	-----	.67	1.37	.75	.67	-----	1.43	1.12	1.37	1.37	.67	1.25	1.00	1.25	.67	1.37	1.25	.71
Linn	Cedar Rapids	.50	-----	.41	1.25	1.00	1.00	-----	.58	1.00	.58	.58	-----	1.25	1.00	1.25	1.25	.58	1.00	.90	1.00	.58	1.25	1.00	.58
Dubuque	Dubuque	.50	-----	.38	1.37	1.00	.84	-----	.58	1.00	.58	.58	-----	1.00	.92	1.20	1.00	.58	.84	.84	1.00	.58	1.00	1.00	.58
Webster	Fort Dodge	.40	-----	.35	1.37	1.00	.80	-----	.46	.80	.46	.46	-----	.90	.72	1.00	.90	.46	.58	.72	.80	.46	.90	.80	.46
Wright	Eagle Grove	.35	-----	.32	1.00	.77	.77	-----	.39	.80	.39	.39	-----	.72	.60	.80	.77	.39	.58	.70	.80	.39	.77	.80	.39
Kansas:																									
Wyandotte	Kansas City	.46	-----	.38	1.14	1.14	1.14	.80	.80	1.14	.80	.80	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	.80	1.14	1.14	1.14	.80	1.14	1.14	.80
Sedgwick	Wichita	.41	-----	.38	1.13	.87	1.00	.53	.53	1.00	.53	.53	.66	.66	.75	1.00	.90	.53	.66	.66	.66	.53	.66	.66	.53
Shawnee	Topeka	.42	-----	.36	1.37	1.00	1.00	.54	.54	.75	.54	.54	.66	1.10	.88	1.13	1.10	.54	.66	.66	.88	.54	.66	.66	.54
Reno	Hutchinson	.36	-----	.34	1.10	.75	1.10	.45	.45	.87	.45	.45	.55	.55	.75	1.10	1.10	.45	.55	.55	.55	.45	.55	.55	.45
Leavenworth	Leavenworth	.35	-----	.30	1.50	1.00	.65	.44	.44	1.25	.44	.44	.65	.65	.65	1.10	1.25	.44	.65	.65	.65	.44	.65	.65	.44
Brown	Horton	.32	-----	.27	.75	.63	.63	.40	.40	.85	.40	.40	.63	.63	.63	.63	1.00	.40	.63	.63	.63	.40	.63	.63	.40
Kentucky:																									
Jefferson	Louisville	.35	-----	.32	1.05	.95	.75	.40	.45	1.31	.65	.50	.85	.95	.80	1.50	1.37	.65	.60	.60	.85	.55	1.37	1.00	.45
Kenton	Covington	.45	-----	.45	1.62	1.45	.75	.50	.60	1.50	.65	1.00	1.00	1.40	1.35	1.62	1.37	.60	1.37	.75	1.37	.65	1.50	1.62	.60
Fayette	Lexington	.30	-----	.30	1.25	.70	.65	.35	.40	.80	.40	.50	.75	.75	.70	.85	.95	.45	.45	.70	.70	.40	.85	1.00	.40
Daviess	Owensboro	.30	-----	.25	1.25	.60	.65	.35	.40	.90	.45	.40	.75	.60	.55	1.25	1.25	.45	.40	.60	1.00	.45	.85	1.00	.40
Shelby	Shelbyville	.25	-----	.25	1.25	.55	.45	.30	.35	1.00	.35	.35	.60	.40	.40	1.00	.60	.35	.35	.55	.55	.35	.60	1.00	.35
Louisiana:																									
Orleans	New Orleans	.35	-----	.43	1.25	1.00	.85	.50	.70	1.25	.60	.60	{1.00 / 1.25}	1.00	.75	1.00	1.25	.60	1.00	.75	.80	.50	1.25	1.25	.41
Caddo	Shreveport	.30	-----	.40	1.38	1.12	1.00	-----	.50	1.25	.62	-----	-----	1.25	1.00	1.25	1.00	-----	.50	1.00	1.00	-----	.65	-----	.50
East Baton Rouge	Baton Rouge	.30	-----	.36	1.00	.75	1.00	.40	.50	1.00	.40	.40	.75	.75	.75	1.00	1.00	.40	-----	.80	1.00	.40	.75	1.00	.45
Rapides	Alexandria	.25	-----	.30	1.00	.75	.75	-----	-----	.75	.50	-----	.40	-----	.65	-----	.75	-----	-----	.60	-----	-----	-----	-----	.35
Winn	Winnfield	.20	-----	.25	1.00	.50	-----	-----	-----	.60	.40	-----	.40	-----	.45	1.00	1.00	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.40
Maine:																									
Cumberland	Portland	.40	-----	.40	1.25	.80	1.25	-----	.50	1.00	.50	.70	.80	.80	.80	1.13	1.25	.80	-----	.80	.80	.50	1.25	.80	.47
Androscoggin	Lewiston	.37	-----	37	.80	.80	.80	-----	.50	.80	.50	.50	.80	.80	.80	.80	.80	.50	-----	.80	.80	.50	.80	.80	.43
Kennebec	Augusta	.34	-----	.34	.80	.80	.80	-----	.50	.80	.50	.50	.80	.80	.80	.80	.80	.50	-----	.80	.80	.50	-----	.80	.39
Maryland:																									
Baltimore	Baltimore	.33	.40	.33	.75	.75	.75	.51	.51	.75	.51	-----	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75	.51	1.10	.75	.75	.51	.75	.75	.51
Washington	Hagerstown	.29	.35	.29	.55	.55	.55	.45	.45	.55	-----	-----	-----	-----	.55	.55	.55	-----	-----	-----	.55	-----	.55	.55	.45
Frederick	Frederick	.25	.30	.25	.50	.50	.50	.38	.38	.50	-----	-----	-----	-----	.50	.50	.50	-----	-----	-----	.50	-----	.50	.50	.38
Prince Georges	Hyattsville	.25	.30	.25	.75	.45	.75	.38	.38	.45	-----	-----	-----	-----	.45	.75	.45	-----	-----	-----	.45	-----	.45	.45	.38

[1] All fractions of cents dropped.

Hourly wage rates for Works Progress Administration selected occupations, February 1939 [1]—Continued

State and county	City	Laborer			Bricklayers	Carpenters	Cement finishers	Cement finishers' helpers	Concrete mixer operator	Electrician	Electrician helper	Hod carrier	Hoisting engineer	Lather	Painter	Plasterer	Plumber	Plumber helper	Reinforced steel workers	Roofers (composition)	Sheet metal worker	Sheet metal worker's helper	Steamfitters	Structural iron workers	Truck drivers (under 5 tons)
		Common	Construction	Seamstress																					
Massachusetts:																									
Suffolk	Boston	$0.62	$0.85	$0.43	$1.50	$1.37	$1.45	-----	$0.75	$1.50	$0.87	$0.85	$1.37	$1.66	$1.25	$1.66	$1.50	-----	-----	$1.37	$1.37	-----	$1.50	$1.50	$0.75
Hampden	Springfield	.56	.56	.43	1.62	1.25	1.62	-----	.75	1.37	.75	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.12	1.62	1.37	-----	-----	1.37	1.37	-----	1.37	1.37	.60
Worcester	Worcester	.50	.65	.43	1.50	1.17	1.50	-----	.75	1.25	.68	.90	1.37	1.50	1.00	1.50	1.20	-----	-----	1.37	1.37	-----	1.20	1.50	.60
Berkshire	Pittsfield	.60	.60	.37	1.37	1.12	1.37	-----	.75	.75	.65	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.00	1.37	1.00	-----	-----	1.37	1.37	-----	1.00	1.37	.60
Hampshire	Northampton	.50	.50	.37	1.37	1.12	1.37	-----	.75	1.37	.62	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.12	1.37	1.20	-----	-----	1.37	1.37	-----	1.20	1.37	.60
Nantucket	Nantucketown.	.50	.50	.35	1.25	.80	1.25	-----	.75	1.00	-----	.65	-----	-----	.90	1.25	1.00	-----	-----	1.10	1.37	-----	1.00	1.50	.60
Michigan:																									
Wayne	Detroit	.60	-----	.45	1.50	1.25	1.25	$0.75	1.25	1.58	.75	-----	-----	1.50	1.25	1.53	1.50	$0.75	$1.25	1.25	1.25	$0.75	1.50	1.50	.85
Kent	Grand Rapids	.54	-----	.45	1.50	1.00	1.00	.62	.67	1.25	.62	-----	-----	1.00	1.00	1.25	1.25	.62	.77	1.00	1.00	.62	1.00	1.25	.59
Genessee	Flint	.60	-----	.45	1.50	1.00	1.00	.75	.67	1.25	.75	-----	-----	1.25	1.00	1.25	1.25	.75	.85	1.00	1.00	.75	1.25	1.50	.65
Saginaw	Saginaw	.47	-----	.40	1.50	1.00	1.00	.60	.62	1.00	.60	-----	-----	1.00	1.00	1.50	1.10	.60	.68	1.00	1.00	.60	1.10	1.50	.54
St. Clair	Port Huron	.43	-----	.40	1.50	.90	.86	.59	.57	.90	.59	-----	-----	.90	.90	1.25	.90	.59	.62	.90	.90	.59	.90	1.50	.50
Marquette	Marquette	.40	-----	.36	1.25	.90	.75	.50	.50	1.00	.50	-----	-----	.90	.90	1.25	1.00	.50	.57	.90	.90	.50	1.00	1.00	.50
Benzie	Frankfort	.36	-----	.33	1.25	.76	.68	.45	.45	.76	.45	-----	-----	.76	.76	1.25	.76	.45	.50	.76	.76	.45	.76	-----	.45
Minnesota:																									
Hennepin	Minneapolis	.68	.85	.55	1.37	1.25	1.25	-----	-----	1.50	-----	-----	1.40	1.50	1.25	1.50	1.37	-----	1.50	1.20	1.25	-----	1.37	1.50	.75
Ramsey	St. Paul	.63	-----	.55	1.37	1.25	1.25	-----	.85	1.35	-----	-----	1.40	1.50	1.20	1.50	1.25	.75	1.50	1.20	1.25	.75	1.37	1.50	.75
St. Louis	Duluth	.63	-----	.55	1.25	1.12	1.00	-----	.75	1.12	.75	-----	1.12	1.35	1.00	1.35	1.25	.75	1.25	.97	1.10	.75	1.25	1.50	.75
Olmstead	Rochester	.50	-----	.40	1.20	.85	.85	-----	.60	.80	.57	-----	.90	.80	.80	1.20	1.00	.57	.71	.80	.90	.57	1.00	1.50	.57
Itasca	Grand Rapids	.63	-----	.55	1.25	1.12	1.00	-----	.75	1.12	.75	-----	1.12	1.35	1.00	1.35	1.25	.75	1.25	.97	1.10	.75	1.25	1.50	.75
Mississippi:																									
Hinds	Jackson	.30	-----	.30	1.50	1.00	1.00	.75	.75	1.00	.60	.75	1.00	1.00	.80	1.25	1.25	.60	1.00	.87	.87	.55	1.00	1.25	.40
Lauderdale	Meridian	.40	-----	.30	1.25	.85	.85	.65	.75	.85	.50	.65	1.00	.60	.75	1.10	.85	.50	1.00	.85	.85	.50	.85	1.25	.40
Warren	Vicksburg	.25	-----	.25	1.25	1.00	1.00	.75	.75	1.00	.60	.60	1.00	.85	.87	1.25	.85	.60	.85	.85	.85	.50	.85	1.25	.40
Harrison	Biloxi	.40	-----	.25	1.25	1.00	1.25	.85	1.00	1.00	.60	.75	1.00	1.25	.90	1.25	1.00	.60	1.00	1.00	1.00	.60	1.00	1.25	.60
Grenada	Grenada	.19	-----	.20	1.25	.55	.70	.45	.50	.70	.40	.40	1.00	.55	.55	.70	.70	.40	.65	.55	.55	.35	.70	1.25	.30
Missouri:																									
St. Louis	St. Louis	.44	.50	.38	.88	.88	.88	.68	.68	.88	.68	.68	.88	.88	.88	.88	.88	.68	.88	.88	.88	.68	.88	.88	.68
Jackson	Kansas City	.36	.46	.36	.76	.76	.76	.60	.60	.76	.60	.60	.76	.76	.76	.76	.76	.60	.76	.76	.76	.60	.76	.76	.60
Green	Springfield	.32	.40	.32	.70	.70	.70	.56	.56	.70	.56	.56	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.56	.70	.70	.70	.56	.70	.70	.56
Jasper	Joplin	.32	.36	.32	.64	.64	.64	.52	.52	.64	.52	.52	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.52	.64	.64	.64	.52	.64	.64	.52
Cole	Jefferson City	.28	.36	.28	.66	.66	.66	.46	.46	.66	.46	.46	.66	.66	.66	.66	.66	.46	.66	.66	.66	.46	.66	.66	.46
Carroll	Carrollton	.25	.30	.25	.62	.62	.62	.40	.40	.62	.40	.40	.62	.62	.62	.62	.62	.40	.62	.62	.62	.40	.62	.62	.40
Montana:																									
Lewisand Clark	Helena	.75	.75	.50	1.50	1.13	1.50	.88	1.00	1.13	.88	1.00	-----	1.26	1.13	1.50	1.26	.88	1.00	1.00	1.26	.88	1.26	1.26	1.08
Silver Bow	Butte	.80	.80	.62	1.63	1.50	2.02	.91	-----	1.67	1.06	1.32	-----	1.63	1.37	2.02	2.02	1.06	-----	1.24	1.50	.91	2.02	1.50	1.16
Cascade	Great Falls	.70	-----	.55	1.63	1.50	1.50	.90	1.20	1.37	.90	1.13	1.37	1.50	1.24	1.63	1.37	.90	-----	1.20	1.24	.90	1.37	1.24	1.14
Dawson	Glendive	.62	-----	.45	1.51	1.26	1.51	.85	1.21	1.26	.85	1.21	-----	1.51	1.21	1.51	1.51	.85	-----	1.21	1.21	.85	-----	1.26	.86
Nebraska:																									
Douglas	Omaha	.50	-----	.40	1.37	1.12	1.25	.50	.60	1.25	.50	.50	1.12	1.25	.90	1.25	1.25	.55	1.12	.95	1.00	.70	1.25	1.25	.55
Lancaster	Lincoln	.42	-----	.40	1.25	.88	1.00	.50	.60	1.12	.50	.50	1.12	1.00	.80	1.00	1.00	.55	.70	.90	.85	.70	1.00	1.20	.55
Hall	Grand Island	.40	-----	.32	1.00	.75	.75	.40	.50	.90	.40	.45	.90	.75	.70	.85	.85	.50	.60	.70	.80	.60	.85	1.00	.50
Dawes	Chadron	.30	-----	.30	1.00	.75	.75	.40	.50	.90	.40	.45	.90	.75	.70	.85	.85	.50	.60	.70	.80	.60	.85	1.00	.50
Nevada:																									
Washoe	Reno	.62	-----	.48	1.75	1.25	1.00	.70	.70	1.50	.70	1.17	1.25	1.50	1.50	1.75	1.50	.70	1.25	1.25	1.25	.70	1.50	1.25	.70
Clark	Las Vegas	.62	-----	.48	1.00	1.00	1.00	.75	1.00	1.00	.75	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.25	.75	1.00	1.00	1.00	.75	1.00	1.00	.70
Ormsby	Carson City	.62	-----	.48	1.50	1.10	1.00	.75	1.00	1.25	.75	1.00	1.25	1.37	1.10	-----	1.37	.75	1.25	1.10	1.25	.75	1.37	1.25	.70
New Hampshire:																									
Hillsborough	Manchester	.45	-----	.40	1.30	1.00	1.12	-----	.60	.85	.60	.60	-----	1.25	.90	.75	1.00	.60	-----	1.00	.75	-----	.90	-----	.75
Merrimack	Concord	.40	-----	.37	1.25	.75	1.25	-----	.50	1.00	.50	.50	-----	.60	.80	.60	.75	.50	-----	.75	.60	-----	.75	-----	.60
Coos	Berlin	.40	-----	.35	.75	.75	.75	-----	.50	.75	.50	.50	-----	.60	.75	.60	.75	.50	-----	.60	.60	-----	.75	-----	.60
Carroll	Conway	.35	-----	.35	.70	.70	.70	-----	.45	.70	.45	.45	-----	.55	.70	.55	.70	.45	-----	.55	.55	-----	.70	-----	.55
New Jersey:																									
Camden	Camden	.50	.60	.43	1.62	1.37	1.25	-----	-----	1.50	.75	1.07	1.75	1.50	1.00	1.62	1.50	.60	-----	1.05	1.50	.80	1.50	-----	.75
Hudson	Jersey City	.50	-----	.43	1.88	1.75	1.75	-----	-----	1.81	.96	1.14	1.75	1.90	1.75	1.88	1.50	.75	-----	1.60	1.65	1.00	1.50	-----	.90
Passaic	Paterson	.50	1.00	.43	1.75	1.50	1.50	-----	-----	1.50	.87	-----	1.75	1.65	1.00	1.75	1.50	.75	-----	1.40	1.65	1.00	1.50	-----	.85
Essex	Newark	.50	1.12	.43	1.81	1.75	1.81	-----	-----	1.75	1.00	-----	1.75	1.62	1.25	1.81	1.50	.75	-----	1.51	1.65	1.00	1.50	-----	.90
Atlantic	Atlantic City	.50	.62	.41	1.50	1.25	1.25	-----	-----	1.50	.67	-----	1.75	1.25	1.00	1.50	1.25	.62	-----	1.00	1.00	.62	1.25	-----	.75
Cumberland	Bridgeton	.40	.50	.35	1.00	.80	.75	-----	-----	1.00	.67	-----	1.75	1.00	.70	1.00	.80	.62	-----	.80	.80	.50	.80	-----	.70
Hunterdon	Lambertville	.40	.50	.31	1.12	1.00	.65	-----	-----	1.00	.65	-----	1.75	1.00	.80	1.12	1.00	.60	-----	1.00	1.00	.60	.85	-----	.70
New Mexico:																									
Bernalillo	Albuquerque	.40	-----	.37	1.50	1.25	1.00	.46	1.00	1.25	.85	.75	1.25	1.25	1.00	1.50	1.25	.85	-----	1.00	1.25	.90	1.25	1.50	.75
Santa Fe	Santa Fe	.34	-----	.34	1.50	1.12	1.25	.39	1.00	1.25	.85	.75	1.25	1.25	1.00	1.50	1.25	.85	-----	1.00	1.25	.90	1.25	1.50	.75
Taos	Taos	.31	-----	.31	1.50	1.12	1.25	.35	1.00	1.25	.85	.75	1.25	1.25	1.00	1.50	1.25	.85	-----	1.00	1.25	.90	1.25	1.50	.75
New York City	New York City.	.49	-----	.55	1.88	1.75	1.75	-----	-----	2.00	1.20	-----	2.00	1.75	1.50	2.00	2.00	1.16	.71	1.85	1.85	-----	2.00	1.92	-----
New York (Upstate):																									
Albany	Albany	.47	.50	.43	1.37	1.00	1.37	-----	.55	1.05	.59	.59	1.45	1.37	.95	1.37	1.20	.59	-----	1.20	1.20	.59	1.20	1.37	.55
Erie	Buffalo	.50	-----	.43	1.50	1.30	1.00	-----	.85	1.25	.70	.60	1.33	1.50	1.25	1.50	1.37	.60	-----	1.10	1.15	.60	1.37	1.50	.65
Monroe	Rochester	.55	.65	.43	1.37	1.22	1.37	-----	.55	1.37	.70	.60	1.37	1.37	1.20	1.37	1.37	.60	-----	1.10	1.18	.55	1.37	1.37	.55
Onondaga	Syracuse	.50	-----	.43	1.37	1.00	1.00	-----	-----	1.25	.75	.60	1.12	1.20	.90	1.20	1.25	.75	-----	1.00	1.25	.60	-----	1.20	.59
Schenectady	Schenectady	.44	.60	.40	1.45	1.00	1.20	-----	.51	1.20	.55	-----	1.40	1.20	.87	1.45	1.35	.55	-----	1.20	1.20	.55	-----	1.20	.51
Chemung	Elmira	.45	-----	.37	1.50	1.00	.90	-----	.60	1.00	.60	-----	1.00	1.12	1.00	1.50	1.20	.60	-----	1.00	1.00	-----	-----	1.12	.55
Cattaraugus	Olean	.45	-----	.34	1.25	.90	.70	-----	.51	.95	.65	.50	1.20	1.20	.90	1.20	1.20	.60	-----	1.00	-----	-----	-----	1.12	.55
Lewis	Lowville	.40	-----	.31	1.00	.65	-----	-----	.75	.65	.50	.50	1.00	1.12	.65	1.00	.65	.50	-----	1.00	1.00	-----	-----	1.00	.50
North Carolina:																									
Wake	Raleigh	.28	-----	.28	1.00	.60	.60	.40	.40	.80	.40	.40	.60	.75	.60	.80	1.00	.40	-----	.60	.80	.40	.80	1.00	.60
Durham	Durham	.29	-----	.29	1.00	.60	.60	.40	.40	1.00	.40	.40	.60	.75	.66	.88	1.00	.40	-----	.60	.88	.40	.88	1.00	.60
Mecklenburg	Charlotte	.29	-----	.29	1.00	.60	.60	.40	.40	1.00	.40	.40	.60	.75	.66	.88	1.00	.40	-----	.60	.88	.40	.88	1.00	.60
Gaston	Gastonia	.23	-----	.23	.80	.50	.50	.35	.35	.80	.35	.35	.50	.65	.50	.80	.80	.35	-----	.50	.80	.35	.80	.80	.50
Harnett	Dunn	.20	-----	.20	.80	.40	.50	.30	.30	.80	.30	.30	.50	.50	.50	.80	.80	.30	-----	.50	.80	.30	.80	.80	.40
North Dakota:																									
Cass	Fargo	.48	-----	.48	1.35	.90	.70	.55	.55	.90	.55	.55	.70	1.00	.85	.95	1.00	.55	.70	.75	.75	.55	1.00	1.00	.55
Burleigh	Bismarck	.48	-----	.48	1.35	.90	.69	.55	.55	.90	.55	.55	.69	1.00	.85	.95	.90	.55	.69	.75	.75	.55	.90	1.00	.55
Walsh	Grafton	.40	-----	.40	1.35	.80	.55	.45	.45	.80	.45	.45	.55	.80	.75	.85	.80	.45	.55	.65	.65	.45	.80	1.00	.45
Ohio:																									
Cuyahoga	Cleveland	.60	-----	.43	1.62	1.37	1.37	.88	1.15	1.65	.88	.88	1.50	1.62	1.30	1.62	1.50	.92	-----	1.42	1.37	-----	1.50	1.62	.75
Hamilton	Cincinnati	.60	-----	.43	1.62	1.45	1.37	.65	.90	1.50	.65	1.00	-----	1.40	1.35	1.62	1.50	-----	1.37	1.25	1.37	-----	1.50	1.52	.65
Summit	Akron	.60	-----	.43	1.50	1.12	1.37	.71	.80	1.20	.71	.71	1.50	1.50	1.15	1.62	1.37	.71	1.37	1.12	1.12	-----	1.37	1.62	.65
Franklin	Columbus	.50	-----	.43	1.56	1.15	1.00	.65	.65	1.00	.65	.80	1.30	1.20	1.12	1.37	1.37	-----	1.25	.75	1.00	-----	1.37	1.37	.65
Clark	Springfield	.50	-----	.40	1.25	1.00	1.00	.60	.65	1.00	.60	-----	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.35	-----	1.00	-----	-----	-----	1.20	-----	.60
Allen	Lima	.40	-----	.37	1.25	.85	.85	.45	.45	.85	.45	.45	-----	.85	.85	1.25	.85	.45	.85	.85	-----	-----	.85	.85	.50
Ross	Chillicothe	.45	-----	.34	1.50	.80	.80	.51	.51	.90	.51	-----	.75	1.12	.80	1.12	1.12	-----	.80	-----	-----	-----	1.12	-----	.50
Warren	Franklin	.40	-----	.31	.85	.65	.65	.45	.45	.85	.45	.45	-----	.65	.65	.80	.85	-----	.65	.65	.65	-----	.65	.65	.40

[1] All fractions of cents dorpped.

Hourly wage rates for Works Progress Administration selected occupations, February 1939 [1]—Continued

State and county	City	Laborer: Common	Laborer: Construction	Laborer: Seamstress	Bricklayers	Carpenters	Cement finishers	Cement finishers' helpers	Concrete mixer operator	Electrician	Electrician helper	Hod carrier	Hoisting engineer	Lather	Painter	Plasterer	Plumber	Plumber helper	Reinforced steel workers	Roofers (composition)	Sheet metal worker	Sheet metal worker's helper	Steamfitters	Structural iron workers	Truck drivers (under 5 tons)
Oklahoma:																									
Oklahoma	Oklahoma City.	$0.41	-----	$0.41	$1.50	$1.25	$1.50	$0.61	$0.61	$1.15	$0.61	$0.61	$0.90	$1.25	$1.00	$1.50	$1.25	$0.63	-----	$1.25	$1.25	$0.61	$1.25	$1.25	$0.61
Tulsa	Tulsa	.41	-----	.41	1.50	1.25	1.25	.61	.61	1.35	.61	.61	.90	1.25	1.25	1.50	1.25	.63	-----	1.15	1.35	.61	1.50	1.25	.61
Muskogee	Muskogee	.36	-----	.36	1.50	1.00	1.00	.49	.49	1.00	.49	.49	.75	1.00	1.00	1.15	1.25	.53	-----	1.00	1.25	.49	1.25	1.25	.49
Okmulgee	Okmulgee	.32	-----	.32	1.40	1.00	1.05	.45	.45	1.00	.45	.45	.75	1.00	1.15	1.35	1.00	.46	-----	1.25	1.25	.45	1.10	1.00	.45
Craig	Vinita	.29	-----	.29	1.25	.75	.80	.37	.37	.90	.37	.37	.65	.60	.70	.85	1.00	.40	-----	1.00	1.00	.37	1.00	1.00	.37
Oregon:																									
Multnomah	Portland	.50	-----	.46	1.50	1.13	1.13	-----	.75	1.25	-----	1.13	1.00	1.38	1.10	1.50	1.50	-----	$1.13	1.38	1.20	-----	1.50	-----	.78
Marion	Salem	.48	-----	.40	1.20	1.00	.78	-----	.55	1.00	-----	-----	-----	1.00	.90	1.20	1.25	-----	.78	.78	.78	-----	.78	-----	.70
Clatsop	Astoria	.44	-----	.37	.85	.85	.85	-----	.55	.85	-----	.85	.85	.85	.85	.85	.85	-----	.85	.85	.85	-----	.85	-----	.63
Columbia	St. Helens	.44	-----	.34	.85	.85	.85	-----	.55	.85	-----	.85	.85	.85	.85	.85	.85	-----	.85	.85	.85	-----	.85	-----	.60
Pennsylvania:																									
Allegheny	Pittsburgh	.50	$0.80	.50	1.75	1.49	1.49	-----	1.49	1.65	-----	1.12	1.55	1.75	1.37	1.75	1.70	1.00	-----	1.37	1.49	.65	1.70	1.49	.65
Philadelphia	Philadelphia	.50	-----	.50	1.63	1.25	1.25	-----	1.00	1.37	.65	.69	1.49	1.49	1.12	1.55	1.44	-----	1.25	.85	1.25	.60	1.44	1.65	.71
Lackawanna	Scranton	.50	-----	.50	1.49	1.12	1.20	-----	.75	1.12	.62	.60	-----	1.12	1.12	1.50	1.20	.62	-----	1.00	1.12	.60	1.20	1.12	.60
Dauphin	Harrisburg	.50	-----	.50	1.25	1.00	1.25	-----	.59	1.06	.70	.70	1.25	1.12	.85	1.25	1.12	.60	1.00	.85	1.00	.60	1.12	1.50	.59
Erie	Erie	.50	-----	.50	1.49	1.14	1.25	-----	.59	1.25	-----	.65	1.00	1.20	1.04	1.49	1.25	.65	.90	.70	.85	-----	1.25	1.12	.65
Northampton	Bethlehem	.50	-----	.50	1.20	1.20	1.20	-----	.60	1.20	.65	.90	1.20	1.20	1.00	1.20	1.20	.65	1.00	.89	.89	-----	1.20	1.20	.59
Butler	Butler	.50	-----	.50	1.25	1.25	1.25	-----	.57	.90	.60	.57	.80	1.00	.85	1.25	.85	.57	.70	.80	.80	.57	.85	.80	.57
Rhode Island:																									
Providence	Providence	.50	-----	.39	1.50	1.00	1.15	-----	.60	1.15	.65	.70	1.50	1.37	1.00	1.50	1.35	.60	1.50	1.15	1.15	.60	1.37	-----	.60
Newport	Newport	.45	-----	.39	1.50	1.00	1.15	-----	.60	1.15	.65	.70	1.50	1.37	1.00	1.50	1.35	.60	1.50	1.15	1.15	-----	1.37	-----	.60
Bristol	Bristol	.45	-----	.39	1.50	1.00	1.15	-----	.60	1.15	.65	.70	1.50	1.37	1.00	1.50	1.35	.60	1.50	1.15	1.15	-----	1.37	-----	.60
South Carolina:																									
Charleston	Charleston	.27	-----	.27	.90	.75	.75	.48	.48	1.00	.48	-----	-----	.75	.75	.90	1.25	.48	-----	1.00	1.00	.48	1.25	-----	.38
Richland	Columbia	.27	-----	.27	.90	.75	.75	.48	.48	1.00	.48	-----	-----	.75	.75	.90	1.25	.48	-----	1.00	1.00	.48	1.25	-----	.38
Greenville	Greenville	.26	-----	.26	.75	.75	.75	.45	.45	.75	.45	-----	-----	.75	.75	.75	1.00	.45	-----	1.00	1.00	.45	.45	-----	.34
Anderson	Anderson	.22	-----	.22	.75	.75	.65	.38	.38	.75	.38	-----	-----	.50	.65	.75	.75	.38	-----	.75	.75	.38	.75	-----	.28
Abbeville	Abbeville	.19	-----	.19	.60	.50	.50	.30	.30	.50	.30	-----	-----	.50	.50	.60	.60	.30	-----	.60	.60	.30	.60	-----	.24
South Dakota:																									
Minnehaha	Sioux Falls	.40	-----	.37	1.37	.90	.80	.42	.54	.90	.42	.42	.54	-----	.80	1.20	1.00	.42	-----	.54	.54	-----	.80	-----	.40
Brown	Aberdeen	.40	.42	.37	1.37	.80	.80	.42	.52	.90	.42	.42	.52	-----	.80	1.20	1.00	.42	-----	.52	.52	-----	.80	-----	.40
Brookings	Brookings	.40	.41	.37	1.37	.80	.80	.41	.50	.90	.41	.41	.50	-----	.80	1.20	1.00	.41	-----	.50	.50	-----	.80	-----	.40
Tennessee:																									
Davidson	Nashville	.30	-----	.30	1.50	1.00	1.25	.42	.42	1.12	.42	.42	1.00	1.25	1.00	1.37	1.25	.42	-----	.65	1.00	.42	1.25	1.25	.65
Shelby	Memphis	.30	-----	.30	1.62	1.12	1.12	.42	.42	1.25	.65	.62	1.25	1.00	1.00	1.56	1.37	.42	-----	1.00	1.12	.42	1.37	1.25	.75
Knox	Knoxville	.30	-----	.30	1.25	1.00	1.00	.42	.42	1.25	.42	.42	1.00	1.00	.80	1.25	1.25	.42	-----	1.00	1.00	.42	1.25	1.37	.42
Washington	Johnson City	.26	-----	.26	.60	.60	.60	.34	.34	.60	.34	.34	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.34	-----	.60	.60	.34	.60	.60	.60
Sullivan	Bristol	.21	-----	.21	.50	.50	.50	.28	.28	.50	.28	.28	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50	.28	-----	.50	.50	.28	.50	.50	.50
Coffee	Tullahoma	.18	-----	.18	.40	.40	.40	.23	.23	.40	.23	.23	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.23	-----	.40	.40	.23	.40	.40	.23
Texas:																									
Harris	Houston	.35	.55	.29	1.50	1.12	1.25	.55	.55	1.50	.55	.55	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.50	1.50	.55	1.12	1.12	1.50	.55	1.50	1.12	.55
Dallas	Dallas	.35	.55	.29	1.50	1.00	1.00	.55	.55	1.25	.55	.55	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.50	1.50	.55	1.00	1.00	1.37	.55	1.50	1.00	.55
Bexar	San Antonio	.30	.45	.29	1.50	1.00	1.00	.45	.45	1.25	.45	.45	1.00	1.50	1.00	1.50	1.50	.45	1.00	1.00	1.25	.45	1.50	1.25	.45
McLennan	Waco	.30	.45	.27	1.50	1.00	1.00	.45	.45	1.00	.45	.45	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.25	1.00	.45	1.00	1.00	1.00	.45	1.00	1.00	.45
Potter	Amarillo	.30	.45	.26	1.50	1.00	1.00	.45	.45	1.25	.45	.45	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.50	1.25	.45	1.00	1.00	1.00	.45	1.25	1.00	.45
Bell	Temple	.25	.40	.22	.75	.75	.75	.40	.40	.75	.40	.40	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75	.40	.75	.75	.75	.40	.75	.75	.40
Bee	Beeville	.30	.45	.20	.75	.75	.75	.45	.45	.75	.45	.45	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75	.45	.75	.75	.75	.45	.75	.75	.45
Utah:																									
Salt Lake	Salt Lake City	.50	-----	.50	1.25	1.10	1.10	.65	.60	1.10	.65	1.10	-----	1.25	1.10	1.50	1.10	.65	-----	1.10	1.10	.65	1.10	-----	.65
Weber	Ogden	.50	-----	.50	1.25	1.10	1.10	.65	.60	1.10	.65	1.10	-----	1.25	1.10	1.50	1.10	.65	-----	1.10	1.10	.65	1.10	-----	.65
Utah	Provo	.50	-----	.50	1.25	1.10	1.10	.65	.60	1.10	.65	1.10	-----	1.25	1.10	1.50	1.10	.65	-----	1.10	1.10	.65	1.10	-----	.65
Carbon	Price	.50	-----	.50	1.25	1.10	1.10	.65	.60	1.10	.65	1.10	-----	1.25	1.10	1.50	1.10	.65	-----	1.10	1.10	.65	1.10	-----	.65
Vermont:																									
Washington	Montpelier	.40	-----	.35	1.00	.86	.75	-----	.50	.90	.50	-----	.70	-----	.75	1.00	.90	.50	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.45
Chittenden	Burlington	.40	-----	.35	1.25	.86	.75	-----	.50	.90	.50	-----	.70	-----	.75	1.25	.90	.50	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.45
Addison	Middlebury	.32	-----	.32	.70	.65	.55	-----	.40	.90	.40	-----	.60	-----	.55	.70	.70	.40	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.35
Virginia:																									
Norfolk	Norfolk	.28	.41	.28	1.37	.90	.60	.50	.50	.90	.50	.50	.60	-----	.80	1.25	1.10	.50	-----	.75	.75	.50	1.10	.80	.45
Henrico	Richmond	.28	.41	.28	1.25 .51	.70 .51	.70 .51	.41	.50	.80 .51	.41	.41	.80	-----	.70 .51	.90 .51	.80 .51	.41	-----	.80 .51	-----	.41	.80 .51	.90	.41
Roanoke	Roanoke	.30	.38	.27	.90	.47 .65	.47 .65	.38	.38	.65	.38	.38	.65	-----	.47 .65	.62	.65	.38	-----	.65	.65	.38	.65	.90	.40
Dinwiddie	Petersburg	.26	.34	.26	.44 1.00	.44 .60	.44 .50	.34	.34	.75	.34	.34	.75	-----	.44 .60 .71	.75	.75	.34	-----	.60	.60	.34	.75	.70	.34
Arlington	Alexandria	.25	.38	.25	.80 .60	.45 .60	.45 .60	.38	.38	.70	.38	.38	-----	-----	.40 .65	.80	1.00	.38	-----	.70	.60	.38	1.00	.80	.38
Halifax	South Boston	.19	.25	.19	.78 .95	.31 .50	.35 .50	.25	.40	.70	.25	.25	.85	-----	.31 .45	.60	.78	.25	-----	.60	.50	.25	.78	.60	.30
Washington:																									
King	Seattle	.58	-----	.46	1.50	1.24	1.24	-----	.73	1.50	-----	1.24	1.24	1.50	1.24	1.50	1.50	-----	1.24	1.24	1.35	-----	1.50	1.35	1.09
Spokane	Spokane	.51	-----	.51	1.50	1.24	1.35	-----	.61	1.24	-----	1.09	1.24	1.50	1.24	1.50	1.35	-----	1.24	1.02	1.24	-----	1.35	1.50	.89
Pierce	Tacoma	.58	-----	.46	1.50	1.29	1.35	-----	.73	1.50	-----	1.24	1.24	1.50	1.24	1.50	1.50	-----	1.29	1.24	1.35	-----	1.50	1.35	1.09
Snohomish	Everett	.50	-----	.40	1.46	1.23	1.23	-----	.66	1.46	-----	1.07	1.17	1.46	1.23	1.46	1.46	-----	1.17	1.23	1.30	-----	1.46	1.30	.98
Yakima	Yakima	.46	-----	.37	1.17	1.00	1.17	-----	.53	1.05	-----	.88	.75	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.11	-----	1.17	1.17	1.05	-----	1.11	1.24	.75
Pacific	Raymond	.48	-----	.34	1.31	1.08	1.02	-----	.69	1.23	-----	.97	1.23	1.08	1.15	1.31	1.31	-----	1.15	.97	1.23	-----	1.31	1.31	.92
West Virginia:																									
Cabell	Huntington	.45	-----	.45	1.25	1.00	1.25	.55	.55	1.12	.55	.55	1.00	1.00	1.00	.100	1.25	.55	.80	1.00	1.00	.55	1.00	1.35	.80
Kanawha	Charleston	.45	-----	.45	.80	.80	.80	.55	.55	.80	.55	.55	.80	.80	.80	.80	.80	.55	.80	.80	.80	.55	.80	.80	.80
Harrison	Clarksburg	.45	-----	.45	.80	.80	.80	.55	.55	.80	.55	.55	.80	.80	.80	.80	.80	.55	.80	.80	.80	.55	.80	.80	.80
Berkeley	Martinsburg	.40	-----	.40	.80	.80	.80	.50	.50	.80	.50	.50	.80	.80	.80	.80	.80	.50	.80	.80	.80	.50	.80	.80	.80
Greenbrier	Alderson	.40	-----	.40	.80	.80	.80	.50	.50	.80	.50	.50	.80	.80	.80	.80	.80	.50	.80	.80	.80	.50	.80	.80	.80
Wisconsin:																									
Milwaukee	Milwaukee	.85	-----	.50	1.45	1.20	1.30	-----	.87	1.30	-----	.95	1.35	1.38	1.12	1.38	1.35	-----	1.25	1.00	1.20	-----	1.36	1.38	.86
Dane	Madison	.61	-----	.50	1.38	1.10	1.02	-----	.70	1.30	-----	.75	1.00	1.22	1.02	1.25	1.25	-----	1.24	.90	1.10	-----	1.25	1.38	.65
La Crosse	La Crosse	.54	-----	.46	1.25	1.00	1.00	-----	.62	1.00	-----	.75	1.00	.89	.89	1.11	1.20	-----	1.00	.66	.89	-----	1.20	1.00	.60
Marinette	Marinette	.50	-----	.42	1.00	.80	.80	-----	.54	.71	-----	.54	1.00	.80	.71	1.00	.80	-----	.80	.54	.71	-----	.80	.80	.50
Door	Sturgeon Bay	.48	-----	.42	.80	.71	.71	-----	.59	.71	-----	.54	1.00	.71	.71	.71	.71	-----	.71	.54	.71	-----	.71	.71	.50
Wyoming:																									
Laramie	Cheyenne	.42	-----	.42	.61	.61	.61	-----	.61	.61	.48	.48	.61	.61	.61	.61	.61	.48	.61	.61	.61	.48	.61	.61	.48
Natrona	Casper	.42	-----	.42	.61	.61	.61	-----	.61	.61	.48	.48	.61	.61	.61	.61	.61	.48	.61	.61	.61	.48	.61	.61	.48
Albany	Laramie	.42	-----	.42	.61	.61	.61	-----	.61	.61	.48	.48	.61	.61	.61	.61	.61	.48	.61	.61	.61	.48	.61	.61	.48
Carbon	Rawlins	.42	-----	.42	.58	.58	.58	-----	.58	.58	.47	.47	.58	.58	.58	.58	.58	.47	.58	.58	.58	.47	.58	.58	.47

[1] All fractions of cents dropped.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION,
Washington, D. C.

SURVEY OF COMPARATIVE LIVING COSTS

A survey of comparative living costs in five small southern cities and five northern cities of similar size, just completed by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for Administrator Elmer F. Andrews, of the Wage and Hour Division, United States Department of Labor, found the average was 3.1 percent lower for the five southern cities.

The study was undertaken by the Bureau of Labor Statistics at the request of Mr. Andrews, who wanted all pertinent information on questions that may come before him in conducting hearings and passing upon the minimum-wage recommendations of the various industry committees. The questions of wage differentials in favor of the South and of living costs in the South, as compared with the North, have already come up before some of these committees.

The report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics showed that while, on the average, rents in the five southern cities surveyed is 7.6 percent lower than for similar housing in the North and fuel costs are 34.2 percent lower, there was no essential difference in food costs. The cost of clothing was 2 percent higher in the five southern cities surveyed; furniture, furnishings, and equipment 3.8 percent higher, and miscellaneous items 3 percent higher.

Rents for company houses were not included in the survey of cities in either region because the Fair Labor Standards Act provides that the wages required under the act may include "the reasonable cost, as determined by the Administrator, to the employer of furnishing such employee with board, lodging, or other facilities." The rents tabulated were for houses of four, five, and six rooms having, as a minimum, running water, inside flush toilets, and electricity for lighting.

Families in both regions have adapted their expenditures to local prices, consuming more of the goods which are relatively cheap in the locality, and less of those goods and services which are relatively more expensive. Thus, based on the prices of goods consumed by an average family of an employed wage earner in the North, the Bureau of Labor Statistics finds that the cost of such a northern budget is 1 percent less in the five southern cities surveyed than in the northern cities surveyed. In dollars, the cost is $1,387 in the northern cities and $1,374 in the southern cities. Wage-earner families in the five southern cities, on the average, would have to spend $13 less annually than wage earners in the five northern cities to live on the same standard.

On the other hand, it is pointed out, the cost of goods consumed by an average family of an employed wage earner in the South was found to be 5.3 percent less in the five southern cities than in the five northern cities.

Since these differences reflect essentially contrasts in buying habits and tastes, rather than in the quality of the living involved, the Bureau of Labor Statistics presents an average of the two patterns of expenditure. The difference of buying habits and of costs was most pronounced in the case of specific foods. Thus the price of corn meal in the five northern cities was almost twice that in the five southern cities covered, and the consumption of corn meal by northern wage-earner families is less than 2 percent of that in the South. Sweet potatoes averaged about 2½ cents less per pound in the southern cities but southern consumption is almost three times as high as northern. Milk prices averaged 2 cents higher per quart in the five southern cities but only half as much milk is consumed by southern wage-earner families. The average price of white bread was 25 percent higher in the South than in the North but southern consumption of this item was only one-third of that in the North.

You will note that in California a common laborer gets 81 cents an hour in San Francisco, and so on down the line until he only gets for the same class of work 45 cents an hour in Fort Bragg. A plasterer gets $1.67 an hour in San Francisco and only 84 cents an hour at Fort Bragg, a difference of approximately 100 percent.

I could go on down through almost the entire list of States and point out similar conditions more outstanding in some cases than in others. In the State of Delaware a common laborer in the city of Wilmington gets 41 cents an hour. In the city of Dover he gets only 25 cents an hour.

In the State of Illinois, whose Representatives appear so pleased with present conditions, it appears that a common laborer in Peoria, the residence of our good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], gets 50 cents an hour. In the county of Clay he gets only 31 cents an hour. It also appears that in that State in the city of Chicago, a plumber gets $1.70 an hour; in the county of Clay the same laborer, doing the same kind of work, gets only 61 cents an hour.

In the State of Iowa it appears that a common laborer in the city of Des Moines gets 67 cents an hour, whereas in the town of Eagle Grove he gets only 35 cents an hour. In New York City a plasterer or a plumber gets $2 per hour; in Lowville, N. Y., the plasterer gets $1 per hour, and a plumber only 65 cents. In Covington, Ky., a reinforced-steel worker is paid $1.37 per hour, while the same worker, if he has a job in Shelbyville, Ky., gets only 35 cents per hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that it is not possible to go into all of these discriminations, but we are seeking to do something here to correct them.

I have invited the subcommittee who had this matter under consideration to work out some plan itself in connection with the W. P. A., but it has not done so. If the plan that I suggest here is not a fair plan, it may be changed to some other plan when the bill reaches the Senate, or the matter may be worked out in conference; but certainly a situation in which the same class of labor in different sections of the same State is paid wages differing in amount anywhere from 100 to 400 percent, ought to be corrected, not to speak of the outrageous differentials between States and sections and particularly against the South.

This amendment was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations. Eighteen members of the committee supported it and nineteen opposed it. Every Republican on the committee opposed and a large majority of the Democrats favored it. The same thing will be true here today so far as the Democrats are concerned. It only lost in the committee by a majority of 1 vote. It seems to me, and I appeal to the House at this time, that the basis of fixing these wages set out in my amendment is a fair basis and ought to be adopted by the Congress. If it should not be adopted, then certainly an amendment of like character ought to be written into the bill in order that further consideration on this subject may be assured before the Senate when the bill reaches that body.

Why men who voted on the passage of the wage-hour bill that southern industry should be allowed no differentials at all in wages should vote for their W. P. A. constituents to have four or five times as much in some instances as men doing the same work in the South is beyond my comprehension. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment may close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not object to the limitation of time, but so far on this bill I have not used one minute of time. I would like to have 5 minutes on this amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The hour is getting somewhat late. I would dislike to have the House remain here until midnight.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request, and will make it 15 minutes, and I would like to reserve 2 minutes of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment be confined to 15 minutes, the gentleman from Virginia reserving 2 minutes for himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I know the Committee is getting restless and probably would like to dispose of this matter and get away. I am as anxious as anyone to do that. I cannot see, though, why a provision of this kind, something approaching this type of provision, was not placed in the bill by the committee.

It is going to be right interesting for me to listen to members of the committee oppose this amendment. This amendment provides that wage differentials shall not vary greater than the cost of living. So far as I am concerned, I can think of no more equitable proposition than that. Of course, costs of living over the United States do vary. For instance, down in the rural sections of my district some people live cheaper than they do in the cities, but it is not anything like the differential paid for W. P. A. labor as between the cities and the rural sections or the cities and the small towns. Within my State county lines, imaginary lines, with a neighbor living on one side and a neighbor on the other, doing exactly the same work, there is a differential in some instances of as much as 20 percent in the amount that one on one side receives as against the one on the other side. There is no sense in such a situation. No one can explain it. No administrator of W. P. A. will attempt to justify it, except to say that it is an arbitrary rule laid down by the W. P. A.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. After all, is not the purpose of this whole legislation to give people a living, and the cost of living should be considered in fixing the wage to be received?

Mr. NICHOLS. It is not anticipated here that we will make work on W. P. A. so attractive that they will make it a livelihood, or make it a life pursuit; and unless you are going to place some limitation on differentials of wage scales similar to this, then those favored sections of the United States which enjoy a dollar-an-hour labor are employing labor at such a high wage that you are making it as attractive to them to be on W. P. A. as it is for them to be in private employment; and this should not be the situation.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Does not this differential between localities cause misunderstanding and discontent?

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course it causes discontent. It causes lack of content among neighbors actually across an imaginary line which divides them.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I sought to make an observation in the time of the gentleman from Oklahoma because I did not understand that I was allotted time. I reemphasize the fact which has been emphasized by the previous speaker and I give an example. In Monongalia County, W. Va., the wage paid W. P. A. workers is lower than the amount paid W. P. A. workers just across the line in Greene County, Pa. Living conditions, climatic conditions, all conditions are identical in these two counties, one in West Virginia where a lower rate is paid, and the other in Pennsylvania where a higher rate is paid. This is absolutely wrong and certainly not in the spirit of a fair work-relief program. In the past, as now, I have joined my colleagues in an attempt to right this wrong which exists.

In West Virginia we find a higher wage paid in one county than in another. This same situation exists in many, many sections of West Virginia and in other States. I certainly hope, and believe, that the membership of this Committee is going to try at this time to vote for this amendment as it has been offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], or, if not such an amendment, certainly some proposal which will tend to cure the evil which exists today in connection with wage differentials paid to W. P. A. workers. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I certainly favor this amendment. As an illustration, in the State of Michigan, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, the wage scale for common labor is $44, but in lower Michigan, and especially around the metropolitan areas, it runs as high as $60. W. P. A. officials attempt to justify that differential on the ground that it costs less to live in our section than it does in the metropolitan area. With the long winters and with the extra clothes and all that is needed up in our section, it certainly justifies the same wage scale as any other part of the State.

I think the amendment that has been offered cures this situation to a certain extent, but there still will be a differential based on the argument of the W. P. A. that there is a difference in the cost of living.

I am offering an amendment also that will set a rate exactly the same throughout the State. I hope that this amendment passes, but I am offering an amendment a little later to see that the same wage scale is set throughout the State and that there be no differentials within the bounds of the State. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have come at last to an amendment on which there should be no difference of opinion. We are not asking for any additional money. The passage of this amendment will not add one dollar of expense to the Treasury or to the taxpayers. The passage of this amendment will simply say that we are trying to do justice to everyone, regardless of the locality in which they live. It will simply say that the United States Government intends in this operation to apply the same rule it has required by its laws that the citizens of this Nation apply when dealing one with another. The citizens who work for private industry in my State draw, under the Wage and Hour Act, the same wage in the same industry that they draw in other States, without regard to cost of living, but this amendment would say we want to be just, we want to go further than the Wage and Hour Act and say that we will give to the man who lives in the industrial section, where the costs of living are high, a higher wage in order that he may meet the cost of living.

We will give to the man who lives in the big city more money than we will give to the man who lives in the country, because it takes more to live in the city, and we will give him in exact equality and with even-handed justice the same percentage payment in proportion to the cost of living as it bears in either section.

I hope we will not find a division here down this middle aisle when the vote is taken. I realize that on the committee vote every Republican member of that committee voted against this amendment. If this amendment is voted down, it will be because of those gentlemen on this side. If defeated it will be voted down on that side of the aisle, just as it was in committee. I cannot understand how my Republican friends can go home and say to their people who are not drawing the same wage in proportion to the cost of living in their community that is being drawn in other communities, "We voted to keep you from getting your fair share—from enjoying the same opportunity to earn a living that other citizens of the United States have."

Let the United States deal justly with all our people, regardless of where they live.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the question of wage differentials is one of the most difficult problems not only that the W. P. A. has to contend with but that industry has to contend with. Wage differentials exist in private in-

dustry, maybe not to the same extent, but it exists just the same, and it is an extremely important matter. I do not know what the effect of this amendment may be. But when you undertake to fix this sort of standard for a wage, I am confident it will do one thing. It will cut down the number of jobs that may be given by the W. P. A. Why do I make that statement? Because I am sure no one's wages will be lowered. Whatever will be done will be to raise the level and when you raise the lower wages you cut down the number of jobs to be obtained.

There is a provision later on in this bill, which the committee hopes will be sustained by the House, recommended by the W. P. A., and it is the President's idea, that we get back to a security wage with a 130-hour month, rather than the prevailing rate of wages with a shorter-hour month. The W. P. A. feels this will, to a large extent, relieve some of this discrimination in the way of wage differentials, although not altogether. The W. P. A. feels it will be a long step in that direction.

I hope the committee will not adopt the pending amendment, because while I am most sympathetic with the objective which my friend has in mind, I am quite confident it will have the effect of materially decreasing the number of jobs which will be at the disposal of the W. P. A. program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 80, noes 122.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. TARVER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 111, noes 159.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEOUGH: Page 17, strike out the whole of subsection (b) of section 16, beginning on line 19 or page 17 and ending on line 6 of page 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Employable persons who have been certified as in need of employment for a period of 6 months or more, and who have not in that period been given employment on work projects, shall have preference in employment over persons who have been in active employment status on such work projects for a period of 3 years or more."

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the amendment I propose in lieu of that which has been submitted by the committee, I would like to direct the attention of the House to the very fine achievements that the deliberations of this body today have accomplished in the direction apparently set out by the Appropriations Committee at the time of its deliberations and study with relation to the fiscal appropriation for W. P. A. for the year 1939–40. You have listened, as have I, in one instance to the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, refer in great praise to the splendid accomplishments of the W. P. A., and in the next indicate that with relation to certain of the activities that had been supervised by the W. P. A., the expenditure of money has been a complete loss with relation to the activities which he enumerated.

I say with all respect to the entire membership of the Appropriations Committee, and particularly to the subcommittee that made a study of the W. P. A., that insofar as the objective you have deliberately sought to achieve is concerned, which is a complete restriction of the W. P. A. activities to the point of complete sabotaging of this great agency of the Federal Government, on the success you achieved, I pay you my high compliments.

I also wish to direct the attention of the members of the Committee that apparently the Appropriations Committee felt quite confident as to its ability to achieve the result I now so highly praise it for; and not content alone with the destruction of the W. P. A. I wish to direct the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that with relation to another great agency of the present national administration of Government of the United States, the P. W. A., they have accomplished practically the same result.

May I direct attention to what was accomplished by the $125,000,000 which was taken from the $1,477,000,000 recommended by the President and approved by the Budget, to which reference has been so frequently made by those who discussed the fact that in this instance the Appropriations Committee stood by the President? They brought in the amount the President recommended, failing to indicate that in taking down $125,000,000 of it, allocating that to the P. W. A., they have failed to bring in the $1,477,000,000 the President asked for, in that they have diverted $125,000,000 to the P. W. A.

All I ask you to do is recall that when this Congress was convened on the 3d day of January this year there was offered a recommendation from the President that the deficiency appropriation for the W. P. A. be $875,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I thank the members of the Committee for this generous contribution of an additional 5 minutes. I really feel, however, I need offer no apology because for the 5 years I have been here I have inflicted myself on the House on only two other occasions.

I feel deeply about what has been done today. I say that the W. P. A. program for next year has been sabotaged. I say that in view of the previous appropriations by the Congress of our country to the extent of approximately $5,000,000,000 for P. W. A., a child 5 years old must know that $125,000,000 in the direction of the P. W. A. program stultifies and destroys that sort of a program. So we can say to the Appropriations Committee, and with particular emphasis not to my Republican colleagues on the left but to those of my Democratic faith on the right who joined with the Republicans in bringing in this sort of a program, that they will answer to the people, not alone of their respective districts but of the country, in that they have stabbed their leader in the back. I still believe that the people of America love Franklin D. Roosevelt more than they love any Representative in this House. [Applause.]

I say to the Republicans who booed instead of cheered that you will not have long to wait. We will meet in convention about a year from now and the Republican Party will be in as great a state of confusion wherever they meet for their national convention as they have been in the last 10 years since you elected Herbert Hoover in 1928. I say to you again—and I welcome your boos—who will the distinguished representative of your political philosophy be that you will nominate? Will it be the daring young prosecutor of New York? [Applause.] Fine, and I hope he is nominated. But I want to say to my Republican friends that if the Republican candidate is the young gentleman of New York, who was given his opportunity to make his place in the sun because of the great, broad outlook on matters of civil government by the present distinguished Democratic Governor of New York, the Honorable Herbert Lehman, I have no worry as to the result, in spite of the fact there will be some on the Republican side of this House who will take the cry to the country, "No third term for a President." Some of you will have to "eat crow" in that event, at least the distinguished Member from New York, Hon. HAMILTON FISH, who defended in 1912 a third-term candidate. So we welcome the issue.

I wish it could be established tonight that the people of America would be asked to decide between any Republican, whether he be Dewey, Vandenberg, Taft, or anyone else. [Applause.] Oh, I trust there will be a better spirit of sportsmanship. Because of the applause from the Republican side I failed to complete the list. Maybe you will have to go back to the distinguished citizen of California, Herbert

Hoover, or possibly you may come out to Chicago and select him who was the Republican candidate 2 years ago for Vice President, who is well known in the city of Chicago as the "carpetbagger from New Hampshire," Frank Knox, the publisher of the Chicago Daily News.

I say to you Republicans, this is your inning this afternoon. You have done a dastardly job. I am sorry there were any Democrats who made this double assassination of the W. P. A. and P. W. A. a possibility. I repeat, let us have Hoover in '40 against Franklin Delano Roosevelt and I know what the verdict of the people will be. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if we can agree on a limitation of time on this section. There has already been 10 minutes of debate on the section. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, and I would like to have 3 minutes of that time.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'TOOLE. How many amendments to this section are on the Clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. At least 30 amendments.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not to this section, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state, in answer to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from New York as to the number of amendments to this particular section, that the Chair's statement referred to the title. There are about 30 amendments to the title. The Chair is informed that there are about 13 amendments to this particular section.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the fact that we have over 13 amendments to this section and it is proposed to limit debate to 20 minutes, can we be assured that 10 minutes of that debate will not be taken up in making a Democratic Presidential nomination speech like the last one?

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PARSONS. To what section does the pending motion pertain?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state that the motion applies to section 16.

Mr. PARSONS. To section 16 only?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. How does it happen that we are amending section 12 and later sections when amendments pertaining to section 11 are undisposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that those amendments can be offered later.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his preferential motion.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOOK) there were—ayes 67, noes 222.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MCKEOUGH: On page 17, line 19, strike out all of subsection (b).

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, if my amendment does not carry, every person who has been certified on W. P. A. in the United States who has been on the roll for 18 months, regardless of whether he or she has 1 or 10 dependents, will go off of the rolls and cannot be restored for 60 days.

I cannot conceive how the committee could put such a provision in this bill. Imagine a man or woman with five or six dependents, who has been on W. P. A. for 18 months, put off the rolls for 60 days with no job, no way to feed his family.

You have on page 19, subsection (g), a provision that investigations must be made from time to time, not less than once in every case every 6 months and take workers off the rolls who are not entitled to be there.

I want to purge the rolls of W. P. A. of everyone who does not belong there, and place those on the roll who should be there. I will join you in such an effort, but I say you make a mistake when you take a man or woman with a family off the rolls for 60 days simply because they have been on W. P. A. for 18 months.

When the investigations are made that you provide for in subsection (g), you are going to purge the rolls of those who do not belong there, but do not make those suffer who have wives and children at home and cannot secure work in private industry. When you remove those from the roll not entitled to certification you make room for those who are.

I appeal to you to give some thought to this provision, and I maintain that this subsection should be stricken from the bill.

Let us rely upon subsection (g) to purge the rolls. That is fair. I know you have people certified who have never been able to get an appointment and I would like to see those persons recognized, but not at the expense of a man with a wife and several children who cannot get work in private industry. If the W. P. A. will make subsection (g) work then you will make room for worthy cases but to serve notice now to men and women with dependents that August 31 you must, regardless of the conditions in your home, get off the roll is unfair and will cause untold suffering. Let us be reasonable and not go to such extremes. Those of us who come from the large cities know very well what this provision will mean. It is too drastic and should be stricken from the bill especially when you have another provision that makes it sure investigations are to be made to determine who should and who should not be recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it true that this amendment will not only work a hardship on these men with families, but in the case of sewing-room projects, on which are employed needy widows, many of whom have children, who have been on the rolls for more than 6 months, this provision would automatically force all of them off the rolls?

Mr. COCHRAN. It would force them off of the rolls and even if they were recertified the next day, under the provisions of this subsection, they could not get back for 60 days.

In my city, St. Louis, W. P. A. itself is in charge of certifications. Up to August 1938 the State and cities took care of certifications but the money ran out and it was necessary to turn over the work to W. P. A. At that time I pleaded with the W. P. A. officials, city, State, and the Administrator in Washington, to set up an efficient certification system. Those they did place in the office were efficient but I regret to be forced to admit they did not detail a sufficient number of investigators to do the job as it should be done.

On the W. P. A. relief rolls you will find honest men and women—intelligent, capable of making proper investigations, and they will do just as good a job as the nonrelief worker or the social worker if given an opportunity. I cannot conceive of a better W. P. A. project than a sufficient number of competent investigators to continually look into the home conditions of the workers who have been certified. Set up such a project to carry out subsection (g) of this section and you have no need of the provisions of subsection (b), which I seek to strike from the bill. You set up the machinery to do a real job under subsection (g). I appeal to the membership to support my substitute and not make honest men, women, and children suffer by taking their food and shelter from them, as you will do if you leave the provisions I refer to in the bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKEOUGH].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California to the amendment offered by Mr. McKEOUGH: At the end of such amendment add the following: "*Provided*, That veterans and persons 45 years of age and over shall not be removed from employment under the terms of this subsection."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the most clear-cut proposal you have before you is the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], for which I shall certainly vote. I offer my amendment in order to give you a chance to perfect the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, which I believe needs to be perfected in this manner, but I shall certainly vote for the substitute motion of the gentleman from Missouri and for every other measure which will change or make less drastic this vicious and cruel provision from the bill.

This is the one provision in the bill that I cannot understand the committee putting in. It means that 700,000 people, many hundreds of thousands of them heads of families, will arbitrarily, without consideration, be immediately dropped from the rolls. I do not think you can administer a thing like that. I do not think you can defend it. I can understand the committee's reason for wanting to rotate employment, but you cannot do it in this way without completely disrupting work on every project and without untold hardship.

The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois would make rotation possible on a decent, workable basis, but with the House in the frame of mind it is now the only thing you can do in a clear-cut fashion is to adopt the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri and be done with this kind of effort until we have time to do it in some decent way so it will not work this hardship to a great percentage of people who would be affected by this provision, including many men of 45 years of age or over.

I have a table here but, obviously, there is no time to read it, but I can show that the percentage of people employed for longer periods goes up until it reaches 29 percent of those people, 60 years of age or over, who have been on the rolls this length of time. These are the people who will be affected by this measure and not the people who could get other jobs. Most of them have already done so.

Obviously, I am not speaking very well because I feel pretty deeply about this and I think it is too bad we have to consider a thing like this at such a late hour when the livelihood of so many American citizens is immediately at stake. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to address the Committee?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I understood the Chair had reserved 5 minutes for me.

The CHAIRMAN. A number of amendments are pending. If there is no further debate on the McKeough amendment and the substitute, the Chair will put the pending amendment to a vote so that other pending amendments might be considered.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will take my time now, if the Chair will give it to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, please let the House be assured that I have no personal interest in keeping them here any longer than they desire to stay. Whenever the Committee wishes to rise, and, of course, the Committee could do it, anyway, I am perfectly satisfied. The Members are not being ridden by anybody, but are doing what evidently the majority of the Committee desires to do, namely, stay here and complete the bill.

About this amendment, my good friend from Illinois [Mr. McKEOUGH] waxes himself into a lather, chastising the Committee on Appropriations about not giving time to consider this important bill and his amendment, and he takes 10 minutes' time making a political speech and never even mentions his amendment. I am not sure that we have not some amendments in this bill against political coercion that could almost be brought up against my friend from Illinois. Talk about putting politics in relief.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Oh, if I thought I were half as efficient in political activities as the gentleman from Virginia, I would never worry about being reelected.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I appreciate my friend's good humor.

I must not overlook the fact that my good friend spanked the committee about sabotaging the P. W. A. program. Think of it, the committee sabotaging the P. W. A. program. Why, the President has not sent one penny of Budget estimate here for the P. W. A. program. It has not been sabotaged.

Mr. McKEOUGH rose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, I cannot yield any further. The Starnes bill was referred to the Budget, and they reported that it was not in accordance with the President's financial program. The Committee on Appropriations has not sabotaged any P. W. A. program.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to hear the gentleman dispute what I said about this provision and the effect of it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Very well, I will dispute it "good" for you. Mr. Chairman, the most humane thing written into this bill is this amendment requiring rotation of W. P. A. workers. [Applause.] Let me say this: If the Government were undertaking to give a job to every person out of work, if the program of the administration were to provide a job for every person eligible for a W. P. A. job, what these gentlemen say about the inhumanity of taking them off the rolls would be eminently true, but the program has never called for doing more than giving a job to about one in every three or four entitled to it.

What has happened? People have gotten on this program in some places and have remained there for months. In the city of New York 44 percent of the people on W. P. A. have been there since the beginning of the program. What about the inhumanity, what about the starving, what about the hundreds of that army of people standing in line in New York City who would like to have some of the benefits of this Government program that you will not let get on the program because you want to perpetuate the people already there?

Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. MARCANTONIO rose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, no; I cannot yield. The whole effort here is to perpetuate, to freeze upon the W. P. A. rolls the people already there. Why not shed a few tears for the deserving American citizens who have never had a meal from the W. P. A. in the whole three and a half years? [Applause.]

What does the committee ask them to do? It asks them, after they have been there for 18 consecutive months with a Government job, to stand aside and give those people in line who have not had a job an opportunity, and if, at the end of 60 days, the certifying agency says that they should be sent back to W. P. A., then send them back and put them to work.

I cannot see the inhumanity of that. It seems to me that is eminently proper and fair. It gives a fair chance and opportunity to people to have the benefits of this program rather than giving those benefits to just a favored few.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a serious question.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman is going to ask a serious question, I shall have to yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. When they go back at the end of 60 days, what will you do with those on the rolls at that time?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am very glad the gentleman has asked that question. There is a monthly turnover of from 100,000 to 150,000 on the pay roll.

They are on and off for one reason or another. In addition to that, under the 18 months' provision there will be people going off every month, having served during 18 months, standing aside and giving some other poor fellow a chance. And, ladies and gentlemen, listen to this: Some of the most deserving cases tonight, people who honestly and sincerely deserve more Government help than anybody in the United States are not the people who are on the rolls. They are people who have fought and fought and fought, who have scraped the bottom of the barrel, who have exhausted every possible means to keep from asking for Government help. And here we are objecting to some fellow who has had 18 months of it standing aside while they have a chance to get up. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state for the information of the committee that there is about 11 minutes left and there are 12 or 13 amendments pending. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is a member of the committee seeking recognition. The gentleman from Massachusetts, another member of the committee, is seeking recognition. Under the rules the Chair is compelled to recognize those gentlemen.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] did not really mean what he said in declaring that those of us who do not agree with him want to freeze everybody on the relief rolls who are now employed on the W. P. A.

I feel that it is only fair to say that not one Member of this body has advocated freezing anyone on the relief rolls. If any Member of this body desires to do such a thing it has not even been hinted during all this discussion. Such a statement is simply begging the question. We are inclined to go from one extreme to the other. That some would like to make a career of the W. P. A. cannot be denied. There have, of course, been abuses of relief. These abuses should and will be corrected in an orderly way. I think it is fair to say that the average Member of this House feels there should be some kind of practical humane rotation on the W. P. A. If his hard and fast rule is written into law, however, you will thereby do a gross injustice to many desperately needy people who are unable to help themselves.

Let me give you the practical effect of this harsh provision: In nearly every county of every State there have been established W. P. A. sewing rooms, established for and operated by women, all of whom were unemployed and unskilled. It has been my observation that a very large percentage of the ladies in those sewing rooms are needy widows with children. These sewing-room projects have been the means of feeding many hungry mouths and of making it possible for thousands of children to attend school, many of whom would otherwise suffer. If such deserving people are arbitrarily taken from the relief rolls, if they are thrown out into the streets, many will be unable to secure jobs. That is what I am thinking of in this harsh provision. That is certain to be the practical result of such provision. Surely some compromise can be worked out when this body is in a happier mood whereby those deserving people can be taken care of in a fair and humane manner. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Under subsection (g), which provides for investigation, you will purge the rolls and then you will give an opportunity to those who are waiting to get on the rolls to go on?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes. That can and is being done under the excellent leadership of Colonel Harrington.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Why do we not appropriate sufficient to take in those who have not had a chance as well as those who have?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman's point is well taken. I feel very deeply that this Congress should make every possible effort to appropriate sufficient funds to take care of as many of our unemployed as possible. Especially should we strain every effort to aid those who are so desperately in need of assistance. I again remind Members that no one class of people are more deserving or more sincerely grateful than are a vast majority of those good women employed on the W. P. A. sewing projects.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the very distinguished and clever gentleman from Missouri who probably desires to make some facetious observations about the Missouri mule. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHORT. No; I was simply wanting to interrogate my neighbor from Oklahoma, since we have so many sewing rooms in Missouri that cost from $3 to $4 to manufacture a dress which can be bought from a private enterprise at 79 cents; and those taxpayers——

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, the gentleman has told those fairy stories until he has almost convinced himself that they are true. But, of course, he is only jesting. I am unwilling to believe him to be serious. Let me say to him that the sewing rooms I have visited, and I have visited a great many in several States, including some in Missouri, the sewing rooms have more than justified their existence aside from taking care of thousands of those who are unable to find jobs elsewhere. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] is recognized.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] in what he is trying to accomplish, namely spreading the work all around. However, I do not think this is the method to take care of that. I think it is too harsh.

For example, this provision, if enacted into law, will mean that on August 31 about 750,000 individuals on all projects will be fired overnight. The proposal is mandatory. That is why I say it is too harsh. It provides for no exceptions; it allows no discretionary action whatsoever. Regardless of private jobs available, regardless of need, regardless of the number of dependents, regardless of money available for local relief, regardless of any reference to veterans, regardless of age, everyone who has been employed for 18 months must be fired for a period of 60 days.

Let me call attention to the fact that among these 750,000 who will go there are 250,000 persons who have families of 5 or more persons dependent upon them. Let me repeat, there are 250,000 persons who will be fired overnight who have depending upon them 5 or more persons. It would seem just as reasonable to provide that those receiving aid to dependent children, old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and so forth, should be removed from participation for a period of 60 days if they had received these benefits for 18 months. What are you going to do with them during that 60 days? Are you going to let them starve? Are you going to let them shift for themselves? There is no softening of the blow. I ask and I entreat you to vote for this amendment in the interest of ordinary decency and humane treatment of those who need it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from California to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois be read. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Where do I find myself, in between the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Chicago? My amendment seeks to strike out the subsection entirely. When will my amendment be acted upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Missouri offered a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from California has offered an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. The perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from California is the first amendment to be voted upon.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California to the amendment offered by Mr. MCKEOUGH: At the end of such amendment add the following: "*Provided*, That veterans and persons 45 years of age and over shall not be removed from employment under the terms of this subsection."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VOORHIS of California) there were—ayes 83, noes 128.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COCHRAN) there were—ayes 70, noes 155.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. COCHRAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, noes 153.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota moves that the Committee do now rise.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 18, line 6, after the period at the end of the line, insert "No part of this subsection (b) shall be applicable to heads of families aged 45 years and over."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief.

Mr. Chairman, this section refers to the 60-day lay-off period for those working 18 months or more. I ask that heads of families, men or women with dependents, 45 years of age or over, be exempted from this section. I would like the Committee to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 124, noes 129.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 138, noes 132.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his preferential motion.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we have now been in session for almost 10½ hours on one of the most important pieces of legislation that has come before this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his motion.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee)—ayes 52, noes 179.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 17, line 20, after the words "all relief workers", insert "timekeepers and foremen."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. What is good for the relief workers is also good for timekeepers and foremen, and the amendment proposes to add those words to apply the rotation idea to timekeepers and foremen as well as to the relief workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, under a previous agreement it occurs to me that the time on section 16 and all amendments was fixed at 20 minutes. Does that exhaust all debate on pending amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that at the expiration of that time it will exhaust debate on the amendments pending to that particular section, section 16.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I inquire whether the amendments now pending to section 16 are debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. There are several amendments pending, and the Chair is endeavoring, insofar as the Chair can, to have as many Members who have amendments pending given an opportunity to speak upon them.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAY: Page 17, line 20, after the words "all relief workers", insert "excepting veterans."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia) there were—ayes 145, noes 80.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Strike out the language in lines 8 to 18, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 16. (a) In employing, assigning, or retaining for employment on Works Projects Administration work projects preference as to all employment under this title shall be given in the following order: (1) Veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration), the wives of such veterans as are themselves unemployed and not qualified for such employment, and the widows of such veterans who have been certified as in need of such employment by any governmental agency who are qualified and available therefor and who are American citizens: *Provided*, That the fact that a person is entitled to or has received

either adjusted-service bonds or a Treasury check in payment of an adjusted-compensation certificate shall not be considered in determining actual need of such employment: *Provided further*, That if a veteran's income from compensation or pension is less per month than the amount to which he would be entitled per month if assigned to a Works Projects Administration works project for which he is qualified, then he shall be certified as in need of such employment; (2) other American citizens, Indians, and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are qualified and available therefor on the basis of their relative need for such employment."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Why does the gentleman strike out the provision with reference to relative need? Does the gentleman want to prevent this bill from being a relief program?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I will answer the gentleman in my discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I speak for the several veterans' organizations of the United States who requested an opportunity to appear before the committee, and were denied the privilege. Today, as a representative of these veterans' organizations, I have patiently waited for an opportunity to discuss before the committee an amendment on veterans' preference. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for a period of 5 minutes to discuss this amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to see the gentleman have the 5 minutes if I could have 5 minutes to explain his amendment myself. As far as I am concerned, I would be pleased to see him have the 5 minutes if I could have 5 minutes also to comment upon the amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes and that thereafter the gentleman from Virginia may be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, ever since the inception of relief for the unemployed there has been a preference in the various laws for the veteran. There is hardly a Member of this body who has not from time to time received a communication from a veteran, from the wife of a veteran, or from some veterans' organization calling to his attention that those charged with the responsibilty of administering the affairs of the relief agencies have deliberately ignored veterans' preference.

A number of years ago a Member of Congress asked that teeth be placed in the law, and that was done. Recently Members of Congress as well as veterans' organizations suggested preference for the veteran be made very definite in the Relief Act of 1939–40. When a copy of the bill we are now discussing was received a few days ago, representatives of the several veterans' organizations sat down for the purpose of analyzing it, after which this amendment I now offer was perfected. My amendment will give the veteran of this country the preference this Congress and the American people feel he is entitled to. There are no "ifs" and there are no "ands" in it. It honestly gives him preference.

There is nothing new in this amendment. Let us first refer to the adjusted-service certificates or a Treasury check in lieu thereof. It is in the present law and all we are doing is writing it in this proposal. The Veterans' Administration tells us there are 147,929 veterans who have yet to collect their adjusted-service certificates, commonly known as the bonus. Fifty-five thousand eight hundred and fifty veterans have not yet cashed their certificates or turned them into bonds. There are today $287,008,150 worth of bonds still in circulation and yet to be cashed. Therefore, we are simply protecting the veterans who hold these so-called bonus bonds to the extent of making them eligible for W. P. A.

The next point concerns the wives and the widows of veterans. In another section of this bill this committee has given preference to the wives and the widows of veterans living in the District of Columbia. There is your precedent. If you give it to the wives and the widows of veterans in the District of Columbia, why not give it to the wives and the widows of veterans all over the United States?

Then there is another section concerning veterans who receive a pension or compensation. The average pension received by the service-connected veteran of the World War is $39.97. Nonservice connected, the average is $26.49. In many States the veteran is denied the privilege of receiving relief or going on the W. P. A. because he is the recipient of this meager pension or compensation check from his Government. Some States have made the veteran eligible, but by writing this section into this bill the veteran who receives pension or compensation will be eligible for W. P. A. anywhere in the United States.

May I say that we have deliberately stricken from this provision of the bill what we call the relative-needs clause because we feel that the provision would have placed in the hands of the supervisors too much discretionary power. Our intentions, Mr. Chairman, is to write in this bill a provision giving the veteran absolute preference. Once again let me say I am speaking for the veterans of this country and veterans' organizations, and plead with you at this time to support this amendment and by doing so give the veteran the preference to which he is entitled.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEYER of California. Does the gentleman not believe that this amendment is universally desired throughout the Nation?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. The American people want it.

Mr. GEYER of California. I believe that is true.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Does this amendment have the endorsement of the major veterans' organizations?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It has. A major veterans' organization of the United States prepared this amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I have an amendment which has been prepared for the purpose of clarifying subsequent sections. Under one of the sections as now construed a person might get benefits under the social-security program of only $9, yet he would be cut off.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. My purpose is to clarify the section and correct that situation. I bring this to the attention of the Members now because I understand the time is limited.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The veteran has been discriminated against thus far, has he not?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. No one in this House knows the veteran problem better than you, Mrs. ROGERS. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be very brief. I appreciate the zeal which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] has always displayed for the veteran. We know his heart is in that work. We know he is thinking in terms of the veterans probably more than in terms of any other class of citizen.

I personally do not believe that the veteran, if he understood this proposition, would ask Congress to pass it. I think I know something of the psychology of the veteran and I do not believe that he would ask that he be given preference over a man or a woman with six or eight children who is in much greater need than he. [Applause.] I do not believe that is the attitude of mind of the veteran. The group to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred

probably was composed of representatives of the various veterans' organizations, but I do not believe their act was in any way an official act of any veterans' organization.

Let me tell you what the committee has attempted to do. We recognize the country's obligation to the veterans. We believe this obligation should be recognized, and the veterans have many preferences. They have hospitalization and advantages of that sort. We believe that if any real soldier had thought about the matter—and I mean no reflection on anyone—he would say that the first need to be taken care of is the need of those who are hungry and who have children who have to be fed and taken care of. That should be the law, and it is in the law as the committee has written it. The first thing required should be need. We say that where the needs are the same the preference should be given to the veteran. I believe that is what the people of America want and that is what the veteran wants, and that is what the bill says. I trust that the amendment will be voted down and the committee's position sustained.

We have written a fair provision in this bill. There are some of the provisions of the amendment that I shall not go into in detail, but I notice toward the end of the amendment it is provided:

If a veteran's income from compensation or pension is less per month than the amount to which he would be entitled per month if assigned to a Works Progress Administration works project for which he is qualified, then he shall be certified as in need of such employment.

In other words, if he was drawing some form of pension but it was not quite as much as he might draw as a relief worker, he would still get preference over someone who had no income, someone with children or someone with other dependents. I say we have attempted here to write a fair provision based on need. The veteran is to have the advantage over anyone else where the needs are the same. I believe that is perfectly fair. I believe that is how far the committee should go, and I hope you will vote down the amendment. This will give the veteran, in my opinion, not only what is fair, but what I believe he would choose if he had knowledge of this subject from all angles.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHANNON) there were—ayes 57, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'TOOLE: On page 19, after line 18, insert the following new subsection:

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

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the hiring, retention, and the mode for dismissing veterans in the W. P. A., but it fails to provide any penalty against any supervisor who illegally discharges a veteran.

We have learned from experience in the city of New York and in many other cities that communistically inclined supervisors have in many cases illegally dismissed veterans. This amendment provides that in the event of such illegal dismissal the penalty shall be that the supervisor or administrator himself or herself shall lose their position.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'TOOLE), there were—ayes 82, noes 124.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York demands tellers. Those in favors of ordering tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Eighteen Members have arisen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

Mr. PARSONS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make the point of order against sections 29, 30, and 31, on page 27, on the ground that this is an appropriation bill, and the sections mentioned are legislation on an appropriation bill. Also, I make the point of order that in addition to its being legislation on an appropriation bill contrary to existing law, the language seeks to enact penalties involving far-reaching consequences to practically everyone outside of the W. P. A. appropriation bill. This point was brought up 1 year ago when something like the same language was used in this bill, and the language was ruled out on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. On May 21, 1937, in connection with the W. P. A. relief bill, which was under consideration at the time, the Chairman, Mr. O'Connor, ruled on the identical question which the gentleman from Illinois has raised and on that occasion the Chairman said:

The bill in question is not a general appropriation bill and, therefore, clause 2 of rule XXI does not apply.

Following that precedent, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. PARSONS. But, Mr. Chairman, the Chair does not take into consideration the point I raised that the language seeks to impose penalties involving every person outside of the W. P. A.

The CHAIRMAN. The ruling which the Chair has just quoted applies also to the point of order raised by the gentleman on the matter of penalties.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a series of amendments, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair informs the gentleman from Illinois that a number of amendments are pending to section 16, and while the time for debate has expired on the amendments, the amendments will first have to be disposed of before other amendments to the sections in title 2 may be considered.

Mr. PARSONS. Then, Mr. Chairman, may I ask that I be recognized upon the conclusion of the voting on the amendments pending to section 16?

The CHAIRMAN. That is something which the Chair does not consider a parliamentary inquiry and he is unable to answer it at the present time. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 17, line 19, strike out all of subsection (b) of section 16 and insert the following:

"In making any reductions in Works Projects Administration work-relief employment which may be necessary as a result of the passage of this resolution, relief workers who have been continuously employed for 3 years or longer shall be the first to be dropped from employment. After September 1, 1939, if in any work relief certifying area there are relief workers who have been continuously employed for 3 years or longer on Works Projects Administration or Works Progress Administration work projects and there are employable persons who have been certified as in need of employment for a period of 6 months or more and who have not in that period been given employment on work projects, the latter shall have preference in employment,, and, if necessary, a corresponding number of relief workers who have been employed continuously on Works Projects Administration or Works Progress Administration work projects shall as rapidly as is consistent with orderly administration, be removed from employment in order to provide employment for such persons who have been certified for 6 months or longer and who have not in that period been given employment: *Provided, however,* That no provision of this subsection shall apply with regard to relief workers who are 45 years of age or older, nor with regard to veterans of any war of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Page 19, line 6, strike out the period at the end of the line and insert a comma and the words "except as provided in section 16 (a) (1)."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PETERSON of Florida) there were—ayes 12, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman, against section 30 of the bill and direct the attention of the Chair to that language in section 30 of the bill, in line 23, which reads, "or any other act of the Congress"; for the reason that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and it goes far beyond the purview of the instant bill under consideration and is not germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order raised by the gentleman from Oklahoma is substantially the same point of order that was raised by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. NICHOLS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman desires to appeal from the decision of the Chair he has the right to do so, but the Chair is rendering his opinion.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman presumed that the gentleman might be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard?

Mr. NICHOLS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be very glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course, I thoroughly understood the ruling of the Chair on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Illinois. I want to read, for the benefit of the Chair, despite the fact that I presume the Chair has read the section, section 30:

It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible by this title—

Up to that point I quite agree with the ruling of the Chair—

or any other act of the Congress—

Which is the part of the section to which I direct my point of order.

Now, this bill is brought to the floor of the House by the Committee on Appropriations. While I have been a Member of this body only a limited number of years and while I have no disposition to argue with the ruling of the Chair, if my feeble conception of the rules of the House has taught me anything it has taught me that legislation in an appropriation bill can only place a limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. In just a moment. I want to get the Chair to listen.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has an improper premise. This is not an appropriation bill. It is a general legislative bill.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Chair that this is quite a liberal education to me as a country Congressman—a beginner here, as it were. I did not know before my distinguished friend from Virginia informed me that it was possible for the Committee on Appropriations to bring to this floor a general legislative bill.

Now, I am aware of the fact that the title of this bill probably attempts to make it a legislative bill. However, the title still provides for appropriations, and I do not think it is broad enough to make it general legislation. Now, maybe you can do that. If you can, then I say I am receiving a liberal education here this evening. If it is an appropriation bill, surely this language is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair indulge me to make an observation on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman briefly on the point of order.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to call the attention of the Chair to the title of the bill, which reads:

Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

The title of the bill says nothing whatever about regulation or legislation in any respect whatsoever, and is nothing except an appropriation bill under its title. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCCORMACK). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair will state that the title of a bill is merely for the purpose of identification. The position taken by the gentleman from Oklahoma, as well as that taken by the gentleman from Illinois, would have been correct, in the opinion of the Chair, if applied to a general appropriation bill; but in the opinion of the Chair there is a clear distinction between a general appropriation bill and the joint resolution pending before the Committee today, which is a combination of appropriation and legislation.

When this bill was introduced on June 13 it was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Appropriations and reported by the Committee on Appropriations and is being considered now as the result of a unanimous-consent agreement.

This bill not being a general appropriation bill, but being legislative in character, the Chair is constrained to rule that the point of order of the gentleman from Oklahoma is not well taken.

For the reasons stated the point of order is overruled.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, while the Chair just stated that this was a combination appropriation and legislative measure, so many of us may have been laboring under the delusion that it was an appropriation of Federal funds that I want to call the attention of the House to different sections of the bill. In line 19, on page 4, appear the words:

The funds appropriated in this section.

Then, beginning in line 6, on page 11, we find the words:

In order to provide for administrative expenses incidental to carrying out the purpose of this title, there is hereby appropriated to the following agencies.

On page 12, line 17, appear the words:

The funds appropriated in this section.

In line 7 on page 13, appear the words:

There is hereby appropriated to the Executive Office of the President.

On page 13, line 19, appear the words:

There is hereby appropriated to the National Resources Planning Board.

Page 14, line 5, reads as follows:

Funds appropriated in this title.

Mr. CELLER. And line 3, also.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; and many more. I have given just a few quotations because some of us who came down here recently want to know what an appropriation bill is.

Page 22, line 4:

The appropriations in this title for administrative expenses.

Page 23, line 15:

Under the appropriations in this title—

And so on through page after page after page.

As long as we have been here today thinking that this was an appropriation bill, and the Committee of the Whole having disregarded the work of the Committee on Appropriations by freezing into the bill all those who are now on relief, and denying relief to heads of families who are over 45 years of

age, if there is not room for all, it might be well to think that over and find out whether it is an appropriation bill or not before we proceed with our discussion.

It might be well if we determine whether the bill as now amended will give relief to those who have not been able to get on relief, and continue on the rolls indefinitely many who have been on for 3 years.

Are we to give relief permanently to a few or are we to treat all fairly, give all a chance?

I favor an equitable program rather than one for the few.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to withdraw the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the hour is late and that everybody wants to go home.

Mr. BENDER. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But also I realize that people back home who are going to be dismissed from W. P. A. rolls will go home to suffer. Some will not even be given direct relief in certain States, and in other States they will have to suffer going through a needs test, suffer humiliation, and will have to suffer being put back on the dole and on direct relief. I think it is not remiss, therefore, that we not go home so soon; that we pause and give those people some thought; and that is why I have taken these few minutes in the close of the debate on this bill to remark on certain tactics that were used throughout the debate.

First of all, every time some amendment was offered on behalf of the unemployed of this country, and every time the gentleman from Virginia got up here to oppose it, he always took a shot at New York City. This proved to be very effective strategy. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia, however, that despite him and the others who have attacked New York City, that New York City, nevertheless, remains the greatest city in the world, as well as the most progressive city in the world. [Applause.] May I also say this—and it will come up shortly in connection with the Federal Theater Project—the gentleman from Virginia charged that there was no literary quality and no dramatic quality to some of the plays that have been produced by that most deserving project. This may be so. I am not a dramatic critic, I do not know; but one does not have to be a dramatic critic or a literary critic to know that the gentleman from Virginia is a great dramatist. I congratulate him on his great literary quality. He, in my opinion, wrote the greatest American tragedy of 1939 when he wrote this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the motion.

Mr. BENDER. I did not understand that debate had been limited on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state for the information of the gentleman from Ohio that under the rules debate on a motion to strike out the enacting clause is limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman from New York who has just spoken misunderstood me when I said "No." Instead of saying "Vote," as he stated, I said "No," and the reason I said "No" was because a few moments ago I went outside and it was hotter than the hinges of hell.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that is not the subject of a point of order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Page 19, line 6, after the period, insert *"Provided,* That 60 days' notice shall be given to any such person before his severance from the service."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Page 19, line 18, after the period insert the following: *"Provided,* That all persons employed under the provisions of this act shall receive 2 weeks' notice before separation from the service."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Page 18, after period, insert the following: *"Provided,* That persons who are residents of any State or political subdivision thereof be given preference on such projects if they are delinquent in their tax payments to such State or political subdivision thereof: *Provided further,* In the employment of such delinquent taxpayers, first preference shall be given to those who agree to assign all of their compensation from such employment to the tax collector responsible for the collection of such delinquent taxes. Such assignment is to be applied to the delinquent taxes of the taxpayer who is so employed. Second preference in such employment shall be given to those delinquent taxpayers who are willing to assign one-half of their compensation to the tax collector responsible for the collection of such delinquent taxes. Such assignment is to be applied to the delinquent taxes of the taxpayer who is so employed. Whenever any public highway, road, or thoroughfare is being improved as a relief project, financed in whole or in part through Federal funds or as a project financed in whole or in part through loans and/or grants of the Work Projects Administration, and where a charge or other assessment is being levied for the improvement thereof, against the property abutting thereon, preference in employment on such improvements shall be given to the owner of such property, or members of his family, until the assessment against the property concerned has been paid: *And provided further,* The person or persons employed under this provision shall assign the compensation received from such work to the appropriate tax collector for the payment of such assessment. The total amount of money paid to any person or persons employed in accordance with this proviso shall not exceed 5 percent of the total labor cost of the project involved."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for me to conceive of anyone so heartless that they fail to sympathize with the people whom circumstances have forced to seek a bare living on the relief rolls. Relief agencies offer a meager existence, at best. Butter and bacon become semiluxuries to go with bread and beans. More's the pity that good American citizens, who are entitled to an opportunity to provide for themselves and their families, should be forced into such a position in a land of plenty, where surplus production of many necessities of life have become a problem.

Despite any disagreement over policies of the Government, which some of us believe have contributed to the necessity of creating, expanding, and continuing the relief agencies, there is general sympathy with the objectives of relief of human misery. And despite the criticism that has been leveled most properly and justly at the waste, inefficiency, and political practices in connection with relief, that has not lessened our sympathies for the unfortunate people it was designed to sustain. Some of these abuses have been corrected in the past, and I trust this measure will serve to adjust other causes for criticism.

It is not my purpose to go over that familiar ground of criticism at this time. I wish to raise another issue, which I believe has been neglected in the past by the Congress and the States. I do not raise this issue in any faultfinding sense. I offer what I hope may prove to be constructive criticism to the end that we will correct a deplorable defect in our relief system.

In any event, no criticism should lie against the Federal relief agencies, necessarily. The fault may lie with the States. For instance, in my own State of Pennsylvania, in an effort to prevent abuses and protect the taxpayers, the Commonwealth has laid down regulations regarding eligibility for relief certification which are working a hardship among a considerable number of people who are actually in dire distress and whom I believe are entitled to relief. The same conditions, I understand, exist in many other States.

I refer to the real property owners—the home owners and the owners of commercial property—who are unable to qualify for governmental assistance by reason of the mere ownership of property and despite their dire distress. I have found that a considerable number of property owners in Pennsylvania, for instance, are unemployed, entirely or partially. By reason of their ownership of property, these people are unable to qualify for relief under the rules and regulations governing the program.

In some cases persons in need of relief, and therefore, I believe, entitled to it, are unable to obtain eligibility certifications because of a small income from some source. Others are barred because of small savings. Still others cannot qualify because some member of the family has a job at a small wage which is inadequate to provide for the needs of the family. In some of the latter cases I have heard that persons with part-time employment which does not pay enough to care for the needs of a family have quit their jobs or deliberately brought about their own discharge in order to be in a position to apply for Government assistance, which offered a more adequate living for themselves and their families. Such instances, however, I understand, are rare, and that is not the situation I am seeking to reach at this time.

I am endeavoring to aid the property owners, and especially the home owners, who are in need of relief and unable to get it. These property owners, who are jobless and without other sources of income, are often unable to pay their taxes. Some of the people in this class already have lost their homes and commercial properties, which have remained unrented for long periods of time—for years in some instances—and therefore have become a drain on their resources rather than a source of income.

I have gone to considerable effort to learn the number of persons who fall into these classes and the extent of this condition in the country. I am sorry to say that I have not met with much success. I have sought information from a number of Federal agencies, State officials, and private corporations which deal with such matters as home and farm ownership and tax delinquents. From none of these sources have I been able to obtain data directly responsive to my inquiries and bearing directly on this point. Therefore I am unable to furnish all the facts and figures I should desire to paint a complete picture of this condition.

However, I believe there will be no dissent from the statement that the American home owner and the property owner constitute the backbone of our country. The very fact that a citizen invests his savings in a home or a piece of business property raises the presumption of thrift on his part. Home owners certainly represent the highest type of American citizenship. When a citizen buys a home in which to live and rear a family he thereby expresses his faith in his country and its government. Such citizens certainly are entitled to special consideration when circumstances make it impossible for them to maintain themselves and their families.

Naturally more sentiment is attached to the home, but the purchaser of business property expresses the same degree of confidence in his country, and he, too, is entitled to special consideration. And, despite the howl we hear about taxes, most citizens pay their taxes on real property more cheerfully than any other levy. As a general rule, citizens will sacrifice all other assets before they will let their home go under the sheriff's hammer or part with a piece of business property.

Inasmuch as home ownership, property holding, makes for good citizenship, I believe we should do everything possible to encourage the acquisition of homes and other property, and, once acquired, we should make it possible for citizens to continue to hold their homes and farms and business properties rather than allow such properties to be sacrificed for taxes.

In pursuance of that thought, I have offered an amendment to this bill. It is designed to assist property owners, the owners of homes, farms, and business properties, who now are delinquent in their tax payments to meet their obligations. This could be done without imposing any additional costs upon the Government. I am convinced it would have a far-reaching economic and social effect in the country.

Under this amendment, it is proposed to employ a certain percentage of property owners, who otherwise are unable to pay their taxes, on all W. P. A. and P. W. A. projects sponsored by all political subdivisions and school districts. In view of the fact that I have been unable to obtain any accurate figures on the number of property owners who would be eligible for certification for such employment, I have set down the arbitrary figure of 5 percent of the total number of all employees on each project. The information I have been able to gather leads me to believe that fully 5 percent of employees on public-works projects of various kinds should be property owners. I am equally sure that property owners, who are unable to pay their back taxes and current levies in any other way, would welcome the opportunity for work which enabled them to meet this obligation of our citizens.

In the employment of these delinquent taxpayers, the amendment provides that first preference shall be given to persons who agree to assign all of their compensation from such employment to the tax collector responsible for the collection of such delinquent taxes. This assignment of wages would be fixed by the terms of employment of such property owners.

Second preference in the employment of the delinquent taxpayers under the amendment would be given to those delinquent taxpayers who are willing to assign one-half of their compensation to the tax collector responsible for the collection of such delinquent taxes.

Under this amendment preference in employment would be given to owners of property on which a charge or other assessment is being levied for the improvement thereof or against the property abutting thereon. In the event the owner of the property is unemployable or is otherwise disqualified for certification and employment, the amendment provides for the employment of members of his family until the assessment against the property concerned has been paid.

Under all three of these employment preference sections, the provision is made that the total amount of money paid to property-owning relief workers shall not exceed 5 percent of the total labor cost of the project involved.

The preference provisions in all three classes included in the amendment would apply only to local political subdivisions such as county, city, borough, township, and school district. All of these governmental units have considerable sums of money tied up in delinquent taxes. In no case would the preference apply to those delinquent in Federal or State taxes.

These suggested changes are designed especially to help collect delinquent taxes in order to permit the various political subdivisions and school districts to continue to sponsor projects. Unless something is done to aid in the collection of delinquent taxes in many of the various political subdivisions throughout the country, I am informed that there soon will be no W. P. A. projects sponsored by these political subdivisions and school districts. At least there is a real danger of a sharp reduction in the number of projects sponsored.

In any event it would be a calamity in many communities in my district if there was any reduction in sponsored projects. That not only would deny work to nonproperty owners but afford no opportunity to delinquent taxpayers to meet their obligations.

If my amendments fail to meet any objection that may be raised against them, I am not only willing but anxious that they should be perfected here and now on the floor of this House. I have no pride of authorship. My only desire is to aid worthy citizens to meet their obligations to the po-

litical subdivisions of the various States and thereby aid the communities in which they live, as well as the good citizens themselves.

My amendments are by no means designed to militate against unfortunate persons who do not own property. My purpose is quite the contrary. It is my desire to aid nonproperty owners as well as the property owners by providing employment which otherwise they would not get if the Government is unable to get sponsors for these various projects.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the ownership of residential property which is not of substantial or unusual value does not affect eligibility for assistance, provided that such property is used by the owner as his home. Inasmuch as the owner is eligible for assistance under these circumstances, he is also eligible for certification to W. P. A.

However, in Pennsylvania the ownership of business property renders its owner ineligible for assistance and consequently for W. P. A. certification, unless the property is offered for sale on the open market and cannot be sold for a sum approximating its present value.

Naturally it follows from that statement of the situation in Pennsylvania that no one who is eligible for State assistance has been denied W. P. A. certification because of the ownership of business or residential property in accordance with the requirements already mentioned.

I am informed, however, that what used to be termed "land poor" now applies to many owners of modest city homes and small farm homes. By reason of circumstances beyond their control the owners, or owners of equity in these homes and farms, and many small business establishments are unable to meet their city, county, and other local taxes and either have lost their property already or are now in danger of losing it. In many instances this property represents a man's life savings. When his home or farm or a little store building is sold for taxes he is wiped out. Everything he has struggled years to purchase is gone, and the effect on many men disillusioned under such circumstances does not make for good citizenship.

I appeal to the Members of the House to give their sympathetic consideration to these amendments. I am sure the adoption and application of this plan to aid the home owners and other property owners at this time will go far toward making better citizens and strengthen the economic and financial structure of the Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: At the end of line 18, page 17, add the following: "*Provided*, That no person whose need for employment has not been certified as provided in section 16, subsection (d), shall be employed as timekeeper, boss, or supervisor, on any Works Projects Administration works project if there are persons unemployed whose need for employment has been certified as provided in said section 16, subsection (d), who are qualified and capable of performing the duties of timekeepers, bosses, or supervisors."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: On page 17, strike out lines 19 to 24, inclusive, and on page 18 strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr RAMSPECK: Page 18, line 1, after the comma, strike out "and" and insert "or."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PARSONS: Page 27, line 8, strike out lines 8 to 13, inclusive, and insert the following:

"It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any administrative or supervisory capacity in the Works Projects Administration knowingly to solicit, or knowingly be in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the campaign expenses of any individual or political party from any certified person receiving compensation or employment provided for by this title: *Provided*, That any certified worker shall not be prohibited from making voluntary contributions to any party campaign he desires."

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have all of my amendments reported, in order to conserve time, and I also ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes on the five amendments, so that we can vote on all of them en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all of the amendments may be reported and considered en bloc, and I will ask for only 5 minutes to explain them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. PARSONS:

Page 27, line 22, after the word "for", strike out the word "or" and insert "certified workers"; and line 23, after the comma, strike out "or any other act of the Congress."

Page 28, line 5, after the word "person", insert "employed in any administrative or supervisory capacity in the Works Projects Administration"; and in line 6, after the word "any", insert "certified."

Page 28, line 19, after the word "the", strike out "Federal Government" and insert "Works Projects Administration"; and in line 22, after "election", insert a period and strike out "or affecting the results thereof"; and in line 24, after the word "privately", insert "and publicly."

Page 29, strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert "in management of political campaigns or in political conventions."

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, as one Member of Congress who has never in his public life solicited one dime of contributions from any person and has never promised a position of any kind or nature or assisted in the securing of any project of any kind or nature to court political favor with a single constituent in my district, I believe I am in position to offer these amendments to sections 29, 30, and 31. [Applause.]

The only changes these amendments I have offered make in this bill are that they confine the prohibition on political activity to W. P. A., and that is all the Committee on Appropriations, handling this bill, has the right to bring in for the House to vote on at this time.

The amendment to section 29 limits the unlawful acts to those who are in an administrative or supervisory capacity in the W. P. A., so they cannot solicit or make assessments upon certified workers. The amendment to section 30 provides that the certified worker, if he chooses to make a contribution to the Socialist Party, the Republican Party, or the Democratic Party, has a right to do so voluntarily, but absolutely not by coercion. The change that is made in section 30 is the same as above. It applies to certified workers as far as promising any position for a political consideration is concerned.

In subsection (b) on page 28 the amendment again applies to the administrative and supervisory force and to the certified worker, so that no supervisor or foreman can intimidate any certified worker on account of race, color, creed, or political affiliation.

The amendment to section 31 again confines the "administrative or supervisory" force to the agency of the Works Progress Administration, eliminating the other agencies of the Federal Government, which in my opinion should be eliminated from this bill. This gives those persons an opportunity to express both publicly and privately their own political ideas upon political subjects, but does prohibit them from in any way managing a political campaign or taking part in political conventions.

I do not believe we should even mention the political situation in this bill, but in view of the fact the committee has brought in the sections here we on this side believe we should amend them to apply only to the Works Progress Administration. Therefore, I hope that the chairman of the committee

will accept these amendments because we have sought to do with these amendments what I believe the bill sought to do, that is, to eliminate as far as possible politics in W. P. A. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask for an immediate vote in order not to consume any additional time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on these amendments close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am not out of sympathy with what the gentleman says, but I should like the Committee to know before it takes action on these amendments what the effect of them will be. Both parties, all parties, have inveighed against politics in relief. The provisions the gentleman seeks to strike out of the bill are the so-called Hatch amendments, which were put into the bill in the Senate at the beginning of this session of Congress when they had up Public Resolution No. 1, the $725,000,000 deficiency for W. P. A. for this fiscal year. These provisions were thoroughly debated at the time, the conferees brought them back to the House, and they were debated again in the House, and they were adopted in the House, although I opposed their adoption at the time for the same reason the gentleman did. The amendments the gentleman seeks to strike out of this bill are now in existing law.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman knows I am not seeking to strike these out. I am only limiting the provisions in this section to the W. P. A.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is limiting them; all right. The effect is that in this relief bill you will be loosening and lightening and lessening the inhibitions against political activity. However laudable your motives and the motives of the Congress may be, I question whether that should be done. This is existing law as the committee has brought it here. In my judgment we should certainly not back-track any on it. I do not believe it will be understood.

I believe it will be very hard for any Member of Congress to understand how he has sought to eliminate politics from relief and yet has voted to undo and to take out of the bill inhibitions and restrictions which have been put into the law for the purpose of protecting relief against politics.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois take politics out of the W. P. A.? Will not his amendment have exactly the effect the Hatch amendment sought?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know what the effect of it would be, I may say to the gentleman. I certainly do not want to take the responsibility. Even with these amendments in the bill, if they are too stringent, certainly there is still a lot of politics in it. Certainly, there is no argument for loosening or lightening it. I cannot see any argument for that. [Applause.] I certainly cannot see why we want to take that action.

Mr. CELLER. Under the present wording of the bill, if Mr. Farley or the head of the Republican Party would write a letter merely inviting a W. P. A. worker or a W. P. A. administrative official to a dinner, he would incur liability to a fine of $1,000 and could be sent to jail for the commission of a felony, although he might do it perfectly innocently.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know what the effect of it would be.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman said we are loosening the regulations. We positively are not loosening the regulations upon the W. P. A. We have included in these three sections that are in here now that even a Member's secretary could not go out and work for the success of his Congressman, because you include in that compensation under any act of the Congress of the United States. We are not loosening here the restrictions on the W. P. A.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not question the gentleman's motives in offering the amendments, but the fact remains that you are here repealing certain provisions of the law that were deliberately written into the law for the purpose of trying to take politics out of relief, and I do not believe we should change it in this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PARSONS) there were—ayes 96, noes 181.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. PARSONS and Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 123, noes 176.

So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WARREN). For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. This body has been legislating for 12 hours without a rest——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his preferential motion.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri) there were—ayes 27, noes 162.

So the motion was rejected.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. NORTON: On page 25, beginning in line 1, strike out all of section 25.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anything anyone can say tonight is going to change the temper of this House, but I beg of you before proceeding with this bill to stop and consider just what you are doing to 9,000 men and women working on these theater projects. It has been said so many times that the men and women on the theater projects should not be paid out of Government funds because they are members of the Communist Party. I do not believe that. I certainly would not be here tonight speaking for them if I had any idea that this were true. It is very easy to pin a label on anyone. Many of you gentlemen here tonight may have a label pinned on you before very long, but I want to say to you that it is much more difficult to have a label removed than to pin one on anyone; and when I consider the men and women I know who have been working on these projects, the time they have given, and the necessity they are, I cannot believe that the gentleman from Virginia is serious when he insists that section 25 be retained in this bill.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'TOOLE. May I inform the gentlewoman from New Jersey that this afternoon I received a telegram from the St. Ephrem Roman Catholic Church Club, asking for a continuation of the Federal theater project.

Mrs. NORTON. And I may say to the gentleman that I have received many telegrams not only from Catholics, but from Protestants and from members of every religious denomination. This is not a question of religion, it is a ques-

tion of simple justice to 9,000 men and women who need employment. If they are removed from their employment on W. P. A. there is no place for them to go. They are trained in the arts, they are trained in the work of the theater, and they have given great satisfaction in the work they have been doing. I beg of you to support me in striking out section 25 and give these needy people a chance to live. I have heard employers of labor criticized on the floor of this House, but I venture to say the most cold-blooded employer would hesitate to discharge his employees with no notice whatsoever.

I do not know when I have felt so much concerned about anything as about this terrible thing that the Committee is attempting to do to 9,000 helpless men and women who are struggling for an opportunity to work in order to protect themselves and their families.

I sincerely hope the Committee will pause long enough before casting their vote to think of how they would feel if they were placed in the same position these men and women are in tonight, realizing that in less than 10 days, unless you strike out this section, they will not know where to go to secure their daily bread. So I beg of you tonight, before you go to your comfortable homes, to think twice before, by your vote, you deprive 9,000 persons of their right to a home. That is the sort of thing responsible for communism.

Some of my reasons for offering my amendment are—

First. Because the abolition of the project represents discrimination within the administration.

Second. Because it represents discrimination against a recognized form of professional work.

Third. Because its abolition is proposed on the basis of testimony before the investigating committee that concentrated on the work of the New York City unit of the project, and therefore presented an inadequate picture and was, in addition, false and misleading.

Fourth. Because public support for the project, represented by an audience of over 30,000,000 people and by box office receipts amounting during the present calendar year to 10 percent of the total operating cost, testifies to its importance in American life.

Fifth. Because its preservation and rehabilitation of the skills of its employees is attested to by the mere fact of its having returned to private industry 2,650 people out of an average employment of 9,000, and because the skills of its workers would deteriorate and disappear without proper outlet.

Sixth. Because the project's services to the underprivileged, constituting 65 percent of the total audience, is worthy of continuance.

Seventh. Because abolition would mean the end of the cultural and educational advantages that the project has been able to offer both to its workers and to its audiences.

Eighth. Because the Federal theater in recapturing a lost audience for the theater and discovering a new one has stimulated the commercial theater and has therefore kept off the relief rolls many who would otherwise be on them without this extension of activities by the commercial theater.

The allegations made against the Federal theater project are chiefly these:

(1) That the project does not employ qualified professional theater people in need, but employs a great number of amateurs who have no professional ability and no need for relief.

This statement is absolutely false, as can be verified by consultation with the heads of theatrical unions now in Washington to fight for this project. Ninety-five percent of the entire personnel of the project came from relief rolls, and the vast majority of people in the theatrical category on the project are highly qualified professionals by virtue of both training and experience. If this project were full of amateurs, keeping jobs away from professionals, you can be quite sure that these professional theater unions would be fighting against the project and not for it.

(2) Charges have been made that the Federal theater is communistic in its leadership, the plays that it gives, and in the audience which supports it.

All three of these charges are absolutely untrue. The people in policy-making positions on the project are not Communists. The director of the national project is a registered Democrat, and has been for many years a member of the Congregational Church. She was born in Redfield, S. Dak., educated in the public schools of Iowa, at Grinnell College, Iowa, and at Ratcliffe in Massachusetts. She has worked in the theater profession in New York for the past 10 years. On the basis of some forty plays which she directed at Vassar College, she was sent as a representative of the Guggenheim Foundation to study the relationship of government to the theater in 12 different European countries. She was the first woman to receive a Guggenheim Fellowship.

Her assistants in this great enterprise are, for example, George Kondolf, director for New York City, born and educated in Rochester, N. Y., a well-known producer and a Catholic; Harry Minturn, director for Chicago and the Midwest, a resident of Illinois and a producer and director of his own midwest stock company for a quarter of a century; the Los Angeles project is directed by Alexander Leftwich, formerly with the Shuberts, for many years well-known in Broadway productions; projects in Seattle, Denver, Boston, San Francisco, Philadelphia, New Orleans, and other cities are directed by well-qualified producers with from 10 to 25 years' experience in show business.

One of the most important policy-making posts, the Director of the Play Bureau, is held by Emmet Lavery, well-known playwright and author of one of the most successful plays in years, the First Legion. Mr. Lavery is a resident of New York State, dramatic critic, lawyer, and is active in civic affairs in his home city of Poughkeepsie.

I call your attention to these details to show that the Federal theater projects are in the hands of reputable people of sound political and religious convictions.

PLAYS

To go on to the plays given by this project. In 4 years the project has produced 1,200 plays, a list of which is available to any Member of this body who asks for it. These plays include the greatest number of classic, religious, and children's plays ever given by any theater organization in the United States. This list also includes a great many American plays from early days, as well as modern plays in techniques which have been highly praised by the critics and to a noticeable extent adopted by commercial producers. Some modern American plays are of course controversial in nature, just as the majority of good plays in the commercial theater today are apt to deal with current problems.

This has been true of any drama of any value since the time of Euripides, Shakespeare, and Ibsen. A theater which does not at least occasionally deal with such problems is not a living theater. Many of these plays have been highly original in subject matter and method. And why not? Surely it would have been stupid to believe that all of these people could be reemployed in exactly the same kind of plays which landed them on relief. Proof of the fact that the project has been wise in its choice of plays and has stimulated the commercial theater is shown in the incontrovertible fact that over 2,600 people have returned to private industry.

AUDIENCES

It has been alleged that the audiences for the Federal theater are communistic. This statement has been repeatedly disproved by evidence. While it is true that no one can stand at the entrance of a theater and question people coming in as to their political faith, it is equally true that the Federal theater has on the record an imposing list of audiences, including organizations of every political faith and every religious creed.

Statements have been made about the Federal theater project both before the investigating committee and on the floor of this House which, to my certain knowledge, are grossly untrue. I now propose to make statements in refutation, and every one of my statements is based on fact.

It has been alleged that the Federal theater is composed chiefly of amateurs who have no right to relief under the guise of professional theater people. Ninety percent—90 percent, let me repeat—of the performers on the Federal theater are professionals by training and experience; people who have hitherto made their living in some form of the theater. The remaining 10 percent are workers in categories necessary to the high standard of production required for the project. Allow me to present figures—accurate, recorded figures—regarding the New York unit of the Federal theater, to which this allegation of amateurism has been chiefly directed. Of the 1,150 actors on the pay roll of the Federal theater in New York, 85 percent belong to one or another theatrical union of long standing, the majority of them to Actors' Equity, others to Chorus Equity, and to the American Federation of Actors, and so forth. Actors' Equity, as you know, is the recognized actors' union and is an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor. Union affiliation, as you also undoubtedly know, is the accepted standard of professionalism.

The professional quality of these people is further attested by their having not only received positions in Broadway plays, Hollywood film companies, on radio networks, but received grants of various sorts from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, the Guggenheim Foundation, Yale University, the University of North Carolina, the University of Syracuse, and many other educational institutions.

It has been alleged that the Federal theater project is dominated by communism, chiefly in New York. Do you know that the director of that project in New York is a Catholic and that the director of the National Service Bureau is a Catholic? You know, I think, how the Catholic Church stands with regard to communism. Do you know that of the plays produced by the Federal theater not one can rightly be accused of approving or promoting subversive activities and the brief prepared by the project for inclusion in the record of the Dies committee hearings—a brief that, incidentally, the committee did not see fit to include in its record—refuted point by point the allegations made by irresponsible witnesses against certain plays of the Federal theater? Do you know that the complete and official list of the organizations which have sponsored Federal theater in New York City through the medium of theater parties clearly gives the lie to the accusation that the audience for Federal theater is communistic?

This list of organizations, also a part of the Dies brief, includes 263 social clubs and organizations, 264 welfare and civic organizations, 271 educational organizations, 95 religious organizations, 21 organizations from business and industry, 82 professional unions, 29 fraternal organizations, and so forth.

It has been alleged that the Federal theater has done very few plays, and those of no merit. The number of plays presented by Federal theater since the first curtain went up in the autumn of 1935 is, in round numbers, 1,200. By no stretch of the imagination can this be called "very few plays." It is record-staggering in its size, in its geographic spread, in its high average of success. It includes such unquestioned hits as the poetic play, Murder in the Cathedral; the cavalcade of vaudeville called Two a Day; the classic melodrama, Dr. Faustus; the living newspaper on housing conditions called One-third of a Nation; the touching chronicle of the young Abraham Lincoln entitled "Prologue to Glory," which incidentally was the only play—commercial or otherwise—to receive four stars in the season of 1937–38 from Burns Mantle, dean of New York's drama critics. The record includes the marionet shows given to more than 200,000 people over a 50,000-mile circuit throughout the State of Oklahoma; the Nativity plays given every Christmas in the parks and squares of the Nation before audiences numbering hundreds of thousands; the children's plays that have brought happiness to the youth of our depression and have taught them that there is more to theater than shadows on a screen.

The list includes plays like Twelfth Night and She Stoops to Conquer that the Federal theater took over the turpentine circuit in Florida to regions so remote that people came barefooted, their oxcarts lighted by kerosene lamps, that they might have the opportunity to see flesh-and-blood actors. This is important theater, real theater, that can enthrall such people—these millions who have been starved for living drama and who would never have had the means or the opportunity to see any theater at all without this project.

It has been alleged that the Federal theater has no public support. I think you will realize from the above what kind of public support Federal theater gets. Thirty million people have seen Federal theater plays. If you could reach them, I think you would find very few voices that would not urge you to continue Federal theater, that it might go on to entertain, to amuse, to instruct, to bring some measure of cheer into lives that have sadly lacked it. But let me also present some figures to reinforce this statement. The Federal theater has, through its box-office receipts, brought over $3,000,000 into the United States Treasury. How many other W. P. A. or other Government projects can point to such a record? The money expended by Federal theater has not been expended on shows; it has been expended on human beings, the human beings for whose relief Congress voted money. Nine out of every ten dollars has gone to these people in wages, leaving only $1 out of every $10 for scenery, costumes, lights, properties, theater rentals, royalties, and all the other expenses involved in production.

Furthermore, the box-office receipts of the Federal theater show a steady increase. In the first year of operation 3½ percent of the operating cost of the project was met through admissions collected. In the present calendar year, admissions have increased to an amount equaling 10 percent of total operating costs. In other words, Federal theater has an active public sponsorship that can be measured in cold figures: Sponsorship amounting to 10 percent of the cost of the project. On the basis of the record it is logical to assume that this would continue to increase. What better sponsorship can be asked?

Finally, it has been alleged that these people on the Federal theater project do not need work. Why is a professional actor, a director, or designer, a stagehand any different from a laborer, an engineer, a writer, a bricklayer? Their skills are equally worthy of preservation, and can get equally rusty without the appropriate work to keep them up to par. The personnel of the Federal theater is just as worthy as personnel in any other field, just as needful and desirous of work. And in the last 3½ years these people have had the blessing of work, work that restored their self-respect, work that revived and sharpened their capabilities in order to fit them for a responsible return to private industry. And the project has actually returned 2,650 of them already to private employment. These people of the Federal theater project are not fakes, they are not "relief racketeers," they are not chiselers. They are members of an important and respected profession. To take away their chance to work at that profession is to condemn them to despair and ruin.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I fancy that at some time or other every Member of Congress in his high-school and college days has indulged in amateur theatricals and has taken a fling at the Thespian art. I fancy that in their days everyone has become acquainted with the cultural value of the theater.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not now. I fancy that every Member of this House appreciates the cultural value of the theater, but there comes a time when the theater can be prostituted by suggestion and otherwise, and I think that has been done by

the theater project under the W. P. A. If you need any other proof you may examine some of the titles of the plays that have been foisted on the American public in the name of culture.

It is a rather long and engaging list, but I have jotted down just a few. On page 128 of the hearings on the relief appropriation bill considered by the committee in March of this year, you will find a list of the plays produced by the Federal theater project from 1935 to 1939. They were produced in 41 cities in 21 States. There you will find nine pages of plays. I have one here—A New Deal for Mary, which is a grand title. Then there is The Mayor and the Manicure, and Mother Goose Goes to Town. Also, A New Kind of Love. I wonder what that can be? It smacks somewhat of the Soviet. Then there is Up in Mabel's Room. There is an intriguing title for you. That is from the pen of Avery Hopwood, who inflicted such stuff on the public a few years ago. I think I knew him years ago. Here is another, Be Sure Your Sex Will Find You Out. [Laughter.]

Then the State Department might well take note of this—A Boudoir Diplomat. Then there is, Around the Corner. That must be the elusive prosperity we have been seeking for some 6 or 7 years. Correspondent Unknown. Then there is Cheating Husbands. That would be well for the front page of some Washington daily. Next we have Companionate Maggie, and then this great rhetorical and intriguing question, Did Adam Sin? Another one that they have dished up is Go Easy Mabel, and still another that would strike the fancy of anybody—Just a Love Nest. Here is one that is surely adapted to the tempo of modern age, Lend Me Your Husband. And then this very happy title, Love 'Em and Leave 'Em. Also we have Mary's Other Husband.

Now, if you want that kind of salacious tripe, very well, vote for it, but if anybody has an interest in decency on the stage, if anyone has an interest in real cultural value, you will not find it in this kind of junk, and I suggest that we leave the bill as it is and vote down the amendment of the gentlewoman from New Jersey. [Applause.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes. [Cries of "Vote!"] I withdraw my request.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we have here a proposition that means the very existence of some 9,000 men and women who are employed now in the theater projects, Federal art projects. It is nice to see the House in such a fun-loving mood at this hour, but still this is a serious proposition. I do not know where the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], from Peoria, Ill., got all of his ability and knowledge as a dramatic critic. He has read some titles that are humorous. We have had a little slightly off-color display in the House—some ribald humor. I just want to match the gentleman from Peoria, Ill. [Mr. DIRKSEN], and his knowledge of the drama with the knowledge of the following men and what they say about the Federal arts, because I have here a letter which reads as follows:

Open letter to Congressmen:

We, the undersigned dramatic critics, deny the statement made in Congress on June 14 by Congressman CLIFTON A. WOODRUM to the effect that "every theatrical critic of note has expressed his disapproval of these]Federal theater project[productions" and that "the theater project has never presented any production of distinction except the Swing Mikado." We declare that we have had many occasions to praise productions of the Federal theater in New York, many of which have been distinguished contributions to the art of the theater and others of which have been creditable in many respects. If Mr. WOODRUM had looked up the record, he could not possibly have made this statement concerning critical reaction to Federal theater productions in New York. If a fair and impartial estimate of the work of the theater project had been wanted, we should have been glad to give him our opinion for what it was worth—in consensus, that the theater project in New York, at least where we are most familiar with it, has been, on the whole, an institution of great value to the life of the community and that, apart from its Broadway productions, it has performed many less conspicuous services whose value could not be estimated. We believe emphatically that the project should not be abolished.

Brooks Atkinson, dramatic critic, New York Times; Burns Mantle, dramatic critic, New York Daily News; Sidney Whipple, dramatic critic, New York World-Telegram; Allene Talmey, dramatic critic, The Vogue; Wolcott Gibbs, dramatic critic, New Yorker magazine; Otis Ferguson, dramatic critic, New Republic; John Gassner, dramatic critic, Forum magazine; Paul Peters, Life magazine; Joseph Wood Krutch, The Nation magazine; Mrs. Euphremia Van Rensselaer Wyatt, representative, the Catholic World; Kelcey Allen, Daily News Record and Women's Wear; Arthur Pollack, dramatic critic, Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

Whose opinion will you take? The answer is in your hands. [Applause.]

Mr. SIROVICH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close at the end of 5 minutes on this one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I have not yielded for that and I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WARREN). The gentleman from New York had already been recognized, but preceding that the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], chairman of the committee. This would not take the gentleman from New York from the floor.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, everything that has ever been written regarding the education, the culture, and the civilization of the world is found in the writings of nature, art, and science.

Nature is the life of the universe. Art represents the thoughts of man. Science typifies correct thinking and observation.

The keys that open the secret mysteries hidden in the bosom of nature are mechanics, chemistry, physics, and mathematics. They are responsible for the development of science. Science is universal and general. There are no geographical and natural frontiers to science, born of the analytical mind. The scientific mind has a universal logic which expresses itself everywhere in the same form. Throughout the civilized world, in every school, college, and university, they teach the same mathematics, the same chemistry, the same physics, and the identical laws of mechanics. Very frequently two scientists working in different parts of the world have simultaneously, independent of each other, made the same scientific invention or discovery. Art, on the other hand, is individualistic. It is subjective. It represents the soul of each individual. While science has no frontiers or boundaries, art in every way typifies the soul of a nation. It portrays the creative imagination of the individual. It represents the independent illusion of the individual mind and records the heart beats of the deepest emotions in the soul of the individual.

Art may be divided into five divisions. The drama and its allied arts. Music and its allied arts. The graphic arts. The plastic arts. Painting and its allied arts. Never in the history of the world has it ever happened that two dramatists

have written the same, identical plays, using the same words and identical expressions in every scene or act. Never have two musical composers created the same identical musical compositions. Never have two painters or sculptors painted the same canvas or sculptured alike the same object or form. Never have two novelists written the same identical novel, using the same words and phrases. In other words, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, art is individualistic. It has its own boundaries and frontiers. You may have American drama, Italian music, Greek sculpture, French painting, English novels, but science has no boundaries, no frontiers.

The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, my good friend CLIFTON WOODRUM, of Virginia, and his associates on that committee have assassinated the fine arts of the W. P. A. Nine thousand people working in that division of the W. P. A. have received the death sentence for their indefatigable toil and labor in trying to preserve American culture. The Government's experiments in the drama, music, painting, and literature have created a cultural revolution in America. They have brought the American artist and the American audience face to face for the first time in their respective lives. The arts have become the possession of millions of people in every section of our country who never before had the means or the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of American culture, the result of the extension and expansion of the American mind. Twenty-five million people in 22 States have witnessed Federal theater productions. Sixty-five percent of this audience had never ever witnessed productions of the living, spoken drama. In the music project Federal musicians, working on the W. P. A. rolls, have played to aggregate audiences of 92,000,000 persons in 273 cities in 42 States. They have taught grown-ups and little ones to play the piano, violin, saxophone, mandolin, and countless other musical instruments; to learn to appreciate the melodies, harmonies, symphonies, and compositions of the great masters. Eleven million people have witnessed art exhibits or have been taught in art classes to love, criticize, and analyze the masterpieces of the great creative geniuses of the past. The American Historical Guidebook series, that gives the history of all the historic places in our country, that would stimulate the patriotism of local communities, has brought happiness and pleasure to millions of our citizens. The recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations is that all this good work performed by the fine arts division of the W. P. A. be destroyed. Every civilized nation in the world fosters, stimulates, and subsidizes its fine arts. America, the richest and greatest nation in the world, through the action of its Subcommittee on Appropriations, would destroy the potentialities for the development and perfection of American culture.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how you look at a pancake, whether thick or thin, it has two sides. My beloved colleague and friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a member of the Appropriations Committee, ridiculed, jeered at, laughed at, excoriated, and denounced the diversified plays presented by the theatrical divisions of the W. P. A. It was unworthy of his fine, brilliant, and splendid mind. It may trouble his just conscience in days to come. It was flippant, tactless, picayunish. He went from the sublime to the ridiculous as he explored the dramatic gutter and dilated upon the worst aspects of the drama, forgetting that many of the plays he enumerated had long been played by various theaters for the past generation. His vehement denunciation, coupled with the action of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, will spell the death knell for 9,000 good Americans to maintain themselves, to be self-supporting and self-respecting, by providing for their wives, children, and loved ones.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to see three great plays in the theater project of the W. P. A. One was Murder in the Cathedral, a play by T. S. Eliot, an Anglicized American. Most of the dramatic critics of our city recognized this poetic production as one of the great plays of this generation. I thought this play was sublime. Over 60,000 people witnessed its performances.

A Prelude to Glory characterized the early life and career of America's great and martyred President, Abraham Lincoln. The tenderness, sweetness, and humanness that expressed the early life of our heroic President, made a most profound and indelible impression upon my mind. For virility and nobility of character, for courage, for idealism and heroism, few plays have stirred my imagination more than this simple patriotic production of the early and tragic life of Abraham Lincoln in the story of the Prelude to Glory.

Then came one-third of a Nation, which portrayed the tragedy of the dwellers in the slums of our city. The dialog, characterization, and action of the play gripped the audience. On many an occasion I unconsciously found the tears rolling down my cheeks. I was overwhelmed. Bitterness and rancor urged me as a public official to vote to abolish these pest holes that exploit and commercialize the lifeblood of our fellow man, that ethics and religion teach us to love, honor, and respect.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the generous and kindly hearts of my colleagues to replace the fine-arts provision within the framework of the P. W. A. that will refuse to relegate 9,000 innocent men and women from becoming the victims of hunger, penury, and want.

Mr. Chairman, I know you are all actuated by the highest motives in your deliberations and activities, and I trust you will not crucify the Federation of Arts Unions, which is composed of 14 A. F. of L. and C. I. O. unions, with a membership of 75,000 in Greater New York. The 14 organizations represent some 8,000 members on the Federal arts projects in New York City, none of whom have one communistic member, and no one of whom is a member of the Workers Alliance.

Mr. Chairman, the modern theater is an escape from the hard realities of life created by the machine age. It enables our fellow citizens to run away from the boredom, tedium, and monotony of the mill, mine, loom, and factory, and from the world of reality to the world of phantasy, imagination, and illusion.

Every civilized nation of the world subsidizes the theater and its allied arts to grow, prosper, and flourish. By your actions and vote today you will determine whether America has culturally arrived at the age of maturity or whether dead property in the guise of economy is superior to human rights. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts) there were ayes 56 and noes 192.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire: On page 17, line 2, add "*Provided*, That all unskilled labor, certified from the relief rolls, shall hereafter be paid weekly."

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, the W. P. A. employs more people than any other organization in this country. They are paid today semimonthly. This amendment provides that these workers be paid the same as all other industries in this country pay their labor—that is, weekly. The amendment speaks for itself. I have waited almost 12 hours to offer this amendment, which affects almost 3,000,000 people.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. I yield.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I compliment the gentleman on his anxiety to get the money to these W. P. A. workers as quickly as possible. I wonder if the gentleman voted on the last amendment to dismiss 9,000 of them from the pay roll?

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. I did.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. JENKS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title I, which is the title we have just been considering for 3 or 4 hours, that all debate on title I and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many amendments are there to title I? I have had an amendment pending to section 11 for the last 4 hours. We have been all over the bill since then.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to answer the gentleman's inquiry. Eight amendments are pending at the desk.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that debate close on this title and all amendments thereto in 15 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman modify his request to allow 2 minutes of debate for each amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto close in 16 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will not the gentleman from Virginia state for the RECORD his interpretation of paragraph (e) at the top of page 19 with regard to the striking off of persons who are eligible for social-security benefits? If he will take time to do that I shall not object.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That means if they are eligible for social-security benefits and if there are funds available to pay those benefits.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would mean that the States have funds with which to pay benefits in order to make Federal funds available?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 16 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: Page 22, line 23, before the word "the", insert "in or connected with the Works Projects Administration", and on page 23, line 1, after the word "any", insert the word "such."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to put this bill in the same condition we attempted to place the similar bill in January of this year, and that was to prohibit civil service for the employees of the Works Progress Administration only. There are paid from funds under this bill employees in the Treasury Department, in the Agricultural Department, and in various other agencies of the Government that have no connection with the Works Progress Administration. If my amendment is adopted it will limit the exclusion of civil service to the Works Progress Administration only, as the House attempted to do in January of last year. The Senate changed that provision last year and it was agreed to in conference.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman explain a little further, pointing out specific examples?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It will let the employees of the Agricultural Department and other agencies, the Treasury Department and the General Accounting Office, come under civil service. They are covered in section 6.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The National Youth Administration?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; it will let the National Youth Administration employees come under civil service.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Farm Credit Administration?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It will let all of them in under civil service.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; that is the effect of the amendment, and that is what the gentleman from Virginia undertook to do in January here, but the Senate changed it. I hope that the House may approve this amendment and give the President the opportunity of extending civil service to those employees not connected with the Works Progress Administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 21, line 16, after the period, insert "No portion of the appropriation made under this resolution shall be used to pay the salary of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, in just a few words, this amendment makes it impossible to pay the salaries of anyone advocating the overthrow of our form of government through force or violence. I think there is not as much to fear from this small group of people as some would have us think. I feel, however, that our Government ought not to support and maintain people who advocate its overthrow through force or violence. [Applause.] You need but look at the hearings briefly to be convinced that there is in W. P. A. a considerable group who belong to this class of people. Let them go on and preach their doctrines, let them sing their hymns of hate against America, but let them find support from a place other than the public pay roll. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOOK: On page 16, line 16, after the figure "1", insert "and such a monthly earning schedule shall provide that the same rate of pay be paid for similar work in all sections of any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Page 14, line 24, strike out paragraph (c), beginning on page 14, line 24, down to and including line 13, page 15.

ON A MOTION TO STRIKE OUT A PARAGRAPH WHICH INCREASES AND TIGHTENS UP SPONSORS' CONTRIBUTIONS THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to strike out the paragraph which increases the contributions of sponsors and tightens up the contribution of sponsors on non-Federal projects. The paragraph penalizes poverty. This provision of the bill discriminates against the

poorer States, counties, and municipalities. If this provision of the bill is honestly and impartially enforced, it will wipe whole Southern States off the W. P. A. map. It will wipe out the drought-stricken States of the West. It will wipe out hundreds of communities and districts throughout the country. The committee report makes it plain it intends this language shall be construed to both increase and tighten up sponsors' contributions.

In order to make sure about this, let me give you just two brief quotations from the report. On page 21 the report says:

Under the present law sponsor's contributions are authorized. The joint resolution adds the requirement that the contribution be an adequate one.

And on page 22 is the following:

The committee believes that sponsors' contributions should be increased. The Works Progress Administration has spent nearly $7,000,000,000, and a very large part of it has gone as grants in the form of public projects to States and local communities. Their sponsors' contributions have been increased but are not yet a fair proportion of the cost.

Now, just set these plain statements over against existing conditions, which ought to be known to every Member of Congress who knows anything about what is going on in his district. If I do say it myself, when I go out home I get out on the ground to find out how this money is working.

I have found two things which are pertinent here. One is that most of the best and most desirable W. P. A. projects in my district could not have been built under the $40,000 Federal grant grudgingly yielded by the committee to head off a fight and which I discussed here on the floor earlier in the day; and the other is that some of them could not have been built under the stiffer requirements laid down in the pending bill.

I know how even the present looser requirements have had to be stretched to the limit in order to give many poor communities any project at all. I really wonder sometimes how much some really able Members of Congress know about how these recovery and relief programs have operated on the ground. I wonder if they ever put in many weary hours with an efficient and resourceful W. P. A. director, who salvaged old mining machinery and equipment from abandoned mines and set up a plant, and made his own brick, and his own oil mix for street and road jobs, and taught his unskilled workers how to make their own material and build the buildings, so that they even became able to build their own homes.

I wonder if they have been through the W. P. A. school buildings in remote and isolated settlements, where the children have been given some of the advantages of children in the better towns and cities, and where the school building has become the center of community life and maybe the only decent building in the place. That sort of thing will be largely stopped under this bill. Perhaps in many cases you could not look too closely into what went to make up the poor sponsors' contribution under existing law. Maybe it got a very liberal allowance on sand and gravel furnished free by Mother Nature.

This paragraph is in favor of the rich sponsor and against the poor sponsor. Under this provision of the bill, to him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that he hath.

You may vote down my amendment, and I know you will, but I want to say right now that you are going to learn a whole lot about it before Congress convenes again in January 1940. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Colorado) there were—ayes 33, noes 141.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOUSTON: Page 28, line 2, after the period, insert "That no recommendations of any persons who shall apply for office or place under the provisions of this act which may be given by any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, except as to the character or residence of the applicant, shall be received or considered by any person concerned in making any appointment under this act."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to enlighten the public and take the pressure off the Members of the House. Almost every unemployed man and woman thinks a Congressman can get someone displaced and he or she put in that place any time the Congressman wants to do so. If he does not do it, then be is to blame. I want to either have the authority or else let the public know we do not have that authority. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAY: Page 23, line 25, after the words "efficient administration", add "*Provided*, That as to all administrative and supervisory positions, preference of appointment shall be given to veterans who are qualified therefor."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FAY) there were—ayes 43, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: At the end of line 16, page 21, add the following: "*Provided*, That the Works Projects Administration shall not employ any person whose need for employment has not been certified as provided in section 16, subsection (d) in any position, if there is available for employment persons whose need for employment has been certified as provided in section 16, subsection (d), and who are capable and qualified to perform the duties of said positions."

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply proposes that if people are certified for employment according to the provisions of this bill they shall be employed, and that no one who is not certified shall be employed in any position as long as people who are certified are unemployed if they are capable and qualified to perform the duties of the position. It is simply a question whether we want relief money and relief work to go to the relief worker or to someone put on relief who is a nonrelief worker and who does not need the work.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana) there were—ayes 110, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Page 29, beginning in line 10, strike out all of section 32.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose strikes out that part of the bill known as section 32, which denies to a W. P. A. supervisor, administrator, or anyone in an executive position the opportunity to run for any political office or to be a campaign manager for any candidate for office. As far as I am personally concerned, I do not believe that when a man goes on relief or works for the W. P. A. he should forfeit his American citizenship. If a man wants to run for justice of the peace, wants to run for member of a park board, or wants to run for a nonsalaried position, it seems to me that we should not prohibit him from exercising that right.

That is not politics in relief; that is a man exercising his prerogative as an American citizen to run for a position in public life in the United States. If he were bringing political influence to bear on subordinates, if he were

exercising undue influence on those who would come immediately under his sway, there would be justification then, it seems to me, for such a provision as is in the bill, but my amendment provides for striking out an interference with what I deem to be an American's right to exercise his prerogatives of citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be agreed to. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DUNN) there were—ayes 61, noes 158.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, title II, which runs down through pages 30, 31, 32, and part of 33, is the familiar Public Works Administration part of the bill. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that title II may be considered as having been read and be printed in the RECORD, and that it be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 31, line 20, after the word "agency", insert "unless such agency agrees to require that at least 25 percent of the labor to be employed on such project shall be taken from relief rolls and."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. RAMSPECK for the committee amendment: Page 31, line 20, after the word "agency", insert "unless such agency will require that at least 25 percent of the labor employed on such project will come from relief rolls if such labor, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Public Works, is available and qualified and will not unreasonably interfere with the construction of such project and."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, the difference between my substitute and the committee amendment is simply that under the committee amendment if the 25 percent relief labor is not available or no qualified relief labor is available the project cannot proceed. Under the substitute amendment I have offered, if, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Public Works, who would be the person in charge of P. W. A., the labor is not available or is not qualified, then other labor can be used as is the case under the present law.

I believe we ought not to tie the hands of whoever is to direct these P. W. A. projects so as to make it impossible for them to operate by requiring 25 percent relief labor. In some parts of the country you will find that the necessary skilled workers needed for such construction as P. W. A. often does are not to be found and cannot be had, and to insist on such a requirement would mean that P. W. A. projects could not be constructed in many of the rural sections of this country.

I hope the Committee may see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield, while I cannot speak for anybody but myself, I may say that as far as I am concerned I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. I cannot speak for the committee, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman. I do not believe this will interfere with the purpose of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 162, noes 21.

So the substitute to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, as amended by the substitute of the gentleman from Georgia.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 31, line 21, strike out the word "Administrator" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Commissioner."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Page 33, line 9, strike out the word "Administrator" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Commissioner."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: Page 30, line 9, after "Title II—Public Works Administration Projects", strike out all of sections 201 to 205, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 201. (a) In order to increase employment and to provide for the general welfare by providing for useful non-Federal public-works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works has heretofore financed or aided in financing, pursuant to title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, or the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, there is hereby appropriated to the Public Works Administration (herein called the 'Administration') in the Federal Works Agency, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $275,000,000, together with any balance or balances of the appropriation made by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 not reserved or made available by the Congress for administrative expenses of the Administration and not now or hereafter expended pursuant to allotments made prior to the effective date of this act, such sums, together with the sum of $125,000,000 transferred from section 1, to remain available until expended, and, subject to the provisions hereinafter set forth, to be expended at the direction of the Federal Works Administrator (herein called the Administrator), with the approval of the President, for (1) the making of loans or grants, or both, to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions, instrumentalities or agencies thereof, or other public bodies (herein called public agencies), for projects of such public agencies; and (2) the construction and leasing of projects, with or without the privilege of purchase, to any such public agencies.

"(b) No funds available under this title shall be allotted for any project which in the determination of the Administrator cannot be commenced prior to April 30, 1940, or the completion of which cannot be substantially accomplished prior to December 31, 1941: *Provided*, That this limitation upon time shall not apply to any project delayed by litigation in any Federal or State court.

"(c) No grant shall be made in excess of 45 percent of the cost of any non-Federal project, and no project shall be constructed for lease to any public agency unless the Administrator shall determine that the nonrecoverable portion of the cost of such project shall not exceed 45 percent of such cost.

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

"(e) Not exceeding $9,750,000 of the funds available under this title, in addition to the moneys authorized by subsection 201 (f) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 and the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940, to be used for administrative expenses of the Administration for the fiscal years 1939 and 1940, shall be available to pay administrative expenses of the Administration for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940. The Administrator shall reserve from the amount available under this title an adequate sum for administrative expenses of the Administration in connection with this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, subject to authorization hereafter by annual appropriation acts for the utilization thereof.

"SEC. 202. (a) The Administration is authorized to sell any bonds, securities, or other obligations which it has heretofore acquired or hereafter acquires, and to use the proceeds realized from the sale thereof for the making of further loans pursuant to the provisions of this title.

"(b) The Administration is authorized to exchange any bonds, securities, or other obligations which it has heretofore acquired or hereafter acquires for any other bonds, securities, or other obligations of the same or any other public agency.

"SEC. 203. On and after the effective date of reorganization plan No. I, transmitted to the Congress by the President of the United States pursuant to the authority granted by the Reorganization Act of 1939, all laws, Executive orders, and other documents referring to the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works shall be deemed to refer to the Public Works Administration, and all laws, Executive orders, and other documents referring to the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works shall be deemed to refer to the Federal Works Administrator.

"SEC. 204. All limitations of time on the continuance of the Administration, or on the performance of its functions or exercise of its powers, and all limitations as to time on the authority of the Administrator to make allotments or to expend funds or do any other act, under or pursuant to the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, or the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, or under any other act, are hereby repealed. The Administration is hereby continued and is authorized to continue to perform all functions which it is authorized to perform on the date of enactment hereof, until otherwise provided by law; and all provisions of law existing on the date of enactment hereof, and relating to the availability of funds for carrying out any of the functions of such Administration, are hereby continued until otherwise provided by law. That portion of section 201 (a) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 which reads 'to remain available until June 30, 1940,' is hereby amended to read 'to remain available until expended,' and the sum appropriated by said act is hereby made available until such sum is expended.

"SEC. 205. The Administration is hereby authorized to receive and consider applications for aid under the provisions of this title or of any other act hereinbefore referred to, including applications amendatory of other applications heretofore or hereafter received: *Provided*, That no new applications shall be received by the Administration after April 30, 1940.

"SEC. 206. Section 206 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, as amended by section 204 of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, and that portion of section 201 (f) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 which reads 'for the completion (except liquidation) of the activities of such administration,' are hereby repealed; and the date specified in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, as amended by section 201 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937 and by section 202 of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, prior to which, in the determination of the Administrator, projects for which moneys made available by such act were authorized to be granted, can be substantially completed is hereby changed from 'July 1, 1940,' to 'December 31, 1941,' and the dates specified in section 201 (b) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, prior to which, in the determination of the Administrator, projects for which moneys appropriated by such act were authorized to be allotted, could be commenced and substantially completed, respectively, are hereby changed from 'January 1, 1939,' to 'April 30, 1940,' and from 'June 30, 1940,' to 'December 31, 1941,' respectively.

"SEC. 207. (a) There is hereby appropriated to the Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended, the sum of $75,000,000, to be expended at the direction of the Administrator, with the approval of the President, for the making of allotments to Federal agencies for the financing of Federal construction projects and the acquisition of land for sites therefor, such projects to be selected from (1) projects authorized by law and (2) projects for the enlargement, extension, or remodeling of existing Federal plants, institutions, or facilities.

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

"SEC. 208. No provision of title I hereof other than section 1 (a) shall apply to this title II or to any funds available under this title.

"SEC. 209. This title may be cited as the 'Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939.' "

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Alabama ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD and considered as read?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes, Mr. Chairman; because it has been published in the RECORD and further because of the fact that each Member has been furnished with a copy of it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what the number of the bill is and whether or not it is available for us here?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. If the gentleman will turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, June 15, he will find the amendment there in full.

Mr. TABER. It is the entire bill that was presented to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No; it is not the bill, H. R. 4576.

Mr. TABER. What is it?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. It is a condensed form of that bill and in my remarks I shall give the gist of it to the Members.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the title and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I object, Mr. Chairman, I want 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, including the time of the gentleman from Alabama, and I shall ask for 3 minutes of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 3 minutes being reserved by the gentleman from Virginia. Is there objection?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I move, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the members of the committee will turn to page 7251 of the RECORD of June 15 they will find therein the amendment which I am offering in the nature of a substitute for the entire title II of the committee's bill.

To summarize, the amendment which I offer will continue the P. W. A., will provide an additional $275,000,000 for non-Federal projects, and $75,000,000 for Federal projects. It will remove the committee's limitation of $225,000 as the limit for the Government's loan or the Government's grant as a part of the project. It will make the P. W. A. section of this bill conform to the Executive order in keeping with reorganization plan No. I.

This summarizes, briefly, the chief features of the amendment.

If we substitute it for the committee's title II, it will eliminate the provision adopted a moment ago, providing that 25 percent of the labor used on these projects must come from the relief rolls. The experience of the P. W. A. has been that relief labor is unsatisfactory for a number of reasons: First, because these P. W. A. projects are let to private contractors, that the prevailing wage is paid, that the contractor usually obtains his labor from men who are members of organized labor. This situation would be considerably aggravated if you attempted to write in this 25-percent provision. It will eliminate the threat of strikes or labor disturbance which might otherwise impede the progress of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in a sound, constructive public-works program. The Congress has evidenced during the past 6 years by its action, time after time, that it, too, is interested in a sound, constructive public-works program.

No taint of scandal, no breath of suspicion, no complaint of political activity have resulted from the activities of the P. W. A. There are some things that should be called to your attention in respect to the P. W. A. In a P. W. A. program you have a uniform contribution by the community. More than $2,000,000,000 has been raised outside of the Government grants made to P. W. A. during the past 6 years, to stimulate private business and industry. In addition $830,000,000 has been loaned to communities which will be recovered at 4-percent interest. A striking fact was developed in the hearings on this program. That fact is that of the money due today on Government loans for P. W. A., less than 1 percent is now in default after 6 years' operation.

More than two and a half billion dollars' worth of orders have been given to private business and industry in the heavy industries as a result of the P. W. A. program. If you are interested in stimulating private business and industry, my amendment will afford the only opportunity that you will have under this bill, and if you are genuinely interested in private employment behind the firing lines, in the mines, in the fields, in the factories, you will support this public-works program, because two and a half times the number of people who are actually employed on the site are given employment in private business in providing the materials going into these projects.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I rise simply to state that as an ardent advocate of W. P. A., I am heartily in favor of this amendment.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, I think the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has offered a very wholesome and constructive amendment which would help every city in the Union and help to reemploy the unemployed.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think it is also a fact that 1,300,000 people are benefited now because of the P. W. A.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct. Approximately 1,300,000 people are being employed today as a result of the P. W. A. program. [Applause.] The distinguished gentleman from West Virginia has demonstrated many times his interest in a sound and constructive public-works program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This is one amendment which I think the Members of the House should be able to vote upon without any doubt in their minds as to whether or not their constituents back home approve of the amendment, because during the year 1938, in every section of the country, in every district practically, in every community in the United States, there were held elections wherein the voters were asked to determine whether or not a bond issue should be authorized so that the local community could take advantage of a P. W. A. grant; 3,210 elections were held and 81 percent of the elections were approved by a majority of the voters, which shows what the people at home think of the P. W. A. program.

These elections covered every conceivable kind of project, and as I said before were held in every kind of district, both Republican and Democrat. The fact is the people back home have approved the P. W. A. program, and I think it is very significant that of 3,210 elections held as to whether they would approve these projects, 2,625 approved them by a majority vote. In the 1938 P. W. A. Act we provided that the projects should be finished before July 1940. It is significant that over 1,000 of the projects were completed 14 months ahead of time, and another thing in connection with the P. W. A. program is that the P. W. A. has never come back to Congress and asked for a deficiency appropriation.

They have done a splendid job. The referendums show conclusively that the people wanted them, that the sentiment is for the P. W. A. There has never been any scandal connected with it. It has done a wonderful job in every respect. Those of you who believe that the sum carried in this bill for work relief is not quite sufficient should vote for this amendment as introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] because it will stimulate construction and help unemployment, promote recovery, and is an amendment that I think the Members of the Committee could vote for without any doubt in their minds as to the good it will do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, as one who has been concerned all day about the problem of jobs for people and one who has been disappointed on a number of occasions in the way amendments were voted down by this Committee, I rise at this time to urge the support of the House for this constructive amendment.

This amendment will mean, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] has so ably stated, an increased volume of employment. Much of it is indirect, it is true, but it is an increased volume of employment just the same. It will be a constructive measure for this House to take at this late hour of the night.

It will be something that will mean encouragement to business. It will mean that over half of this money which is provided will be repaid to the Federal Government or else provided by local communities. It is a shame and a thing for which I cannot think of one single decent excuse that we should have to consider a matter of this importance at this hour and with the House in its present utterly unconstructive frame of mind.

As I say, this is an amendment upon which I should think a great number of the Members of this House, whatever their views have been up to this time about these various measures, could agree upon and pass, in order that we may give stimulation and encouragement to the improvement in American business and some few jobs to those who need them and are denied by other provisions of this bill.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Is it not true that if we do not adopt this amendment P. W. A. will be closed out by the legislation we are about to pass?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. At least, it is true that P. W. A. will only have $125,000,000, and certain limitations that the gentleman from Alabama has explained will be put upon it.

If my figures are correct, last year the Congress provided some $965,000,000 for this P. W. A. program. This year, even if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it will only be $400,000,000. With the W. P. A. cut one-third, I submit that it is most important, therefore, that this amendment should be adopted. We are not going to solve this unemployment problem by a deflationary program. It cannot be done that way. This measure, as I say, is a constructive one and should be adopted.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In the first 4 months of 1939 the figures have been brought forward by the Engineering News Record that more than 45 percent of all contracts on public agencies have been brought about through the P. W. A. construction work.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This amendment, if adopted, would raise the bill $350,000,000 above the Budget, would it not?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know that it will be that much. I only know the people of America need this right at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] for 3 minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I rise in favor of the Starnes amendment, because I know P. W. A. to be the finest relief agency that has been created by this Congress.

It is rather difficult for me to understand the attitude of the committee. They not only have practically eliminated the P. W. A. but they have destroyed it by putting in provisions making it impossible to operate. Insofar as the cities are concerned, they have put a restriction of some $225,000 on any project insofar as the Federal contribution is concerned. That means that schoolhouses, bridges, or any similar project cannot be constructed in metropolitan districts. The reason for that they only know.

Insofar as the other provision that 25 percent of the workers must come from relief rolls is concerned, they know that that destroys the P. W. A. program. It destroys it for the reason that on the relief rolls they do not have the type of labor necessary to do the work required by P. W. A.

They further know that about $700,000,000 have been voted by States, counties, and cities as the sponsors' contribution, and they expected when they voted this large amount of money that the program would be continued as it operated last year. Now what do we find? A $125,000,000 set-up, about 25 percent of what is needed; and by that I mean there is no part of this country that has not put the stamp of approval upon the P. W. A.

The administrators have been highly trained technical men, most efficient in caliber. There has been no suspicion of politics in connection with a single project on P. W. A. I submit to you, that in all fairness to the people back home who, after all, are paying the bills, whether it be a Federal contribution or a State contribution, if they want a P. W. A. program, that is the program we should give them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, what other amendments to this title are pending?

The CHAIRMAN. There is one other amendment to the title pending, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May it be reported for information?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] will be reported for the information of the committee.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Proposed amendment by Mr. LELAND M. FORD: On page 31, line 12, after the word "made", strike out the words and figures "in excess of $225,000 or"; and in line 13, after the word "project", insert a period and strike out the remainder of line 13 and all of lines 14 to 17, inclusive.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California, if adopted, would enable this small amount of $125,000,000 which we are giving to P. W. A. to be used on a few large projects. The thought of the committee in putting this amount in the bill was that in view of the fact that the money was coming from relief labor and was a small amount, merely an adjunct to the P. W. A. program, that projects larger than $500,000 should not be considered—that it should be spread over the country in small projects.

As to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, let us be clear on this, if you please. It increases the bill over and above any Budget estimate $275,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is $350,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Three hundred and fifty million dollars. This is added to the bill over and above the Budget estimates if the Starnes amendment is adopted. I am told—I do not have the figures—but I am told that this would put the total of the public debt above the constitutional debt limit we have in this country.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. The President's Budget figures show that on June 30, 1940, the national debt will have reached $44,457,845,210, leaving a leeway of $542,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Let us get this straight, if you please. I appreciate the fine work of the Public Works Administration, I appreciate the fine work that the Public Works Administration has done, but we sent the Starnes bill to the White House asking whether or not it was in accordance with the President's program. It is still down there, it has not come back.

I do hope the House will adopt the committee's view that no program of that kind should be embarked upon, certainly unless the President asks us to do so. I think we can follow his leadership on that; and I do hope that the House will not in this relief bill write a public-works program. We have information in the press that great pressure has been brought to bear for a public-works program. So far we have had no information upon the subject from anybody, and I do not believe this House in this relief bill should write a public-works program when it has not been requested, and we have no right to suppose that it is in accordance with the financial plans and program of the President.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. Is it not true that because of amendments offered to the bill raising the proportion to 45 and 55 the amount that will actually be allowed to W. P. A. will be $289,000,000?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Two hundred and eighty-nine million dollars will go to this program the way the bill stands. It may be that before this Congress is over there will be some kind of administration policy adopted as to whether or not there should be a public-works program.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill we have no Budget estimate, no request from the President. The only Public Works money that has been provided is for the heavy construction work that is taken out of W. P. A. and put into P. W. A.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will not be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STARNES) there were—ayes 103, noes 208.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LELAND M. FORD: Page 31, line 12, after the word "made," strike out the words and figures "in excess of $225,000 or", and in line 13, after the word "project", insert a period and strike out the remainder of line 13 and all of lines 14, 15, 16, and 17.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to submit this amendment by reason of the fact that it affects my county. I believe, however, there are many other counties throughout the country that are affected in the same way, namely, that it is restrictive upon our large operations and projects coming within the limitations of the amendment. For instance, we lost 19 bridges in the flood of March 2, 1938, that cost us something like $29,000,000. We have no courthouse. The courthouse was condemned because of the same flood. Under the bill as written we would be tremendously hurt. We could each year put up in the county all those bridges, and build four or five courthouses if it were not for the factor of human need, but relief needs take $43,000,000 out of the $69,000,000 Budget. We cannot use the money for the purpose of building bridges and courthouses but must devote it to so-called "human needs." I believe there are many counties in the country in a similar position.

I rise to ask the Committee to support the amendment and remove this limitation, particularly on those large jobs. Answering my friend and colleague the gentleman from Virginia, it is true that the jobs will be limited to $500,000, but it is on those jobs that we really need the help. I am asking you to vote for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

PROVISIONS COMMON TO ALL TITLES

SEC. 301. No funds appropriated in this joint resolution, whether administered by the Federal Government or by the States or local governmental agencies from funds contributed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall be used by any Federal, State, or other agency to purchase, establish, or expand mills, factories, or plants which would manufacture or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products in competition with existing industries.

SEC. 302. None of the funds appropriated by this joint resolution shall be used for the manufacture, purchase, or construction of any naval vessel, any armament, munitions, or implement of war, for military or naval forces, and no funds herein appropriated or authorized shall be diverted or allocated to any other department or bureau for such purpose.

SEC. 303. No part of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be loaned or granted, except pursuant to an obligation incurred prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, to any State, or any of its political subdivisions or agencies, for the purpose of carrying out or assisting in carrying out any program or project of constructing, rebuilding, repairing, or replanning its penal or reformatory institutions, unless the President shall find that the projects to be financed with such loan or grant will not cause or promote competition of the products of convict labor with the products of free labor.

SEC. 304. In expending appropriations or portions of appropriations, contained in this joint resolution, for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any appropriation unit herein shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended, and in grades in which only one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, or (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, or (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law, or (5) to reduce the compensation of any person in a grade in which only one position is allocated.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TERRY: Page 33, line 22, after the word "factories", strike out the words "or plants"; and on said line 22 after the word "mills", strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am going to accept the amendment.

Mr. TERRY. I may say to the gentleman from Virginia, this is not the amendment he agreed to accept. It is the second one the gentleman is willing to accept. This strikes out the words "or plants."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is all right. We will accept this one.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman explain the amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the gentleman ought to explain the amendment in order that the gentlemen of the House may understand what it is.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The members of the Committee do not understand it.

Mr. TABER. What is the object of the amendment?

Mr. TERRY. It is to eliminate the words "or plants."

Mr. TABER. Why does the gentleman want to strike that out?

Mr. TERRY. Because it is in the present law and it may apply to a great many P. W. A. projects that have been approved and allowed and for which funds will be in this $125,000,000 transfer.

Mr. TABER. It says "or plants which would manufacture or produce for sale articles," and so forth.

Mr. TERRY. I leave the word "mills" and "factories" in there. The only words I strike out are "or plants."

Mr. TABER. The gentleman must have some object in mind, and I think he ought to be fair with the House and tell us.

Mr. TERRY. I am perfectly willing to say what my object is. There are a number of small towns over the country that have power plants and water plants for which they have asked P. W. A. allotments. If we leave the words "or plants" in there, we will eliminate any chance of these little towns getting money for these projects.

Mr. TABER. They do not manufacture articles or commodities.

Mr. TERRY. No; but I want to be sure it does not interfere with these allotments.

Mr. TABER. The word "plants" is limited to apply to the following words: "which would manufacture or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products in competition with existing industries." That would not interfere with a power plant.

Mr. TERRY. A power plant produces electricity and I am afraid that with the word "plants" in there, it might take in these small projects.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It means under the gentleman's amendment that you can spend public money for the purpose of building industrial plants?

Mr. TERRY. Oh, no. In a great many of the small towns of the country they have P. W. A. applications pending, and the funds have been allotted for the purchase of machinery for small water plants and electric plants and I do not want them to be interfered with by this general language.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TERRY) there were—ayes 82, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 33, line 24, after the word "existing", strike out the word "industries" and insert the words "mills, factories, or plants, as the case may be."

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is just to clarify the language there. In line 22 it refers to mills, factories, or plants. Then it says that they shall not compete with existing industries. These industries may not be mills, factories, or plants, so that in the place of the word "industries" my amendment provides the words "mills, factories, or plants, as the case may be." The amendment, as I understand it, has been accepted by the committee, and it merely clarifies the language.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman it has not been accepted by the committee. I told the gentleman as far as I was concerned I did not see any objection to the clarifying language being put in, but I did not speak for the committee.

Mr. TERRY. I correct my statement and say that the gentleman from Virginia agrees with me.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. How does this amendment differ from the provision written in the last relief bill?

Mr. TERRY. I may say to the gentleman I am unable to give him that information.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman express to the House his objective in offering this language?

Mr. TERRY. My objective in offering the language was just to make the language apply to mills, factories, or plants, instead of industries generally.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What is the reason the gentleman offers that change in the language? What is the real objective behind the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. TERRY. If the gentleman can understand the English language, he can see what the objective is—to make it apply to factories and plants.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The words the gentleman offers are narrower than the term "industries."

Mr. TERRY. Yes.

Mr. MASON. And it conforms to the other.

Mr. TERRY. It conforms to the other part of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TERRY) there were—ayes 128, noes 149.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NICHOLS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with instructions that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that amendment has already been voted on.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes; but the bill has been changed since then by amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Since a similar amendment was offered before, an amendment has been voted on and intervening action has taken place. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, in the closing hours of the writing of this all-important piece of legislation by the House of Representatives, I take this opportunity to compliment one of the great parties of the United States. I have seen members of that party in the House of Representatives this afternoon in voting on amendments offered to this bill, which would, in my judgment, have made it better legislation, vote in almost solid bloc in voting down those amendments. I wish to compliment and pay just tribute to the Republican Members of the House of Representatives for the tenacity with which they have driven to their objective. [Applause.] I believe they have accomplished a purpose, and that purpose has been to make this bill less beneficial to the people on relief in the United States than it would have been had many of the amendments that have been offered been adopted.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McGRANERY. The gentleman, I suppose, has observed that at no time has a majority of the Democrats on this side of the House gone along on any of the propositions referred to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Now that we have had this nice little lecture on ethics and party loyalty, let me say to my good friend from Oklahoma that this bill, which is about to become law, was the unanimous judgment of the Democrats on the subcommittee, who studied the question, with perhaps one exception on one item to which one of the gentlemen on the subcommittee did not agree. In addition, almost without exception the action taken by the House today has been concurred in by our distinguished leader. In one instance our distinguished Speaker disagreed. At no time upon any major amendment that was not adopted did as many as 100 Members of the House vote against the action taken, and there are over 200 Democrats here.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOLAND. I just want to inform the gentleman that I am one of the Members of the House here that did not agree with his viewpoint on this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I wish to say also that I am one of the Democrats on this side who did not agree. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have observed a very peculiar complex that Members of Congress have. If a Member has an amendment which he wishes adopted, I have never

observed any of my partisan friends over here turning down any assistance from the other side of the aisle if he could get it. [Applause.] I have never observed the members of my party on election day running the Republicans away from the polls who came to vote for Democratic candidates.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. When did the Republicans generally ever vote the Democratic ticket either here or at the polls?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. When did they do it? They did it in 1932.

Mr. O'TOOLE. What did they do in 1928?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. And what will they do in '40? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SABATH. They will again vote the Democratic ticket.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think they will, too. I think it will be all right.

I deplore the idea that we make personalities out of these things and that they make partisanship out of it. It seems to me that we ought to try to follow the course that seems right to us. In the 16 years that I have been in Congress I have often wanted to see these gentlemen do the right thing. I am glad that today they have done it so many times.

We have brought here a program that I feel perfectly confident carries out the humanitarian policies which the Democratic Party wanted to put into effect, to wit, to make this relief program operate for the benefit of project workers all over the country and to give them jobs, and I believe that this project does that.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does not the gentleman join me, then, in paying a tribute to the Republican Party in that it takes practically their solid vote in order to get us to do the humanitarian thing that the gentleman speaks of? [Applause.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I would like to say personally and as a member of the committee, that although there has been some implied criticism of the very able and distinguished gentleman from Virginia, that there has always been a majority, and often a two-thirds majority, of the Democrats and a large number of the Republicans standing behind him on every issue. This showed the confidence of the Members not only in his character, but in his ability, and is a finer tribute than any which has been paid in my experience in Congress to any man handling a bill in the House. [Applause.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. May I respectfully call the attention of everybody here to the fact that it is now 12:30 a. m.?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 33, line 24, change the period to a colon and add "*Provided, however,* That this section shall not apply to the use of funds available under section 201 (a) for non-Federal public works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works has heretofore financed or aided in financing."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the attention of the Members on the left-hand side of the aisle. I am going to reach out for a few votes here and I think I can get them.

I had hoped that possibly the distinguished chairman of the committee would accept this amendment. It has for its purpose the continuance of the practice on the part of the Public Works Administration of permitting cities, towns, and States to build the kind of projects they have built heretofore. It has nothing whatsoever to do with any competitive industrial plants, but simply permits the Public Works Administration to grant the cities, municipalities, and counties the right to build waterworks, power plants, hospitals, and such public improvements as heretofore permitted under the law.

The first section of title III, section 301, provides that no funds made available by the joint resolution shall be used to purchase, establish, or expand any plants which would manufacture or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products in competition with existing industries. Because of the manner in which this provision is drafted, it is applicable to the Public Works Administration as well as to the Works Projects Administration. In a more restricted form it appeared in the first deficiency bill enacted in March of this year; but it was there made applicable only to W. P. A. As applied to W. P. A. it is a necessary and desirable provision to prevent the use of Federal relief funds for the purpose of establishing industries competitive with private factories and plants.

However, as applied to the Public Works Administration, this provision will have an effect which everyone will recognize as undesirable. For example, it will prevent cities, towns, and villages from building, with Federal aid, their own water systems, regardless of how urgent it is for the health and welfare of their citizens, and irrespective of how desirable it is from the viewpoint of relieving unemployment.

The language of the provision in the present bill is also so broad that cities and towns may not be able to build hospitals with Federal aid because they may compete with private institutions; dormitories in State universities, because they may compete with private rooming houses and restaurants; certain park facilities in competition with private amusement centers; and irrigation works in competition with privately owned water companies. The adoption of this provision as it is written, particularly in its relation to the P. W. A. program, could effectively block a considerable portion of the program and make impossible a large number of needed facilities, the construction of which would put non-Federal funds to work, turn the wheels of private industry, and relieve unemployment.

In order to correct this obviously serious situation I intend to offer the following amendment to section 301, which will retain the provision as fully applicable to W. P. A., but will make it inapplicable to P. W. A. financing of projects of the kind which it has heretofore financed:

Change the period to a colon and add: "*Provided, however,* That this section shall not apply to the use of funds available under section 201 (a) for non-Federal public-works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works has heretofore financed or aided in financing."

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNGDAHL: On page 33, line 22, after the word "factories", insert the word "stores", and in line 23, after the word "manufacture", insert the words "handle, process."

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, after this long session until the wee hours of the morning I feel like Jonah did when he found himself in the mouth of the whale—this is an awful spot to be in. However, I ask your indulgence for just 2 or 3 minutes because I feel that my amendment should have the support of both sides of the House.

This amendment is intended to help the small-business man. I congratulate the committee on putting section 301 into this bill, because I do not believe that our relief funds should be used to set up competitive government industries as against private industry. During the last few months we have heard a great deal from the small-business men of this country. These small-business men have

asked Congress to do something for them in their present plight. I can see no reason why, if there should be protection for the mill operator and the manufacturer, and I believe there should, why the operator of a small elevator in a small town, a creamery operator, a poultry operator, or a cannery operator should not have the same protection. I do not believe that relief funds should be used in any instance in competing with private industry. [Applause.]

There is one agency in the Government administering relief which I think is guilty of some of these abuses, and in support of this contention I desire to read the following affidavit:

I, Joe Webber, Dickinson post office, North Dakota, being duly sworn, do depose and say that one Joe Kubista came to and solicited for the sale of stock in the Farmers Union Creamery, advising that there were two ways in which the stock might be purchased: The one by borrowing the money from the Resettlement, and the other by giving a claim note to the creamery itself. In either case the note would be for $27.50. I told him I would join if the note were to be made to the creamery and with the understanding that the dividends would apply and would pay the note. About 3 weeks later, which was early this spring, I received a letter notifying me that a check was at the creamery for me to endorse for the stock. This was a Government check. I went in and told them I wouldn't sign the check, as I had told Kubista that I would only join by giving the note to the creamery. I never signed the check, and I told them to send it back. I haven't been to the Resettlement office nor have I seen any of them, as they are not giving me grants any more. I was satisfied with the grants I got, but I wasn't notified when they were to be discontinued.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of May, 1939.

FRAYNE BAKER,
Notary Public of Burleigh County, N. Dak.

My commission expires May 26, 1945.

John Maher, of Morristown, S. Dak., post office, farming in Sioux County, N. Dak., being first duly sworn, does depose and say that he had his truck working on a W. P. A. project under Ray Nehl for a period of 10 months beginning in May of 1938, and that he averaged pay for the use of the truck about $40.80 a month, and out of this he had to pay for gas and oil and keep the truck in repair, and the repairs were more than $100; that he could not afford to rent the truck out, as he was not employed with the truck; that in February 1939 he found it necessary to take the truck off the W. P. A. project and tried to get a personal assignment to W. P. A.; that early in March he applied for relief grants; that he did get a grant for the month of March and understood that he was to receive the same grant for each of the months of April and May, but that he has received nothing since the grant for March; that the information has been put out generally in this locality that in order to participate in the mutual-aid benefits or relief projects that you must be active in or at least join the Farmers Union organization; that there are seven activities relating to farmers' operations in Sioux County, which seven include Soil Conservation, F. S. A., Mutual Aid, Water Conservation, A. A. A., Farmers' Union, and county commissioners; and that insofar as the farmers are concerned these activities are dominated and run by the same three men—James J. Maiher, Ray Nehl, Zale Palmer, combined with Oliver Dahl, secretary of the Farmers Union; that there is a project now being sponsored by the Farmers Union, a land-buying program, which has for its purpose the elimination of all farmers in the community above the ratio of one section for each farmer, and that even though the project has not yet become effective, that talk is current to the effect that the names of the farmers to have these projects are already selected, and that for this reason grants, loans, or assistance are not being provided for those not chosen to remain, and that Soil Conservation checks have even been held up; that the affiant had previously had medical-aid cards and that the cards were allowed to expire before new ones were issued, and that each time in the interim medical assistance had been required, but even though the cards expired through no fault of the affiant, medical bills incurred were refused of payment; that James J. Maiher, Ray Nehl, and Zale Palmer all have Resettlement loans; that the same three have put crops in the ground this year but have done none of the farming themselves; in other words, they are not farming farmers. That of the personal knowledge of the affiant, Zale Palmer, above described, has qualified land for crop insurance by merely running a drill over the weed field without seeding grain properly.

JOHN MAHER.

Subscribed and sworn to this 1st day of June 1939 before me, Frayne Baker, notary public of Burleigh County, N. Dak.

[SEAL] FRAYNE BAKER.

My commission expires May 26, 1945.

I, George Koeffler, Dickinson, N. Dak., post office, being duly sworn, do depose and say that: I don't belong to any union or organization, and don't want to join any. Mr. Kubista, who sells stock for the Farmers Union Creamery, came out to see me about joining the union. I signed a receipt, but I don't know that I signed any note, but I was advised by the Farm Security Administration that there was a check for me to sign for my stock in the Farmers Union. This was a Government check which I saw, and was for $27.50. But I wouldn't, and I haven't signed this check. They told me there wouldn't be any interest to pay, but if I signed a note I understand that there is supposed to be interest on it. Mr. Kubista told me that if I didn't sign the check they might not give me a grant when I needed one, or a Government loan. I haven't had any grants this year and haven't any Government loan, but I did get grants last year. Several of my neighbors, Joe Webber, Valentine Webber, and Tom Steier, who I have talked to, have checks downtown, but they won't sign them either. These are the only neighbors I have talked to and know about. I talked to the manager when he wrote me the first letter, the manager from the Farmers Union Creamery. I went in and told them I am not signing that check, but he said we couldn't force you to sign the check, but we would like to have your help; we would like you to help us out; we need the money to run that creamery. You never have to pay it; just haul my cream and they will take the amount of the dividend off the note. When they sold those shares they always told the same story.

GEORGE KOEFFLER.

Subscribed and sworn to, this 27th day of May 1939, before me, Frayne Baker, notary public of Burleigh County, N. Dak.

[SEAL] FRAYNE BAKER.

My commission expires May 26, 1945.

Mind you, gentlemen, that is a sworn statement. Just because he would not buy a share of stock in a creamery, he could not get a relief grant from the Farm Security Administration. These small-business men have to pay for this relief bill in taxes, and they are entitled to your protection as against the setting up of any competitive business created by relief funds in their community. [Applause.]

I sincerely hope that you will seriously consider this amendment.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does the gentleman's amendment eliminate these political abuses?

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. It will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL]. It removes a racketeering business supported by the Farm Security fund. We have in the State of Wisconsin a certain gentleman who has been on the pay roll of the A. A. A. for many years, who desires to put in factories, storage warehouses, and so forth, out of Farm Security stock. What we want from Farm Security is the man on the farm to be aided and helped, to be made to rehabilitate himself on the farm, and not be engaged in building hosiery factories, manufacturing plants, warehouses, storage plants, and all sorts of things. This is the best amendment offered to this bill today.

I have supported this bill. I believe in the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] not only in his magnificent sincerity but in the manner in which he has taken charge of this bill today, and after many years of sitting up in this Press Gallery and looking over this House, watching his performances, I can say that this has been a great day, because I believe that the Democratic side and the Republican side are working together for those needy persons and they will now have an opportunity to give more aid to these people on the farms. Unless you have seen it, you cannot imagine the distress in a drought area where a man's farm has been swept away, where all of his possessions are gone. He must have aid. He needs it. He needs every dollar of it, and he does not need a lot of manufacturing racketeers. I am ready to vote. I shall vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to tell just casually the full import of the additions made to this section 301 by the amendment which has been suggested. Let me say that section 301 as it stands without this amendment, is the strongest statement against business being interfered with by these Government operations that we have ever had in this law. I think it goes far enough. The

gentleman undertakes to put in here "stores," and then to insert the words "handled and processed." I am unable to say how far that goes and how much it might interfere with this program. I do not believe we ought to enlarge upon that section.

I ask you to vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YOUNGDAHL) there were ayes 114 and noes 171.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCCORMACK, 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 326, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the resolution, as amended, do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. TABER. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 326 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the resolution back to the House with the following changes in those parts of the joint resolution relating to relief and its administration by Works Progress Administration: Provide for allocation of funds to States, Territories, and the District of Columbia by grants-in-aid to enable them to carry out the relief programs determined and administered by them, and in which they participate through reasonable financial and other contributions.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to recommit the resolution.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. 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 373, nays 21, answered "present" 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—373

Alexander	Arends	Barry	Blackney
Allen, La.	Arnold	Bates, Ky.	Bland
Andersen, H. Carl	Ashbrook	Bates, Mass.	Bloom
Anderson, Calif.	Austin	Beam	Boehne
Anderson, Mo.	Ball	Beckworth	Boland
Andrews	Barden	Bell	Bolles
Angell	Barnes	Bender	Boren
Bradley, Mich.	Ford, Miss.	Leavy	Rutherford
Bradley, Pa.	Ford, Thomas F.	LeCompte	Ryan
Brooks	Fries	Lemke	Sabath
Brown, Ga.	Gamble	Lesinski	Sacks
Brown, Ohio	Garrett	Lewis, Colo.	Sandager
Bryson	Gartner	Lewis, Ohio	Sasscer
Buck	Gathings	Ludlow	Satterfield
Buckler, Minn.	Gavagan	McAndrews	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Gearhart	McArdle	Schafer, Wis.
Bulwinkle	Gehrmann	McCormack	Schiffler
Burdick	Gerlach	McDowell	Schuetz
Burgin	Geyer, Calif.	McGehee	Schulte
Byrne, N. Y.	Gibbs	McGranery	Schwert
Byrns, Tenn.	Gilchrist	McKeough	Scrugham
Byron	Gillie	McLaughlin	Seccombe
Caldwell.	Gore	McLeod	Secrest
Cannon, Fla.	Gossett	McMillan, John L.	Seger
Cannon, Mo.	Graham	McMillan, Thos. S.	Shafer, Mich.
Carlson	Grant, Ala.	Maas	Shanley
Carter	Grant, Ind.	Maciejewski	Shannon
Cartwright	Green	Magnuson	Sheppard
Case, S. Dak.	Gregory	Mahon	Simpson
Chandler	Griffith	Maloney	Sirovich
Chapman	Griswold	Mapes	Smith, Conn.
Chiperfield	Gross	Marcantonio	Smith, Ill.
Church	Guyer, Kans.	Marshall	Smith, Maine
Clark	Gwynne	Martin, Colo.	Smith, Ohio
Clason	Hall	Martin, Ill.	Smith, Wash.
Claypool	Halleck	Martin, Iowa	Smith, W. Va.
Clevenger	Hare	Martin, Mass.	Snyder
Cochran	Harness	Mason	Somers, N Y.
Coffee, Nebr.	Harrington	Massingale	South
Coffee, Wash.	Hart	May	Sparkman
Cole, Md.	Harter, N. Y.	Merritt	Spence
Collins	Harter, Ohio	Michener	Springer
Colmer	Hartley	Miller	Starnes, Ala.
Connery	Havenner	Mills, Ark.	Steagall
Cooley	Hawks	Mills, La.	Stearns, N. H.
Cooper	Healey	Mitchell	Stefan
Corbett	Heinke	Monkiewicz	Sullivan
Costello	Hess	Monroney	Sumner, Ill.
Creal	Hinshaw	Moser	Sutphin
Crosser	Hobbs	Mott	Sweeney
Crowe	Holmes	Mouton	Talle
Crowther	Hook	Mundt	Tarver
Culkin	Hope	Murdock, Ariz.	Taylor, Tenn.
Cullen	Horton	Murdock, Utah	Tenerowicz
Curtis	Houston	Murray	Terry
D'Alesandro	Hull	Myers	Thill
Darden	Izac	Nelson	Thomas, N. J.
Darrow	Jacobsen	Nichols	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney	Jarman	Norrell	Thomason
Dempsey	Jarrett	Norton	Thorkelson
DeRouen	Jeffries	O'Brien	Tibbott
Dickstein	Jenkins, Ohio	O'Connor	Tolan
Dingell	Jenks, N. H.	O'Leary	Treadway
Dirksen	Jensen	Oliver	Van Zandt
Disney	Johns	O'Neal	Vincent, Ky.
Ditter	Johnson, Ill.	Osmers	Vinson, Ga.
Dondero	Johnson, Ind.	O'Toole	Voorhis, Calif.
Doughton	Johnson, Luther A.	Pace	Vorys, Ohio
Douglas	Johnson, Lyndon	Parsons	Vreeland
Dowell	Johnson, Okla.	Patrick	Wallgren
Doxey	Johnson, W. Va.	Patton	Walter
Duncan	Jones, Ohio	Pearson	Ward
Dunn	Kean	Peterson, Fla.	Warren
Durham	Kee	Pfeifer	Weaver
Dworshak	Keefe	Pierce, N. Y.	Welch
Eaton, Calif.	Keller	Pittenger	Wheat
Eaton, N. J.	Kennedy, Martin	Poage	Whelchel
Eberharter	Kennedy, Md.	Polk	White, Idaho
Edmiston	Kennedy, Michael	Powers	White, Ohio
Elliott	Keogh	Rabaut	Whittington
Ellis	Kerr	Ramspeck	Wigglesworth
Elston	Kilday	Randolph	Williams, Mo.
Engel	Kinzer	Rayburn	Winter
Englebright	Kitchens	Reece, Tenn.	Wolcott
Evans	Kleberg	Reed, Ill.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Faddis	Knutson	Rees, Kans.	Wolverton, N. J.
Fay	Kocialkowski	Rich	Wood
Fenton	Kramer	Risk	Woodruff, Mich.
Fernandez	Kunkel	Robinson, Utah	Woodrum, Va.
Fish	Lambertson	Robsion, Ky.	Youngdahl
Flaherty	Landis	Rogers, Mass.	Zimmerman
Flannagan	Lanham	Rogers, Okla.	
Flannery	Larrabee	Romjue	
Ford, Leland M.	Lea	Routzohn	

NAYS—21

Burch	Ferguson	Reed, N. Y.	Tinkham
Casey, Mass.	Hoffman	Robertson	Wadsworth
Celler	Luce	Rockefeller	Williams, Del.
Cole, N.Y.	McLean	Short	
Crawford	O'Day	Smith, Va.	
Drewry	Peterson, Ga.	Taber	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Barton

NOT VOTING—36

Allen, Ill.	Boykin	Cox	Fitzpatrick
Allen, Pa.	Brewster	Cummings	Folger
Andresen, A. H.	Cluett	Curley	Fulmer
Bolton	Courtney	Dies	Gifford

Hancock	Jones, Tex.	Owen	Richards
Hendricks	Kelly	Patman	Rodgers, Pa.
Hennings	Kirwan	Pierce, Oreg.	Sumners, Tex.
Hill	McReynolds	Plumley	Taylor, Colo.
Hunter	Mansfield	Rankin	West

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Barton (for) with Mr. West (against).
Mr. August H. Andresen (for) with Mr. Cox (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Jones of Texas with Mr. Brewster.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Allen of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Owen with Mr. Pierce of Oregon.
Mr. Hill with Mr. Courtney.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Curley.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WEST. I withdraw my vote of "yea" and vote "present." The gentleman from Texas, if he were here, would vote "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. KELLY, is ill. Were he here, he would have voted "yea."

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HUNTER, and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KIRWAN, were unavoidably absent. Had they been present, they would have voted "yea."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. ALLEN, was unavoidably detained. Had he been present, he would have voted "yea" on the relief bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. FOLGER, was unavoidably absent. Had he been present, he would have voted "yea."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks upon the relief bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today a telegram from the engineer of my city.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. DOUGHTON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 6851) to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday when the bill H. R. 6851, the tax bill, is taken up for consideration that general debate to be confined to the bill shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and myself.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; this was agreed upon by the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs have until 12 o'clock midnight on Saturday to file a report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that mean both majority report and minority views?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. I understand the minority views have already been filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting speeches made at the Palestine Exhibition at New York City, May 28. I have a report from the Public Printer, inasmuch as it takes over two pages. I now renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENEROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Washington, Mr. KNUTE HILL, is unavoidably absent. Had he been here he would have voted "yea" on the bill just passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Father's Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY]?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the reason for the absence of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KIRWAN, is that he was called away suddenly to Ohio this afternoon. If present, he would have voted "yea," as stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY]?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen from New York, Mr. CURLEY and Mr. FITZPATRICK, were detained from the floor. If present, they would have voted "yea."

CORRUPTION AND CORRECTION

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 17 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with our routine duties nearly done and with pressing measures of many kinds now off our hands, the House shortly faces two matters unobstrustive enough in form but of major moment for the integrity of the Nation.

I

The Hatch bill from the Senate, nervously awaiting action by us, is negatively second to nothing in importance. It faces us with the hard decision as to whether we believe enough in the constitutional way of doing things to cure our democratic ills before they grow chronic and become fatal. Corruption of relief in any form is unmitigatedly pernicious. Party victory won by any sort of cheating sticks in the craw of every patriot; but victory won by prostituting the pride of

the W. P. A. worker or by making appear venal the hunger of the poor is plainly pusillanimous.

As a partisan I apologize for my own party where it is guilty of this, and as a patriot I apologize to the country for the Republican Party when it is guilty of this. But the only apology that sincerely applies is an unfaltering voice raised against such meanness and a prompt vote for its immediate correction. I welcome this chance indeed to put myself down as a Democrat who believes this purification more important than Democratic success in 1940; and I wish to be known as a politician who presumes an election with honor to be infinitely more important than his own reelection. We cannot make it too hard on "vote rustlers," despicable "jack rollers" as they are of our political hustling. They are indeed the immoral equivalent of the cattle rustlers whom in the Texas of my youth we treated to the limb of a tree, without ceremony and without apology. In this spirit I welcome the chance to vote for Senator HATCH's proposal to make penal the offense of using relief to influence elections.

The season is most opportune for the Federal Government to nurture the civic quickening now stirring in our municipalities. Let Chicago remember Kansas City and let Pittsburgh imitate Cincinnati. Let our Nation march with the best of its members to correct corruption in all of its members, but first of all corruption in its own service. This bill is our best chance this session to show the country that we dare to be decent in the face of temptation to win the easy way.

II

Significant as the Hatch bill is, however, its importance is negative and limited. Purity in politics is not enough. We need potency as well as purity. There is work to be done, and skill is required for the doing. To correct corruption without providing for improvement is merely to splurge. The Hatch bill would correct one corruption without correcting what causes corruption.

We are fortunate in having on the way a bill which furthers positively the cause to which the Hatch bill is negatively devoted—the cause of potent purity. I refer to the Ramspeck bill, H. R. 960. I am happy to take my hat off to this quiet southerner, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], for bringing to the birth a bill so important. Without drama but with determination, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], has pursued the unspectacular for the lasting good of his country. As at the beginning of my service I rated the Civil Service Committee of the House more important for me than the Committee on Foreign Affairs, so now I rate the forthcoming bill—fathered and mothered by the gentleman from Georgia—as the most important measure for all of us that will come before the House this session. Only a little perspective is required to see its importance. We as individuals come and go, the Federal services go on, we hope, forever. Who works for the improvement of this service extends the weight of his influence beyond his narrow span of years. Let us lift our eyes with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] to "the ramparts that we guard."

Leaving for the proper time a detailed analysis of the bill to our colleague from Georgia, I beg you in advance to reduce still further the role of patronage in politics. This bill lays another ax to the tap root of our ancient evil. The popular will to get jobs by "pull" is the root of our worst political corruption, and the rotten fruit which we Representatives willy-nilly contribute is our will to win with the aid of those who have already lost their civic independence to us. At election time we push around those who earlier pulled our legs for jobs. Now, this is politics at the lowest possible pitch, the politics, for short, of pull-and-push. It is democracy functioning indeed at or near a dead level with its twin enemies, communism and fascism; for patronage is the pull of fear on the one side and the push of intimidation on the other. It is a practice twice belittling; it belittles him who takes and him who gives.

It was De Tocqueville, the clear-eyed Frenchman, who matched Andrew Jackson's blindness with these words of light upon America five score and five years ago:

> The universal and inordinate desire for place is a great social evil; * * * it destroys the spirit of independence in the citizen, and diffuses a venal and servile humor throughout the frame of society * * * a government which encourages this tendency risks its own tranquillity and places its very existence in great jeopardy.

Most of us politicians derive less pleasure from this profanation of our noble calling than our people think. The error of most of us is not in enjoying it but in lacking courage to stop the foolishness. The few who do get pleasure out of playing this game of joint belittlement are enemies of democracy, however much they pose as friends of the people. The civic art unmatched in its majesty they make to mean using the sacred ballot to club themselves a path to personal power. The bully is ill concealed in such action. Such vulgar peasants of politics should not be allowed permanently to degrade the high opportunity offered the rest of us by public life. Just as there are pleasures gonadic and pleasures gastronomic which civilized men control through standard ideas of conduct, so the moronic pleasure of wielding power over job holders and the ironic pleasure of serving a bully must both be corrected in politics at a level where ideas of voters can count for more than the orders of bosses.

Politics is a game that can be played by decent individuals for the stakes of enlarging public decency and expanding private happiness. But the moronic impulse which turns power into poison must be curbed before we reach a level where a great many things now allowed simply are not done. As many employers, subsequently grateful, fight the industrial decency of collective bargaining, so many politicians, destined to be grateful to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], fight still the spread of political decency toward affairs administrative.

III

It is only a lack of perspective which still permits patronage to be called practical politics. Many Republicans show this short-sightedness by opposing extension of civil service on the ground that the Democrats now have most of the jobs. Many Democrats feel that from their long years in power the Republicans still have more Federal jobs than Democrats. Which of us is right I do not know. But I know which of us is wrong—both of us. For any settlement which perpetually provokes another fight reflects an attitude of mind that dooms politics to preoccupation with its own machinery instead of freeing it for the ends it professes: enhancement of life, enlargement of liberty, embracement of happiness.

We Democrats and Republicans can answer each other perpetually and adequately, and never settle a thing for the better, if we keep our eyes lowered to the level of grab. Indeed, we have been thus answering each other adequately since the beginning of the Republic. Thomas Jefferson started the argument when upon accession to power in 1800 he found all offices in the hands of his political enemies. He argued: "If a due participation of office is a matter of right, how are vacancies to be obtained? Those by death are few; by resignation, none. Can any other mode than that of removal be proposed?"

Well, no partisan on his side spoke up, and Jefferson was in no mood to hear a patriot. So he spread over the deed to be done these high-sounding words—made less high-sounding by the sacrilege of my brackets—and we were off to a start not yet stopped.

> This is a painful office [with just a tinge of pleasure]; but it is made my duty [it always is], and I meet it as such [brave patriot thus to judge his own partisan cause]. * * * It would have been to me a circumstance of great relief [there's little reason to doubt it], had I found a moderate participation of office [spoils never seem moderate to the partisan until they're monstrous] in the hands of the majority. I would gladly have left to time and accident [let a tear drop on the bier of a dead enemy whose job we want] to raise them to their just share. But their total exclusion [it always seems so] calls for prompter corrections [let there be no delay; the deed must be done]. I shall correct the procedure [or make it worse]; but that done [that done, 'tisn't

done] return with joy to that state of things [not yet realized], where the only questions concerning a candidate shall be, Is he honest? Is he capable? Is he faithful to the Constitution? ['Tis a consumation devoutly to be wished.]

Jefferson had some excuse, spite of this grim fun at his expense; and he had the good reason that civil service was not yet born. We have less excuse and hardly any good reason at all for continuing to perpetrate upon public service the inefficiency of patronage and upon our helpless fellow citizens its aristocratic effrontery. Why, the very term itself, "patronage," flouts the patrician patron doling out putrid plums to his "plebs." Little excuse indeed have we and no reason at all, when even the master dispenser of our time, the Honorable James A. Farley, declares in his autobiography:

With time, patience, and hard work, I could construct a major political party in the United States without holding out a single job to deserving partisans.

Mr. Farley has the grace to put the matter honestly, even after his successful and prideful experience with the other way of constructing a major political party in the United States. Says he of his own experience in 1933:

I had anticipated quite a rush of deserving patriots who were willing to help carry the governmental burden, but hadn't the slightest conception of how great the stampede would be.

We need now to call all genuine patriots to our side to furnish the time, patience, and hard work which Mr. Farley prescribes as the conditions of success in this—or, I may add, in any other—worthy enterprise. We are within sight of the formal completion of civil service in the Federal Government; the Ramspeck bill will indeed, but for one exception, complete its extension. But when done in form, the real job of perfecting its spirit remains. That will require more than fair-weather patriots, that will require more than hell-raisers or flag-wavers. [A constituent this week demanded a job of me as payment for carrying one flag, in one parade, for 1 hour!] We friends of merit in government need to rid ourselves of all cult aureoles so as to make what's civil in word civil in deed, what's service in form service in fact. After agitators must come administrators, and fighters abroad are not infrequently critics at home. Security generates its own lethargy, and bureaucracy requires surgeons as well as administrators. A hint to the sufficient is wise.

But our present opportunity is to complete a process long going forward with many sideswipes and not a few head-ons. For just as, in a famous formula, "bad money drives out good money," so the easy virtue of patronage prostitution keeps friends of merit fighting for the honor rather than for the radical improvement of the virtue already achieved. We must not forget the continuing tasks of improvement when the slow advance of a century ends in formal victory. But this final drive may prove the hardest. For already all the old saws are rasping forth their stale stupidities.

And with all the ancient novelties of a century or so comes one new duplicity. We propose to stop corruption in relief through the Hatch bill, but W. P. A. is the one exception we have had to make—for any hope of success—in the Ramspeck bill. We are "agin" corruption, but we are not for correction. It is not even smart to argue so. Nor does it conceal the blowgun caliber of this pop-off of puerile partisans for them to say that W. P. A. may prove temporary. If it has the duration of even a month, we ought to stop whatever corruption is proved; and the only effective way to stop corruption is to make correction; and the way to do this is to provide in manner nonpartisan for all administrative personnel. Let each such partisan look in the mirror and behold in himself a candidate for the council of Wisetown. In Wisetown it was, I think, that the council decreed: First, we will build a new courthouse; second, we will build it of the material in the old courthouse; third, we will not tear the old house down until we have finished the new one.

Of this, why say more? Nobody can fool all the people all the time. The Ramspeck bill, with even this ludicrous exception, will put us way forward on the path of correction. If we do not accept this opportunity to make a gentleman's agreement for the good of the Nation, then I propose a game for all proud partisans to play on the closing day of Congress. It is called "Busting Boobs." You play it in a garden. It is a kind of party, you see. Let each group that loves party advantage more than national welfare line up facing each other not too far apart. Then let each line bow quickly from the hips, to see what boob can "bust" what boob's head in joint deference to partisanship.

Even if this game does not knock any patriotic sense into any partisan's head, it may serve as a common garden-variety party to remind us that even aristocratic England has a better public service than we have been able to effect, in spite of our just pride in business efficiency and in spite of our fine national deference to popular education.

It is high time that we corrected our administrative inferiority, not out of emulation of any foreign power but out of consciousness of our own public power long gone half to waste. The Ramspeck bill, plus other measures from his committee, will complete the larger tasks still before the Federal Government. They will not only regularize the entrance into Federal service, they will also facilitate honorable exit when days of usefulness are done. I do not for the moment speak of that segment of the retirement bill that applies to Congressmen. Sufficient unto that aspect will be our collective wisdom. But to remove from patronage, to put under a merit sign, the remaining jobs of our National Government is to complete our first step toward efficiency in affairs common. It is a long step as well as a first step, though by no means a final step.

IV

What we call civil service is in many a State and not a few cities a virtuous cover-all for the worst iniquities of civic bullies. I know that, and you know that. But to do nothing about it save to be "regusted" is to do nothing about it at all. The Federal civil service will clearly bear improvement, but it has the fine advantage of being for the most part honest. Any equally honest politician, who does not like it, is estopped from crying up its vices until he has himself piped down on patronage. For the patronage system is not only infinitely worse, but it is his patronage encroachment upon the civil service which mostly creates the evils complained of by him in the civil service. Only a clown should be allowed thus to cry aloud his own self-mutilation without being laughed out of court. And the American public is rapidly detecting clownishness in whoever does it. We shall correct the evils of the civil service only by perfecting it in and through the practice of merit in getting and keeping all skilled public employees.

It is no longer time for administrative clowning, with our domestic debt what it is, with our position among the nations what it is, with our relief load what it is. Our best chance to reduce the rate of governmental spending by Republicans or Democrats is to increase efficiency through stopping the avoidable waste of patronage. Our best chance to get intelligent solutions of economic problems through means political is for us politicians to free ourselves from being inefficient employment agencies so that we may have a little time to learn, to think, and to confer on problems of state. A term in Congress should be and could be a liberal education at public expense, but to many it becomes, for this very perversion of its function, a kind of "durance vile." Our best chance to increase our self-respect and respect before the country is to stop doing what we cannot do well and learn to do better what we are here to do, the devising of wise public policies through the compromise of our deep differences.

Some politicians believe it suicide to their own hopes thus to free themselves of patronage. It may be so for them. It may be so for all. But an honorable death is more than comes to every man. It is arguable, on the plane of success, that the best chance of a man to be reelected is to make himself worthy of reelection. That is a faith, yes; but a faith which to forfeit is openly to renounce the democratic way of life. No Representative is worthy of reelection if he steals to get it, nor is he fully worthy unless he is willing to clear his mind for

legislation by sweeping his desk clean of the excrescences of irresponsible job brokerage.

V

The Hatch bill, then, gives us a chance to rid ourselves of vermin. Let us do it. But it will do little good, if that is all we do. Dogs that live with fleas can never gnaw themselves clean. To be afraid to be unclean is no recipe for cleanliness. Nor is it enough for cleanliness merely to want to be clean. We must maintain a housekeeper to keep our cleaned residence spick and span. The civil service is our best national housekeeper for administrative affairs. The Ramspeck bill, extending its domain, can give our will to decency the wit to win through to national cleanliness. Nothing can be done in government save through machinery carefully created and closely watched. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] proposes to extend the machinery for positive improvement and we shall watch it until our Government has as good administration as American business is said to have.

The Hatch bill can be made to cure an abnormal perversion of present politics. The Ramspeck bill can finish the cure of our normal perversion, the practice of personal patronage at public expense. This Congress ought not to go home until both bills are law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with reference to the National Youth Administration, the appropriation for which is included in the bill just passed, together with a few telegrams and letters which I received pertaining thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARRETT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the request of the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

JOHN MUIR-KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

House Resolution 223

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 H. R. 3794, a bill to establish the John Muir-Kings Canyon National Park Calif., to transfer thereto the lands now included in the General Grant National Park, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a report from the United States Commissioner of Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Des Moines Register.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. PIERCE, has been in close attendance all day, but, due to his physical condition and the lateness of the hour, it was necessary for him to absent himself. Had he been present he would have voted "yea" on the bill just passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the bill H. R. 6853, and to include a copy of the bill—and it is a short bill—and also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on Flag Day, and to include a certain quotation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain magazine and newspaper articles and a letter from a business concern in Minneapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER]?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BOLTON; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GIFFORD; the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. PLUMLEY; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. RODGERS, were unavoidably absent. If they had been present, they would all have voted "yea" on the relief bill just passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a communication from a woolen mill in Woonsocket, R. I., and some newspaper articles concerning trade agreements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include an address delivered before the Executive Club of Chicago by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and to include also the introduction by the president of that club.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file minority views of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the neutrality bill, that these views be incorporated with the majority views when filed, and that the minority views be placed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address made by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short address of mine on neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at the point in the RECORD where I offered three amendments while we were in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the floor this evening and include therein certain additional affidavits.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KELLY (at the request of Mr. BEAM), on account of serious illness.

To Mr. PACE, for June 19 to 21, inclusive, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business on the Consent Calendar in order on Monday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 162. An act to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States;

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Roland P. Winstead;

H. R. 805. An act to extend further time for naturalization to alien veterans of the World War under the act approved May 25, 1932 (47 Stat. 165), to extend the same privileges to certain veterans of countries allied with the United States during the World War, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1363. An act for the relief of George Houston;

H. R. 2058. An act for the relief of Jessie Denning Van Eimeren, A. C. Van Eimeren, and Clara Adolph;

H. R. 2179. An act to ratify and confirm certain interest rates on loans made from the revolving fund authorized by section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, approved June 15, 1929 (46 Stat. 11), and for other purposes;

H. R. 2200. An act to dispense with particular allegations as to renunciation of allegiance in petitions for naturalization and in the oath of renunciation of foreign allegiance by omitting the name of "the prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty" of which the petitioner for naturalization is a subject or citizen;

H. R. 2251. An act for the relief of Russell Anderegg, a minor, and George W. Anderegg;

H. R. 2478. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Milling Co. and Wisconsin Telephone Co.;

H. R. 2583. An act for the relief of A. W. Evans;

H. R. 2695. An act for the relief of Kenneth B. Clark;

H. R. 3065. An act to amend Public Law No. 370, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 906);

H. R. 3077. An act for the relief of Adam Casper;

H. R. 3132. An act to authorize the disposal of cemetery lots;

H. R. 3367. An act to define the status of certain lands purchased for the Choctaw Indians, Mississippi;

H. R. 4084. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938;

H. R. 4745. An act relating to benefit assessments from condemnation proceedings for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of alleys or minor streets;

H. R. 4940. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5066. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate proceedings in adoption in the District of Columbia," approved August 25, 1937;

H. R. 5436. An act to authorize the grant of a sewer right-of-way and operation of sewage-treatment plant on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., by the village of Youngstown, N. Y.;

H. R. 5474. An act to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938;

H. R. 5488. An act to provide for the widening of Wisconsin Avenue in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5680. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (Public, No. 187, 72d Cong.);

H. R. 5801. An act to grant permission for the construction, maintenance, and use of a certain underground conduit for electrical lines in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5933. An act for the relief of Frances Virginia McCloud;

H. R. 5934. An act for the relief of W. Elisabeth Beitz;

H. R. 5935. An act for the relief of Charlotte J. Gilbert;

H. R. 5966. An act to establish a Coast Guard Reserve to be composed of owners of motorboats and yachts;

H. R. 5987. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925 (43 Stat. 1119);

H. R. 6109. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River at or near the city of Niagara Falls, N. Y.; and

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to provide that the United States extend to foreign governments invitations to participate in the Seventh International Congress for the Rheumatic Diseases to be held in the United States during the calendar year 1940, and to authorize an appropriation to assist in meeting the expenses of the session.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes a. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 19, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Monday, June 19, 1939, beginning at 10 a. m., there will be continued a public hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill (H. R. 6369) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto; to create a Railroad Reorganization Court; and for other purposes.

There will be continued a public hearing before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary on Wednesday, June 21, 1939, at 10 a. m., on the bill (H. R. 2318) to divorce the business of production, refining, and transporting of petroleum products from that of marketing petroleum products. Room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings in room 219, House Office Building, at 10 a. m., on the bills and dates listed below:

On Tuesday, June 20, 1939, on H. R. 4307 (committee print), to extend the provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to all common carriers by water in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the committee rooms, the Capitol, on Tuesday, June 20, 1939, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of S. 326, for the payment of awards and appraisals heretofore made in favor of citizens of the United States on claims presented under the General Claims Convention of September 8, 1923, United States and Mexico.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

871. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 20, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 28, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 342); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

872. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision affecting an existing appropriation for the Bureau of Biological Survey, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

873. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the fiscal year 1939 and prior fiscal years, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 344); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

874. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1939, to remain available until June 30, 1940, amounting to $34,400, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

875. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for administrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration, for the fiscal year 1940, amounting to $1,500,000, such sum to consist of not to exceed $500,000 from the mutual mortgage insurance fund and not to exceed $1,000,000 from the account in the Treasury comprised of funds derived from premiums collected under title I of the National Housing Act (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

876. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision affecting the appropriation for the War Department for "acquisition of lands for radio beacons, Army," contained in the Military Appropriation Act, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

[*Omitted from the Record of January 30, 1939*]

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. House Resolutions 325 and 408, Seventy-fifth Congress. Resolutions on a survey and inspection of soldiers' hospitals and other Veterans' Administration facilities; with amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[*Submitted June 16, 1939*]

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 159. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection thereon of the Columbian Fountain in Washington, D. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6852. A bill authorizing Federal participation in the commemoration and observance of the four hundredth anniversary of the explorations of Francisco Vasquez de Coronado, establishing a commission for that purpose, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 278. Joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of an additional sum of $851,111.59 for Federal participation in the New York World's Fair, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 291. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to accept the invitation of the Government of Norway to the Government of the United States to participate in an International Exhibition of Polar Exploration, which will be held at Bergen, Norway, in 1940, and authorizing an appropriation to cover the expenses of such participation; without amendment (Rept. No. 851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 320. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 46, approved August 9, 1935, entitled "Joint resolution requesting the President to extend to the International Statistical Institute an invitation to hold its twenty-fourth session in the United States in 1939"; without amendment (Rept. No. 852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 223. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3794, a bill to establish the John Muir-Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., to transfer thereto the lands now included in the General Grant National Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 853). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6836. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6851. A bill to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6093) for the relief of Irene E. Smith; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6210) for the relief of George R. Stringer; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6339) for the relief of Frances Wetterer; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6358) for the relief of Ira Ellis Veal; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6418) for the relief of Ellsworth Grant Waters; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6436) for the relief of H. W. Sharpe, trustee for the stockholders of the Joliet Forge Co., and the estates of the Joliet National Bank and the Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, of Joliet, Ill.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6463) for the relief of James D. Scott; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Civil Service.

A bill (H. R. 6483) for the relief of Henry J. McCann; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6571) granting a pension to Jesse P. Gaither; Committee on Claims discharged, and 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. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 6869. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Plum River and its tributaries in Carroll County, Ill., for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 6870. A bill to grant to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a retrocession of jurisdiction over the General Clarence R. Edwards Memorial Bridge, bridging Watershops Pond of the Springfield Armory Military Reservation in the city of Springfield, Mass.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 6871. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture more effectively to assist in the voluntary adjustment of indebtedness between farm debtors and their creditors; to provide for the transfer of certain mortgages and foreclosed farm property from the Federal land banks to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the refinancing thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 6872. A bill to amend sections 4886, 4887, 4920, and 4929 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 31, 32, 69, and 73); to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6873. A bill to amend sections 4904, 4909, 4911, and 4915 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 52, 57, 59a, and 63); to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LUCE:

H. R. 6874. A bill to repeal section 4896 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 8), and amend sections 4885 and 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 41 and 78); to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MYERS:

H. R. 6875. A bill to amend section 4903 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 51); to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6876. A bill to make uniform in the District of Columbia the law on fresh pursuit and to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to cooperate with the States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIROVICH:

H. R. 6877. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 851), as amended (40 Stat. 705; 35 U. S. C. 68), so as to protect the United States in certain patent-infringement suits; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 6878. A bill to amend section 4894 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 37); to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 6879. A bill, Peace Act of 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CULLEN:

H. R. 6880. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey an easement in certain lands to the city of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6881. A bill to implement the provisions of the Shipowners' Liability (sick and injured seamen) Convention, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6882. A bill authorizing the continuance of the prison industries reorganization administration, established by Executive Order No. 7194 of September 26, 1935, to June 30, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 6883. A bill to provide for more expeditious payment of amounts due to farmers under agricultural programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6884. A bill to encourage travel in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUYER of Kansas:

H. R. 6885. A bill to aid the several States in making, or for having made, certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FADDIS:

H. R. 6893. A bill to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War, and who have not attained the rank to which recommended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6894. A bill to amend section 186 of the Criminal Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. J. Res. 328. Joint resolution to provide free admission to historic shrines owned by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia and Arlington County, Va.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEA:

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print and bind the proceedings of Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in the rotunda, upon acceptance of the statue of Will Rogers, presented by the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CULKIN:

H. R. 6886. A bill granting a pension to Mabel Schermerhorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 6887. A bill granting an increase of pension to Cyrus G. Fox; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 6888. A bill for the relief of Esther Jacobs; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 6889. A bill for the relief of Frances M. Hannah; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SACKS:

H. R. 6890. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Spagnuolo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 6891. A bill for the relief of William M. Irvine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 6892. A bill for the relief of Willard Isham, executor of the estate of Clara H. Isham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLUETT:

H. R. 6895. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth S. Weishaar; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 6896. A bill for the relief of the Nathan Products Corporation; 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:

3815. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Lester House, of Coshocton, Ohio, and 231 others, urging passage of the Casey bill (H. R. 6470); to the Committee on Appropriations.

3816. By Mr. CULKIN: Resolution passed by the State of New York in senate and and assembly, petitioning the Congress of the United States to recognize the responsibility of the Federal Government for hospitalization of the alien insane and defective and to take appropriate action to this end; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3817. Also, petition of Julia K. Rice, of Oswego, N. Y., and 59 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3818. By Mr. CURLEY: Letter of the Harlem River Towboat Line, Inc., of New York City, opposing the Lea bill, to regulate water transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3819. By Mr. CARTER: Senate joint resolution of the California Legislature, No. 23, memorializing Congress to provide for the control of the mud flow of Mount Shasta; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3820. Also, Senate Joint Resolution of the California Legislature, No. 19, memorializing Congress to construct a breakwater and port of refuge at Pillar Point, San Mateo County, Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3821. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, New York City, urging support of House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3822. By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: Petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, New York City, urging enactment of House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3823. Also, petition of Works Progress Administration Teachers' Union, Local 453, of the American Federation of Teachers, New York City, expressing opposition to certain provisions of the relief appropriation bill for 1940, and urging adoption of House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3824. Also, petition of the Labor's Non-Partisan League, expressing opposition to certain provisions of the relief appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1940; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3825. Also, petition of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, comprising a membership of 13,000 civil employees in the city and State of New York, urging enactment of House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3826. Also, petition of the Workers Alliance of America, urging enactment of House bill 6470, the Casey-Murray bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3827. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of Bart Manganaro, James Moreschi, Lillian Oriowsky, Charles Davis, Herman Drimer, and Sidney Killner, of New York City, concerning House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3828. Also, petition of the Building Trades Employer's Association, New York City, concerning Works Progress Administration projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3829. Also, petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, favoring House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3830. Also, petition of the New York Joint Council of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, favoring House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3831. Also, petition of Works Progress Administration Teachers' Union, New York City, favoring House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3832. Also, petition of the National Conference of Church-related Colleges, Washington, D. C., concerning Senate bill 1305, the Thomas bill; to the Committee on Education.

3833. Also, Petition of Labor's Nonpartisan League, Washington, D. C., favoring House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3834. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., relative to Congress authorizing additional loans to local housing agencies, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3835. Also, resolution of the Veterans of the Spanish-American War, G. O. 40 Association, Inc., relative to Maj. Gen. George Van Horn Moseley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3836. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of members of the Klover Reading Klub of Hancock County, Greenfield, Ind., protesting against the involvement of the United States in any foreign conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3837. By Mr. MOTT: Petition of K. E. Marcy, of Marshfield, Oreg., and 29 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3838. Also, petition of F. J. Austin, of Corvallis, Oreg., and 59 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3839. Also, petition of J. W. Wunn, of Eugene, Oreg., and 29 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3840. Also, petition of George Bowman, of Reedsport, Oreg., and 44 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3841. Also, petition of Charles H. Walter, of Marshfield, Oreg., and 59 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3842. Also, petition of Christ Anton, of Marshfield, Oreg., and 29 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3843. Also, petition of William M. Cox, of Marshfield, Oreg., and 29 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3844. Also, petition of K. E. Marcy, of Marshfield, Oreg., and 59 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3845. Also, petition of F. S. Draper, of Marshfield, Oreg., and 29 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3846. Also, petition of Ewen Gillis, of Eastside, Oreg., and 29 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3847. Also, petition of F. R. Kirk, of Marshfield, Oreg., and 29 others, asking for the enactment of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3848. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Works Progress Administration Teachers' Union, Local 453, of the American Federation of Teachers, New York City, favoring House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3849. Also, petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, New York City, favoring House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3850. Also, petition of the Labor Nonpartisan League, Washington, D. C., favoring House bill 6470, the Casey bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3851. Also, petition of the Ohio River Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, opposing Senate bill 2009, the Wheeler bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3852. By Mr. SWEENEY: Petition of American Citizens of Irish Lineage, New York City, concerning the arrest and imprisonment of Sean Russell; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3853. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6470, for the relief of unemployment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3854. Also, petition of the Regular Veterans' Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 5960, favoring the establishment of a national park on the site of the Battle of Franklin; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 19, 1939

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 15, 1939)

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

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

Eternal Father, as we enter into Thy presence in this sanctuary of prayer to speak our inmost thoughts to Thine understanding heart: Make us conscious of the fact that there is a hidden dignity in our souls and a grandeur about our opportunities awaiting our discovery. Grant to us such insight and enthusiasm that the routine of our days, the unromantic duty, the dull task, the prosaic fellowship, even the whole order of existence, from which the hope of novelty has long since fled, may shine in wondrous light, as, with open eyes, we look into the heart of Thy law. Help us all in these momentous days to see our path and to love it; to be equal to life's highest possibilities; and, in finding Thee once more in our duty, may we also discover Thee in the range and richness and mastery of all our powers. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 15, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING RECESS—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 15th instant, the following message from the House of Representatives was received by the Secretary on June 16, 1939: That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 162. An act to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States;

H. R. 312. An act for the relief of Roland P. Winstead;

H. R. 805. An act to extend further time for naturalization to alien veterans of the World War under the act approved May 25, 1932 (47 Stat. 165), to extend the same privileges to certain veterans of countries allied with the United States during the World War, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1363. An act for the relief of George Houston;

H. R. 2058. An act for the relief of Jessie Denning Van Eimeren, A. C. Van Eimeren, and Clara Adolph;

H. R. 2179. An act to ratify and confirm certain interest rates on loans made from the revolving fund authorized by section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, approved June 15, 1929 (46 Stat. 11), and for other purposes;

H. R. 2200. An act to dispense with particular allegations as to renunciation of allegiance in petitions for naturalization and in the oath of renunciation of foreign allegiance, by omitting the name of "the prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty" of which the petitioner for naturalization is a subject or citizen;

H. R. 2251. An act for the relief of Russell Anderegg, a minor, and George W. Anderegg;

H. R. 2478. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Milling Co. and Wisconsin Telephone Co.;

H. R. 2583. An act for the relief of A. W. Evans;

H. R. 2695. An act for the relief of Kenneth B. Clark;

H. R. 3065. An act to amend Public Law No. 370, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 906);

H. R. 3077. An act for the relief of Adam Casper;

H. R. 3132. An act to authorize the disposal of cemetery lots;

H. R. 3367. An act to define the status of certain lands purchased for the Choctaw Indians, Mississippi;

H. R. 4084. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938;

H. R. 4745. An act relating to benefit assessments from condemnation proceedings for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of alleys or minor streets;

H. R. 4940. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5066. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate proceedings in adoption in the District of Columbia," approved August 25, 1937;

H. R. 5436. An act to authorize the grant of a sewer right-of-way and operation of sewage-treatment plant on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., by the village of Youngstown, N. Y.;

H. R. 5474. An act to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938;

H. R. 5488. An act to provide for the widening of Wisconsin Avenue in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5680. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (Public, No. 187, 72d Cong.);

H. R. 5801. An act to grant permission for the construction, maintenance, and use of a certain underground conduit for electrical lines in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5933. An act for the relief of Frances Virginia McCloud;

H. R. 5934. An act for the relief of W. Elisabeth Deitz;

H. R. 5935. An act for the relief of Charlotte J. Gilbert;

H. R. 5966. An act to establish a Coast Guard Reserve to be composed of owners of motorboats and yachts;

H. R. 5987. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925 (43 Stat. 1119); and

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to provide that the United States extend to foreign governments invitations to participate in the Seventh International Congress for the Rheumatic Diseases to be held in the United States during the calendar year 1940, and to authorize an appropriation to assist in meeting the expenses of the session.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1796) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, disagreed to