THE WAY OF SECURITY
BY FRANCES PERKINS

President Roosevelt closed his message to Congress in June with these words:

We must dedicate ourselves anew to a recovery of the old and sacred possessive rights for which mankind has constantly struggled—homes, livelihood and individual security. The road to these values is the way of progress. Neither you nor I will rest content until we have done our utmost to move further on that road.

It is, indeed, a way of progress we seek rather than a makeshift to tide us over the present emergency. We are looking not only for a plan to alleviate today's miseries, but to prevent, as far as is humanly possible, their recurrence.

We talk of the New Deal without perhaps realizing fully the conditions which have made the New Deal so necessary. Blinded by superficial appearances, few looked far enough ahead in the years of so-called prosperity to see whether the road was leading, or realized that we were coming to a sharp turn where the old signposts meant little or nothing. Clearly a system which will assure personal security to the individual can only be achieved by wise planning based on careful and far-sighted examination of the many factors involved.

Starting as we are from a depth of personal insecurity such as we have never known before, we must look to it that we build a sound and enduring system. The clutter and debris of the past must be cleared away. Old values, old ideas, must be examined, not in relation to their worth in the past but for their usefulness in the changing present.

It was to conduct a detailed study on the basis of which sound legislation might be formulated for presentation to the Seventy-fourth Congress for action that the Committee on Economic Security was appointed by the President last June. The Committee includes the secretary of labor as chairman, the secretary of the treasury, the attorney general, the secretary of agriculture and the federal emergency relief administrator, all of whose departments have a special interest in the problems under consideration, has been appointed to assist the Committee in an advisory capacity. Edwin E. Witte, well-known labor economist, is directing the study, which is being made by a staff of experts. We also have the helpful cooperation of the Advisory Council on Economic Security, prominent representative citizens whose advice will be sought not so much on technical details as on broad general policies. The Committee's report is to be made to the President in December.

It is clear that the Committee's problem is a dual one—to map a course which can be adopted with the least possible delay to meet our present abnormal situation and to outline at the same time a long-range program into which every step taken now shall fit as part of a comprehensive and coordinated system. Only in this way can we expect to achieve our ultimate goal: the greatest possible measure of security for the individual citizen against the hazards of life over which he has no control. While it is out of the question to expect the complete program to be put into effect at once, we certainly cannot adopt a do-nothing policy in the meantime or take refuge in haphazard, stop-gap measures.

While the problem of insecurity is one which affects 90 percent of the American people, unemployment is obviously the most important single cause of today's distress. Almost 80 percent of the families now receiving relief have been driven to seek public aid from this reason alone. There has been an estimated increase of 4 million employed from the appalling low point of March 1933. Between 7 to 9 million of the 50 million persons who are normally gainfully employed were still without employment (other than relief work) in September 1934, according to the estimate of the American Federation of Labor. Above 1 million were employed on emergency projects through the Public Works Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

In his radio address of September 30, President Roosevelt stated very clearly his attitude toward unemployment:

Some people try to tell me that we must make up our minds that for the future we shall permanently have millions of unemployed just as other countries have had them for over a decade. What may be necessary for those countries is not my responsibility to determine. But as for this country, I stand or fall by my refusal to accept as a necessary condition of our future a permanent army of unemployed.

This statement, however, must not be taken to mean that the President expects that there will never be unemployment in the future. There never has been a time in any country when literally every able-bodied man who wanted work had a job. Even in good times unemployment was a much more serious problem than was generally realized; on the average some 2 million persons were unemployed in what were considered our most prosperous years.

In considering this problem, we must realize that unemployment occurs from a great variety of causes. There is seasonal unemployment and technological unemployment, as well as cyclical unemployment. I am not one of those who believe that improvements in processes of production will result in an ever-increasing volume of unemployment. But changes in technique and market demands constantly involve some wage earners in more or less prolonged unemployment. Even in the twenties many industries were declining. Nor should we forget that in industries which are prospering, some firms are constantly losing out, with resulting unemployment to many. Individuals lose their jobs from a still greater variety of causes and while often they promptly get other jobs, the reverse is just as likely to be true. There need be no permanent army of the unemployed; the unemployed will not be the same people. Even now there is considerable interchange between the employed and the unemployed. But we must recognize that unemployment will long continue to be a great hazard for all wage earners.

The problem is far too complex to be solved by any one formula or "ism." I do not look upon unemployment insurance as a panacea. It has distinct limitations, but also great values. It is particularly beneficial to the largest single group in our population—the regularly employed, steady, industrial workers. For them unemployment insurance is a dependable first line of defense.

A beginning has been made in the Wisconsin unemployment reserves and compensation act—admittedly an
inadequate law but a pioneer step of progress. In many other states unemployment insurance bills were seriously considered in the last regular legislative sessions; in five of them bills were favorably acted upon in one house. In Congress the Wagner-Lewis bill was endorsed by the President and recommended for passage by the House Committee on Labor.

The great opportunity to inaugurate unemployment insurance on a nation-wide basis lies ahead, however, and it is the subject to which our Committee is devoting probably more attention than to any other question. Our study in this field is headed by Bryce Stewart of the Industrial Relations Counsellors, Inc., who has been studying unemployment insurance continuously for fifteen years and has also had practical experience in employment-office and unemployment-insurance administration. I have little doubt that our Committee will recommend the enactment of a national unemployment-insurance law, which, however, as the President indicated in his message in June, will require cooperation by the states. I believe that the coming winter offers the best opportunity we are likely to have for a generation to gain unemployment insurance in this country. But many difficulties still have to be overcome and all who believe in unemployment insurance should make their reasons clear both to the Congress and to the state legislatures.

In our interest in unemployment insurance, we are not neglecting other major hazards. Social insurance is being considered from many angles: workmen's compensation, accident, health and invalidity insurance, retirement annuities and old-age pensions, survivors' insurance, family endowment and maternity benefits and assistance to dependent children and families without a breadwinner. The problems of providing work, training, or opportunities for self-employment for the unemployed are also being investigated, and the costs, the handling of funds and all the various financial aspects are being carefully analyzed.

Accidents are among the hazards which contribute to the insecurity of the average person. In normal periods, around 25,000 workers are killed in industry annually, 150,000 suffer permanent injuries and nearly 3 million some temporary disability; non-industrial accidents take a much heavier toll. Sickness, it is estimated, costs the American people annually $900 million in lost earnings and $13 1/2 billion for medical care. The real tragedy in these figures lies in the fact that some people are sick a long time and that many people cannot pay for the necessary care when they are ill. Medical care for a large segment of our population has therefore been both inadequate and an unfair burden on the medical profession, which alone of all professions has been expected to render free service to the poor. While medical facilities are better today than they have ever been, hospitals are half empty and physicians and nurses idle because so many people can not afford badly needed services.

Some governmental responsibility for the health of the people has been assumed through the Public Health Service which, by its preventive and educational work, has performed a greater service than is generally realized. A growing number of hospitals, visiting-nursing organizations and similar services conducted by municipalities, counties and states extend free service or services at reduced rates to indigents and to persons with low incomes. At the same time, there has been a growing public response to the principle of insurance as shown by the rapid spread of group hospitalization plans in the past two years.

Compulsory health insurance has been accepted abroad by both physicians and lay persons as a great public benefit; the most successful systems are those set up in cooperation with the medical profession. The possibilities of some advance-payment plan for medical and hospital care, developed along lines adapted to our American conditions are being studied for our Committee by Edgar Sydenstricker, chief statistician of the United States Public Health Service and director of medical research for the Milbank Memorial Fund, and by J. S. Falk, also of the Milbank Fund, whose services were made available to us at our request.

We are studying also the possibilities of extending public-health facilities, particularly in the preventive field. With illness, as with all other hazards, prevention insofar as is possible is vastly more important than cure or relief. Thanks largely to the initiative and the progressive attitude of the American medical profession we have made great progress in the prevention of illness, but we certainly have not realized what might be done to keep all the people well. In all our studies touching on health problems we shall seek the advice and cooperation of the medical profession. We are organizing a general medical advisory committee and special groups of consultants on dental, public health, and hospital problems. Our best hope for constructive progress in this field lies in the active cooperation of the profession and its assistance in working-out a program advantageous alike to its members and to the public.

As for the hazards of old age, we know that of the 6 3/4 million of our people of sixty-five years or over a very large proportion is financially dependent. Competent observers estimate that in 1930 approximately 2,700,000 were supported wholly or partly by others; last December about half a million were receiving emergency relief, while 115,000 were receiving state pensions, with a long waiting list of eligibles. Large numbers of the aged have lost all their savings in the depression, and unemployment has made it impossible for many children to continue to support their parents.

There is another factor, which, while not properly an old-age problem, cannot be ignored in a well-rounded program of security. For occupations requiring great strength or dexterity, a considerable number of plants have established rules barring most of the older workers. In lines where skill and experience count, the older workers are not discriminated against, but for the lower-income groups—unskilled and semi-skilled—even middle age is a distinct handicap. The age limit for women employees seems to be lower than for men, probably because women are largely employed in tasks requiring dexterity and speed. While we cannot accept without protest a system which screws men and women at 45 or under, we must realize that there is a growing group of older workers for whom employment opportunities must be provided if they are to enjoy reasonable security.

Twenty-eight states now have some system of old-age pensions and the coverage is being progressively extended to a larger group. There are,
however, several obvious defects in the present schemes. Residence requirements are high; the age at which persons become eligible, usually seventy, is too late; and the system of local administration is open to serious criticism. The chief objection, however, is that financial provisions are usually meager. Under the present situation, although the coverage has increased on paper, actually the systems are breaking down. Fewer eligibles are in fact receiving the pensions. Instead they are lumped with their children or other relatives, on relief—an "economy" which has little to recommend it. Some form of government subsidy, granted on the acceptance of standard requirements, is obviously indicated.

Non-contributory pensions given to a person on reaching a certain age must necessarily be small and based, at least to some extent, on need. Sympathy with the right of old people to a decent life in their declining years is naturally great, but we cannot afford to let our enthusiasm blind us to the underlying economic factors, or sweep us into unsound legislation. Since the President's message to Congress in June, there have sprung up all over the country schemes for promoting large pensions for elderly people regardless of need. The large following which some of these unrealistic schemes have attracted shows very clearly the need of a carefully studied and definite plan. The way of progress to real security for the greatest number can never lie in such "get-rich-quick" schemes.

NON-CONTRIBUTORY systems of old-age pensions have been in operation in Europe for many years. Small, but fairly adequate, pensions are granted to persons whose income falls below a standard minimum on arrival at a certain age. The tendency has been to set up, in addition to these grants, which are of course being increased, a system of insurance by which on arrival at a specified age, the old person receives as a right a pension towards which he has contributed during his working years. The recent Railroad Retirement Act is an American example of this type of legislation. Barbara N. Armstrong of the University of California, author of Insuring the Essentials, is in charge of our study on provisions for old-age security, with Professor J. Douglas Brown of Princeton and Murray Latimer, chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, as advisors.

The hazard of death overhangs us at all ages. As a nation we are beginning to wake up to the fact that the wage earners. Large groups of self-employed people of low incomes—farmers, artists, teachers and other professional people, many tradesmen and a considerable number of small employers—are quite as much in need of additional measures for personal economic security as is the so-called industrial population.

The secretary of agriculture is a member of the Committee on Economic Security and his department has undertaken the responsibility for making recommendations on measures to give an added security to farmers and agricultural workers. While it is difficult to give adequate protection to the self-employed, they can not be overlooked in any adequate program for economic security. Sentiment in favor of security legislation is evidently growing rapidly. At the worst, I believe, the inevitable opposition will only retard, not prevent, the ultimate achievement of our objective.

I believe that actual depression will be averted if we get on with our job. It is a question of amount and timing. The country is growing so rapidly that our concern must be rather to avoid being swept into hasty or ill-considered action. With a well-conceived program carefully thought through, we can move with confidence, slowly but surely, on that way of security to which we are committed.
PRESIDENT Roosevelt closed his message to Congress in June with these words:

We must dedicate ourselves anew to a recovery of the old and sacred possessive rights for which mankind has constantly struggled—homes, livelihood and individual security. The road to these values is the way of progress. Neither you nor I will rest content until we have done our utmost to move further on that road.

It is, indeed, a way of progress we seek rather than a make-shift to tide us over the present emergency. We are looking not only for a plan to alleviate today's miseries, but to prevent, as far as is humanly possible, their recurrence.

We talk of the New Deal without perhaps realizing fully the conditions which have made the New Deal so necessary. Blinded by superficial appearances, few looked far enough ahead in the years of so-called prosperity to see whether the road was leading, or realized that we were coming to a sharp turn where the old sign-posts meant little or nothing.

Clearly a system which will assure personal security to the individual can only be achieved by wise planning based on careful and far-sighted examination of the many factors involved.

Starting as we are from a depth of personal insecurity such as we have never known before, we must look to it that we build a sound and enduring system. The clutter and debris of the past must be cleared away. Old values, old ideas, must be examined, not in relation to their worth in the past but for their usefulness in the changing present.

It was to conduct a detailed study on the basis of which sound legislation might be formulated for presentation to the Seventy-fourth Congress for action that the Committee on Economic Security was appointed by the President last June.

The Committee includes the secretary of labor as chairman, the secretary of the treasury, the attorney general, the secretary of agriculture and the federal emergency relief administrator, all of whose departments have a special interest in the problems of national security. Under the leadership of A. J. Aitkneyn, assistant secretary of labor, a technical board made up of outstanding persons in the government service, with special knowledge of the problems under consideration, has been appointed to assist the Committee in an advisory capacity. Edwin F. Witte, well-known labor economist, is directing the study, which is being made by a staff of experts.

We also have the helpful cooperation of the Advisory Council on Economic Security, prominent representative citizens whose advice will be sought not so much on technical details as on broad general policies. The Committee's report is to be made to the President in December.

While the problem of insecurity is one which affects 90 percent of the American people, unemployment is obviously the most important single cause of today's distress. Almost 80 percent of the families now receiving relief have been driven to seek public aid from this reason alone. There has been an estimated increase of 4 million employed from the appalling low point of March 1933. Between 7-9 million of the 50 million persons who are normally gainfully employed were still without employment (other than relief work) in September 1934, according to the estimate of the American Federation of Labor. Above 1 million were employed on emergency projects through the Public Works Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

In his radio address of September 30, President Roosevelt stated very clearly his attitude toward unemployment:

Some people try to tell me that we must make up our minds that for the future we shall permanently have millions of unemployed just as other countries have had them for over a decade. What may be necessary for those countries is not my responsibility to determine. But as for this country, I stand or fall by my refusal to accept as a necessary condition of our future a permanent army of unemployed.

This statement, however, must not be taken to mean that the President expects that there will never be unemployment in the future. There never has been a time in any country when literally every able-bodied man who wanted work had a job. Even in good times unemployment was a much more serious problem than was generally realized; on the average some 2 million persons were unemployed in what were considered our most prosperous years.

Considering this problem, we must realize that unemployment occurs from a great variety of causes. There is seasonal unemployment and technological unemployment, as well as cyclical unemployment. I am not one of those who believe that improvements in processes of production will result in an ever-increasing volume of unemployment. But changes in technique and market demands constantly involve some wage earners in more or less prolonged unemployment. Even in the twenties many industries were declining. Nor should we forget that in industries which are prospering, some firms are constantly losing out, with resulting unemployment to many. Individuals lose their jobs from a still greater variety of causes and while often they promptly get other jobs, the reverse is just as likely to be true. There need be no permanent army of the unemployed; the unemployed will not be the same people. Even now there is considerable interchange between the employed and the unemployed. But we must recognize that unemployment will long continue to be a great hazard for all wage earners.

The problem is far too complex to be solved by any one formula or "cure." I do not look upon unemployment insurance as a panacea. It has distinct limitations, but also great values. It is particularly beneficial to the largest single group in our population,—the regularly employed, steady, industrial workers. For them unemployment insurance is a dependable first line of defense.

A beginning has been made in the Wisconsin unemployment reserves and compensation act—admittedly an
inadequate law but a pioneer step of progress. In many other states unemployment insurance bills were seriously considered in the last regular legislative sessions; in five of them bills were favorably acted upon in one house. In Congress the Wagner-Lewis bill was endorsed by the President and recommended for passage by the House Committee on Labor.

The great opportunity to inaugurate unemployment insurance on a nation-wide basis lies ahead, however, and it is the subject to which our Committee is devoting probably more attention than to any other question. Our study in this field is headed by Bryce Stewart of the Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc., who has been studying unemployment insurance continuously for fifteen years and has also had practical experience in employment-office and unemployment-insurance administration. I have little doubt that our Committee will recommend the enactment of a national unemployment-insurance law, which, however, as the President indicated in his message in June, will require cooperation by the states. I believe that the coming winter offers the best opportunity we are likely to have for a generation to gain unemployment insurance in this country. But many difficulties still have to be overcome and all who believe in unemployment insurance should make their reasons clear both to the Congress and to the state legislatures.

In our interest in unemployment insurance, we are not neglecting other major hazards. Social insurance is being considered from many angles: workmen's compensation, accident, health and invalidity insurance, retirement annuities and old-age pensions, survivors' insurance, family endowment and maternity benefits and assistance to dependent children and families without a breadwinner. The problems of providing work, training, or opportunities for self-employment for the unemployed are also being investigated, and the costs, the handling of funds and all the various financial aspects are being carefully analyzed.

Accidents are among the hazards which contribute to the insecurity of the average person. In normal periods, around 25,000 workers are killed in industry annually, 150,000 suffer permanent injuries and nearly 3 million some temporary disability; non-industrial accidents take a much heavier toll.

Sickness, it is estimated, costs the American people annually $900 million in lost earnings and $1.5 billion for medical care. The real tragedy in these figures lies in the fact that some people are sick a long time and that many people cannot pay for the necessary care when they are ill. Medical care for a large segment of our population has therefore been both inadequate and an unfair burden on the medical profession, which alone of all professions has been expected to render free service to the poor. While medical facilities are better today than they have ever been, hospitals are half empty and physicians and nurses idle because so many people can not afford badly needed services.

Some governmental responsibility for the health of the people has been assumed through the Public Health Service which, by its preventive and educational work, has performed a greater service than is generally realized. A growing number of hospitals, visiting-nursing organizations and similar services conducted by municipalities, counties and states extend free service or services at reduced rates to indigents and to persons with low incomes. At the same time, there has been a growing public response to the principle of insurance as shown by the rapid spread of group hospitalization plans in the past two years.

Compulsory health insurance has been accepted abroad by both physicians and lay persons as a great public benefaction; the most successful systems are those set up in cooperation with the medical profession. The possibilities of some advance-payment plan for medical and hospital care, developed along lines adapted to our American conditions are being studied for our Committee by Edgar Sydenstricker, chief statistician of the United States Public Health Service and director of medical research for the Milbank Memorial Fund, and by I. S. Falk, also of the Milbank Fund, whose services were made available to us at our request.

We are studying also the possibilities of extending public health facilities, particularly in the preventive field. With illness, as with all other hazards, prevention insofar as is possible is vastly more important than cure or relief. Thanks largely to the initiative and the progressive attitude of the American medical profession we have made great progress in the prevention of illness, but we certainly have not realized what might be done to keep all the people well. In all our studies touching on health problems we shall seek the advice and cooperation of the medical profession. We are organizing a general medical advisory committee and special groups of consultants on dental, public health, and hospital problems. Our best hope for constructive progress in this field lies in the active cooperation of the profession and its assistance in working-out a program advantageous alike to its members and to the public.

As for the hazards of old age, we know that of the 6½ million of our people of sixty-five years or over a very large proportion is financially dependent. Competent observers estimate that in 1930 approximately 2,700,000 were supported wholly or partly by others; last December about half a million were receiving emergency relief, while 115,000 were receiving state pensions, with a long waiting list of eligibles. Large numbers of the aged have lost all their savings in the depression, and unemployment has made it impossible for many children to continue to support their parents.

There is another factor, which, while not properly an old-age problem, cannot be ignored in a well-rounded program of security. For occupations requiring great strength or dexterity, a considerable number of plants have established rules barring most of the older workers. In lines where skill and experience count, the older workers are not discriminated against, but for the lower-income groups—unskilled and semi-skilled—even middle age is a distinct handicap. The age limit for women employees seems to be lower than for men, probably because women are largely employed in tasks requiring dexterity and speed. While we cannot accept without protest a system which scraps men and women at 45 or under, we must realize that there is a growing group of older workers for whom employment opportunities must be provided if they are to enjoy reasonable security.

Twenty-eight states now have some system of old-age pensions and the coverage is being constantly extended to a larger group. There are,
Residence requirements are high; the age at which persons become eligible, usually seventy, is too late; and the system of local administration is open to serious criticism. The chief objection, however, is that financial provisions are usually meager. Under the present situation, although the coverage has increased on paper, actually the systems are breaking down. Fewer eligibles are in fact receiving the pensions. Instead they are lumped with their children or other relatives, on relief—an "economy" which has little to recommend it. Some form of government subsidy, granted on the acceptance of standard requirements, is obviously indicated.

Non-contributory pensions given to a person on reaching a certain age must necessarily be small and based, at least to some extent, on need. Sympathy with the right of old people to a decent life in their declining years is naturally great, but we cannot afford to let our enthusiasm blind us to the underlying economic factors, or sweep us into unwise legislation. Since the President's message to Congress in June, there have sprung up all over the country schemes for promoting large pensions for elderly people regardless of need. The large following which some of these unrealistic schemes have attracted shows very clearly the need of a carefully studied and definite plan. The way of progress to real security for the greatest number can never lie in such "get-rich-quick" schemes.

NON-CONTRIBUTORY systems of old-age pensions have been in operation in Europe for many years. Small, but fairly adequate, pensions are granted to persons whose income falls below a standard minimum on arrival at a certain age. The tendency has been to set up, in addition to these grants, which are of course based on a means-test, a system of insurance by which on arrival at a specified age, the old person receives as a right a pension towards which he has contributed during his working years. The recent Railroad Retirement Act is an American example of this type of legislation. Barbara N. Armstrong of the University of California, author of Insuring the Essentials, with Professor J. Douglas Brown of Princeton and Murray Latimer, chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, as advisors.

The hazard of death overhangs us at all ages. If death comes to the breadwinner while his family is still young its economic consequences are far more serious than if it occurs late in life. Many mothers in such families have a low earning capacity, and their going to work does not solve the economic problem, particularly if the mother must hire someone else to care for the children. About 1 in 10 of the families on relief has no member who is employed or seeking work, and in 1 in 16 to 1 in 8 cases the only employable persons are women, three-fifths of whom have dependent children. The total number of families in this group is much larger than the number of families aided under mothers' pension laws would indicate. With 7 million children under sixteen years of age on relief rolls, the necessity of providing for security for this group of future citizens is obvious, both through a comprehensive health program and by an amplification of the mothers' pension laws.

As a nation we are beginning to wake up to the fact that we are at least a quarter of a century behind most of Europe in our protection of the lower-income groups. It is an encouraging sign, however, that with our customary American energy, having seen the light, we are pursuing it with vigor and enthusiasm. Already in this vast sea of insecurity there are a few islands of hope. In the first place, the present Administration has felt keenly the public responsibility for individuals who are in distress through no fault of their own and the federal government has taken a major part in the work of relief. The sum of $234 billion has been appropriated for direct and work relief. Further, $3,800,000,000 has been appropriated for public works, $785 million for the CCC and $525 million for drought relief. The Administration looks with sympathy on the human and personal side of the problem, realizing that it is not a dole Americans want, but work. Up to the present, through the CWA, the PWA and the CCC, several millions have been given employment on projects financed wholly or in part from federal funds, as part of the program for relief. But what has been done is by no means adequate. As I see it, in the course of time, we shall have to establish in this country substantially all of the social-insurance measures which the western European countries have set up in the last generation—adapted, of course, to American conditions and improved through study of Europe's experience.

Social insurance alone, however, does not promise anything like complete economic security. More important than all social-insurance devices together is employment. We need continuous study of employment opportunities, advance planning of public works, and emergency work programs on a much more extensive scale than we now have them. Our public employment service has made great progress during the past two years under the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act, but it will need to be much expanded if it is to play its full part.

There are many people who cannot be brought under an unemployment-insurance system and even the insured worker, especially during periods of depression, may exhaust his right to benefits. Other countries with long-established unemployment insurance systems have found it necessary to supplement insurance benefits through public-assistance grants and public-works projects. For these reasons, we deem our studies of employment opportunities, headed by Meredith B. Givens of the Social Science Research Council, and of public employment, which is in charge of Eleanor Ross of the economic staff of the FERA, as most important. Our report certainly will include several recommendations on employment and it is to be hoped that legislation may result from them this winter.

The problem of insecurity, of course, does not involve only the wage earners. Large groups of self-employed people of low incomes—farmers, artists, teachers and other professional people, many tradesmen and a considerable number of small employers—are quite as much in need of additional measures for personal economic security as is the so-called industrial population.

The secretary of agriculture is a member of the Committee on Economic Security and his department has undertaken the responsibility for making recommendations on measures to give an added security to farmers and agricultural workers. While it is difficult to give adequate protection to the self-employed, they can not be overlooked in any adequate program for economic security. Sentiment in favor of security legislation is evidently growing rapidly. At the worst, I believe, the inevitable opposition will only retard, not prevent, the ultimate achievement of our objective.

I believe that actually the voice of opposition will be drowned by the wave of enthusiasm for social insurance which is sweeping the country. It is growing so rapidly that our concern must be rather to avoid being swept into hasty or ill-considered action. With a well-conceived program carefully thought through, we can move with confidence, slowly but surely, on that way of security to which we are committed.

December 1934
A. HOW WOMEN HAVE EVOLVED

1. For the purposes of this questionnaire I shall describe my field as public official responsible for improving the welfare of wage earners.

Women have pioneered in this field within the past 50 years. Hour laws, working laws, workmen's compensation laws, minimum-wage laws, nightwork laws, were passed in the various States, in large part as the direct or indirect result of the efforts of women. Not only in the enactment of legislation were women functioning but in administrative capacities as public officials.

The pioneers are easily identified. Among them we count Florence Kelley, Jane Addams, Mrs. Raymond Robins, Mary Dreier, Grace Abbott, Rose Schneiderman, Mary Dewson, Mary van Kleck, Mary Anderson, Julia Lathrop.

2. The last ten years have witnessed important advances in the program designed to meet workers' basic needs. We are recognizing as a Nation that this program to promote shorter hours, higher wages, and a voice in the terms and conditions of work, comprises an essential economic factor for national prosperity.

Among the new Federal agencies that have been developed to aid wage earners are the Social Security Board, the National Labor Relations Board; the Federal Housing Authority, the Railroad Retirement Board, the National Mediation Board. Within the Department of Labor itself we have seen the reorganisation of the Employment Service; the establishment of the Division of Public Contracts and the Division of Labor Standards; and vital new activities undertaken by the Children's Bureau. Of special importance is the recent formation of the Department's Wage and Hour Division to administer the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.
In general, women have found significant opportunities for responsible service in these agencies designed to protect workers.

B. WHAT WOMEN HAVE ACHIEVED IN YOUR FIELD

3. Few women have had an opportunity to serve in either State or Federal Legislatures; to date, only less than 30 women have been sent to the U. S. Congress.

A substantial number of positions in the State Labor Departments have gone to women, especially those connected with the administration of laws affecting women and children. There is an increasing recognition being given to women of long experience and recognized achievements. Behind the scenes, women still furnish much of the stimulus for the increased public recognition of wage earners' needs.

4. Throughout the country and particularly within the Federal Government service, many well-trained women are doing experimental work in raising labor standards and, though they are not generally known to the public, they are making valuable contributions through study, research, and experimentation. Among the agencies where women are carrying on this kind of work are the National Labor Relations Board; the Works Progress Administration; particularly the establishment of workers' education classes throughout the country; and the hundreds of work projects for unemployed women, many of which have been highly creative. In the Bureau of Home Economics in the Department of Agriculture, women scientists have been investigating every possibility of making the workers' dollar stretch to capacity in buying food and clothing. In the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the work of professional women is exceedingly varied. Some are collecting first-hand data from original sources; others are gathering
material from secondary sources, all throwing light on labor and industrial conditions and on economic and social problems.

5. It is generally recognized that because women on the whole have a humanitarian viewpoint they excel rather strikingly in service work where the factor of monetary profit is not the objective. Activities of the Government service - State and Federal - fall into this category, as does the work done by labor and welfare organizations.

6. The maturity which comes with years of service and experience is an asset in the field of labor-welfare.

C. PROBLEMS FOR EXPANSION FACING WOMEN IN MY FIELD

7. Under questions 1 and 2, I have indicated that responsible posts in my field are increasing and have discussed some of the factors that may be held responsible.

8. Mine is a field which offers unusual opportunities for youth. Reforms demand energy which young people can best supply. There may not be the most responsible jobs for some years but they generate the momentum necessary to pass new laws, to organize new industries, to carry on much of the hard routine of labor-law enforcement.

9. The limitations of the field for youth are those relating to inexperience. Many jobs for beginners pay very little; outside Government service numerous labor-welfare jobs start on a volunteer basis, where such valuable experience is gained.

D. WHAT WOMEN MAY LOOK FORWARD TO IN THE FUTURE

10. In the first place, women can exercise the franchise and elect capable women and men who appreciate what women can contribute to public office. Under such circumstances, old prejudices against women in
administrative capacities can be broken down. In the second place, women through their organizations can continue to emphasize the "merit principle" in government. When merit alone is considered for job placement women have fairer opportunities to compete with men for jobs. In the labor field women workers can demand that they be represented by women officers, business agents, convention delegates, and other union officials.

11. ECONOMICALLY

In the economic field one important problem is the establishment of the principle of equal pay for equal work. We know that women often are discriminated against in the world of business and the professions merely because of their sex, regardless of merit and ability. The right of married women to work also has an economic basis. Barely is the need for women to support dependents recognized on the same plane as that of men's need. Women need to maintain vigilantly their right to contribute to social progress in any capacity for which they qualify, whether this means paid or other employment.

SOCIALLY

It has been true, I think, that because women have had such a struggle to hold their own and meet heavy competition from men in business and the professions, many of them, at times, have lost sight of certain social responsibilities they should fulfill not only to win more rounded lives for themselves but to make a vital contribution to the national welfare. Women with trained and disciplined minds should not be "too busy" on their jobs to engage in the outside in politics, to actively participate in civic and social welfare movements. Though their time is not so free...
as that of women of leisure, their business experience adds to the value of their contribution.

PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION FOR WOMEN

The program of industrial legislation for the protection of wage-earning women was initiated because of observed and striking facts; namely, the overwork, under payment and unhealthful surroundings of the working women who crowded into factories in the latter part of the 19th century. The woman wage earner enters what is largely a man's world based on man's physical structure, habits, and social status. The laws which reduce her fatigue by limiting hours, requiring seats, prohibiting or limiting night work, and guaranteeing her a living wage are all aids to her in her struggle to work with health and happiness and to compete fairly with men who by habit and greater experience have most of the advantages in the competitive struggle.

NOW PERSONALLY

1. It is difficult to generalize as to whether marriage and the home interfere with woman's achievement in her professional field or any other. It all depends on the circumstances of the particular woman. If her income is large enough to provide for skilled and reliable household assistance; if her husband is cooperative and objective about her wage-earning activities; if she is strong physically; if her job is one in which she can utilize valuable experience and consciously make a rich contribution to social welfare - surely close home and family ties serve only to realize the type of integrated personality that contributes so largely to professional achievement. On the other hand, the professional
women whose salary is small, who is continuously conscious of inadequate household and child care during her daily absence, or who meets with resistance from her husband when she wants to work, finds, doubtless, that marriage and her home do interfere with achievement on the job.

2. The discriminations interfering with women's progress in my field follow the traditional pattern of opposition to women's emergence from the home and are no greater or less than in other comparable fields.

3. No. I can think of none which is more vital to the wellbeing of society and carries with it greater personal satisfaction.
From the dawn of history women have been at work. But the amount of work accomplished within the course of a day, the type of work done, the conditions under which they have labored—these considerations have been largely outside women’s power to control. The chief reason women work has always been the same—the securing of subsistence for themselves and for those dependent upon them.

Drastic changes in the labor of American women have been brought about in a little more than a century. These changes are but an integral part of a great industrial readjustment in our nation. From highly skilled work in their own homes, women have shifted to a large extent into the less skilled and more monotonous of industrial jobs.

Of necessity women have accepted these changes. In so doing they have lost much of value to themselves as persons, though the contribution their labor has made to national economic progress has been great. The individuality of their products which brought personal satisfaction has been lost in the standardized output of machines.

In the early days of our country, girlhood training developed skill that could be utilized during a lifetime, as it related directly to the care of the home and children. But this is not true today. The majority of modern industrial jobs have no relation to women’s family life, but mean only maintenance—the weekly pay envelope.

To what extent are women responsible for these changed ways of life that are outgrowths of factory development? To what extent are they the victims of circumstances beyond their control? Let us trace briefly the effects upon women of the coming of the machines. Without knowing the industry of yesterday, we cannot know the industry of today. The day’s responsibilities of the colonial woman, her entrance into the cotton mills of Lowell and Fall River, her first attempts to right pressing industrial wrongs through trade union organization—all these are important, for they give perspective.

The early colonial home was not merely a dwelling but a productive institution, and the center of the productive life of a community. In these homes from dawn to dark women spun, wove and sewed, cooked and made butter, cheese, candles and countless other everyday articles. In general, manufacturing of all kinds was in the hands of women as was agriculture in the hands of men.

A large part of the time of colonial women was spent in the two processes of spinning and weaving. The raw materials were furnished by the household and the finished products destined primarily for household use. When the family needs were met, extra money could be earned through the sale of the products of the spinning wheels to the village store, or through knitting stockings or weaving cloth to order for individual customers.

This article and the two on the opposite page are offered to give you background and data for your thinking on the proposed Women’s Charter. They continue the series begun in March, and planned with the aid of our special Women’s Charter Committee, of which Miss Mary Stewart is Chairman.

It is of importance to note one factor which gave to the early work history of American women a peculiar flavor. This was the Puritan concept of the relation of virtue and work to sin and idleness. Laziness and lack of industry were even summarily punished. Women did not work only from choice during this period of our history. The attitude of the colonial public was one of rigid insistence that they be employed for their own and the national welfare.

The first power loom was erected at Waltham, Massachusetts, in 1814. The industrial changes which followed in the wake of this event were revolutionary. While as late as 1810 only about 2 per cent of American cloth was made in factories, by 1820 textile manufacturing was definitely a factory industry. No longer was it profitable for women to weave in their homes. This is obvious from the rates reported to have been paid home weavers. “Sheumbs which were woven in 1818 for 8 cents a yard were worth only 3 cents to the weaver in 1824, the rate on stripes and checks which had been 6 cents in 1818 had fallen to 2½ cents in 1824.”

Strong economic forces made it inevitable that women should follow their traditional occupation of weaving and spinning from home to factory. In the New England of the early nineteenth century, labor was scarce and male workers were needed by agriculture. It was generally feared that men power diverted from

(Continued on page 152)
Women are clothed in wood, colored with coal, and perfumed with coal tar. Quite the nicest and most glamorous women, too, nowadays. Dr. Gerald Wendt, director of the American Institute of the City of New York, who wears a glass tie and will soon be seen walking about in a glass suit. Speaking recently before the Tudor City Forum he said:

"Science has invaded the kitchen, the boudoir and milady's wardrobe; it is transforming our lives daily, shaping our civilization . . ."

Now, the average woman is not much concerned with civilization, strictly speaking. It seems a little remote, and she likes to think in concrete terms. But just the same, the average woman is not what she seems, and civilization must therefore be regarded quizically—woman making up, as she does, a good part of civilization.

Modern woman is a walking reminder of the magic brewed in the chemist's crucible; ten to one these days she is an out and out "woman of science," clothed from the skin out, housed, shod and jeweled synthetically. She is fast becoming enshrined in a synthetic setting, with furnishings, furniture and home manufactured by miracles from inorganic matter.

In spite, however, of all that science has done to enhance her glamour, woman is not noticeably grateful. Instead, she is quite inquisitive about the means, just takes for granted the end, and walks through life blissfully on her scuffless, plastic, synthetic shoes, unaware of the romantic circumstances under which her clothes, her utilities and her luxuries were born.

The game in which the modern chemist is outplaying nature is "synthetics," which is Greek for "compositions." The cards are a bit of wood, and coal, and air. The contest is to see whether man or nature can create more beauty in a given time for woman's adornment, can evolve more utility.

Quite a challenge? Perhaps. "Consider the lilies of the fields." Yet the chemist—particularly the young chemist around 25 years of age—is discovering ways to keep man's score card high.

The 1937 knight serves his lady by sending up offerings of gas and fire in his chemist's laboratory! Which calls to mind that Villon, the eighteenth century French romanticist, in that now immortal poem to his lady, wrote, "If I were King what treasures would I bring . . . You would have the moon and stars to wear . . . If I were King . . ."

Ladies in 1937, thanks to chemistry, do wear the sun, the moon and the stars, not counting all the rays in the color spectrum. Do you remember when, not so many years ago, a woman on a shopping tour used to hold up hands in horror if the sales clerk dared show her "artificial" silk?

"Artificial? Oo-oo-! Take it away! I want real silk!" was her cry. Artificial silk profaned the spaminings of that industrious little silk worm, and was somewhat akin to devil's witchery.

Were the chemists downhearted? They
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INDEPENDENT WOMAN
BOOKBINDING BY A MASTER

An outstanding event in the art world this month was Miss Marguerite Duprez Lahey's exhibition of her bookbindings at the J. P. Morgan Library. Some of the rarest and most fabulously valuable books in the world have been bound by Miss Lahey for the Morgan collection. But the exhibition includes also many works she has done for others, notably her gorgeous moderns.

Miss Lahey not only designs the bindings but carries out herself every one of the eighty separate processes necessary to bind a book. She uses precious metals in her work, gold and platinum, which are most effective combined with the softly brilliant green and blue leathers of modern books. Her tools on the ancient times is especially fine. Since she works alone, it often takes her three months to finish a book, but the result is well worth all her loving care.

Art Note: Mrs. Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney's statue of Peter Stuyvesant, Dutch Colonial Governor of New Amsterdam, will soon be erected in Stuyvesant Park, New York. The casts have been delayed in order to settle the great question which was Peter's famous peg-leg, the right or the left. The pendils waged war over the matter, some championing one leg, some the other. The right won.

SILVER SCREENINGS

Quality Street (KKO) adapted from Sir James Barrie's play, which seems so dated to read or to stage, has captured much of its quaint charm on the screen. This is due in the first place to Katharine Hepburn's exquisite performance and to an unusually fine supporting cast: Fay Bainter, C. W. Linder, Estelle Winwood and Frances Treadway.

No one should miss Elephant Boy, based on Rudyard Kipling's, "Toomai of the Elephants" and superbly directed by Robert Flaherty. The principal characters are a young boy, engagingly played by Saba, a Hindu, aged thirteen, and his elephant Kala Nag. Some critics have feared "Toomti" may not be a commercial success. I sincerely hope they are mistaken. To me, the film is as exciting as it is unusual and beautiful.

ON THE AIR

Speaking of feminine achievement, did any of you hear Marion Anderson, the colored contralto, when she sang with the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra a few weeks ago? Her voice came over the radio lastrous as velvet. When Toscanini heard her at Salzburg he said: "A voice like hers occurs once in a hundred years." Her career is a real success story. The people of her Baptist Church worked hard for a fund to train Marion's voice, for they early recognized her great gift.

The International Singing Mouse contest will be broadcast over the Red Network, NBC, Sunday, May 2, at 2:15 p.m. I hope you'll all tune in to root for our champion—Minnie of Chicago. Walt Disney and Thornton Burgess were among the judges in the recent United States contest, and a brand new song in honor of the winner: "I Love Singing Minnie" was broadcast by the Norwegian Quartet.

I have noted, however, a lack of feminine enthusiasm for Minnie. Is it race prejudice? After all Minnie can't help being a mouse. But I suppose inarticulate tendencies will persist, even among career women!

A Blanket Amendment

(Continued from page 132)

We believe that women's opportunities are greatest when they have a fair field in the business and industrial world, unhampered by restrictive legislation applying to them alone; that legislation, if necessary, should be based on the nature of the work and not on the sex of the worker.

Owing to non-enforcement, proof is lacking that hours and wage laws for women have been generally beneficial. The vice-president of the Consumers' League of New York, in a letter to The New York Times, January 6, 1938, conceded that in not a single state having wage and hours legislation for women has it been possible generally to enforce the law, and the Women's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor (Bulletin 61) agrees that minimum wage laws have not been sufficiently enforced to furnish material for a complete investigation. We say that whenever enforcement has taken place, evidence is available to prove loss of employment and the limiting of opportunities of women.

UNITED'S new fleet of MAINLINER-SKY LOUNGERS—21-passerenger club planes—sleepers—is at your service offering fast, comfortable, convenient flights daily to Atlantic City via New York or Philadelphia, from Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Omaha, Denver, Salt Lake City, and all Pacific Coast cities.
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WIN A ROUND TRIP FLIGHT TO THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS CONVENTION IN ATLANTIC CITY July 18 to 25, 1937
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Men labor leaders oppose wage legislation for men on the ground that "the minimum would tend to become the maximum." They refuse to "relinquish" their "liberties" and become "serfs of the nation." They say that men are banded together in labor organizations and can bargain collectively and that women cannot do that. They claim that unemployment among men is created by the undercutting of women, therefore there must be a low for women. The percentage of unskilled and unorganized men in industry so greatly exceeds the percentage of unskilled and unorganized women that it is absurd to claim that men are in a better position than women to bargain collectively. If women undercut men, it is no solution of the economic problem to handicap women with a minimum wage so that men may undercut them.

BUSINESS WOMEN INVOLVED

To some extent, business and professional women have sought to avoid the labor issue as something not concerning them, yet they are included in most legislative proposals. Governor Lehman's original wage bill applied to "any industry, trade, business or class of work in which women and minors are gainfully employed."

Twice the U. S. Supreme Court refused to accept the doctrine that mature women may be subjected to restrictions upon their liberty of contract which could not lawfully be imposed in the case of men. It declared that "prescribing minimum wages for women alone would unreasonably restrain them in competition with men and tend arbitrarily to deprive them of employment and a fair chance to find work." Owing to the recent about-face of one Justice, resulting in the repudiation of these former opinions, the Court now considers women of "special interest to the state" and assumes that their liberty is not as precious as the liberty of men.

What are women going to do about it? Does anyone know of any better first step than to have the principle of equal rights for men and women guaranteed in the framework of our Constitution? It requires no great power of discernment to recognize the fact that without it women will be powerless to prevent the suppression of their rights and the destruction of their liberties.

Women in Industry

(Continued from page 133)

the land, agricultural interests would suffer. Women, then, logically supplied the labor needed to maintain the new industries. In his famous Report on Manufacturers Alexander Hamilton argued that one of the most important advantages of establishing manufacturers was "the employment of persons who would otherwise be idle.

...In general, women and children are rendered more useful by manufacturing establishments than they otherwise would be.

The cotton mills of the early period paid high wages, or at least so they seemed to women experiencing their first earnings activities. Wages in the mills were far higher than for such teaching posts as were then available to women. No social stigma was attached to mill work during the early days of factory textile manufacture. Other than teaching no field of employment was open to educated women, nor were there any opportunities for specialized training.

It is not surprising then, in view of all these factors, to find it estimated that in 1827 women constituted nine-tenths of the 1,200 operatives of six Lowell cotton mills.

Lowell, as others of the first New England weaving towns, had a signal character. The historic success of the "Lowell family system" was due in the first analysis to the high order of the labor supply tapped. The workers were almost all young women and little girls, largely farmers' daughters, delighted with the opportunity for social life provided by big towns. Lucy Larcom, the poetess, came down to Lowell to work and "enjoy refined society."

Except in rare instances the rights of mill girls at Lowell were secure. They were not driven. Working life was made easy. They were paid in full for extra work. "Our own account of labor done by the piece was always accepted and our own estimate of time taken off," according to the account of a mill worker of the day.

But this happy state was not to continue indefinitely. Wages were reduced, and the first Lowell strike was called in 1834 in protest. The young ladies walked in procession in their famous white muslin dresses, with green parasols and stockings. There were no bands but they sang:

"Oh! isn't it a pity that such a pretty girl as I Should be sent to the factory to pine away And die! Oh! I can not be a slave; I will not be a slave, For I'm so fond of liberty That I can not be a slave."

The strike at Lowell was not the first American textile strike in which women had participated. In 1828 from three to four hundred women at Dover, New Hampshire, went on strike, and again six years later eight hundred women were able to resist for some time a cut in wages.

The early women textile workers used much the same methods of acquainting the public with their cause as trade unions use today. The Dover girls organized to resist reductions of wages, monthly payments, and overtime work. They expressed their complaints by means of street parades, protest meetings, placards, poetry, and widely published resolutions. They appointed committees to secure the support of workers in other towns, and raised funds to relieve the strikers. In general, the strikes of women workers during this period are noteworthy for the hopefulness, the determination, and the daring with which they were conducted.

The first effort of organized women workers to use a weapon other than the strike came about in the early eighteen forties. During this period the Lowell Female Labor Reform Association whose president was Sarah G. Bagley, secured thousands of signatures of factory operatives to petitions for the ten-hour day to be presented to the Massachusetts legislature.

The first American governmental investigation of labor conditions came about when Miss Bagley, early in 1845, testified at textile mill conditions before the Massachusetts legislative committee. Although these textile workers did not win all they asked at the time, it has been felt by many authorities that these organized working women were more influential than any other group in creating a public sentiment that from that time on has made Massachusetts a leader in the enactment of labor legislation.

It is not to be thought that women textile workers were the only pioneers in the early trade union movement. The first records we have of unionization on the part of women concern a protective organization of tailoresses in April, 1825. These tailoresses and the seamstresses from this time on organized many societies and went on strike in New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. In 1831, 1,400 needlewomen con...
the development of the factory system has affected immensely the lives of all American women. Millions of housewives have watched labor-saving devices such as washing machines, rags, electric ranges, irons, toasters, take over household tasks. They have gladly used factory-produced canned products, bakers' bread, ready-made clothing. But against these gains in women in general must be charged the cost of insecurity and inadequate living on the part of a significant section of the nation's woman population—those women who are wage earners. In 1930 there were some two million women employed in mechanical and manufacturing industries alone, or roughly five million women wage-earners in the producing and distributing trades.

Since the establishment of the factory system women have been forced to face certain other problems in connection with their women's routine. Two basic factors have been consistent—an over-supply of women for the jobs available and lower wages for women than for men. In addition, women have shared with men the detrimental consequences of the failure of employers to provide adequate protection against working conditions that marred their health. With men they have suffered from the lack of economic planning which results in seasonal unemployment, and from the unbalanced relation between production and consumption that has brought devastating depressions. Women as well as men have been frequently victims of sudden layoffs due to rapid technological changes which have made their labor superfluous. They have shared with men the nervous strain brought about by the noise, vibration, and ever-increasing speed of power-driven machines.

Women, perhaps more than men, have suffered from the continuous subdivision of industrial processes that has increased so greatly the monotonous and unskilled jobs, in which women so largely have found employment. Perhaps more than men, they have felt the effects of unhealthy long hour schedules, permitted to continue even after extensive mechanization made shorter hours practical. Such excessive hours in the factory frequently followed by other hours spent in caring for family needs in the home have had vicious effects on workers' health, sapping strength and undermining efficiency.

The remaining vestige of colonial home production—industrial home work—has constituted an additional burden on women whose exploitation through such a device has been especially appalling. In squalid tenement homes that are badly heated and lighted, women driven by family needs, make or finish garments, string tags, knot or embroider or carry on a multitude of other activities for distressingly low wages.

But these problems of women workers, introduced even in the early days of the machine and intensified in some cases and mitigated in others in the years that followed, have not gone unchallenged. Much credit, in the first place, must go to progressive employers who have felt an urgent responsibility for developing policies and standards to promote the welfare of their employees simultaneously with the extension of their plant activities to increase profits.

Not a little has been accomplished by

---

DISCERNING mothers today are pointing out to their daughters the Venus way to health and carefree activity every day in the year.

ANY a lovely, young looking matron has daughters who look scarcely younger than herself. She has made a study of how to conserve her brimming vitality and charm. Among other things, she knows the importance of the proper kind of sanitary protection which excludes jangled nerves, the worry of insecurity and annoying discomfort.
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women's trade unions during the age of machinery. It is true that the last half of the nineteenth century did not witness a continuance of the vigorous and sturdy union activities of Lowell, Dover, and the other New England mill villages. Perhaps the explanation lies in part in population changes. Immigrants from Ireland, Canada and later from Southern Europe, about the middle of the century began to replace the native-born women at the New England looms. These newcomers depended directly on their weekly earnings to provide food for themselves and their families. Furthermore, they were strangers in a new country where it was very difficult to undertake any trade union action until they became a part of the community.

Throughout the second half of the century, women's unions were ephemeral in character, usually organized in time of strikes and frequently disappearing upon the settlement of the disputes which brought them into being. In 1869, however, women boasted their first national organization—the Daughters of St. Crispin, a union of women comprising two or three dozen local lodges scattered across the country from Maine to California. The brief career of the Knights of Labor which had about 50,000 women members in 1886 lasted soon after steadily declined, should also be mentioned. Renewed activity among Trade Union women came in 1903 with the formation of the National Women's Trade Union League. Patterned on the Women's Trade Union League of Great Britain, its purpose has been to unite in one national organization working women—whether already in unions or not—together with sympathizers with the movement outside the actual labor ranks. This League, active today, has given considerable impetus to the organization of women workers.

But the public has not left the determination of work standards and the solution of industrial problems wholly in the hands of employers and trade unions. The public's growing understanding of the need for the regulation of employment conditions has resulted in the increasing adequacy of labor legislation. In many cases, as in early Massachusetts, agitation for labor laws has been initiated by the trade unions. Frequently such movements have been also actively supported by humanitarian and far-sighted employers, aware of the value of increased efficiency and good will brought about by improved conditions of work. Greater scientific knowledge about the effects of industrial poisons, about the laws of human efficiency and fatigue has been used as the basis of new laws to protect the worker.

Most recently the country has embarked on a widespread program of social security for American workers. For example, the new unemployment compensation laws provide something for them to live on when they are out of work. Under the old age assistance laws old men and women receive a monthly cash income when they have no other means of support. At one time such aged poor were "on the county." By means of the old-age annuity plan wage earners are assured by the United States Government of an income when they are old. To this end both the workers and their employers contribute funds based on the amount of wages.

For the mitigation of many of the ills to women workers brought about by the fact that the system the Government is thus gradually assuming responsibility in accordance with its functions as laid down in the Constitution of the United States "to promote the general welfare." For women must work and they must work for wages. Industry needs them and they must have jobs. It is one of the hopeful signs of our times that more and more public emphasis is being placed upon the woman worker as a person—her health, her wages, her right to organize, her right to a job and security.

On the ALERT in WASHINGTON

The Federation's Legislative Representative will report current vital happenings monthly in these pages while Congress is in session

Washington, D. C., April 19, 1937.

Last month's roll about "not a single carbon" had hardly appeared when the requested letters began to appear, and now we have an Honor Roll. Members of Congress have heard from the following clubs regarding our desire that the anachronistic Section 213 of the Economy Act be repealed and that federal aid should be given to public education so as to provide adequate educational opportunity for all children: Birmingham, Durham, Greensboro, and Huntsville, Alabama; Hayward, California; and Russell, New Mexico. And the legislation chairman of the New Castle, Pennsylvania club came to call! Of such staff is legislative effectiveness made!

In the meantime, another bill which embodies the principles of one of our recommendations on our legislative program has been approved by Mrs. Dorothy J. Dunn, National Legislation Chairman, H. R. 2970, the Keppel Bill to extend the civil service to agencies now outside the service, was mentioned in last month's report and some of you may already have asked your Congressman to send you a copy of the Hearings. Further action on the bill may be combined with action on the President's proposal for reorganization of the Executive Departments, which contains similar provisions and which we would likewise support.

The important thing at the moment is to reaffirm as strongly as possible our desire for support and extension of the merit system. In spite of the emphasis this question received in the campaign and the overwhelming public support evidenced by the Gallup poll, it is reported that more than seventy bills introduced at this session of Congress are in direct violation of the merit system. Our concern over the situation should be expressed in any future communication with Congressmen.

Latest developments on Section 213: With the Celler Bill, H. R. 3498, still held up in the House for lack of a special rule, a new avenue of approach has been opened up through the introduction by Senator McKeever of S. 2121. This bill, which is similar to the Celler Bill, provides, "In any reduction of personnel in any branch or service of the United States or District of Columbia governments and in the ap
designation of persons to the classified civil service, no person shall be discriminated against or given any preference because of the marital status of such person or because the husband or wife of such person is in the service of the United States or the District of Columbia.

Latest developments on "federal aid to public education": Hearings in the House have just been concluded on H. R. 5962, a revision of Congressman Fletcher's earlier bill, H. R. 2898, which he introduced on March 29 to bring his bill into agreement with the amended Harrison-Black Bill, S. 419, which was reported out by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on March 18. An attempt is being made to bring the Harrison-Black bill to a vote in the Senate sometime soon, but the recent concern over the probability of having to increase taxes if expenditures are not quickly curtailed has caused Majority Leader Robinson to oppose its consideration. By the time this report reaches you, more definite news of the bill will probably have appeared in your daily newspaper.

Opal D. David
INDEPENDENT WOMAN
Dear Frances,

You will be glad to know that *People At Work* is going into its second edition at once. Are there any errors—I mean typographical, or of figures—that you want to correct? I have discovered several small ones that I am sending to the publishers at once—spelling, a semi colon, one wrong name i.e. St Louis for Louisville. If you have, send them to the John Day Co with such speed as the Steel situation and the Longshoremen strike and the Building Trades and a few little details like that leaves you.

You'll be interested also to know that up to the time I left New York last week, 236 reviews of the book had been received—all favorable but two and there the criticism was on the ground that you were not radical enough. It is a great grief to the publishers that no one has knocked the book—they say it is such good publicity.

A clergyman—name forgotten—used it for his text at the Labor Temple on Sunday. I am trying to get a copy of the sermon.

Among the charming letters that the publishers have received so far—and they tell me that they are coming all the time—are ones from, John Dewey, Alfred Smith, Lilliam Wald, Mary Austin, John B. Commons, Carrie Johnson, Adolph Berle—a dozen others whose names escape me.

I am going to be in Washington for a week or two attending to some work of my own, can't you lunch with me at a nice cool remote place that I know?

Affectionately,

[Signature]

Mary
THE NEED FOR THE CHILD LABOR AMENDMENT

by

Frances Perkins
Secretary of Labor.

The permanent abolition of child labor has become a matter of important national policy. Universal agreement is professed as to the end to be attained, but differences of opinion as to the method whereby it is to be achieved have brought this policy into the field of public discussion.

The year 1935 will mark a definite stage in the history of Federal action to protect American childhood from harmful labor. During this year the protection temporarily given to children under the codes will expire with the National Industrial Recovery Act which was passed for a two-year period only. During this year, too, the legislatures of 44 States will meet in regular session, and will have the opportunity to complete the ratification of the child labor amendment to the Constitution, thus authorizing Congress to establish minimum child labor standards applicable throughout the entire country, and also to extend and strengthen State child labor legislation.

Past experience has demonstrated the fact that child labor fluctuates with the business cycle. If Federal safeguards now provided temporarily under the codes are removed child labor will again be utilized by employers wishing to keep immediate labor costs at the lowest possible level and the great divergence in existing State standards will again result in unfair competition among employers in different sections of the country. Children in the States with lower child labor laws will be handicapped by excessive labor costs, while children in other States will be handicapped by insufficient labor costs. In the business depression of a labor surplus, there was also, in a number of States, an appreciable increase in the Federal laws were in existence. While the Federal laws were in existence, the number of child labor cases reported in a number of States was much smaller than the number of cases reported in the States where the Federal laws were not in force.

The ratification of the child labor amendment to the Constitution will provide a general federal basis for the protection of American childhood from harmful labor. It will, in addition, authorize Congress to establish minimum child labor standards to be applicable throughout the entire country, and to extend and strengthen State child labor legislation.
competition among employers in different sections of the country. Children in the States with high standards will receive protection and opportunities for healthful growth, education, and training while children in other States will be handicapped by the prompt return of child employment, low wages and long working hours.

History repeats itself. When the first Federal child labor law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, States with lower child labor standards than those set by the Federal law experienced a prompt increase in the number of working children under 16 and the immediate restoration of a longer working day. There was also, in a number of States, an appreciable increase in the violation of State laws. While the Federal laws were in effect, many States took steps to improve their own child labor laws and administrative practices. During the succeeding legislative progress was much less rapid. Comparison of 1920 and 1930 Census figures shows a general downward trend in the numbers of gainfully employed children during the decade. Yet in 1929 reports on first working papers issued to 14 and 15 year old boys and girls in 42 of the largest cities showed a four percent increase over the preceding year in the number of children of these ages leaving school for work per 10,000 total population of the same ages.

As business stagnation became more pronounced during the depression period, the nation was confronted with the tragic paradox of children leaving school to compete with their parents for any kind of a job at any kind of a price. Fly-by-night industries sprang up in many sections, threatening the standards of reputable employers. The sweatshop, which all had believed a thing of the past, reappeared, with exploitation of young boys and girls as its inevitable corollary. In some factories a large proportion of the labor
evidence of general recognition by mankind that the employment of child supply was made up of workers under 16. Hours of work increased, children working as much as ten or twelve a day. Wages dropped to as low as a few cents an hour. It was in the spring of 1903 that conditions in some of the clothing factories in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania became so oppressive that the child workers struck—the first "baby strike", as it was called, in this country.

Those who contend that child labor regulation should be left entirely to the States find it difficult to explain why these conditions did not impel the States to take action. Strengthening of State laws had been recommended by a national conference of representatives of State departments of labor, national organisations, and Federal agencies that had been held in Washington in December 1932 on the call of the Children's Bureau. This conference recommended that the 47 State legislatures holding sessions in 1933 should enact laws providing for a 16-year minimum age for entering employment. To counteract the deplorable breakdown of standards on all sides it was believed that real progress would be made. Yet despite this concerted effort, only two States enacted laws providing for a 16-year minimum. Only four States—Ohio, Wisconsin, Utah, and Montana—now have a 16-year minimum age for entering employment. The majority of the States still retain the old 14-year minimum and a few have a 15-year minimum for work during school hours.

Against this background it is interesting to consider the accomplishments under the National Industrial Recovery Act with its more than 500 codes of fair competition which, in general, set 16 as the minimum age for industrial or commercial employment and 17 or 18 for employment in especially hazardous industries. A 16-year minimum is permitted for part-time work in certain mercantile pursuits during daytime hours when school is not in session. These codes, which are based on agreements between employers and the President, are
evidence of general recognition by management that the employment of child labor is not only socially undesirable but economically costly, in the long run, in terms of efficiency, safety, maturity of judgment, and dependability.

As a means of making these gains permanent, the President, in a recent letter to the secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, said:

"One of the accomplishments under the National Recovery Act which has given me the greatest gratification is the outlawing of child labor. It shows how simply a long desired reform, which no individual or State could accomplish alone, may be brought about when people work together. It is my desire that the advances attained through N.R.A. be made permanent. In the child labor field the obvious method of maintaining the present gains is through ratification of the Child Labor Amendment. I hope this may be achieved."

The Federal Child Labor Amendment was submitted to the States by Congress in 1924 by a vote of 297 to 69 in the House and 61 to 23 in the Senate. It had the endorsement of all political parties. Participating in the drafting of the amendment were some of the ablest constitutional lawyers in the country. Among those helping to draft it were Senator George Wharton Pepper of Pennsylvania, the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, Senator Samuel M. Shortridge of California, and Representative I. H. Foster of Ohio. Those who supported it actively included, among many others, in the Senate, the late Henry Cabot Lodge, Republican leader of the Senate in 1924, Senator Charles C. Curtis, and Senator Joseph T. Robinson, and in the House, the late Nicholas Longworth.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Section 1. The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under eighteen years of age.

Section 2. The power of the several States is unimpaired by this article except that the operation of State laws shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to legislation enacted by the Congress.
It will be noted that unlike the Eighteenth Amendment, this proposal contains no prohibition or regulation of the employment of children in the amendment itself. It merely empowers Congress to legislate in this field, and any law passed by Congress can be changed by a simple majority vote at any session. Nor does the amendment give Congress power to control the school and home lives of 45,000,000 children as is sometimes contended by its opponents. Penalties for violation of child labor laws fall on the employers of children, not on their parents. Only places where children are to use the Census language, "gainfully employed,"—in other words, working for pay—come within the scope of a child labor law. Labor legislation, as developed in the State and in limited areas of Federal jurisdiction, exclude has a recognized content which would/fantasy applications or interpretations of the powers which would be granted to Congress under the proposed amendment. All Federal legislation, of course, is subject to review by the Supreme Court.

The amendment has now been ratified by 20 States: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Sixteen more ratifications are necessary. It is very important that the requisite number of States ratify promptly so that the advances made under the National Industrial Recovery Act may be continued without interruption.

Some occupations in which children are employed in large numbers remain entirely outside the jurisdiction of the National Industrial Recovery Act. A study made by the Departments of Labor and Agriculture and the Federal Emergency Relief Administration following the strikes in Ohio union fields last summer revealed 18 percent of the workers under 16 and 10 percent under 14 years of age. These were not children working on their parents' farms but
hired hands in commercialized agriculture working at wages so low that often the combined earnings of a family totaled less than $250 a year.

Opponents of the child labor amendment have sought to arouse farmers against it on the ground that it will prohibit children from helping their parents on the farm and in the home, in feeding the chickens, bringing in the corn, washing dishes, and doing other chores. It is inconceivable that a Congress responsible to the people, who have an opportunity, through Congressional elections, for frequent review of its acts, would pass laws of this kind. As Secretary of Agriculture Wallace said: "Coming from an agricultural State I am familiar with the attempts of opponents of the amendment to arouse farmers against it on the ground that farm boys and girls would no longer be permitted to help with the chores, and that the parents' authority over their children would be seriously impaired. Of course this is nonsense and every fair-minded person who knows anything at all about the proposed amendment knows that it is nonsense. . . . the Amendment ought to be adopted."

The Amendment would authorize Congress to legislate only with reference to the labor of persons under the age of 16 years, whereas certain provisions of State laws relating to the employment of minors apply to all under the age of 21. Under the proposed amendment Congress will be able to give boys and girls under 16 the same protection against employment in hazardous occupations that has been given by the National Industrial Recovery Act codes in the

Perhaps of all the arguments advanced against the amendment, the claim that it was inspired by Communists is the most incomprehensible. It would seem to indicate, however, that those who can no longer win by logic or legal argument seek to win by fear. The red herring of communistic influence is
utilized in much of the literature circulated last year in opposition to the amendment. The assertions made in some of this literature are easily dispelled for the record is clear, but many fair-minded people who read misleading statements and misquotations have no opportunity to discover the facts for themselves.

For example, chief responsibility for drafting the amendment has been attributed to the late Florence Kelley. While Mrs. Kelley made an outstanding contribution to the whole movement for improvement of child labor conditions, and was deeply interested in the amendment, the wording of the amendment was developed in conferences of constitutional lawyers, members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and members of a committee of distinguished men and women headed by the late Samuel Gompers.

The late Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard University, gave one of the briefest and best arguments in favor of the child labor amendment in an address before the Society of Harvard Dames when he said:

"I am surprised at the illogical character of the arguments put up by the intelligent and experienced persons who are protesting against the child labor amendment. That amendment does nothing but provide that Congress shall have the power to pass laws concerning child labor which shall apply to the whole country. That power seems to me to be absolutely indispensable to the correct, sound, orderly management of the whole subject of child labor and its confessed evils."

The American Legion has given vigorous and effective assistance in the campaign for the ratification of the amendment. In its recent convention at Miami it reaffirmed its endorsement. The American Federation of Labor
has always been one of its principal sponsors. The support of these
organizations, the effective leadership of the National Child Labor Com-
mittee, and the efforts of 21 other national organizations including, civic,
welfare, educational, religious and labor groups, and of a large number of
the Nation's most distinguished citizens in every walk of life working for
the amendment, should insure success in 1936. Ratifications by the necessary
sixteen States will make permanent the great gains for children achieved under
the National Recovery program.
April 5, 1935.

Miss D. Eunice Wilber,
Asst. Editor, N. Y. State Education,
N. Y. State Teachers Asso.,
152 Washington Avenue,
Albany, N. Y.

My dear Miss Wilber:

As suggested in your letter of February
16th I am sending you herewith an article for New York
State Education, the official magazine of the New
York State Teachers Association.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Secretary.
February 25, 1935

Miss D. Emma Wilber,
Assistant Editor, New York State Education,
New York State Teachers Association,
152 Washington Avenue,
Albany, N. Y.

My dear Miss Wilber:

I shall be very glad to write the article on Youth and Unemployment for New York State Education, requested in your letter of February 16.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Secretary.

[Handwritten note: Copy or this draft in C. 13.]

Wilber, J. Emma
MEMORANDUM

To: The Secretary
From: Miss Lenroot

I think it would be desirable to contribute an article on Keeping Faith With Youth to "New York State Education". We shall be glad to prepare a draft for you in this office, if you would like to have us do so.

February 20, 1935
February 16, 1935

The Honorable Frances Perkins
Secretary of Labor
Washington - D. C.

Dear Miss Perkins:

"New York State Education", official magazine of the New York State Teachers Association, will carry a discussion in the May issue of the theme, "Keeping Faith with Youth."

We want very much to include an article on "Youth and Unemployment." Can you possibly find the time to write? Articles should not exceed 1200 words and should be in by March 30.

That we may know how to plan, may we hear from you?

Very sincerely,

[Signatures]

DEW:CR
Assistant Editor
Memorandum
To: Miss Jurkowitz
From: Miss Lenroot
Re: Article for publication in "New York State Education"

The accompanying article was prepared at the request of the Secretary for Miss D. Emma Wilber, Assistant Editor, New York State Education, New York State Teachers Association, 152 Washington Avenue, Albany, N.Y. It is transmitted herewith for approval by the Secretary.
YOUTH AND UNEMPLOYMENT
BY
Frances Perkins, Secretary
United States Department of Labor

During the early years of the depression the question uppermost in the minds of many people was, "What will be the effect on our children of these years of unemployment and family distress?"

Already we are beginning to find the answer to that question. The children who were 10, 12, or 15 years of age back in the year 1929 are of high school and college age today. What have the past five years done to them? What does the future appear to hold for them? What is their own attitude toward the world in which they live?

If we are to take the word of thousands of these young people themselves, the answer seems to be that many of them face the future with anxious hearts, with baffled minds, and with uncertainty as to their work opportunities.

Youth—if we include young people from 16 to 24 years of age within the meaning of this term—embraces one-sixth of the total population of the United States. The intelligence, courage, and idealism of youth have played an important part in building our Nation. Today, more than ever, we need the optimism, the faith, the enthusiasm and the dauntless spirit which have always been considered the special attributes of youth to help us overcome our problems and find our way safely into the new world of tomorrow. The challenge which we have to meet is therefore, that of providing not merely some measure of relief or occupation for the young people today but also opportunities for useful endeavor which will enable them to develop the special abilities and capacities of which the world stands in need.

There was a time, however, whether it be completion of present school...
Of the more than 20,000,000 young people of both sexes from 16 to 24 years of age inclusive listed in the 1930 Census, more than 5,000,000 were neither at work nor in school. Nearly half of this group was under 21 years of age. The employed group 60 to 24, inclusive, totaled over 11,000,000, some of them being listed as attending school also. Those attending school only in that year totaled over 3,800,000, of whom over 3,500,000 were under 21 years of age.

Between Census years, the only source of information as to nation-wide trends in juvenile employment is in the reports assembled by the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor from State and local officials in charge of the issuance of employment certificates to children leaving school to go to work. The majority of these reports relate to children 14 and 15 years of age, but about one-third of the States from which the bureau receives state-wide or partial statistics issue certificates to boys and girls 16 and 17 years of age. These reports show that while there had been an actual increase in child labor in 1929, there was a great decrease in 1930, the year the Census was taken. Young people as well as adults were thrown into the ranks of the unemployed. Each year after 1929 the employment certificate figures indicated a further decline until 1933, when, for the first time there was a slight upturn in the number of employment certificates issued to 16 and 17 year old boys and girls. During 1933 the number issued to 14 and 15 year old children declined still further, especially during the last four months of the year after the NRA codes began to eliminate those under 16 from industrial and mercantile occupations.

The increasing percentage of attendance at high schools and colleges during recent years is proof that many young people went back to school or enrolled for postgraduate courses. The fact that so many of our young people have stayed in school upon arriving at the legal working age, or have returned to school after vain efforts to find a job, is one of the brighter aspects of the experience of the past few years.

There comes a time, however, whether it be completion of grammar school,
high school, college, or more advanced professional training, when young people want to stop learning and begin earning. Many have to contribute to the support of their families or to the education of younger brothers and sisters. Others become restless and dissatisfied with school and feel that any kind of a job is better than the school room. Those who have been able to go through a period of training for a professional career feel that the time has come for them to take their places in the working world.

Whatever the incentive for leaving school, it is when the young people seek a place among the wage earners that they encounter disillusionment and hardship. Some of them enter blind-alley jobs and become discouraged. Some of them trudge from door to door attempting to sell on commission articles that no one wants to buy. Without special training they cannot compete with more highly trained workers.

Under the codes children under 16 have been removed from industrial occupations. Every effort should be made to conserve these gains, and to keep young people in school as long as possible. Four States (Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas) have no provision for keeping in school children between 14 and 16 years of age even though they may be unemployed. In twenty-two other States serious exceptions are made to the rule that children up to the age of 16 must be either in school or at work. In New York State a bill was introduced in the legislature this year to amend the education and employment of minors. Such measures are urgently needed. Extension of scholarships to boys and girls above the age of 16 who wish to continue in school is one of the most constructive ways of serving youth.
It is estimated very roughly that more than 3,000,000 young people over 18 and under 25 are looking for work. One of the first measures of the present administration was the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps for single, unemployed young men between those ages. Reports that have come to us regarding the boys who have had the benefits of this camp experience indicate greatly improved health and morale.

Educational projects for the unemployed have been developed extensively through the emergency education program of the FERA and have attracted large numbers of young people. Self-aid for college students, provided as a Federal project by the FERA, has enabled approximately 100,000 young people to obtain a college education who otherwise would have been denied this opportunity.

The Federal Committee on Apprenticeship Training, created by executive order, and including representatives of the U. S. Department of Labor, the National Recovery Administration, and the Office of Education, is promoting efforts to provide openings for young people in certain occupations. This program provides that for those skilled trades in which the period of training necessary to provide a journeyman’s rating exceeds one year, a program of employment and training may be developed whereby the employer may pay an initial wage of not less than 25 percent and an average wage of not less than 50 percent of the journeyman’s wage. This apprenticeship program which will not result in the displacement of skilled workers now employed but will insure broad training to certain young workers, functions through State committees composed of the Director of Vocational Education, a representative of the State Labor Department, the Employment Service, a Labor Compliance official of the National Recovery Administration and an employer and an employee representative. This committee approves contracts and supervises training. Local trade committees assist in mapping out training programs in their particular trades.
The constructive use of leisure time is one of the most important of the problems of youth. At the Conference on Youth Problems held last year under the auspices of the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of the Interior it was recommended that aggressive efforts be made to stimulate leadership in the educational and recreational fields to meet the needs of the age group from 16 to 25 years. Many young people desire education, vocational training or activity directly related to advancement in the working world rather than purely recreational or cultural programs. The possibility of providing real work experiences, through a work relief program or otherwise, together with continuation of education in some form, should be definitely explored.

As young people reach the teens and twenties, their personalities, interests, and aptitudes diverge more and more, so that they may be considered as a uniform group only with respect to age. School and educational programs for the great numbers of young people remaining in or returning to school beyond the legal school-leaving age must be enriched and at the same time be made more flexible and more readily adapted to the wide range of interests of an age group that, on the whole, can find no satisfaction in routine.

Not the least of the perplexities confronting young people today is lack of self-confidence and conviction as to the fields in which lie their best chances of achievement and satisfaction. Furthermore, when jobs are scarce, they feel the need of being fitted to do more than one kind of work—of trying out their abilities in more than one type of occupation. To help them in meeting these problems, guidance and adjustment service by persons with broad knowledge of industry and skill in determining individual capacities are greatly needed.
Valuable experience in the development of such service was gained through the Adjustment Service in New York City and by the tri-city experiment of the Employment Stabilization Research Institute under the auspices of the University of Minnesota. The Junior Consultation Service jointly maintained in New York City by the Junior Division of the New York State Employment Service and the Vocational Service for Juniors is also making a notable contribution in these fields.

Our purpose in all these activities and others which I hope may be developed, is not merely to help young people over a difficult period, but to equip them with education and training suited to their own special interests and abilities which will be of permanent value. At the same time we must not lose sight of their great need of avocational interests and hobbies which will help them to lead a more full, well-balanced and satisfying life in the world of the future.
analysis of our economic and
there has emerged a new sense of
of labor in American life. At some
national industrial program, out of
°
to living as the result of
experience between those who own
work in them, child labor in
wage earners in our national life
achievement of that permanent and
we are committed as a Nation. We
basic conceptions that a free self-
regulating people make for a better country and greater happiness for
all. In continuing that conception there needs to be a sober con-
consideration of the ways by which the wage earners of America may
operate and express the full genius derived from their way of life.
That this is generally recognised by Americans is shown by the
fact that labor has attained status in this country since the World War
and wage earners have advanced their conditions greatly. This has been
particularly true in the years since 1933 during which improvements
have been made through legislation and by custom. The United States
Department of Labor has been an active leader in assisting in the de-
development of a program of reasonably short hours of labor, adequate
income from wages, safe and healthful conditions of work, elimination
of child labor and practical industrial relations based on collective,
analysis of our economic and
here has emerged a new sense of
of labor in American life. At some
national industrial progress, out of
ential to living as the result of
experience between those who own
no work in them, child labor in
patterns of wage earners in our national life
achieved by that permanent and
we are committed as a Nation to
our basic conceptions that a free self-
regulating people make for a better country and greater happiness for
all. In continuing that conception there needs to be a sober con-
consideration of the ways by which the wage earners of America may
participate and express the full genius derived from their way of life.
That this is generally recognised by Americans is shown by the
fact that labor has attained status in this country since the World War
and wage earners have advanced their conditions greatly. This has been
particularly true in the years since 1933 during which improvements
have been made through legislation and by custom. The United States
Department of Labor has been an active leader in assisting in the de-
velopment of a program of reasonably short hours of labor, adequate
income from wages, safe and healthful conditions of work, elimination
of child labor and practical industrial relations based on collective
By Frances Perkins

Under the impulse of the analysis of our economic and industrial life in recent years there has emerged a new sense of the significance and importance of labor in American life. At some place in the development of our national industrial program, out of which must flow those goods essential to living as the result of work, there must be a mutuality of experience between those who own and manage industries and those who work in them.

The active participation of wage earners in our national life is more and more important for the achievement of that permanent and democratic civilization to which we are committed as a Nation. We must continue to have faith in our basic conceptions that a free self-regulating people make for a better country and greater happiness for all. In continuing that conception there needs to be a sober consideration of the ways by which the wage earners of America may participate and express the full genius derived from their way of life.

That this is generally recognized by Americans is shown by the fact that labor has attained status in this country since the World War and wage earners have advanced their conditions greatly. This has been particularly true in the years since 1913 during which improvements have been made through legislation and by custom. The United States Department of Labor has been an active leader in assisting in the development of a program of reasonably short hours of labor, adequate income from wages, safe and healthful conditions of work, elimination of child labor and practical industrial relations based on collective
farmers and investors through an increase in the purchasing power of wages and salaries, and through the encouragement of employers and employees to engage in collective bargaining and conciliation, mediation and arbitration through Government agencies.

Of special significance to wage earners at this time is the Fair Labor Standards Act which is part of such a program as has been outlined above. It applies to interstate industries and puts a floor under hours, a ceiling over hours of work and ends child labor in these industries. While it is too early to evaluate fully the effect of this progressive measure its ultimate contribution to the social and economic betterment of the United States is certain to be great.

This legislation is as definitely in the interest of wage earners as is other legislation passed since 1933. Personal and family security has been provided in some degree through the Social Security Act with its old age pension accounts, unemployment insurance, cash aid to old people who are in want, assistance for dependent children and provision for the blind. The National Labor Relations Act, guaranteeing the ancient and constitutional right to organize for collective bargaining, has also brought with it protection of the civil liberties of workers.

Such social legislation as all this is primarily in the interest and for the improvement of life of American wage earners but its influence goes far beyond this group. Its real benefits are not confined to one class of our economic order but are and will be shared in by management,
farmers and investors through an increase in the purchasing power of so many of our people and the increased stability of our social interest, will give us a practical and desirable and normal economic life. As millions of workers have more money to spend on human cooperation. In the future, farmers will gain in income, manufacturers in sales, and wages as a national basis; continuity of unions amongst employers in earnings and investors in dividends.

Everyone will agree that all this is desirable. And as it is achieved through custom and familiarity more and more over the years to come we can look forward to constantly improving relations between labor and management. There will be fewer and fewer industrial disputes as the practice of collective bargaining becomes more general with mutual agreement, good faith and understanding and cooperation by employers and workers.

Then, too, we can make a more balanced economic progress in the future if labor, management, farmers and investors agree to strive together toward goals of higher material and cultural standards of living. Such a movement should result in improved standards of life which will benefit the great mass of the people. These will express in our government, but make a progress of which our traditional national purposes and will represent an adjustment to changing conditions. Democratic methods of government and of living combined with an acknowledged common purpose to secure by mutual adjustments of our human institutions a labor policy of cooperation in the whole tolerant national life for the poor and least-advantaged members of our society and a full opportunity for intellectual and spiritual development for all.
Common social purpose, combined with varied types of self-interest, can and will give us a practical and desirable and cor-
rected democratic cooperation. Included in these ideals are:
high wages on a national basis; continuity of minimum income;
stability of employment; reasonable profits; the conservation
and maximum utilization of natural resources; opportunity for in-
vestment of savings in expanding industries and in new industries.

Under a system of fair competition and democratic coopera-
tion the labor movement becomes naturally the best spokesman of the
group interest of the workers. To have such a status organized labor
must strive to obtain the consent of the workers through methods of free
choice. The unions will then become more than ever what they were
originally supposed to be, educational groups and negotiators of contracts
for their members. Under the new conditions the opportunities will be-
come greater since their right to do this is recognized in law.

Labor policy in a democracy is not a program conceived by a
government, but rather a program of action which wage earners and em-
ployers must work out together in a society which develops naturally out
of the work they do together in industry and the life they lead. They
have much more in common than in conflict. Hand in hand with the growth
of our American institutions a labor policy is developing in the United
States which will help to improve the conditions and lot of workers in
the years to come.
Among the first items that one sees in our growing labor policy are the following:

1. Government action to establish minimum basic standards for labor below which competition should not be permitted to force standards of health, wages, or hours;

2. Government influence to bring about arrangements which will make possible peaceful settlements of controversies and relieve labor of the necessity of resorting to strikes in order to secure the right to be heard; and to negotiate with employers with regard to working conditions.

3. Government aim through legislation and through cooperation between employers and workers to make every job the best that the human mind can devise as to physical conditions, human relations and wages;

4. Government encouragement of such organization and development of wage earners as will give status and stability to labor as a recognized important group of citizens having a contribution to make to economic and political thought and to the cultural life of the community;

5. Government effort to the end that labor play its appropriate part in the study and development of any economic policies for the future of the United States; and

6. Government encouragement of mutuality between labor and employers in the improvement and increase of production and in the development in both groups of a philosophy of self-government in the public interest.

The growth of organized labor in membership and in public significance in recent years has been remarkable. The recognition on the part of many employers of the wisdom of close and active partnership in working out with their organized workers the problems of the industry has been most stimulating to everyone who has in mind the organic law which set up the United States Department of Labor.
Clearly this increase in numbers and importance brings to organized labor great obligations and responsibilities. These obligations are to industry and to the country as well as to its members. There is every indication that they can and will be discharged faithfully. Time and experience are necessary to full performance.

If the right balance is to be preserved, if lasting progress is to be made, there must be a spirit of give and take, of compromise now, or there will be a later. No perfect system is arrived at overnight. Nor can we always sit on the fence, always in the interest of the country. Progress now and there are many of us who will live to see American labor fulfilling the challenge to take and maintain its new status in modern society effectively, realistically, and enthusiastically.

Thousands of employers accept the worker as a partner; only a relatively small number of employers refuse to deal with them. I repeat what I have said on several occasions, there must be industrial peace but with justice.

The workers' desire for stability of income and job, and the industries' equal need for the best use of plant and machinery indicate that the next great step in industrial management in this country will be made by management and labor working together in the conscious development of scientific methods of stabilizing both production and work in American industries. And after that has been started, I predict that labor and management will work together to increase production.

These methods must vary with the industries, but the further expansion of productive capacity so desirable can be accomplished more safely along with the increased stability so necessary both socially
Under the impact of the analysis of our economic and social system in the recent years there has emerged a new sense of the significance of labor and economically. Neither of these can be effectively accomplished without the informed and vigorous participation of organized workers. The American labor movement includes men of capabilities, skill, vision, and patriotism. The rank and file of American labor is known everywhere for skill, efficiency, good humor, sagacity. American labor rates high in world opinion. Challenges put to labor will be met.

There will be a lag. No perfect system is arrived at over-night. Men move forward and there are many of us who will live to see American labor fulfilling the challenge to take and maintain its new status in modern society effectively, realistically and conscientiously.

That role is generally recognized by Americans as being in the last three decades the elevated status in this country since the World War. The same quarters have enforced their conditions greatly. Labor has been particularly active in the years since 1930 when economic changes have been made through legislative tax by revenue. The United Front of the movement of labor has been an active leader in the development of a program of reasonable and effective labor relations. Income from wages, safe and healthful conditions of work, abolition of child labor and practical industrial relations based on national bargaining and conciliation, mediation and arbitration, strategy and periodic agitation.
By Frances Perkins.

Under the impulse of the analysis of our economic and industrial life in recent years there has emerged a new sense of the significance and importance of labor in American life. At some place in the development of our national industrial program, out of which must flow those goods essential to living as the result of work, there must be a mutuality of experience between those who own and manage industries and those who work in them.

The active participation of wage earners in our national life is more and more important for the achievement of that permanent and democratic civilization to which we are committed as a Nation. We must continue to have faith in our basic conceptions that a free self-regulating people make for a better country and greater happiness for all. In continuing that conception there needs to be a sober consideration of the ways by which the wage earners of America may participate and express the full genius derived from their way of life.

That this is generally recognized by Americans is shown by the fact that labor has attained status in this country since the World War and wage earners have advanced their conditions greatly. This has been particularly true in the years since 1933 during which advancements have been made through legislation and by custom. The United States Department of Labor has been an active leader in work and assisting in the development of a program of reasonably short hours of labor, adequate income from wages, safe and healthful conditions of work, elimination of child labor and practical industrial relations based on collective bargaining and conciliation, mediation and arbitration through government agencies.
Of special significance to wage earners, at this time, is the Fair Labor Standards Act which is part of such a program as has been outlined above. It applies to interstate industries and puts a floor under hours, a ceiling over hours of work and ends child labor in these industries. While it is too early to evaluate fully the effect of this progressive measure its ultimate contribution to the social and economic betterment of the United States is certain to be great.

This legislation is as definitely in the interest of wage earners as is other legislation passed since 1933. Personal and family security has been provided in some degree through the Social Security Act with its old age pension accounts, unemployment insurance, cash aid to old people who are in want, assistance for dependent children and provision for the blind. The National Labor Relations Act, guaranteeing the ancient and constitutional right to organize for collective bargaining has also brought with it protection of the civil liberties of workers.

Such social legislation as all this is primarily in the interest and for the improvement of life of American wage earners but its influence goes far beyond this group. Its real benefits are not confined to one class of our economic order but are and will be shared in by management, farmers and investors through an increase in the purchasing power of so many of our people and the increased stability of our social and economic life. As millions of workers have more money to spend in the future, farmers will gain in income, manufacturers in sales, employers in earnings and investors in dividends.
Everyone will agree that all this is desirable. And as it is achieved through custom and familiarity more and more over the years to come we can look forward to constantly improving relations between labor and management. There will be fewer and fewer industrial disputes as the practice of collective bargaining becomes more general with mutual agreement, good faith and understanding and cooperation by employers and workers.

Then, too, we shall make more balanced economic progress in the future if labor, management, farmers and investors work together toward the goals of higher material and cultural standards of living. Such a movement will be political in the sense that whatever success we express will benefit the great mass of the people. These must in our American way be a social movement which will be in accord with our traditional national purposes and will represent adjustments to changing conditions.

Common social purpose, mutual understanding and cooperation of varied, self interest, can and will give us a practical and desirable democratic cooperation. Included in these purposes are: High wages on a national basis; continuity of income; stability of employment; reasonable profits; the conservation and maximum utilization of natural resources.

Given the reasonableness of the American people, progress can be made towards our goal through the method of fair competition.

Under a system of fair competition, the labor movement becomes a recognized spokesman of the group interest of the workers. To
have such organized labor must strive to obtain the consent of the workers through methods of free choice. The unions will then become more than ever what they were originally supposed to be, educational groups and negotiators of contracts for their members. Under the new conditions the opportunities will become greater since their right to do this is recognized in law.

Labor policy in a democracy is not a program conceived by a government, but rather a program of action which wage earners and employers must work out together in a society which develops naturally out of the work they do and the life they lead. Hand in hand with the growth of our American institutions a labor policy is developing in the United States which will help to improve the conditions and lot of workers in the years to come.

Among the first items that one sees in our growing labor policy are the following:

1. Government action to establish minimum basic standards for labor below which competition should not be permitted to force standards of health, wages, or hours;

2. Government influence to bring about arrangements which will make possible peaceful settlements of controversies and relieve labor of the necessity of resorting to strikes in order to secure the right to be heard;

3. Government aid through legislation and through cooperation between employers and workers to make every job the best that the human mind can devise as to physical conditions, human relations and wages;

4. Government encouragement of such organization and development of wage earners as will give status and stability to labor as a recognized important group of citizens having a contribution to make to economic and political thought and to the cultural life of the community;
5. Government effort to the end that labor play its part in the study and development of any economic policies for the future of the United States; and,

6. Government encouragement of mutuality between labor and employers in the improvement of production and in the development in both groups of a philosophy of self-government in the public interest. If labor's rights are defined by law and by government, then certain obligations will, of course, be expected of wage earners, and it is for the public interest that these obligations should be defined by labor itself. How that such discipline as is necessary should be self-imposed and not imposed from without. This is the basis of all organized codes of ethics in modern society.

The growth of organized labor in membership and in public significance in recent years has been remarkable. The recognition on the part of many employers of the wisdom of close and active partnership in working out with their organized workers the problems of the industry has been most stimulating to everyone who has in mind the organic law which set up the United States Department of Labor.

Clearly this increase in numbers and importance brings to organized labor great obligations and responsibilities. These obligations are to industry and to the country as well as to its members. There is every indication that they can and will be discharged faithfully. Time and experience are necessary to full performance. If the right balance is to be preserved, if lasting progress is to be made, there must be a spirit of give and take, of compromise now on one side, now on the other, always in the interest of the country as a whole.

Labor problems cannot be solved by force. There must be mutual agreement, good faith, and understanding and cooperation by employers and workers. Thousands of employers accept the worker as a partner; only a relatively small number of employers refuse to deal with them. I repeat what I have said on several occasions, there must be industrial peace but with justice.
The workers' desire for stability of income and job, and the industries' equal need for the best use of plant and machinery indicate that the next great step in industrial management in this country will be made by management and labor working together in the conscious development of scientific methods of stabilizing both production and work in American industries. And after this base has been established, the further expansion of productive capacity so desirable can be accomplished more safely along with the increased stability so necessary both socially and economically. Neither of these can be effectively accomplished without the informed and vigorous participation of organized workers.

The American labor movement includes men of capabilities, skill, vision, and patriotism. The average of the groups most closely tied to leadership is high, quite as high as the average in other groups of American. The rank and file of American labor is known for skill, efficiency, good humor; sagacity. American labor rates high in world opinion. Challenges put to labor will be met. There will be a lag. No perfect system is arrived at over night. Men move forward and there are many of us who will live to see American labor fulfilling the challenge to take and maintain its new status in modern society effectively and realistically.
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I have been asked to speak to you tonight on the administration's program for economic security which is now, as you know, before Congress. It seems to me that few legislative proposals have had as careful study, as thorough and conscientious deliberation as went into the preparation of these measures. The program now under consideration represents, I believe, a most significant step in our National development, a milestone in our progress toward the better-ordered society.

As I look back on the tragic years since 1929, it seems to me that we as a Nation, not unlike some individuals, have been able to pass through a bitter experience to emerge with a new-found insight and maturity. We have had the courage to face our problems and find a way out. The heedless optimism of the boom years is past. We now stand ready to build the future with sanity and wisdom.

The process of recovery is not a simple one. We cannot be satisfied merely with makeshift arrangements which will tide us over the present emergencies. We must devise plans that will not merely alleviate the ills of today, but will prevent, as far as it is humanly possible to do so, their recurrence in the future. The task of recovery is inseparable from the fundamental task of social reconstruction.

Among the objectives of that reconstruction, President Roosevelt in his message of June 8, 1934, to the Congress placed "the security of the men, women and children of the Nation first." He went on to suggest the social insurances with which European countries have had a long and favorable experience as one means of providing safeguards against "misfortunes which cannot be wholly eliminated in this man-made world of ours."

Subsequent to this message he created the Committee on Economic Security, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, to make recommendations to him with regard to these problems. The recommendations of that committee are embodied in the economic security bill, now pending in Congress. The measures we propose do not by any means provide a complete and permanent solution of
our difficulties. If put into effect, however, they will provide a greater degree of security for the American citizen and his family than he has heretofore known. The bill is, I believe, a sound beginning on which we can build by degrees to our ultimate goal.

We cannot hope to accomplish all in one bold stroke. To begin too ambitiously in the program of social security might very well result in errors which would entirely discredit this very necessary type of legislation. It is not amiss to note here that social legislation in European countries, begun some 25 years ago, is still in a developmental state and has been subjected to numerous changes as experience and changing conditions dictated.

It may come as a surprise to many of us that we in this country should be so far behind Europe in providing our citizens with those safeguards which assure a decent standard of living in both good times and bad, but the reasons are not far to seek. We are much younger than our European neighbors. Our abundant pioneer days are not very far behind us. With unlimited opportunities, in those days, for the individual who wished to take advantage of them, dependency seemed a reflection on the individual himself, rather than the result of social or economic conditions. There seemed little need for any systematic organized plan, such as has now become necessary.

It has taken the rapid industrialization of the last few decades, with its mass-production methods, to teach us that a man might become a victim of circumstances far beyond his control, and finally it "took a depression to dramatize for us the appalling insecurity of the great mass of the population, and to stimulate interest in social insurance in the United States."

We have come to learn that the large majority of our citizens must have protection against the loss of income due to unemployment, old age, death of the breadwinners and disabling accidents and illness, not only on humanitarian grounds, but in the interest of our National welfare. If we are to maintain a healthy economy and thriving production, we need to maintain the standard of living of the
lower income groups in our population who constitute 90 per cent of our purchasing power.

England, with its earlier industrialization, learned this lesson earlier, as well. The world depression caught up with Great Britain sooner than it did with us. She has known the haunting fear of insecurity as well as we. The foresight of nearly three decades has, however, found her somewhat better prepared with the basic framework of a social insurance system. Social insurance in Great Britain has proceeded progressively since the first decade of the century. Championed by the liberal Lloyd George and beginning with the old age pension act of 1908, it has known many revisions and extensions. Since its inception, however, it has gradually overcome the opposition of its critics, and there has never been any thought of abandoning the system. It is today in a healthy state of growth.

Practically all the other industrial countries of Europe have had similar experiences. In the trial and error procedure of Europe's quarter century of social legislation—in that concrete experience—is contained sound truths as well as mistakes from which we can learn much.

But we cannot build solely on European experience. We, with our particular kind of State-Federal Government, our wide, expansive country, with its varying economic and social standards, have many needs different from those of the more closely knit, homogeneous European countries.

The American program for economic security now before our Congress follows no single pattern. It is broader than social insurance, and does not attempt merely to copy a European model. Where other measures seemed more appropriate to our background or present situation, we have not hesitated to deviate from strict social insurance principles. In doing so we feel that we have recommended the measures which at this time seemed best calculated under our American conditions to protect individuals in the years immediately ahead from the hazards which might otherwise plunge them into destitution and dependency.

Our program deals with safeguards against unemployment, with old-age security, with maternal aid and aid
to crippled and dependent children and public health services. Another major subject—health insurance—is dealt with briefly in the report of the Committee on Economic Security, but without any definite recommendations. Fortunate in having secured the cooperation of the medical and other professions directly concerned, the committee is working on a plan for health insurance which will be reported later in the year. Our present program calls for the extension of existing public health services to meet conditions accentuated by the depression. Similarly, the provisions for maternal aid and aid to dependent and crippled children are not new departures, but rather the extension and amplification of safeguards which for a number of years have been a recognized part of public responsibility.

Let me briefly describe the other measures now under consideration which do represent something of a departure from our usual course.

Recognizing unemployment as the greatest of all hazards, the committee gave primary emphasis to provisions for unemployment—employment assurance. This measure is embodied in the $4,800,000,000 public works resolution, which is separate from, but complementary to, the economic security bill itself. Employment assurance, the stimulation of private employment and the provision of public employment for those able-bodied workers whom private industry cannot yet absorb is to be solely a responsibility of the Federal Government and its major contribution in providing safeguards against unemployment.

It should be noted that this is the largest employment program ever considered in any country. As outlined by the President, it will furnish employment for able-bodied men now on relief, and enable them to earn their support in a decent and socially useful way. It will uphold morale, as well as purchasing power, and directly provide jobs for many in private industry who would otherwise have none.

For the 80 per cent of our industrial workers who are employed, we propose a system of unemployment compensation, or insurance, as it is usually called. In our concern for the unemployed, we must not overlook
this much larger group who also need protection.

No one who is now employed can feel secure while so many of his fellows anxiously seek work. Unemployment compensation, while it has distinct limitations which are not always clearly understood, is particularly valuable for the ordinarily regularly employed industrial worker who is laid off for short periods because of seasonal demands or other minor industrial disturbances. He can, during this period when he has a reasonable expectation of returning to work within a short time, receive compensation for his loss of income for a limited period as a definite contractual right. His standard of living need not be undermined, he is not forced on relief nor must he accept other work unsuited to his skill and training.

Unemployment Insurance, wherever it has been tried, has demonstrated its value in maintaining purchasing power and stabilizing business conditions. It is very valuable at the onset of a depression, and even in the later stages will serve to carry a part of the burden of providing for the unemployed. For those who have exhausted their rights to unemployment benefits and for those who, in any case, must be excluded from its provisions, we suggest that they be given employment opportunities on public work projects. In these two measures, employment assurance and unemployment compensation, we have a first and second line of defense which together should form a better safeguard than either standing alone.

The unemployment compensation system has been designed to remove an obstacle which has long prevented progressive industrial States from enacting unemployment insurance laws—fear of interstate competition with States not having such laws. Having removed that obstacle, the law allows the States full latitude to develop the kind of unemployment compensation systems best suited to their individual needs.

The bill provides for a Federal tax on pay rolls against which credit is allowed the employer for contributions to an approved State unemployment compensation fund. By this Federal tax every employer will be placed on
the same competitive basis from a National standpoint, and at the same time, aside from compliance with a few minimum Federal standards, every State will be free to adopt the kind of law it wants.

One of the most important of the Federal requirements is that all unemployment compensation funds shall be deposited with the Federal Treasury in Washington, so as to assure their availability when needed and make it possible to utilize the reserves which will accumulate in conformity with the credit policy of the Nation.

We feel that this is a most fortunate time for the Government to take action on unemployment insurance. There has been a rapidly growing enthusiasm for it in the States for years. Many States have already prepared excellent legislation of this kind or are studying the subject, and they are but waiting word from Washington, so that they may proceed with the plans which have been so long under consideration.

I come now to the other major phase of our program. The plan for providing against need and dependency in old age is divided into three separate and distinct parts. We advocate, first, free Federally-aided pensions for those now old and in need; second, a system of compulsory contributory old-age insurance for workers in the lower income brackets, and third, a voluntary system of low-cost annuities purchasable by those who do not come under the compulsory system.

Enlightened opinion has long since discarded the old poor-house method of caring for the indigent aged, and 28 States already have old-age pension laws. Due to financial difficulties, many of these laws are now far less effective than they were intended to be. Public sentiment in this country is strongly in favor of providing these old people with a decent and dignified subsistence in their declining years. Exploting that very creditable sentiment, impossible, hare-brained schemes for providing for the aged have sprung into existence and attracted misguided supporters. But the administration is confident that its plan for meeting the situation is both humane and practical and will receive the enthusiastic support of the people.

We propose that the Federal Gov-
...erament shall come to the aid of the State pension systems already in existence and stimulate the enactment of similar legislation elsewhere by grants-in-aid equal to one-half the State expenditures for such purposes but not exceeding $15 per month. This does not necessarily mean that State pensions would not anywhere exceed $30 per month. Progressive States may find it possible to grant more than $15 per month as their share. The size of the pension would, of course, be proportionate to the need of the applicant and would quite likely vary with conditions in different States. A larger pension would, for example, be necessary in certain industrial States than in communities where living conditions are easier.

For those now young or even middle-aged, a system of compulsory old-age insurance will enable them to build up, with matching contributions from their employers, an annuity from which they can draw as a right upon reaching old age. These workers will be able to care for themselves in their old age, not merely on a subsistence basis, which is all that gratuitous pensions have anywhere provided, but with a modest comfort and security. Such a system will greatly lessen the hazards of old age to the many workers who could not, unaided, provide for themselves and would greatly lessen the enormous burden of caring for the aged of future generations from public funds. The voluntary system of old-age annuities is designed to cover the same income groups as does the compulsory system, but will afford those who for many reasons cannot be included in a compulsory system an opportunity to provide for themselves.

Many of you will be interested to know that the two proposed annuity systems in no way infringe on the commercial annuity markets. Officials of insurance companies have themselves remarked that these measures would touch a strata of our population for whom commercial annuities are prohibitively expensive. These officials feel that the measures we propose will prove advantageous to their companies rather than the reverse, in so far as they promote public interest in the insurance movement.

This, in broad outlines, is the program now before us. We feel that it
is a sound and reasonable plan and framed with due regard for the present state of economic recovery. I can do no better than to pass on to you the words with which President Roosevelt closed his letter submitting these recommendations to the Congress now in session:

"The establishment of sound means toward a greater future economic security of the American people is dictated by a prudent consideration of the hazards involved in our national life. No one can guarantee this country against the dangers of future depressions, but we can reduce these dangers. We can eliminate many of the factors that cause economic depressions, and we can provide the means of mitigating their results. This plan for economic security is at once a measure of prevention and a method of alleviation. "We pay now for the dreadful consequence of economic insecurity—and dearly. This plan presents a more equitable and infinitely less expensive means of meeting these costs. We cannot afford to neglect the plain duty before us. I strongly recommend action to attain the objectives sought in this report."
Washington
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I AM deeply sorry that I have had to forego the opportunity of accompanying my old friend, Senator Ryan Duffey, to Milwaukee to be with you as I had planned tonight. But the closing days of a far-reaching and memorable session of the Congress of the United States keeps me here in Washington.

You doubtless know everything that I am going to say to you—because starting as early as last Monday certain special writers of a few papers have given you a complete outline of my remarks. I have been interested and somewhat amused by these clairvoyants who put on the front pages many days ago this speech which, because of pressure of time, I could only think out and dictate this very morning.

Whatever his party affiliations may be, the President of the United States, in addressing the youth of the country—even when speaking to the younger citizens of his own party—should speak as President of the whole people. It is true that the Presidency carries with it, for the time being, the leadership of a political party as well.

But the Presidency carries with it a far higher obligation than this—the duty of analyzing and setting forth national needs and ideals which transcend and cut across all lines of party affiliation. Therefore, what I am about to say to you, members of the Young Democratic Clubs, is precisely—word for word—what I would say were I addressing a convention of the youth of the Republican party.

A man of my generation comes to the councils of the younger warriors in a very different spirit from that in which the older men addressed the youth of my time. Party or professional leaders who talked to us twenty-five or thirty years ago almost inevitably spoke in a mood of achievement and exultation. They addressed us with the air of those who had won the secret of success for themselves and of permanence of achievement for their country for all generations to come.

They assumed that there was a guarantee of final accomplishment for the people of this country and that the grim spectre of insecurity and want among the great masses would never haunt this land of plenty as it had widely visited other portions of the world. And so the elders of that day used to tell us, in effect, that the job of youth was merely to copy them and thereby to preserve the great things they had won for us.

I have no desire to underestimate the achievements of the past. We have no right to speak slightingly of the heritage, spiritual and material, that comes down to us. There are lessons that it teaches that we abandon only at our own peril. "Hold fast to that which is permanently true," is still a counsel of wisdom.

While my elders were talking to me about the perfection of America, I did not know then of the lack of opportunity, the lack of education, the lack of many of the essential needs of civilization; that all these existed among millions of our people who lived not alone in the slums of
the great cities and in the forgotten corners of rural America—existed even under the very noses of those who had the advantages and the power of government of those days.

I say from my heart that no man of my generation has any business to address youth unless he comes to the task not in a spirit of exultation, but in a spirit of humility. I cannot expect you of a newer generation to believe me, of an older generation, if I do not frankly acknowledge that had the generation that brought you into the world been wiser and more provident and more unselfish, you would have been saved from needless difficult problems and needless pain and suffering.

We may not have failed you in good intentions but we have certainly not been adequate in results. Your task, therefore, is not only to maintain the best in your heritage, but to labor to lift from the shoulders of the American people some of the burdens that the mistakes of a past generation have placed there.

There was a time when the formula for success was the simple admonition to have a stout heart and willing hands. A great new country lay open. When life became hard in one place it was necessary only to move on to another. But circumstances have changed all that. Today we can no longer escape into virgin territory: we must master our environment. The youth of this generation finds that the old frontier is occupied, but that science and invention and economic evolution have opened up a new frontier—one not based on geography but on the resourcefulness of men and women applied to the old frontier.

The cruel suffering of the recent depression has taught us unforgettable lessons. We have been compelled by stark necessity to unlearn the too comfortable superstition that the American soil was mystically blessed with every kind of immunity to grave economic maladjustments and that the American spirit of individualism—all alone and unhelped by the cooperative efforts of government—could withstand and repel every form of economic disarrangement. The severity of the recent depression, toward which we had been heading for a whole generation, has taught us that no economic or social class in the community is so richly endowed and so independent of the general community that it can safeguard its own security, let alone assure security for the general community.

The very objectives of young people have changed. In the older days a great financial fortune was too often the goal. To rule through wealth, or through the power of wealth, fired our imagination. This was the dream of the golden ladder—each individual for himself.

It is my firm belief that the newer generation of America has a different dream. You place emphasis on sufficiency of life, rather than on a plethora of riches. You think of the security for yourself and your family that will give you good health, good food, good education—good working conditions and the opportunity for normal recreation and occasional travel. Your advancement, you hope, is along a broad highway on which thousands of your fellow men and women are advancing with you.

You and I know that this modern economic world of ours is governed by rules and regulations vastly more complex than those laid down in the days of Adam Smith or John Stuart Mill. They faced simpler mechanical processes and social needs. It is worth remembering, for example, that the business corporation, as we know it, did not exist in the days of Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson.

Private businesses then were conducted solely by individuals or by partnerships in which every member was immediately and wholly responsible for success or failure. Facts are relentless. We must adjust our ideas to the facts of today.

Our concepts of the regulation of money and credit and industrial competition, of the relation of employer and employee created for the old civilization are being modified to save our economic structure from confusion, destruction and paralysis. The rules that governed the relationship between an employer and employee in the blacksmith’s shop in the days of Washington cannot, of necessity, govern the relationship between the 50,000 employees of a great corporation and the infinitely complex and diffused ownership of that corporation.

If 50,000 employees spoke with 50,000 voices, there would be a modern Tower of Babel. That is why we insist on their right to choose their representatives to bargain collectively in their behalf with their employer. In the case of the employees, every individual employee will know in his daily work whether he is adequately represented or not. In the case of the hundreds of thousands of stockholders in the present-day ownership of great corporations, however, their knowledge of the success of the management is based too often solely on a financial balance sheet.

Things may go wrong in the management without their being aware of it for a year, or for many years to come. Without their day-to-day knowledge they may be exploited and their investments jeopardized. Therefore, we have come to the recognition of the need of simple but adequate public protection for the rights of the investing public.

A rudimentary concept of credit control appropriate for financing the economic life of a nation of 3,000,000 people can hardly be urged as a means of directing and protecting the welfare of our modern industrialism.

The simple banking rules of Hamilton’s day when all the transactions of a small-sized bank could be kept in the neat financial balance sheet would be a modern Tower of Babel. That is why we insist on their right to choose their representatives to bargain collectively in their behalf with their employer. In the case of the employees, every individual employee will know in his daily work whether he is adequately represented or not. In the case of the hundreds of thousands of stockholders in the present-day ownership of great corporations, however, their knowledge of the success of the management is based too often solely on a financial balance sheet.

And so it goes through all the range of economic life. Aggressive enterprise and shrewd invention have been at work on our economic machine. Our rules of conduct for the operation of that machine must be subjected to the same constant development.

And so in our social life. Forty years ago slum conditions in our great cities were much worse than today. Living conditions on farms and working conditions in mines and factories were primitive. But they were taken for granted. Few people considered that the government had responsibility for sanitation, for safety devices, for prevention of child labor and night work for women.

In 1911, twenty-four years ago, when I was first a member of the New York State Legislature, a number of the younger members of the Legislature worked against these old conditions and called for laws governing factory inspection, for workmen’s compensation and for the limi-
tion of work for women and children to fifty-four hours, with one day's rest in seven. Those of us who joined in this movement in the Legislature were called reformers, Socialists and wild men.

We were opposed by many of the same organizations and the same individuals who are now crying aloud about the socialism involved in social security legislation, in bank deposit insurance, in farm credit, in the saving of homes, in the protection of investors and the regulation of public utilities. The reforms, however, for which we were condemned twenty-four years ago, are taken today as a matter of course. And so, I believe, will be regarded the reforms that now cause such concern to the reactionaries of 1935.

We come to an understanding of these new ways of protecting people because our knowledge enlarges and our capacity for organized action increases. People have learned that they can carry their burdens effectively only by cooperation. We have found out how to conquer the ravages of diseases that years ago were regarded as unavoidable and inevitable. We must learn that many other social ills can be cured.

Let me emphasize that, serious as have been the errors of unrestrained individualism, I do not believe in abandoning the system of individual enterprise. The freedom and opportunity that have characterized American development in the past can be maintained if we recognize the fact that the individual system of our day calls for the collaboration of all of us to provide, at the least, security for all of us. Those words "freedom" and "opportunity" do not mean license to climb upward by pushing other people down.

Any paternalistic system which tries to provide for security for everyone from above only calls for an impossible task, and a regressive utterly uncomenial to the spirit of our people. But government cooperation to help make the system of free enterprise work, to provide that minimum security without which the competitive system cannot function, to restrain the kind of individual action which in the past has been harmful to the community—that kind of governmental cooperation is entirely consistent with the best tradition of America.

Just as the evolution of economic and social life has shown the need for new methods and practices, so has the new political life developed the need for new political practices and methods. Government now demands the best trained brains of every business and profession. Government today requires higher and higher standards of those who would serve it. It must bring to its service greater and greater competence. The conditions of public work must be improved and protected. More party membership and loyalty can no longer be the exclusive tests. We must be loyal not merely to persons or parties, but to the higher conceptions of ability and devotion that modern government requires.

There was a day when political sages, or those who controlled them, took the attitude that anything new, or what they called "new-fangled," would lead to dire results.

There is nothing new in these prophecies of gloom. I read these lines in a paper the other day in little poem entitled Going to the Dogs:

My grandpa notes the world's worn cogs,
And says we're going to the dogs;
His grandad in his house of logs,
Sware things were going to the dogs;
His dad, among the Flemish dogs,
Vowed things were going to the dogs;
The caveman in his queer skin togs,
Said things were going to the dogs;
But this is what I wish to state—
The dogs have had an awful wait.

I would be lacking in any sense of responsibility and lacking in elementary courage if I shared in such a hopeless attitude. I, for one, am willing to place my trust in the youth of America. If they demand action as well as pensions I should be ashamed to chill their enthusiasm with the dire prophecy that to change is to destroy. I am unwilling to sneer at the vision of youth merely because vision is sometimes mistaken. But vision does not belong only to the young.

There are millions of older people who have vision, just as there are some younger men and women who are ready to put a weary, selfish or greedy hand upon the clock of progress and turn it back. We who seek to go forward must ever guard ourselves against a danger which history teaches. More than ever, we cherish the elective form of democratic government, but progress under it can easily be retarded by disagreements that relate to method and to detail rather than to the broad objectives upon which we are agreed. It is as if all of us were united in the pursuit of a common goal, but that each and every one of us were marching along a separate road of our own. If we insist on choosing different roads, most of us will not reach our common destination.

The reason that the forces of reaction so often defeat the forces of progress is that the Tories of the world are agreed and united in standing still on the same old spot and, therefore, never run the danger of getting lost on divergent trails. One might remark in passing that one form of standing still on the same spot consists in agreeing to condemn all progress and letting it go at that. Therefore to the American youth of all parties I submit a message of confidence—unite and challenge! Rules are not necessarily sacred—principles are. The methods of the old order are not, as some would have you believe, above the challenge of youth.

Let us carry on the good that the past gave us. The best of that good is the spirit of America. And the spirit of America is the spirit of inquiry, of readjustment, of improvement; above all a spirit in which youth can find the fulfillment of its ideals. It is for the new generation to participate in the decisions and to give strength and spirit and continuity to our government and to our national life.
For a good many years men of the pros and men interested in public affairs have discussed the need and advisability of a new political party. Not because they were particularly desirous of forming one, but because the alignment between the two major parties seemed illogical. Every time that has been seriously discussed, it has been said, "But we cannot form new political parties. We do not need any third party in the United States."

I think that is true so far as the need of a third party is concerned. We do not need to discuss whether it is wise or not to form a new political party in America because one has been formed and is carrying on the government of the United States. That being so, it seems to me that it is necessary to rally the opposition to that party so that there may still exist two major political parties in our country. I think it is no exaggeration to say, at any rate, I do not intend it with exaggeration, that we are facing the most important crisis that ever has arisen in the history of our country. I realize, and you do, who have attended political meetings more or less, that it is quite common for men discussing political matters, to view possibly from a party standpoint. I think we cannot exaggerate the importance of the present situation, because the issue that will be decided in 1936 for the time being at least, and possibly for a long time to come, can be very simply stated.

That question is whether this country will retain the form of government which we have had for 150 years, or whether we will substitute for it something entirely new and strange. Now, if I am correct in that, one can discuss the present situation from an entirely non-partisan standpoint because upon both sides of that issue a combination of men and women who have formerly been affiliated with both the old parties. I realize that one who has been active in Democratic politics as I have been, more or less, for the larger part of my life, meets the charge when they oppose a Democratic administration, of having changed their political views. I have not changed mine. I have the same political views that I had when I voted for Mr. Roosevelt, and if he had retained the views which he expressed as a candidate I should be anxious to have him re-elected.

I noted your applause when Mr. Wickersham expressed his thankfulness that Congress had adjourned. My gratitude in that respect is somewhat tempered by a feeling of regret that the entire administration had not adjourned! I am not sure that the combination of the executive and legislative branches in Washington is any worse than the executive branch let alone by itself. True the combination between the White House and the capital has been pretty close, but here and there has been a little check. I think you will do honor to one of my political creed to this extent at least to agree with me that the strongest and most effective opposition to the innovations in Government which have been proposed and to some extent carried out, has come from one who has served in the Democratic ranks all his life, Senator Glass. I am not sure that it is entirely right to lay all the blame for the bad legislation which we have been subjected to since 1933 to the party which nominated President Roosevelt. Two or three days ago the Guffey Coal Bill passed the Senate, after passing the House, and if some of you Republican gentlemen and ladies will look over the vote in the Senate, you will find that it required and received the votes of six Republican Senators in order to pass that iniquitous measure. In other words, the new alignment of parties has come in the United States Senate. Day after day a half dozen Democratic Senators, led by Senator Glass, have entered their protest, and supporting New Deal legislation day after day, a half dozen Senators who were elected under the title, Republican, have given support to whatever the White House required. If an alignment as logical and clear and plain as now is seen in the United States Senate can come with the people of the country, quite a different situation would present itself. I have no doubt that a majority, and a large majority, of the people of the United States desire to continue to live under orderly constitutional government. I am quite well aware of the force of a party name, and I realize that the danger of the present situation lies pretty largely in the fact that millions of voters vote for a party name instead of what the party stands for at the time. It is going to require a combination of all the right thinking people in the country to stop the movement now going on, which must result, if it continues long, in the destruction of American institutions as we know them. And it seems to me that the first step in the effort to counteract the work of the new party, is to satisfy honest and conscientious Democrats, that the present administration has no right to call upon them for support.

Thirty million men and women voted for Mr. Roosevelt, and I presume that those of them who voted thoughtfully, who didn't simply vote mechanically, or vote under the impression that the money that they had unwisely invested was lost by something mysterious that Mr. Hoover may have done, or failed to do—voted because they believed in the principles of the Democratic Party as announced in the platform adopted at Chicago. I am perfectly free to say at this non-partisan meeting that I do not think either party ever adopted a better platform than the Democrats adopted in 1932. It began with a sentence which I think is worth noting. "A party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party entrusted with power."

In other words, the convention desired all men to know that they meant their platform seriously, and I think the
country took it seriously. President Roosevelt in his speech platform one hundred per cent.

I suppose some of you have still a memory of what that platform contained! I am going to read just a little part of it for the benefit of those who might have forgotten of acceptance at the Convention, said that he accepted the hazards." That was a covenant with the people. That plank in the platform was written by Carter Glass. At least, he has said so, and I never knew anyone to suspect him of not telling the truth. I wonder, if when Carter Glass wrote that, and the Democratic Convention adopted it, and the President accepted it one hundred per cent, if Senator Glass had in his mind cutting the gold dollar in two, repudiating the gold clause in the bonds, demonetizing gold. Senator Glass might have been Secretary of the Treasury had he been willing to accept the new version of what sound currency means.

"We advocate the removal of government from all fields of private enterprise." That was a covenant with the people. It was accepted by President Roosevelt a hundred per cent. How faithfully it has been lived up to. I take it that Secretary Wallace was not a delegate to that convention, for if he had been, he would surely have entered a protest against that plank as well as against that which follows:

"We condemn the unsound policy of restricting agricultural production." I think the next plank was taken very seriously by the gentleman whom President Roosevelt appointed as budget commissioner, Mr. Lewis Douglas, and who after holding the office nearly a year, resigned. It reads like this: "We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenue, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay."

And there is another interesting paragraph I want to read more I leave this particular subject. "We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 per cent in the cost of Federal Government."

Now assuming that the great bulk of President Roosevelt's supporters in 1912 believed in the platform of the party which nominated him, as I did, and believed in his acceptance at a hundred per cent of that platform, it seems to me that even those who hold the old-fashioned doctrine that men should stay by their contracts, may be excused for not supporting the administration any further. That platform represented democracy I think. The New Deal party is not Democratic. If President Roosevelt's idea is that by accepting the new policy that he has evolved since he became President, he is accepting the platform one hundred per cent, either he did not read the platform, or one hundred per cent means something different to him than it does to us.

The President and all of the leaders of the New Deal party have been more or less disturbed by the proposition that some of us who do not look at things as they did, were reverting back to ancient times, and refer to them as, "bush and buggy days." I am inclined to think there is something connected with rapid transportation that may change a man's views, and I wonder if the President had proceeded to that convention in Chicago in a more leisurely way, whether he would not have either changed his hundred per cent appreciation of the platform or would have better appreciated its merits. I have read the platform of 1932 adopted by the Socialists Party, and as I read it, I have wondered if in some way in that trip in the air, the President did not get the two platforms mixed, and accept the wrong one. If he did make that mistake, he has kept the faith.

The legislation which Congress has recently, I do not think I ought to say, enacted, because Congress did not have very much to do excepting to accept it; has departed from every possible angle that would stamp it as in accordance with Democratic principles, as the Democratic leaders of former years have understood them. I do not mean by that to suggest that they resemble the policies which Republicans have advocated, but they have violated every principle of my old party. Today there is no organized political party functioning as a Democratic Party. There is the New Deal party in power, and opposed to it, naturally the Republican organization. But just as firmly opposed, and I am not sure but more seriously opposed, a great body of men and women who sincerely believe in the doctrines of Democracy as taught by the great leaders of that party. Sometimes I think Republicans and Democrats got a little further apart than was needed, preceding the birth of this new party, because the Republican Party always paid tribute to Lincoln and the Democrats to Jefferson, and if there were two men whose policies differed less than any other two, I cannot recall them. Fundamentally they agreed on fundamentals. Fundamentally they talked the same doctrine, and it does not seem to me that it requires much of an effort for Democrats who still believe in the philosophy of Jefferson and Republicans who accepted the philosophy of Lincoln, to get together in their effort to resume Constitutional Government in our country.

To go over in detail the items of the New Deal legislation and New Deal policies advocated would be impossible, but I can state my objections to it in a sentence. I have three objections to the New Deal legislation. In the first place a very large part of it is dishonest in my opinion, a very large part of it is unconstitutional, and a very large part of it is impractical. Outside of being dishonest, unconstitutional and impractical, I do not know that I would criticize it. Now when I say unconstitutional, I do not mean to say that I have a right to say it is necessarily legally unconstitutional. There are a good many laws passed that absolutely contravene the spirit of the Constitution of the United States that might legally be declared unconstitutional. The court only declares a law unconstitutional when it is compelled to do so. I do not believe the men who advocated N. R. A. thought it was constitutional. No lawyers who read their arguments and briefs would get the idea that they did. Their whole idea was that it would do a good deal of good for the country, but there are acts passed which would go by the court not infringing on the Constitution sufficiently to be declared unconstitutional. And for the last three months in Washington shrewd and cunning attorneys have been working to get
by Congress laws as nearly unconstitutional as possible and still within the law.

It may violate the spirit of the Constitution and still sufficiently comply with the letter to get by the court. And then there is another thought. It is a terrible thing to suggest, but nevertheless, I do suggest it sincerely, that the effort in Washington has been for the last three or four months to pass so much legislation through Congress which is either unconstitutional or on the verge of it that many cases will be presented to the United States Supreme Court involving so much that affects the lives of people that the Court may hesitate or fear to turn the laws down. I think an attempt is being made to terrorize the Court, and if the Court has the courage to go along and do its duty fully and fairly, to then have the Court placed where the movement to alter its powers will enable New Dealers to practically destroy the Court. You can read that plan through all the debates in Congress.

When the Guffey Coal Bill was adopted, the finest speech against it was made by a Democrat from Tennessee. I cannot believe that any lawyer who has read the Guffey Coal Bill believes it is constitutional. But if the Court holds it unconstitutional, I think it is the hope of the New Dealers that the action will render the Court sufficiently obnoxious to the people so that they can rob it of its powers. Argument after argument on that line has been suggested. I said I believed the New Deal to be dishonest. Well, if any of you are fortunate enough to have a Federal Reserve bill in the house when you go home, you look at it and find on it the promise of the United States to redeem it in gold in the United States Treasury. Just try to get it redeemed in gold. I think you have to go back to the time of Henry VIII to find when any English speaking government deliberately debased its own currency. The New Dealers of his time decided that it would be a good idea to cut down the gold sovereign and called them in and cut a corner off them. My impression is that nothing like it has happened since until within the last few months. To get from the American people 25 grams of gold and reduce the dollar down to 15 grams and pay them in silver dollars may be ingenious. The issue of bonds of the United States bearing on their face that they would be redeemed in gold of the weight and fineness of the date of issue and then repudiating the promise was not honest. Why the United States Supreme Court, not by 5 to 4, but by 9 to nothing called that repudiation and the New Deal people claim the victory on that decision. I do not know of any time before in the history of the United States when any statesman in authority advocated repudiation of any portion of the debt of the United States. After the Civil War, when we were about to re-admit the Southern states into the Union, there was fear on the part of some Northern men that there might come a time when the Civil War debt might be repudiated, and we passed an amendment to the Constitution providing that the debt should be paid in full. A partial answer to this criticism is that those from whom the government took gold and gave paper lost nothing as they could buy just as much with the paper as they could with the gold. Well, Secretary Morgenthau, whose name will go down through history with as much publicity as that of Hamilton or Albert Gallatin; Secretary Morgenthau has said that the United States Government made a profit of about three billion dollars when it reduced the value of the gold dollar. It takes a great financial genius to figure how one can take something from another, return him something else and give him full value and make a profit for himself.

The President said, when campaigning, that he intended to do something for silver. He has done something for silver. Mr. Morgenthau says that in what was due the nation made a profit of $600,000,000. Another remarkable financial argument comes from the Treasury. After the bonds were called that were replaced by another issue at a lower rate, it was stated by the Treasurer that we were no worse off, though we had increased the bonded debt, as the bonds bore a lower rate of interest we did not have to pay any more, in annual charges against them. We will never succeed in paying the principal if it runs up any further.

About New Deal policies being impracticable. There are many people who can forgive them for being dishonest and unconstitutional, if they really did work for the material good of the country.

It was decided in Washington that the country had to produce less food. Men and women and children were going without food. One of the favorite retorts of the New Deal was, "Do you want people to starve?" In the interest of preventing people from starvation, a policy was adopted that we could cut down the amount of agricultural production, and starting with wheat, raise less wheat, but the wheat farmer said, "I must have my income." "All right, we will pay you a bonus for the acres you do not plant." That was an original thought: new to Democrats, new to Republicans, new to the world. And the same thing with corn and various other agricultural products. The same with meat products. Hungry people of the industrial centers were getting too much pork and beef so the Government went west and destroyed little pigs and cows. It has been said that anyone who stated they destroyed meat was lying. I checked on it a little to be sure that I would not state it wrong, and I find that the bulk of that meat was put into fertilizer. Just enough meat to be produced to satisfy the needs of the American people, and the wise people in Washington in charge of that work could figure out exactly how that could be done. Well, what happened? They had a drought and Mr. Wallace said if it hadn’t been for the drought it would have come out all right. It has been impossible to gauge the rainfall any time ahead, and the only way a committee could work out the production that was necessary to feed the people of the country would be to know exactly what the weather would be, and to be able to solve all the problems that make farming the biggest gamble in the world. We have been forced since the first of January to import corn in large quantities from Argentina, to import wheat, pork, beef, paying a heavy duty and selling to the American people at an exorbitant price. I state this as an impracticability of the New Deal. We started to reduce the production of cotton and pay the cotton planter for not planting a certain portion of his land. We had been exporting for many years sixty per cent of the cotton crop, never able to use it all in the United States. England uses a great amount and has no cotton fields. What was the result? Why, the natural result that anyone might have anticipated. They are raising cotton in Brazil, Man-
churia and parts of Africa and today the foreign market is being taken on by other nations. Thirty million people in the United States had been dependent upon cotton for a living. Instead of helping the cotton planter it is driving him out of business.

Potatoes were not regarded as a basic commodity. The planter was permitted to plant potatoes. Last year the market opened at Aroostook with potatoes at 35 cents a barrel and never went above 40 and today the County of Aroostook is calling on the United States to lend them money enough to run the schools, and in order to pacify them a potato control bill has been passed. After it has been in practice two years, if there is one practical potato farmer in the state of Maine who votes for it, I shall see if I can't get his relatives to allow me to examine him for sanity.

There is no contest in 1936 between Democrats and Republicans. Get that out of your heads, if it is there. Your fight is between those who support the government and those whom the government supports. Anyone who pleases and would like to quit the life of active American citizens and be dependent on some bureau in Washington, to dictate what they shall do or how they shall live should join the New Deal. But those who want to resume and retain the freedom of American citizens and enjoy the privileges of, if not a fuller and more abundant life, one in which they may preserve their self respect, should join in defeating the New Deal.

What Congress Has Done

By HON. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, United States Senator from Arkansas.

ARRANGED BY THE WASHINGTON STAR. BROADCAST OVER NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY, AUGUST 22, 1935.

NEAR the close of one of the longest sessions of Congress ever held, it may be truly said that the first session of the seventy-fourth Congress has justified its prolongation by passing legislation, the quality of which is comparable to the greatest measures enacted in the history of our Government.

I dare say many people who have followed the newspaper accounts of the proceedings understand the importance of the legislation of this session. Some of the newspaper headlines have related to the differences expressed as to legislation, but the Congress, in the main, has actually been a harmonious, hard-working body engaged in threshing out differences to the end that wise and necessary laws be enacted.

The partisan newspapers have stressed wrangles. That is quite natural for there is drama in a struggle, and no drama at all in the ordinary routine of legislation. Men of principle will fight for their convictions, and in the earnestness of debate sharp things are said. Also, to some extent, politics enters into the motives and movements of Congressmen. That is not so bad as it sounds, for it sharpens criticism of bills, and refines the final measures.

Legislation frequently is suggested by the President as the Constitution contemplates. Administration sources very naturally find the need for legislation from experience in administering prior laws. Every one of the measures disposed of has been debated, analyzed, and I believe improved. Some are still before conferences of the two houses of Congress, in the process of reconciling divergent views of the Senate and House of Representatives.

If the session soon ending had done nothing but enact the social security act, it would have qualified itself for a place among memorable Congresses. This measure represents progress. Old age pensions, unemployment insurance and definite recognition of the obligations to take care of such unfortunate as crippled children, the blind and indigent mothers are some of the features of this new law. The bill creates a Federal-State unemployment compensation; it provides that after September 1, 1936, employers will be assessed excise taxes on their pay rolls of 1 per cent next year, 2 per cent the year following and 3 per cent thereafter. The funds will be paid according to laws adopted by the States. The bill allows a credit up to 90 per cent to employers on account of taxes paid to particular State unemployment funds, and grants a Federal subsidy of $300,000 in 1936 and $49,000,000 annually thereafter to assist the States. The bill authorizes $24,750,000 to assist the States in aid to dependent children; grants are to be made of one-third by the Federal Government and two-thirds by the States with the Federal allowance limited to $5 to a child and $4 to any other child in the same household; $3,800,000 a year is the Federal Government's contribution for the health of mothers and children, especially in rural areas, and $2,850,000 a year is granted in providing surgical and other facilities for crippled children. The nation will grant $8,000,000 to assist the States in general health service and $5,000,000 on a fifty-fifty basis for penalizing the needy blind. There are, of course, other grants and provisions, but the most important of them is a cash benefit to people over 65 years old, based on the total amount of wages received before the beneficiary attained the retirement age. The Treasury is to be reimbursed for these grants by a tax upon both employers and employees based upon the latter's wages. Unemployment insurance is part of the program, the rate of pay being based on the average monthly salary contingent and varying according to the years of employment. Every effort is made in those provisions to guard against favoritism. The Social Security Board will be composed of three members, not more than two of whom to belong to the same political party, and the terms of office will be six years in order that periodical appointments shall not coincide with any presidential term.

The general recognition of the necessity for such a measure was indicated by the vote of the Congress. The House passed it 10 to 1, and there were only 6 votes against its passage in the Senate.

There seems to be a general impression that all the soldier legislation acted on during this session of Congress...
was the soldier bonus bill, which was vetoed by the President, the veto being sustained by the Senate. Actually, there was a number of measures in aid of the ex-soldiers. For example, World War veterans have been restored to former rates of compensation for disabilities, incurred during service and 75 per cent of the former rates for those whose disabilities are described as presumptive, meaning that, while it cannot be established, their disabilities are presumed to have resulted from their period in the Army. Civil War veterans and their dependents are aided by a restoration of 5 per cent. Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents benefited by a complete restoration of pensions at an increased cost of about $45,000,000. New hospitals and additions to existing veterans' hospitals are taken care of by the appropriation of $21,000,000, and free hospitalization is extended to peace-time veterans who are on the pension rolls.

Another bill extends the period during which claims for adjusted compensation may be filed to January 2, 1940, giving opportunity to every soldier to obtain what he is entitled to when this adjusted compensation falls due.

In addition, an arrangement has been effected to have the Finance Committee consider and report a measure relating to the payment of adjusted compensation certificates by the 15th of January next and to proceed to the consideration and disposition of the bill during the session which begins January 3, 1936.

In the early part of this session more attention was paid to the $4,000,000,000 work-relief appropriation than to any other measure that came before the Congress. The purpose of this huge sum, the expenditure of which was left to the program was adopted making the pay rolls, and we could never get rid of the relief. There was even controversy about the rate of pay. Some people thought the Government work under this appropriation should pay the same wages as any other work. The answer to this was that it would require much more than the sum appropriated to meet the pay rolls, and we could never get rid of the relief workers. So the program was adopted making the pay larger than the dole but smaller than the prevailing rate. The obvious purpose of this was to insure that nobody capable of working is to receive Government alms. Experience had shown that the dole system was breaking the morale of many, and in certain sections of the country there were instances of people being content to live on the Federal bounty rather than to accept work, even though the wages were higher than the dole. There was even controversy about the rate of pay. Some people thought the Government work under this appropriation should pay the same wages as any other work. The answer to this was that it would require much more than the sum appropriated to meet the pay rolls, and we could never get rid of the relief workers. So the program was adopted making the pay larger than the dole but smaller than the prevailing rate. The obvious purpose of this was to insure that nobody would stay on work relief who could get a private job. That program is under way, and already its effects are visible in the diminution of the emergency relief rolls. Ultimately there will be left on the list of those getting direct relief merely the unemployed. The care of them will revert to their States. Meanwhile, the $4,000,000,000 will go into public works, C. C. C. camps, highways, roads, streets and railway crossings, and various other enterprises that will put men to work and contribute to public improvement. $900,000,000 is set aside for loans and grants to the States to carry on their own projects, it being specifically provided that of the allotments under this heading 25 per cent of the Federal grant must be expended for labor.

There was $800,000,000 still unused from last year's appropriation. This was lumped in with the rest, so in all there is due to be spent nearly $5,000,000,000 to get people off the relief rolls and into employment which, while not paying enough to put them into competition with the labor in private enterprises, will pay wages sufficient to keep going those who would otherwise have no jobs until the superior pay of private employment takes them out of the Government service.

The banking act was one of the measures about which there was considerable controversy, between those who sought to have closer Government control of the Federal Reserve System and those who sought to diminish the Government's part. There was finally enacted a compromise between these two groups. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is to be made up of seven members appointed by the President. After February 1, 1936, the Secretary of the Treasury and the controller of the currency, who have heretofore functioned, will be eliminated from membership. There is provided a Federal Open Market Committee, having charge of open market operations and the Reserve Banks will act in accordance with its instructions. This committee is composed of the Board of Governors and five members to be elected by the Federal Reserve Banks. It is also provided that purchase of obligations must be made in the open market. The measure places curb on the use of funds for speculative purposes by making it more difficult for member banks to alter reserve requirements on deposits. Reserve banks are required to resume their discount rates every 10 days, subject to the approval of the board. National banks are permitted to make real estate loans up to 50 per cent of the appraised value of the security offered for a term of 5 years, except in cases of amortized loans when 60 per cent may be loaned for a 10-year term. The measure broadens the eligibility requirements of paper upon which the Reserve banks may make loans. It provides that officers, directors and employees of a Reserve member bank may serve in a similar capacity in one other bank if approved by the Reserve Bank governors. It requires all State banks with deposits of $1,000,000 or more to join the Federal Reserve System of 1942, in order to have their deposits insured, and provides for the permanent insurance of bank deposits up to $5,000 per individual account. It limits dealings in securities to purchases and sales upon order, and for the account of customers; and prohibits associations from underwriting any issue of securities. It permits associations to purchase securities for their own account subject to limitations and restrictions by the controller of the currency, and provides that the total amount of the securities of one issuer or obliger held by an association for its own account shall not exceed 10 per cent of the actually paid in and unimpaired capital stock and surplus fund, except that this provision shall not apply to lawful holdings as of the date this legislation is enacted.

The act generally known as the Wagner labor disputes law is perhaps the most important bill from the point of view of organized labor that has come before the Congress. In brief, it creates the National Labor Relations Board, consisting of three members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. States' employees have the right to self-organization, to bargain collectively and to join or assist labor unions. It classifies as unfair labor practice, any effort on the part of an employer to interfere with
employes in the exercise of their guaranteed rights to domi-
nate any labor organization, or discriminate in regard to em-
ployees that might be as well for me at this point to tell you something about the constitutional contro-
versy in regard to some of the recent legislation. The ef-
fort has been made, of course, to comply with the restric-
tions embraced in the Supreme Court's decision. There is
nothing novel about the questioning of the constitutionality
of pending legislation. Very frequently in the past the ques-
tion has been raised, and not infrequently the Supreme Court
has found it necessary to rule against acts of Congress that
were signed by a President. For example, the Supreme
Court declared unconstitutional seven different laws signed
by President Harding. Even President Coolidge, who has
come to typify extreme caution in the American mind, fared
no better than his predecessor, for the Supreme Court
declared invalid laws signed by him. During the relatively
somnolent term of President Hoover the Supreme Court
declared unconstitutional three measures regularly enacted and
signed by the President. Precedent has determined that it
is the function of the judicial branch of the Government
to pass on the validity of all laws, and while Congress never
knowingly adopts a measure that contravenes the known
opinion of the court, it must, in advance of such an opinion,
accept the judgment of its own legal authorities.

Since the founding of the Government there have been
33 strictly Democratic Congresses and 27 Republican
Congresses. The others were a mixture of Democratic Houses
and Republican Senators, or Republican Houses and Demo-
cratic Senators. During the time of the strictly partisan
bodies, the Democrats passed 20 acts declared unconstitutional and the Republicans 42. Therefore, you find that
the Republicans have passed 70 per cent of the acts declared unconstitutional and the Democrats 30 per cent. Twice of these unconstitutional acts were passed under the adminis-
tration of the Republican President and popular war hero,
Gen. Grant. So why all the constitutional partisan furor?

The Seventy-fourth Congress also for the first time brought under Federal control the buses and motor
trucks that so suddenly became an element in our transportation system. The railroads complained that whereas they were under strict control by the Interstate Commerce Commis-
sion, that while they have to pay for rights of way and maintenance of their road beds, this new competition was exempt from all these restrictions. That buses and motor
trucks use the public highways without tax or charge, make
rates to suit themselves, effect mergers or institute competi-
tion just as they please. There is of course, the other side to the story, the argument of the bus and truck companies that they perform a service the railroads cannot perform, for they gather their passengers and freight wherever they happen to be and deliver them to the doors of their homes or their places of business. Out of the controversy has come
this new law, which provides that the Interstate Commerce
Commission shall regulate these services and see to it that
they supply adequate service and insure safety of operations and equipment. The bill leaves out of such control specific
vehicles, such as those used exclusively in carrying live stock,
fish or agricultural commodities, or in the distribution of
newspapers, or those which are used and controlled and
operated by farm co-operative associations.

The legislation that has been enacted is, of course, only
a tithe of the output of the session that began with the new
year. Such important measures as the public utilities bill,
sketching control of the holding companies; the tax bill raising
surtaxes in the higher brackets and increasing the tax on
large estates and several others are still passing through the
legislative hopper. The Guffey coal bill, designed to keep
economic peace in the soft-coal fields, only passed the House
day or two ago. We have passed laws affecting mines and
minerals, railroad transportation, extending deposit insur-
ance, protecting wild life and game. We have added to
the farm credit law, providing for loans to farmers for crop
production and harvesting; declared a policy in regard to
soil erosion; amended the home mortgage financing act;
amended the farm mortgage act benefiting the tenant
farmers and share-croppers; regulated petroleum shipments;
re-enacted railroad retirement legislation that is now
confidently believed will stand the test of Supreme Court
decision, that will give employees who are 65 years of age
and who have completed 30 years of service the opportunity
to retire. While legislation was passed at the past session
singling out benefits to the cotton producers, we have also
enacted legislation benefiting tobacco growers along with other agricultural products. The bill amending the agri-
cultural adjustment act is among the most important passed.
In short, the session just closing has performed an enormous
amount of necessary work.

There was little excitement, there was little publicity
to most of these bills, though each of them represents neces-
sary improvements in our statute books.

It may perhaps give you an idea of how Congress kept
busy seven months when I tell you that there was presented
in the House of Representatives 10,000 bills and resolutions
and in the Senate nearly 4,000. During the same period there
were considered nearly 15,000 nominations.

Much of the legislation, of course, is supplementary to
the laws passed in the session last year. As experience de-
veloped weaknesses in the structure of these laws the errors
were corrected. The rulings of the Supreme Court, of
course, compelled more legislation aimed to bring the or-
dinances in conformity with that tribunal's decisions of old.

It is now possible to take a comprehensive view of the
New Deal, to estimate what the advent of President Roose-
velt has meant to our country. Cast your mind back to
where we were in March, 1933, when he arrived in Wash-
ington. Promptly on his inauguration Congress plunged
into the banking situation. From then on he pursued a pol-
icy designed to help everybody in the Republic. It rescued
the farmers from despair; it put millions of men back to
work; it lighted the furnaces of thousands of mills and fac-
tories that had been cold for years; it brought the income
of our people up by billions of dollars annually. These are
not fancied figures; they are based on the income tax reports
made by our citizens themselves.
Sufficient time is not available to permit a fuller review of the subjects which have engaged the attention of the Congress during the session that is closing. There have been enacted many laws which there is no opportunity now to outline and discuss some of them are of importance. We have labored diligently and earnestly with the single purpose of advancing the public welfare.

I do not say that mistakes have not been made. In a program of such magnitude errors are inevitable, but how small and trifling these seem in comparison with the result. This administration is being subjected to intense criticism, which is understandable considering the approach of next year’s election. Our President has been charged with everything from communism to despotism, and yet you cannot pick up a daily paper that does not reflect a rise in the stock market, an increase in profits, a resumption of dividends; in fact, every manifestation that tells of a country bound back to prosperity. Criticism is often made, but it is usually without one word of constructive suggestion, one idea of a substitute program. I am proud of the record made by the Congress, proud of the part it has played in the accomplishment that has brought us so far toward contentment. It is my belief that when history writes its review of the legislation of this Congress it will be made clear that the laws enacted at this session were for the greatest good to the greatest number.

Undigested Taxes

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION—1935

By THOMAS J. PARKINSON, President of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York and President of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the U. S.

Delivered at a special meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, August 20, 1935.

(A number of details of purely local interest have been allowed to stand in order to present the complete text and give something of the color of the occasion. Inversions indicating the audience’s reactions we allow to remain where they give a more complete picture of the occasion. The proceedings which precede and follow this address are printed in the “Bulletin of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York,” August issue.—Ed.)

UNLESS there is objection the call will be made part of the minutes of this meeting. The Chair hears no objection. The minutes will contain the call of the special meeting, which under the by-laws of the Chamber can consider only the subjects referred to in the call. That being the purpose of this meeting, your officers feel that they need not apologize to you for asking you to convene in mid-summer in this hot weather, but to say a word in explanation of the reasons which inspired their decision to call the meeting.

The general subject of taxation is one about which the average taxpayer—and soon the people of this country will realize that that is the average run of people in the country—has no difficulty getting a bit hot under the collar even in ordinary weather, to say nothing of such weather as that in which we are convening. We called a meeting of representative business men, the members of this Chamber, that we might consider whether there is anything we can do to help those charged with public responsibility in handling the fiscal problems which confront the Federal Government and especially with such tax measures as that now pending in the conference of the Senate and House of Representatives today. It is a strange tax measure with little or no precedent in the history of legislation in this country, unless we are to include the recent history of Louisiana. It is a tax measure which has had its origin in an executive message to the Congress which presented no budgetary reason for new taxes, which dealt only in fundamental questions of governmental policy and the relationship of the Government to the individual. Upon that general message the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, contrary to all precedents in the consideration and evolution of tax proposals, gave only a short hearing and gave even less consideration before recommendation and passage by the House.

In the Senate the procedure was likewise unusual. Look back over the history of this country and you will find that one of our great contributions to parliamentary government has been the committee system, in our legislatures and particularly in our federal Congress. Before the committee those interested have full opportunity to argue the pros and cons of a proposal. The committee, after those interested have been heard, has and takes the time to consider the facts, the meaning and effect of the proposed measures.

Look at the proceedings in the House on this tax bill and you will find nothing like that usual procedure. There have been hurried hearings, a report which does not even attempt to set forth any justifying reasons for the Committee’s recommendations, the barest reference to the fact that the President has asked it in his general message, an apologetic reference with respect to almost every recommendation made by the Ways and Means Committee in place of the usual statements of facts and reasons for its recommendations.

And again in the Senate—a short hearing, no time for consideration, and a report which does not even attempt to justify the recommendations which are made or the provisions of the bill which is reported for action by the Senate. These bills, developed in this way, have been passed by your House of Representatives and by your Senate.

May I take an illustration from a business with which I am familiar. There was in the tax bill passed by the House of Representatives a provision which made it impossible for life insurance companies to pay maturing policies until months after the death of the insured. Today 95 per cent of the claims on matured life insurance policies are paid within 24 hours after presentation of the proofs. Under that...
bill as it passed the House and is now in conference we could not pay beneficiaries under a life policy until we knew how much the beneficiary was to receive from the estate of the deceased insured, and if we did we might have to pay over again to someone else the tax which was finally levied upon that portion of the beneficiary’s estate which he received from the insurance policy.

I know that members of Congress did not mean to put such a provision on the statute books of this country. I know that the Congressmen from this Metropolitan Area did not mean to vote that the funds of widows and orphans, which the insurer was ready to pay, could not be made available for their purposes until months or years after the death of the insured. They not only did not mean it, but they did not know. They passed that bill without knowing what was in it. That is but one illustration of many provisions in that bill which they passed without knowing.

Is that representation of the taxpayers? Is that representation of the average run of people who are the constituents of the Congressmen? Gentlemen, I do not want to be extreme, but this country had its beginning in a little fracas known to history as the “Boston Tea Party.” That in turn was inspired by objection to taxation without representation. I submit that representation means intelligent observation of facts, intelligent consideration of facts and proposals. Without the time necessary for such consideration there is no representation and we are again faced with the danger of taxation without intelligent and effective representation. (Applause.)

May I read a word from that great source of political wisdom, “The Federalist,” in which Hamilton said: “There is no part of the administration of government that requires extensive information and a thorough knowledge of the principles of political economy so much as the business of taxation. * * * The man who understands these principles best will be least likely to resort to oppressive expedients or to sacrifice any particular class of citizens to the procurement of revenue. There can be no doubt that for a judicious exercise of the power of taxation it is necessary that the person in whose hands it is should be acquainted with the general habits and modes of thinking of the people at large and with resources of the country.”

That is a fine bit of advice for anyone charged with public responsibility who undertakes to exercise this great power, this power which Chief Justice Marshall once said is a power to destroy. “The power to tax is the power to destroy.” But the great Chief Justice did not utter that as an invitation to destructive use of the power of taxation. He uttered it as a warning. He never conceived of it in terms of taxation which would destroy, not only the subject of the tax but even destroy the taxpayer himself.

Now, gentlemen, it is because the proposals which form the basis of these pending tax bills now scheduled to come out of conference in some form in the next few days, violate all true principles of taxation, and because they have been conceived, developed and enacted with a haste and recklessness contrary to all our legislative and particularly our revenue legislative history, it is because of those factors involved in this legislation that we have asked you to come together to see whether you, in this organization which is yours to use to effect your purposes, can do something to bring about a more careful consideration of every measure, fiscal or tax, which is brought forward in these troublesome times for the solution of the financial problems of the Federal Government.

We have been drifting into a situation where the easy going methods which have characterized the evolution of this pending tax bill will be likely to suggest other and even more dangerous experiments to solve our more important problems. I do not want to bore you with figures. It is enough to say that the federal, state and local bonded debt in this country forms a blanket of fifty billion dollars of first lien on all the property and property values of this country. As the pressure of that vast debt becomes greater the same easy going and political solution which has characterized the consideration of this tax measure may very well be applied to measures for dealing with that huge obligation in terms of confiscation, repudiation or inflation—inflation which is just a little bit of both confiscation and repudiation.

The problem is growing more serious daily. If the easiest way is to be the way of solution, if the political way is to be the way of solution, as it has been in the consideration of this pending tax bill, then we who are responsible for the administration of business and the funds of business, are face to face with the possibility of resort either to further confiscatory taxation, to hitherto unthinkable repudiations, or to the easy, indirect, misrepresenting solution of inflation.

We know that there are limits to what you and I can do singly or in groups like this Chamber of Commerce in the solution of problems the details of which are so much in the hands of those who hold high public office and have the details at their command. Gentlemen, is there not something that we can do, if not with respect to this particular tax bill, then to the solution of the fiscal and tax problems of this country? In the near future is there not something we can do which will assure us of a more responsible attitude on the part of our Congressmen and a more intelligent consideration of any proposals which are before them?

Asking your pardon for even so much of a statement, I thought you ought to realize why at this time of the year and under all the circumstances we thought that we should grant the request of those members who asked that a special meeting of the Chamber should be called for the consideration of these questions. (Prolonged applause, with the audience rising.)
A Platform from the Repudiated Planks

By COL. FRANK KNOX, Publisher the Chicago Daily News.
Delivered at the Genesee County Republican Field Day, Batavia, N. Y., August 21, 1935.

COME to you here today from the state of West Virginia. In that state before an audience of 10,000 people, I heard one of the principal supporters and defenders of President Roosevelt, Mr. Van A. Bittner, of the United Mine Workers, declare—I quote his language literally—"We will not stand for the dictation of a Hitler; we will not stand for the dictation of a Lenin; we will not stand for the dictation of a Mussolini; and we will not stand for the dictation of the Supreme Court." I say to this gentleman, upon the occasion of my first public appearance since I have heard these words, that he will submit to the decrees of the Supreme Court, just as all of us will submit to them—most of us willingly observant of the decrees of that court—so long as we have the kind of a country that was designed by the men who wrote the constitution.

You may say that the quotation is taken from an extreme and radical protagonist of the New Deal. Very well! I quote you again from an official representative of the Democratic party, Dr. Harriet Elliott, who spoke with me from the same platform in Detroit and spoke as the official representative of the Democratic party. In effect, she said, in my presence, that we must change our constitution if we are to attain social justice in America. On that particular occasion she was the official spokesman for the White House.

But, we need not stop there. The President, himself, on July 6th of this year, addressed a letter to Congressman Samuel B. Hill, Chairman of the subcommittee considering the Guffey Bill, in which he employed language which unerringly reveals his attitude towards constitutional government. He said in that letter "I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

Here we have then, in the words of the President himself, a declaration favoring the passage of a measure of more than dubious constitutionality. Indeed, I am kind in describing it as dubious, for I hold that no intelligent man, and in this class I must surely include the President of the United States—could read the recent unanimous decision of the Supreme Court on the NRA and consider the terms of the Guffey Bill in relation thereto, and not know to a moral certainty what the opinion of the court will be when the Guffey Bill reaches that high tribunal for decision.

The United States, living under a written constitution ratified in 1789, is the oldest form of government to be found among the millions of people in the world today. All other governments, including even the British Empire, have changed in the meantime. Ours, alone, has stood the testing of a century and a half, a period in which we have developed from a sparsely populated string of states along the Atlantic seaboard with approximately three million people, to the greatest nation in the world with a population of 130 millions. Through all the vicissitudes and complexities of those years, including a great civil war; the changes wrought by the development of a great mechanized era; through participation on a huge scale in a world war; and finally, through five or six years of the greatest depression which we have ever known—in all of these troublous years which brought sweeping changes elsewhere, every individual right and liberty guaranteed to us by our constitution is still intact, preserved by that great document given to us by the great spirits of a great era. The American constitution stands today, universally recognized as the greatest written document providing for the government of people anywhere.

To argue thus, is not to write oneself down as a reactionary, or tory. On the contrary, it is to classify oneself as a liberal. A true liberal instinctively puts first in every situation which he must meet, the preservation of individual rights and liberties. Without these, human progress is impossible. Every great advance made by the civilized world has been made under the aegis of individual freedom. I yield to no man in my devotion to progressive principles. All my life, as a working newspaperman, I have fought for the abolition of child labor, and against the exploitation of employees by predatory employers. Thirty-seven states out of the forty-eight already have laws forbidding the employment of children. Thus this evil is almost completely exorcised. We need no amendment of the constitution, destructive of individual rights, to provide that justice be done our working people. In order to achieve a parity in purchasing power for the farmer, it is not necessary that the most individualistic business in the world be regimented and subjected to an autocratic control of a bureaucrat in Washington. That is the Russian, not the American way.

Let me read to you a short quotation from President Roosevelt's inaugural address of March 4, 1933, on this subject:

"Our Constitution is so simple and practical that it is possible always to meet extraordinary needs by changes in emphasis and arrangement without loss of essential form. It has met every stress of vast expansion of territory, of foreign wars, of bitter strife, of world relations. I am prepared under my Constitutional duty to recommend the measures that a stricken nation in the midst of a stricken world may require.

That is as sound today as when Roosevelt said it. To hold fast to the principle of three coordinate departments of government—one of the great principles enunciated by the constitution—is not to be a conservative but to be a liberal because in no other country on earth are individual rights as secure as they are in America. This is true because with a judiciary, equal in power with the executive, entrusted with the interpretation of legislative acts and a supervision of the functions of the executive in the execution of those acts, our constitution provides us with a defense for our individual rights possessed by no other people in the world. Because of this power of the court, now under attack, your individual rights and mine, cannot be invaded or impaired by the whim or caprice or temporary passion of a
legislature or the autocratic designs of a power-drunk executive.

No issue was ever presented in any campaign since the country was born which so directly affected the individual liberty and welfare of each citizen as this issue made by President Roosevelt and his brain trust associates in their assault upon the judicial power of the government. Already they show signs of fear of punishment by an aroused people, but even should they, temporarily, withdraw from the issue they have made, their underlying purpose has been made clear. We know they ultimately propose the substitution of an autocratic executive for the type of government the constitution gave us. And, let me utter this final warning before I leave this subject: Do not be misled by the attractive slogans in which Mr. Roosevelt and the brain trust will garb this proposal. When they talk of social justice; of the evils of child labor; of the exploitation of helpless workers; and of thoroughly bad business practices, bear in mind that within the frame-work of the constitution, without impairment of individual rights, all these reforms can be accomplished. No one thing with the exclusion of evils, to oppose radical changes in our constitutional form of government. It is better for us to insist that reform shall be achieved—less swiftly but more surely—under a constitution that preserves intact the essential doctrine of state’s sovereignty. Nothing could be plainer than the impracticability, in a huge nation of vast expense with more than 100 millions of population, living under varying conditions, that all of our intimate, personal and business affairs be conducted by a vast and autocratic bureaucracy in Washington. The preservation of state governments in their sovereign powers is essential to the preservation of the union itself. As soon as we begin the fiscal policy of abridging state powers in the interest of an autocracy in Washington, we begin to mine the foundations of the republic itself.

I am speaking to you from a rostrum in New York, the state in which Franklin D. Roosevelt served his apprenticeship for the presidency and I should like to submit for your examination the striking parallel in his administration as Governor with his administration as President.

He came into the Governorship singing the same agreeable, optimistic tune as when he assumed the presidency four years later. He proclaimed his faith in a “pay-as-you-go” policy. He called for a balanced budget. He promised an economical administration and the easing of tax burdens. He found a surplus handed to him by his predecessor, Governor Al. Smith, of 90 million dollars and he left a deficit of 96 million dollars. He increased the net funded debt of the state from 254 million to 422 million. His budget for the years 1930, and 1931 were the largest in the state’s history. They have not been equaled since, although the depression has grown in intensity. The fact that budgets have lessened since he left Albany, disproves his alibi that the enormous increase was unavoidable. The bald truth is, they were due mainly to extravagance, loose fiscal management and the use of money for political purposes. He did accomplish much with his extravagant use of your money. He provided himself with a well organized and well greased political machine, even though he had to undermine, as a leader of the Democratic party, the man who made him.

Whenever this present administration is sharply criticized, it almost invariably and irrevocably demands that criticism be “constructive,” as the President blandly puts it in one of his fireside talks, “Well old man, what do you suggest as a substitute?” I have suggested several times, and I should like to repeat here: a very proper substitution for what they are doing now would be the program of 1932 upon which they attained a majority of the votes of the country. In other words, I suggest that President Roosevelt substitute the policies of the party of which he is the titular head—the policies to which that party committed itself when it nominated him, and the policies to which he committed himself in accepting the nomination “100 per cent.” However, he is not going to accept this suggestion. He has gone too far to the left toward radicalism to make this possible. In doing this he alienated a tremendous number of the members of the Democratic party who, loyally believed that a party platform was a sacred pledge, and who hold intense convictions upon the principles enunciated in that platform. Beyond a shadow of a doubt, the Republican candidate in 1936 will be supported by millions of these constitutional Democrats.

Since the repudiated planks of the Democratic platform have no flavor of partisanship, rise above all party questions, and touch upon subjects upon which there is complete unanimity of feeling among thoughtful Americans, I seriously propose that we incorporate these repudiated planks of the Democratic platform in our own platform next year. The ones I have in mind are:

1. An immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures.
2. Maintenance of a national credit by a federal budget annually balanced.
3. A sound currency to be preserved at all hazards.
4. Unemployment and old age insurance under state laws.
5. Stricter and impartial enforcement of the anti-trust laws to prevent monopoly and unfair trade practices.
6. Opposition to the unsound policy of restricting agricultural production.

Of all the issues gratificingly provided by the Roosevelt administration, the greatest issue of all is keeping faith with the public—keeping promises made—proving trustworthy. It is this lack of trust-worthiness and loyalty to pledged word and principle that has created a universal lack of confidence in the administration by the entire business community. Ever since June of 1932, every single indication in the world has been showing steady increases in production and has been showing steady improvement in business and industrial conditions. We, alone, who should have led, have lagged in the procession and even Canada and Mexico have out-stripped us, and England, loyal to economical verities recognized by impartial economists the world around, has led in the prosperity parade.

Out of the callous indifference of the Roosevelt administration to its pledges to the public, we can and must construct a program of economic fundamentals and provide convincing evidence of our sincerity.

Never in the history of popular government has any government ever been able to successfully withstand the disastrous effect of two conditions operating simultaneously. These two factors, which, inevitably, lead to defeat in a popular government, are increased taxes and increased living costs. Both are now present and steadily growing more pressing.
The peak of our federal indebtedness at the end of the world war was twenty-six billions. It is estimated that the national debt at the end of the present fiscal year will be thirty-five billions. There is only one way in which this can be paid—out of taxes collected from you and from me. If you have a small income, do not imagine for one moment that you escape your share of the burden; that only the rich man pays. If you have but twenty dollars per week on which to live, five dollars of that small income each week must go to the tax collector in direct or indirect taxes. The deficit for the present fiscal year is four billion dollars. Since Roosevelt entered the White House the total increase in the national debt has been sixteen billion dollars. On this huge, unprecedented national debt we must pay an annual interest charge of over one billion dollars. If we confiscated every penny of taxable income of everyone who paid an income tax in 1933, we would lack by one-third, the sum necessary to pay the deficit. If we took every penny of this and applied it to this year's expenditures, we would have scarcely enough to cover the year's spending plus the interest due on debt.

This ought to dispose, in the mind of any man, of the idea that the rich man and the well-to-do pay all the taxes. It also shows up in lurid fashion the insincerity and political deception of the present Rooseveltian share-the-wealth tax proposals. If we took the entire income of income-tax payers with incomes in excess of $5,000 per year and divided it among the people of the United States, each one of us would be the richer in the sum of $2.

I cite these facts so as to impress upon you the unescapable truth that this huge burden of taxes which must be shouldered in the future, will be paid, as they always have been paid in the past—out of the earnings of the poor and those of moderate circumstances. You cannot escape your share of the load, and as this fact comes home to the American people, the demand for a change in Washington will grow increasingly imperative as it sweeps from Maine to California.

What about living costs? It now takes $1.80 in the dollar of today, to buy in food and other necessaries what you paid $1.00 for before Roosevelt became President. Had this increase in the cost of living been accompanied by an increase in wages or in total number of people employed in general prosperity, it would be less difficult to meet, but in actual fact, total wages earned, figured on a weekly basis, are actually less under the New Deal than before. The total number of unemployed has enormously increased.

Here then, is that deadly combination of higher taxes and higher living costs to accentuate the growing popular demand for a change. Little wonder that Rhode Island reflecting popular demand for a change, the other day transformed a Democratic Congressional district—always Democratic from the day it was organized until now, and Democratic in the last election by a margin of 21,000 votes—into a Republican district with a majority of 14,000. It is not at all strange that the Democratic governor of Ohio, arbitrarily refuses to call a special election in the state of Ohio to fill a vacancy in Congress recently caused by the death of an existing member. This plain foreshadowing of what is happening in the minds of Americans has brought confusion to the councils of the Roosevelt party in Washington and a demand from the inner members of that party that the imported radicalism of the "brain-trust" which has dominated the administration be abandoned if the party is not to go down in ignominious defeat.

I have just completed a brief tour into several eastern states. The swing in political sentiment against the present autocratic regime in Washington is tremendous. With the Republicans keenly alive to the dangers of the situation, and with the aid of independent voters who are disgusted and disturbed by the extravagances and untrustworthiness of the Roosevelt regime, the East is swiftly returning to its former Republican allegiance. The battle-field, however, in which victory must be won, lies in the Great Middle West. Due to the sharp recession following the war in world demand for food products and the simultaneous substitution of the automobile and tractor for horse-drawn vehicles and machinery, at least 75 million acres have lost their market. It was these two factors which precipitated a farm crisis antedating the business depression by almost a decade. This depression in farming is a matter of the greatest concern to all of us. We cannot have a well balanced national prosperity which does not include a prosperous agriculture. It is imperative that we evolve, as a party, a farm policy which shall be sound economically, because only a sound policy can endure; which shall not depend upon scarcity of food products, and which shall restore to the farmer a parity in purchasing power.

Happily, science has opened one door of opportunity. Already organic chemistry has discovered manifold uses of farm products in industry and is at work, day and night, developing new uses. We may no longer regard the farm wholly as a food factory. It must be that and also a source of raw material for use in industry. Industrial uses of the humble soy bean aptly illustrates how swiftly this progress has been. Last year we produced but a few hundred thousand acres of soy beans. This year, 12 million acres of this curious plant imported from Manchuria, are being grown in the United States. One automobile factory in Detroit alone will this year consume the products of 100,000 acres of soy beans. There are a score of other activities of a similar character through which industry is providing new markets for the farm.

But these two planks in a sound farm policy are, necessarily, of long range variety. In the meantime, we must find—and we will find—some method that will make the farmer free to conduct his own affairs without dictation from Washington, and provide him the environment, on a basis of parity with industry, of his domestic market. When this problem is reached in our national councils devoted to the preparation of a party program, my plea to you men in the east is that you give to this subject a generous and sympathetic cooperation. The Argonne of our campaign next year lies in the Middle West.

Under God, America has a great destiny in the world. It has led and must lead in human progress in the future. Leadership in civilization now, as hitherto, is reserved to those people who are protected in their individual rights.
who enjoy in the maximum degree, personal liberty, and among whom the rewards for individual initiative, enterprise, industry and thrift shall be sufficient to provide the springs of ambition. It was undoubtedly in this fashion that a divine Providence meant that human progress should be made. Today, in an impractical zeal for the swift accomplishment of reforms, there are those who would destroy or impair the foundations of a free society. They would imperil institutions of government which give future generations a chance. They would eliminate reward for energy, industry and thrift. We must, in the coming campaign, rekindle our faith in and renew our allegiance to the imperishable principles which underlie American institutions.

We must hold fast to our heritage of a government of laws, not of men.

(Ed. Note: Because of the new matter, and because we believe it advisable to publish all important speeches by leading Presidential candidates so that our readers and the people generally may have a greater opportunity to study the men and the issues, and for the sake of the record, we present the above address including the brief passages of repetition which have appeared before in Vital Speeches. Perhaps a growing service this type of publication may offer will be the gradual elimination of a large amount of repetition on the part of the speakers themselves.)

The Social Security Act

By FRANCES PERKINS, Secretary of Labor

Delivered over Columbia Broadcasting System, September 2, 1935.

PEOPLE who work for a living in the United States of America can join with all other good citizens on this forty-eighth anniversary of Labor Day in satisfaction that the Congress has passed the Social Security Act. This act establishes unemployment insurance as a substitute for haphazard methods of assistance in periods when men and women willing and able to work are without jobs. It provides for old age pensions which mark great progress over the measures upon which we have hitherto depended in caring for those who have been unable to provide for the years when they no longer can work. It also provides security for dependent and crippled children, mothers, the indigent disabled and the blind.

Old people who are in need, unemployables, children, mothers and the sightless, will find systematic regular provisions for needs. The Act limits the Federal aid to not more than $15 per month for the individual, provided the State in which he resides appropriates a like amount. There is nothing to prevent a State from contributing more than $15 per month in special cases and there is no requirement to allow as much as $15 from either State or Federal funds when a particular case has some personal provision and needs less than the total allowed.

Following essentially the same procedure, the Act as passed provides for Federal assistance to the States in caring for the blind, a contribution by the State of up to $15 a month to be matched in turn by a like contribution by the Federal Government. The Act also contains provision for assistance to the States in providing payments to dependent children under sixteen years of age. There also is provision in the Act for cooperation with medical and health organizations charged with rehabilitation of physically handicapped children. The necessity for adequate service in the fields of public and maternal health and child welfare calls for the extension of these services to meet individual community needs.

Consider for a moment those portions of the Act which, while they will not be effective this present year, yet will exert a profound and far-reaching effect upon millions of citizens. I refer to the provision for a system of old-age benefits supported by the contributions of employer and employee, and to the section which sets up the initial machinery for unemployment insurance.

Old-age benefits in the form of monthly payments are to be paid to individuals who have worked and contributed to the insurance fund in direct proportion to the total wages earned by such individuals in the course of their employment subsequent to 1936. The minimum monthly payment is to be $10, the maximum $85. These payments will begin in the year 1942 and will be to those who have worked and contributed.

Because of difficulty of administration not all employments are covered in this plan at this time so that the law is not entirely complete in coverage, but it is sufficiently broad to cover all normally employed industrial workers.

As an example of the practical operation of the old-age benefit system, consider for a moment a typical young man of thirty-five years of age, and let us compute the benefits which will accrue to him. Assuming that his income will subsequently be $61.25 per month. In the event that death occurs prior to the age of sixty-five, the benefit payments due him from the insurance fund will provide him with $42.50 per month for the remainder of his life. If he has been fortunate enough to have an income of $200 per month, his income will subsequently be $61.25 per month. In the event that death occurs prior to the age of sixty-five, the benefit payments due him from the insurance fund will provide him with $42.50 per month for the remainder of his life.

This vast system of old-age benefits requires contributions both by employer and employee, each to contribute 3% of the total wage paid to the employee. This tax, collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, will be graduated, ranging from 1% in 1937 to the maximum 3% in 1939 and thereafter. That is, on this man's average income of $100 a month he will pay to the usual fund $3 a month and his employer will also pay the same amount over his working years.

In conjunction with the system of old-age benefits, the
Act recognizes that unemployment insurance is an integral part of any plan for the economic security of millions of gainfully employed workers. It provides for a plan of cooperative Federal-State action by which a State may enact an insurance system, compatible with Federal requirements and best suited to its individual needs.

The Federal Government attempts to promote and effectuate these State systems, by levying a uniform Federal pay-roll tax of 3% on employers employing eight or more workers, with the proviso that an employer who contributes to a State unemployment compensation system will receive a credit of 90% of this Federal tax. After 1937, additional credit is also allowable to any employer who, because of favorable employment experience or adequate reserves, is permitted by the State to reduce his payments.

In addition, the Act provides that after the current fiscal year the Federal Government allocate annually to the States $49,000,000 solely for the administration of their respective insurance systems, thus assuring that all money paid for State unemployment compensation will be reserved for the purpose of compensation to the worker. It has been necessary, at the present time, to eliminate essentially the same groups from participation under the unemployment insurance plan as in the old-age benefit plan, though it is possible that at some future time a more complete coverage will be formulated.

The State of New York, at the present time, has a system of unemployment compensation which might well illustrate the salient factors desired in such a plan; in the event of unemployment, the worker is paid 50% of his wages weekly for a period not exceeding 16 weeks in any 52 weeks. This payment begins within three weeks after the advent of actual unemployment. California, Washington, Utah and New Hampshire have passed unemployment insurance laws in recent months and Wisconsin's law is already in effect. Thirty-five States have old-age pension statutes and mothers' pension acts are in force in all but three States.

With the States now the responsibility of devising and enacting measures which will result in the maximum benefits to the American workman in the field of unemployment compensation, I am confident that suspending State action will not fail to take cognizance of this responsibility. The people of the different States favor the program designed to bring them greater security in the future and their legislatures will speedily pass appropriate laws so that all may help to promote the general welfare.

Federal legislation was framed in the thought that the attack upon the problems of insecurity should be a cooperative venture participated in by both the Federal and State Governments, preserving the benefits of local administration and national leadership. It was thought unwise to have the Federal Government decide all questions of policy and dictate completely what the States should do. Only very necessary minimum standards are included in the Federal measure leaving wide latitude to the States.

While the different State laws on unemployment insurance must make all contributions compulsory, the States, in addition to deciding how these contributions shall be levied, have freedom in determining their own waiting periods, benefit rates, maximum benefit periods and the like. Care should be taken that these laws do not contain benefit provisions in excess of collections. While unemployment varies greatly in different States, there is no certainty that States which have had less normal unemployment heretofore will in the future have a more favorable experience than the average for the country.

It is obvious that in the best interests of the worker, industry and society, there must be a certain uniformity of standards. It is obvious, too, that we must prevent the penalizing of competitive industry in any State which plans the early adoption of a sound system of unemployment insurance, and provide effective guarantees against the possibility of industry in one State having an advantage over that of another. This the uniform Federal tax does, as it costs the employer the same whether he pays the levy to the Federal Government or makes a contribution to a State unemployment insurance fund. The amount of the tax itself is a relative assurance that benefits will be standardized in all States, since under the law the entire collection must be spent on benefits to unemployed.

The social security measure looks primarily to the future and is only a part of the administration's plan to promote sound and stable economic life. We cannot think of it as disassociated from the Government's program to save the homes, the farms, the businesses and banks of the Nation, and especially must we consider it a companion measure to the Works Relief Act which does undertake to provide immediate increase in employment and corresponding stimulation to private industry by purchase of supplies.

While it is not anticipated as a complete remedy for the abnormal conditions confronting us at the present time, it is designed to afford protection for the individual against future major economic vicissitudes. It is a sound and reasonable plan and framed with due regard for the present state of economic recovery. It does not represent a complete solution of the problems of economic security, but it does represent a substantial, necessary beginning. It has been developed after careful and intelligent consideration of all the facts and all of the programs that have been suggested or applied anywhere.

Few legislative proposals have had as careful study, as thorough and conscientious deliberation, as that which went into the preparation of the social security programs. It is embodied in perhaps the most useful and fundamental single piece of Federal legislation in the interest of wage earners in the United States. As President Roosevelt said when he signed the measure: "If the Senate and House of Representatives in their long and arduous session had done nothing more than pass this bill, the session would be regarded as historic for all time."

This is truly legislation in the interest of the national welfare. We must recognize that if we are to maintain a healthy economy and thriving production, we need to maintain the standard of living of the lower income groups of our population who constitute ninety per cent of our purchasing power. The President's Committee on Economic Security, of which I had the honor to be chairman, in drawing up the plan, was convinced that its enactment into law would not only carry us a long way toward the goal of economic security for the individual, but also a long way toward the promotion and stabilization of mass purchasing power without which the present economic system cannot endure.
That this intimate connection between the maintenance of mass purchasing power through a system of protection of the individual against major economic hazards is not theoretical is evidenced by the fact that England has been able to withstand the effects of the world-wide depression, even though her prosperity depends so largely upon foreign trade. British economists agree with employers and workers that this ability to weather adverse conditions has been due in no small part to social insurance benefits and regular payments which have served to maintain necessary purchasing power.

Our social security program will be a vital force working against the recurrence of severe depressions in the future. We can, as the principle of sustained purchasing power, in hard times makes itself felt in every shop, store and mill, grow old without being haunted by the spectre of a poverty-ridden old age or of being a burden on our children.

The costs of unemployment compensation and old-age insurance are not actually additional costs. In some degree they have been borne by the people, but, irregularly, the burden has fallen much more heavily on some than on others, and none of such provisions offering an orderly or systematic assurance to those in need. The years of depression have brought home to all of us that unemployment entails huge costs to government, industry and the public alike.

Unemployment insurance will within a short time considerably lighten the public burden of caring for those unemployed. It will materially reduce relief costs in future years. In essence, it is a method by which reserves are built up during periods of employment from which compensation is paid to the unemployed in periods when work is lacking.

The passage of this act with so few dissenting votes and with so much intelligent public support is deeply significant of the progress which the American people have made in thought in the social field and awareness of methods of using cooperation through government to overcome social hazards against which the individual alone is inadequate.

During the fifteen years I have been advocating such legislation as this I have learned that the American people want such security as the law provides. It will make this great Republic a better and a happier place in which to live—for us, our children and our children's children. It is a profound and sacred satisfaction to have had some part in securing this great boon to the people of our country.

Passage of the Wagner Act, creating the National Labor Relations Board, is another important piece of legislation in the interest of wage earners at the recent session of the Congress. It aims to bring about better relationship between labor and management. It assures employees the right of collective bargaining, thus fostering the development of the employment contract on a sound and equitable basis.

The United States Department of Labor is dedicated to the working people of this country and its purpose is to foster, promote and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions and to advance their opportunity for profitable employment.

With this purpose constantly in view it is now striving to bring about adoption of the following programs:

1. The establishment of minimum basis standards for labor below which competition should not be permitted to force standards of health, wages or hours.

2. The making of arrangements which will make possible peaceful settlement of controversies and relieve labor of the necessity of resorting to strikes in order to secure equitable conditions and the right to be heard.

3. Through legislation and cooperation between employers and workers to make every job the best that the human mind can devise as to physical conditions, human relations and wages.

4. The encouragement of such organization and development of wage earners as will give status and stability to labor as a recognized important group of citizens having a contribution to make to economic and political thought and to the cultural life of the community.

5. The encouragement of mutuality between labor and employers in the improvement of production and in the development of both groups of a philosophy of self-government in the public interest. If labor's rights are defined by law and government, then certain obligations will, of course, be expected of wage earners, and it is for the public interest that those obligations should be defined by labor itself and such discipline as is necessary should be self-imposed and not imposed from without. This is the basis of all professional codes of ethics in modern society.

Let us hope that at least a part of this program becomes effective between now and another Labor Day in the interest of wage earners, employers and investors.

Reply to President Roosevelt

By HON. BERTRAND SNELL, Representative from New York

Broadcast August 24, 1935

A merica is the land of opportunity for the individual. Millions came from the Old World inspired by the assurance that here they would escape the oppressive hand of governmental regulation, be permitted to work out their own destinies and enjoy the fruits of their own industry and thrift.

Here they were assured of infinitely better working conditions in every field of activity and infinitely better living standards in the home than could be obtained in any other country in the world.

Here their daily lives have not been, until the advent of the New Deal, regimented or their business policed by some minor governmental official—an age-old condition of the autocratic Old World they sought to escape by coming to America.

Here, until recently, their substance has not been con-
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sumed by a hundred petty forms of taxes to support an army of government bureaucrats.

Here they have enjoyed not only religious freedom, but mental freedom, nurtured by the finest system of free public education civilization has ever known. With the exception of a few States, illiteracy in the United States is practically negligible. It may be said, in passing, that in those exceptional States we find the most enthusiastic support of the New Deal.

There is greater diffusion of wealth in this nation than in any other country of the globe. The common people are infinitely better off in a material way—better clothed, better housed, better fed, have more money in savings institutions, carry more insurance of various kinds, have more and better recreation—than can be found any other place on the face of the civilized globe.

This is true because of the economic system under which this country has been developed, and because of which it has prospered—a system which permitted free play of economic forces. Under this system it has become an adage that it is only three generations from shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves.

The only aristocracy which has survived under this system has been the aristocracy of talent and character. Those who inherited wealth had to hold it by proving their worth in the field of free competition.

Rising generations faced no barrier of caste. They were not restrained by the oppressive hand of government dictation and regimentation, a system which, wherever it exists, operates to perpetuate in power an officialdom which is indolent, wasteful, arrogant, incompetent and generally corrupt.

Our institutions of learning, our churches, hospitals, and benevolent institutions, our great charities—all are financed, both in their construction and maintenance, out of surplus of wealth made possible under our present economic system.

There is no other way to finance these institutions and organizations except by the State—a method advocated and being put into practice by the New Deal. That means State-controlled education, Tammanyized charity and State-controlled religion.

There is no middle ground. European governments are now furnishing examples of the religious intolerance and state-controlled education which the New Deal and the present administration is offering as a substitute for the old one will better serve the real interests of the American people than the one they are asked to discard.

The youth of America—the young men and the young women upon whose shoulders will rest the burden of carrying on our civilization tomorrow—are the ones who must decide the validity of this challenge.

It means comparatively little to the elders of this country, who have lived their lives and are passing off the stage, whether or not the economic, social and political systems—to the preservation of which they have contributed and under which they have gone forward—are to be scrapped.

But to those who are about to take up the responsibilities of citizenship and leadership in the world of affairs it means everything. It is the future of their country and their personal welfare which are at stake.

President Roosevelt, in a radio address delivered last night to the convention of Young Democrats in Milwaukee, Wis., stated there was need for a new economic system because there are no new frontiers and that therefore the welfare of generations to come must be based (I now quote) "on the resourcefulness of men and women, applied to the old frontiers."

The whole philosophy and practice of the New Deal repudiates this statement. The well-defined purpose of all the important New Deal legislation since the inauguration of the President has been to eliminate the element of private resourcefulness and to have the government assume the functions heretofore carried on by private enterprise and exercised by the individual.

That legislation, collectively known as "planned economy," attempts to place a whole people in lock-step and deny to the individual the right to exercise his own judgment and resourcefulness in the management of his own business, farm or factory.

It would reduce every citizen to the status of an automaton—taking orders from a government bureaucrat, neither elected nor accountable to the people.

In the same speech, President Roosevelt stated a new economic system was necessary in order that the next generations may be guaranteed security for themselves and their families.

A little further on, he called upon the radicals of the country—all those who are against what he termed the "old order"—to unite in order to fight for their broad objectives.

At least it must be said in behalf of the President that he practices what he preaches. The tax law which has just been enacted as a part of the "must" legislation demanded by the President is a political measure designed to afford a common meeting place of all the radical groups who are out to "soak the rich" and "share the wealth."

It is a measure designated not to produce revenue but to confiscate property for the use of a vast Federal bureaucracy.

What security does such a program hold out for the
next generation? Let me illustrate. Among the first victims of this law will be the heirs of the late beloved Will Rogers. His estate will be required to raise between a half-million and eight hundred thousand dollars in cash.

Obviously, it does not have that much ready cash on hand. What then? It will be compelled to put on the market some of the property which he owned. Whether that be real estate or securities does not matter. Property of any kind sold at a forced sale is sold at a great loss. Moreover, it depreciates the value of like property.

What is going to happen in the settlement of the estate of Will Rogers will happen in the settlement of every estate which is bludgeoned by this confiscatory tax law, pushed on a reluctant Congress and forced on a helpless people by the President of the United States, in order that he might make his peace with the radical elements of the country, anticipatory of the next Presidential campaign!

In addition, the rising generation will face the necessity of paying off the almost incredible debts which are being incurred by this administration. This, alone, will impair the security not only of the next generation, but of generations to come. It will cripple industry and commerce. It will make it increasingly difficult for generations yet unborn to get ahead.

Nothing so deadens ambition and renders industry and thrift so futile as the certain knowledge that one will not be permitted to enjoy the fruits of his efforts and the profits of his resourcefulness, but will be compelled to turn them over to pay the bills of a profligate government.

In his Milwaukee address the President stated that according to the philosophy of the New Deal our present system must be modified (and I now quote) "to save our economic structure from confusion, destruction and paralysis." Without any attempt to elaborate, I submit there never has been a period within the memory of any living being when there was greater confusion, doubt and fear in the minds of all classes of people, in all walks of life, or a greater threat of destruction of all that is worth while of our economic and political system than exists today, as a direct result of two and one-half years of the Roosevelt administration.

In conclusion it is admitted on all hands that in order to establish this new economic system our Federal Constitution must be wholly rewritten. Already the administration is launching a campaign to that end. This is the most serious of all problems which the young men and women of today must consider and decide.

The Constitution was written not for the rich, or the strong, or for those who occupy places of authority, or have accumulated great wealth. It was written for the humble citizen.

The moment the guaranties that great charter of human liberty gives the individual citizen are abolished, it then becomes a struggle for the survival of the strongest and the most powerful. Every man is then free to invade the field of every other man's rights.

Such a contest would have but one conclusion—those who possess the power, the wealth, and the cunning would control the government and compel all others to do their bidding. Surely the youth of America are not prepared to endorse any administration which is seeking to bring about such a change.

"The Constitution Was Made for Man"

By HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Lawyer, Congressman from Virginia, delivered in the House of Representatives

M R. SPEAKER, in the few years I have been in Congress I have heard more talk about the Constitution and learned less about it than during any other similar period in my life.

It is beginning to look like everyone, whether he comes from the field or the factory or the office or the bar, upon entering this sacred Chamber seems to think that he, by some miraculous endowment from on high, becomes a finished constitutional lawyer.

I am afraid that we talk more and know less about the true meaning, spirit, and intent of the Constitution than we reali...
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First, I admit that there are those who honestly and sincerely think that the administration’s program militates against the Constitution. These fellows, you know, are constitutionally minded and, argus-eyed, see the Constitution being trampled under foot in practically every piece of legislation that comes up. The country has, you know, been afflicted with this group ever since the Constitution was adopted; and everyone knows that if we follow the leadership of this group the House will become, more or less, simply a constitutional debating society.

In the second place, I am afraid that there are those who by training, environment, or unconscious influences are against the program of the administration because they are more considerate of the pocketbooks of the few than they are of the hunger and distress and the unequal opportunities of the many. They, too, are using the constitutional stiletto. If we follow the leadership of these constitutionalists, those in distress will never be given relief and the social and economic inequalities and maladjustments that are rampant today will never be corrected.

And then—and do not overlook this fact—the Republicans and vested interests are making a desperate effort to discredit our great leader and his whole program. They are afraid to come out openly and oppose his program on its merits, and would have it appear that the only reason they are unable to go along with him is because he is riding rough-shod over the Constitution. Back of this attack, I am afraid, is not so much a sincere desire to protect and uphold the Constitution as there is a sincere desire, for political and selfish reasons, to discredit Franklin D. Roosevelt and tear down and disrupt his program. If we follow these pseudoconstitutionalists, God alone can save our country.

Why, this latter group is now going so far as to suggest that the President, by reason of his stand on the Guffey coal bill, is subject to impeachment.

Mr. Bainbridge Colby, one of the Liberty Leaguers, and, of course, speaking for vested interests, in an article appearing in the Washington Herald on Sunday, July 21, makes the suggestion, and in the same newspaper on the same date the great Republican leader, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Snell), speaking of course for the Republican Party, voices the same sentiment. There seems to be a close affinity between the Liberty League and the Republican Party. They not only think and act alike but think and act in conjunction. They may not be one and the same organization operating under two names, but, to say the least, they seem to be in cahoot representing the same interests.

Now, what “high crimes and misdemeanors” do they charge the President with? Why, the impeachment crime consists in writing a letter to Chairman Hill, of the Ways and Means Subcommittee, before which the Guffy coal bill is pending, urging the enactment of the legislation.

Let us look into this letter. Reciting that this great natural-resource industry, “from the standpoint of the operators and miners, has had many years of difficulty”; that “the deposits are limited to a few States, the consumption is Nation-wide”; that “competition and overexpansion have brought destructive price reductions, which have inevitably reacted upon labor standards, with a resulting dislocation, restriction, and obstruction to interstate commerce, and a recurring danger to industrial strife”; that “admitting that mining coal, considered separately and apart from its distribution in the flow of interstate commerce, is an interstate transaction, the constitutionality of the provisions, based on the commerce clause of the Constitution, depends upon the final conclusion as to whether production, conditions directly affect, promote, or obstruct interstate commerce in the commodity”; that “no one is in a position to give assurance that the proposed act will withstand constitutional tests, for the simple fact that you can get, not ten but a thousand differing legal opinions”; that “the situation is so urgent and the benefits of the legislation so evident that all doubts should be resolved in favor of the bill, leaving to the courts, in an orderly fashion, the ultimate question of constitutionality,” he concludes that “a decision of the Supreme Court relative to this measure would be helpful as indicating with increasing clarity the constitutional limits within which this Government must operate,” and expresses the hope that “your committee will not permit doubts as to the constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation.”

Now, what were the facts surrounding the writing of the letter? Eminent constitutional lawyers had appeared before the subcommittee in support of the constitutionality of the legislation. Equally as eminent lawyers employed by those opposing the bill had appeared before the subcommittee in opposition to the legislation on constitutional grounds. The Department of Justice had been requested by the subcommittee for an opinion on the constitutionality of the legislation, and, through an assistant to the Attorney General, had reported that it could not give a positive opinion.

Now, what is the common-sense thing to do under such circumstances? Why, just what the President suggested in his letter, pass the legislation and leave “to the courts, in an orderly fashion, the ultimate question of constitutionality.”

When legislation is urgent and needful, but uncertain because of supposed constitutional prohibitions, is the President to be charged with violating his oath of office in urging the adoption of such legislation, and are we as members of Congress to be charged with violating our oath of office in passing such legislation? In such a case is not the sensible thing to do to go ahead and pass the legislation and let the Supreme Court, the only institution under our system of government that can settle the question, construe the legislation in the light of the Constitution? If the President or the Congress should adopt any other policy, would not it be possible for vested interests to hire eminent lawyers to appear before every committee considering bills opposed by them and raise constitutional objections and thus defeat the legislation?

Have we reached the point where paid attorneys representing special interests, the Liberty Leaguers, and the Republican Party, can by simply raising constitutional objections silence the voice of the President, stay the hand of Congress, and thus put a stop to all legislation not approved by them? Sifted of the chaff, this is the doctrine that is now being preached. The answer is, the Constitution was designed to protect the rights and liberties of more people in this country than the Liberty Leaguers, special interests, the Republican Party, and Representative Knutson’s candidate for the Presidency, the constitutional alarmist, the Honorable Hamilton Fish. It was designed to protect the rights and liberties of all the people. And when the farmers, workmen, and just common, everyday folk through their chosen
representatives ask for laws that will promote their happiness and increase their opportunities the time is not now, and never will be as long as there are free men in America, when their representatives will be frightened, intimidated, or deterred by the pseudoconstitutional cries of the Tories.

Why, as far back as February 1793 the Second Congress passed an act directing the Secretary of War, in conjunction with the Attorney General, to take such action as was necessary to obtain an adjudication of the Supreme Court on the constitutionality of an act passed in 1792. Here Congress entertained doubts as to the constitutionality of the act of 1792, wanted to find out if the act was constitutional, and did the only sensible thing that it could do, directed the proper authorities to test the act before the Supreme Court and thus obtain an adjudication. This instance is cited by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of Marbury v. Madison (1 Cr. 171). This is all the President is doing. He does not know whether the Guffey cool bill is constitutional—no one does—and he is only asking that the legislation be passed so an adjudication can be obtained from the Supreme Court. It is only by legislative enactment and judicial interpretation that we can settle constitutional questions.

The administration's program, everyone realizes, is being viciously attacked by the different organizations of special interests from its holding company, the Republican Party, on down the line to its subsidiaries, like the Liberty League and the United States Chamber of Commerce. They are today spreading their false and misleading propaganda through a subsidized press, over the radio, over telegraph lines, and by pamphlets, in the same brazen false, and unfair methods used by the utility companies when the holding company bill was before Congress. Their planned attack, it is now evident, is through the Constitution. They are trying to frighten the President, the Congress, and the people with the Constitution. They are trying to sell the people on the idea that Democrats have never had the proper regard for the Constitution; that everything the President and the Democratic Congress are doing is unconstitutional; that we are trying to wreck the Constitution; and that they, the appointed guardians and defenders of the Constitution, are trying to send the country from Mr. Roosevelt and his Constitution wreckers. Well, every thinking man and woman knows that this propaganda is pure bunk and unadulterated tommyrot. What special interest is really trying to do is to use the Constitution as a smoke screen to fight behind in their effort to wreck Mr. Roosevelt's program of social justice and economic security and freedom.

To be specific, let me state their line of attack in concrete form. Here is what they are preaching: That, true to form, a Democratic President is suggesting and recommending and a Democratic Congress is passing unconstitutional laws. Well, for passing unconstitutional laws, I will put the record of the Democratic Party up against the record of the Republican Party any day. Let the record speak. During our 146 years of national life the Supreme Court has declared 67 acts of Congress unconstitutional. How many of these acts were passed by Constitution-wrecking Democratic Congress? Why, only 20, or around 29 per cent of the acts that have been declared unconstitutional. On the other hand, Republican Congresses, whom we are now told are the guardians of the Constitution, passed 42 of the unconstitutional statutes, or around 63 per cent. Four of the other unconstitutional statutes were passed by a Democratic House and a Republican Senate and 1 by the first Congress that assembled, which was a nonpartisan body.

Now, that is a pretty good record for the Democratic Party, especially when you take into consideration the fact that we have had—

Democratic Congresses .............................................. 33
Republican Congresses .............................................. 27
Whig Congress ....................................................... 1
Nonpartisan Congress ................................................ 1
Congress: Senate Whig, House Democratic ........................ 1
Congress: House Democrats, Senate Whig ....................... 8
Congress: Senate Republican, House Democratic .............. 2
Congress: Senate Democratic, House Republican ............ 1

Total ............................................................... 74

Of the 60 strictly Democratic or Republican Congresses, 33 were Democratic Congresses and 27 Republican Congresses, and during these Congresses 62 unconstitutional acts were passed, the Democrats passing 20 and the Republicans 42 of the unconstitutional acts. Therefore, if we figure the percentage of unconstitutional acts passed by strictly Democratic and Republican Congresses, you will find that the Democrats only passed about 30 per cent of the acts, while the Republicans passed about 70 per cent.

Here is the record:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date of session</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Date of passage of act held unconstitutional</th>
<th>Act passed by Democratic or Republican Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feb. 24, 1933</td>
<td>Marbury v. Madison</td>
<td>1 Cr. 171</td>
<td>Dec. 24, 1803</td>
<td>Republican.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>July 12, 1929</td>
<td>U.S. v. Harris</td>
<td>1887 U.S. 147</td>
<td>June 26, 1887</td>
<td>Republican.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUMMARY

Number of acts declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court: 67
Number of acts passed by Democratic Congresses: 20 29
Number of acts passed by Republican Congresses: 42 63
Number of acts passed by Democratic House and Republican Senate: 4 6
Number of acts passed by a nonpartisan Congress (first Congress): 1 2
Number of acts passed by strictly Democratic or Republican Congresses:
  By Democratic Congresses: 20 32
  By Republican Congresses: 42 63

Oh, let us pursue a little further this glorious record of acts passed by purely Democratic or Republican Congresses. By Democratic Congresses: 20 32. By Republican Congresses: 42 63.

In spite of the fact that his constitutional record may frighten some of the present-day, self-appointed guardians of the Constitution. What is it? Why, six laws passed during his term of office by a Republican Senate and a Republican House were later declared unconstitutional by a Republican Supreme Court! Now, you self-appointed guardians of the Constitution prepare for a real shock. I have been trying to give you this medicine—although it is your own medicine—in broken doses so far. Well, here is a whole spoonful; and if you are sincere in your criticism of Mr. Roosevelt I know it is going to gag every one of you! How about the great war hero you elevated to the Presidency, General Grant? You claim that he was courageous and honest and a man who regarded his oath of office and I agree with you. But what is his record on the Constitution? Listen! Ten unconstitutional acts of Congress were passed during his term of office by a Republican Senate and a Republican House and two unconstitutional acts by a Republican Senate and a Democratic House, making 12 unconstitutional acts in all! Why, during his term of office alone a Republican Senate and a Republican House passed one-half as many unconstitutional acts as every Democratic Senate and Democratic House we have had since the birth of the Nation!

And yet in the face of such a record the Republican Party has the gall—the unmitigated gall—to lay claim to guardianship of the Constitution! Well, if the Republican Party is the only protection the Constitution has in this
country, then as a lover and defender of the Constitution I exclaim: May God save the Constitution!

Now, with reference to the attitude of the Republican Party toward the Constitution, let us get at the truth of the matter. You know and I know that the Constitution would never have weathered the storms so far if its guardianship had not been committed to the tender ministrations of the Republican Party. You know and I know, based upon past history, that the attitude of the Republican Party toward the constitutionality of legislation depends largely upon whom the legislation will affect.

Legislation passed in the interest of the few and powerful—in the interest of special interests—has always been looked upon with favor by the Republican Party, regardless of the Constitution. On the other hand, legislation passed in the interest of the masses, from the Republican standpoint, is usually branded unconstitutional. From the Republican point of view it is largely a question of who you are legislating for. While illustrations could be multiplied to sustain the above statement, let me give you, for the sake of brevity, just one. The tariff laws were not passed to raise revenue, but to protect special interests—to protect industry—though the only warrant to pass such laws under the Constitution is under the taxing power of Congress to raise revenue.

Not being laws to raise revenue, but laws passed for the avowed purpose of protecting industry, there has always been a grave question as to whether Congress has the power under the Constitution to pass such laws. In spite of the constitutional uncertainty, however, you will find Republican presidents sending messages to Congress urging the passage of tariff laws, and you may search the record from A to Z and you will not find a single word uttered by a single Republican criticizing the Chief Executive for urging the passage of uncertain constitutional tariff laws or questioning the constitutionality of the tariff laws in any way.

And yet, when Mr. Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress invoke the same doctrine in behalf of the farmers and give them through the processing tax feature of the Agriculture Adjustment Act a domestic tariff on certain basic farm products, thus extending to them the same rights and benefits special interests have been receiving all the while under the tariff laws, why the Republican Party, and those representing special interests in both parties, contend that the Agricultural Adjustment Act because it extends the benefits of the tariff to the farmers is unconstitutional? Well, if the taxing power under the Constitution can be invoked to protect industry, why cannot it be invoked to protect the farmer? If the Constitution permits industry to operate on a protected, restricted market, why does not the same instrument, which protect in the interest of all, permit the farmers to operate on a protected, restricted market?

All this Mr. Roosevelt and the Democratic Congress in this particular are trying to do is to give the farmers of America the same protection industry enjoys. Yet we are being told that the President, because he thinks the Constitution extends to farmers and industry alike, should be impeached and the Members of Congress who vote for laws that will accomplish the purpose are guilty of violating their oaths of office. And again I say that such an argument is pure bunk and unabated tommyrot.

Should the Constitution be changed? The answer, as I see the situation, is yes and no. No; if the President's program can be carried out under the Constitution. Yet; if it cannot be, and a majority of our people believe as I do, that child labor should be abolished, that the sweatshop should be banished, that the farmers are entitled to the same protection accorded industry, that labor has the right to organize in its own self-defense, that provision should be made for the aged and helpless, that ruthless and unfair trade practices should be eliminated from business, and the blessings of government distributed along safe and sane lines in a fairer and more equitable manner. While I think that these things can be accomplished by a fair, just, and liberal construction of our Constitution, I do not hesitate to say that if the Constitution is so worded as to bar further social and economic progress that the time has, in my mind, arrived for a change. Only the Supreme Court can tell us where we stand. We should await with patience the decisions that will clear up the confusion that now exists; and then if we have to act our actions should be taken in conformity to the Constitution.

To my fellow Virginians let me say that a few changes in the Constitution should not be such a great shock. Why the Federal Constitution has been changed 21 times, and many of the most important changes were suggested and advocated by that great Virginia political thinker and statesman, the immortal Jefferson. And to Virginians I also call attention to the fact that only recently one of our governors in order to carry out his program to reform our State government not only changed but practically rewrote the Virginia constitution.

These pseudoconstitutional arguments and charges that are now being made are as old as time itself. Why, I remember years ago the constitutionalists of that day, the Pharisees, like their kinsmen of today, afraid to come out and give vent to their true feelings, hid behind the Constitution in making a vicious attack upon a handful of helpless men. You remember the instance. The disciples, hungry and tired on a Sabbath day, passed through a corn field and plucked some of the grain and ate it, and were charged by the Pharisees, the pseudoconstitutionalists of that day, with violating the constitution. The Master saw through their hypocrisy, and when they laid the charges before Him effectively answered them by simply saying that an urgent need had arisen, the disciples were hungry, and that "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath."

And to these pseudoconstitutionalists of today who are attempting to hide behind the Constitution in their effort to destroy the humane and needful programs of Mr. Roosevelt let me answer by paraphrasing the words of the Master: "The Constitution was made for man, and not man for the Constitution."
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THROUGH gatherings such as this the springs of American political life are being constantly renewed. In contrast to a world beset by dictators who have ruthlessly suppressed democratic institutions and all political opposition, we in America still exercise the right of free assembly. I sometimes wonder if that precious heritage is appreciated as fully as it should be. But when I attend meetings like this I am reassured.

For here are men and women who have laid aside their daily tasks to journey perhaps hundreds of miles so that they may participate in discussing, not important personal or business interests but that intangible thing called “the state of the Nation.” We are here to review national policies, and to criticize, if need be, those conducting the Nation’s affairs for their errors and mistakes.

That right to criticize government, no matter how overwhelming its power, is the very foundation of democracy. We have not yet reached the point where we are willing to accept that regimentation of thought, much less of national action, which—whether it be called Hitlerism, Fascism, or its action, which—whether it be called present-day Fascism—characterizes the political trend of present-day Sovietism—characterizes the radical view, Europe. Nor are we willing to accede to the radical view, which—whether it be called Hitlerism, Fascism, or Europe. Nor are we willing to accede to the radical view, which—whether it be called Hitlerism, Fascism, or even to the radical view, which—whether it be called Hitlerism, Fascism, or even to the radical view, which—whether it be called Hitlerism, Fascism, or in its effect on the people, we are being regimented under a new social philosophy into a totalitarian State. Our traditional individualism is to be sacrificed for dependence upon Government crutches and Government doles for everybody and for every purpose.

Furthermore, it has been proposed to amend the Constitution so drastically that the Bill of Rights, regarded for a century and a half as the ark of our personal liberties, will be virtually annulled. The States, for all practical purposes, are to be reduced to mere units of administration for a centralized economic policy, such as has been brought about in Germany under the Nazi regime. The vast American continent would be made to revolve around the White House, Washington as its hub, with the lives and activities of 120,000,000 people regulated under what in radio parlance is called “remote control.”

Nor is this all. The political doctrines which give rise to these acts, and which, unless checked, must result in an eventual dictatorship, would go still further. The rights of citizens, having been trampled upon with a contempt worthy of the Kremlin, are to be further abridged by denying legal redress for wrongful acts committee by the Government. Once more might is to make right. Under a series of bills sent to Congress recently, the administration has the opportunity to make immunity from suits which seek to recover in the courts losses due to taxes subsequently declared illegal, or from the Government’s own competition with private business, subsidized at the taxpayers’ expense.

When two former Democratic Secretaries of the Treasury challenged as “immoral” the proposed measure to outlaw suits against the Government resulting from the gold-clause decision, the Attorney General of the United States replied: “It is an impertinence to speak of any act of government as immoral.” Could any arrogant royal minister, voicing his contempt for those who must pay the bills, have put more plainly the case for absolutism? In defense of such statutes it is argued that the State as sovereign cannot be sued without its consent. That may be so; but what these proposed statutes more truly seek is the revival of the ancient un-American doctrine that the “king can do no wrong.”

Under what has been called the “new deal,” there is projected and under way the gradual alteration of fundamental relationships between the Federal Government and the 48 States. The Constitution itself is being subtly undermined, with transfer of control over the Nation’s economic life to the central authority set up as a new and revolutionary political objective. A vast bureaucracy is being erected which seeks to supervise, in an unprecedented economic and socialistic experiment, all public and private enterprise. Without mandate from the people, we are being regimented under a new social philosophy into a totalitarian State. Our traditional individualism is to be sacrificed for dependence upon Government crutches and Government doles for everybody and for every purpose.
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Now, if there was one idea which the framers of the Constitution intended should be left on the other side of the Atlantic and permanently barred from American soil, it was this doctrine of immunity for the executive power. The very essence of the new Federal Government which was to be erected lay in the limitations to be placed upon its authority. Each of its acts, or the acts of its agents, were to be always subject to judicial review. The whole concept of an independent judiciary appointed for life and headed by the Supreme Court, was designed to insure enforcement of these limitations. For the same reason the provision was adopted that all powers not specifically granted to the Federal agency was reserved to the several States.

These principles, which today are being attacked as belonging to the "horse and buggy" era of our history, received the very closest scrutiny from the constitutional convention. The members of that gathering were thoroughly conscious of those problems that arouse present White House impatience; they had perhaps an even greater experience in conducting government under adverse economic conditions. But from that experience they had learned wisdom; among other things they had become extremely skeptical of popular nostrums and panaceas which were current then as now. Likewise they were quite conscious of the inequalities likely to exist between little States and big States; some would be progressive and others backward. That seems to the founders preferable to attempts at forcing all into a common strait-jacket, which will be foredoomed to failure.

And, since they were profound students of history, they knew that the question of how to effect an equitable exchange between the products of the farm and of the city was as old as civilization itself. They had suffered bitterly from State interference with the workings of economic law. But, unlike modern political leaders, they had a profound distrust of too much government, particularly of that bigness in government which makes the rights of an ordinary citizen seem of small consequence. What concerned the Founders most is what now should concern us most—how to create a government which would function without that traditional evil of all governments—bureaucratic oppression.

Those safeguards set up under the Constitution—the careful balancing of legislative, executive, and judicial power—are no less vital today than they were 150 years ago. Perhaps it is only natural that they should irritate ambitious men who always reach out, under the guise of an "emergency," to gather into their hands more and more authority. Pressing national problems can be solved—so they maintain—only if—and that "if" always looms large in their minds—a completely free hand is given them.

We are likely to forget that it was the evils attendant upon this kind of "personal" government which were primarily responsible for American independence. The colonists were thoroughly familiar with those vagaries of a ruler who issues commands for "must" legislation, who sets his own judgment against courts, and who insists upon enactment within 5 days by the calendar, of tax measures which levy tribute upon commerce and the thrifty for the support of his army of officeholders. It is worthy, remembering that the complaints of the Colonies were directed not against Parliament but at the excesses committed by the King's agents. Some of the grievances cited in the Declaration of Independance have quite a modern ring, as for example:

"He has called together legislative bodies * * * for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures."

"He has made judges dependent upon his will alone for the tenure of their offices."

"He has enacted a multitude of new offices and sent swarms of officers to harass our people and eat of their substance."

"He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws."

America's outstanding contribution to the political philosophy of the world has been in these restraining bounds established for the executive power. This has been accomplished, as I have said, through the creation of an independent judiciary, made part and parcel of the Constitution itself. Only thus could protection be provided against aggrandizement of authority by either the legislative or administrative branches of the Government—each jealously regarding itself as the true agent of the popular will. Indeed, so well has this system worked during 138 years, it should be noted that but 48 laws passed by Congress have been declared invalid.

Four of these decisions have been handed down during the present administration; all relate to improper delegations of power to the Executive.

What is "personal" government? The Supreme Court has defined it as blanket grants of authority without the laying down by Congress of specific rules within which that authority is to be exercised. It was held, in other words, that under no circumstances can the legislative power itself be transferred to the Executive so that orders issued by the President shall have the effect of statutory law. The President can only interpret or define a rule of law previously made by Congress. Yet, as an example of how far we have gone in vesting unprecedented powers in the hands of administrative officials, let me cite what the Secretary of Agriculture may do under recent amendments to the Triple A Act.

He can assign to each individual farmer his proportion of nearly 20 staple crops which are now placed under Federal control. These include everything from cotton, wheat, corn, and tobacco to potatoes, fruits, and nuts, but excluding apples and vegetables, such as asparagus, which are suitable for canning. He can then assign purchase and marketing quotas to each handler of such produce, inspect the books and records of all foodstuff manufacturers, and by "orders" virtually control such businesses. He can declare a surplus to exist for these designated crops; he can use Government moneys in the purchase of excess supplies and arrange for their disposal.

These are but a few of the plenary powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture. Yet, however able and omniscient he may be, I deny that any single individual can be reasonably expected to perform such a multitude of functions. It is repugnant to our system of government to permit any official to decree such sentences of economic life or death. What really happens, of course, is that this authority is delegated in turn to minor bureau chiefs who prepare orders for the Secretary's signature. Thus some obscure in-
individual, of whom the public has never heard and who, in most instances, is a political appointee approved by patronage distributors. Farley, is placed in control of the 40,000,000 farmers—tugs against rain and sun and the purposes of the Almighty. And the result of this thinly veiled autocracy is called a "planned economy"! To me it is unbelievable that American farmers will accept this status of robots, blindly goose-stepping to direction from consignees enthroned at Washington.

Let me give you one further example of this type of "personal" government on which we are hazarding our future as a nation, and which recently brought down one of General Johnson's famous ukasas. It was simply one of the many thousand "executive orders" issued for the regimentation of American industry, of which it happened he had never heard. When the case was appealed, the Supreme Court asked for a copy of the order on which the complaint was based. A hasty search disclosed that by some strange accident this particular order had never been officially published. Yet here was a citizen about to be haled off to jail for breaking a rule, the existence of which was known only to NRA's "crack-downers"!

The administration airily dismisses these cases which I can cite by the score as mere "incidents." Yet they seem to me to differ little from those grievances of which the Colonists complained. "They are the excesses which always must accompany the use of arbitrary authority. The history and record of democratic government has been one of continuous struggle to restrain its own bureaucracies. Thus, after the granting of Magna Charta by King John, the first duty laid upon the 34 succeeding sovereigns before the scepter could be assumed was the reaffirming of those rights on which the government on which we are hazarding our salvation has rested English liberty.

Through the President's oath to uphold the Constitution, we seek that same affirmation. The administering of that oath at his inauguration is made the most solemn act of his entire tenure of office. I mention this only because less than a month ago we find the Chief Executive writing to the chairman of an important House committee as follows:

"I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

What lay behind that extraordinary request which I venture to assert, has no parallel among the writings of any of our Presidents? Is there not here an open invitation to the President to claim the Constitution? Is there not a grave and repudiation of the Constitution? Is there not also a betrayal of the Constitution? Is it not now understandable why Governor Lowden has issued a call to arms for defense of the Constitution?

You have done me the signal honor of asking me to define the issues of the next national campaign. In reply, let me state that in my judgment there is but one issue. Gravely and reluctantly do I say it: "Today, tomorrow, and next year—that issue is—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

With all deference to the high office he holds, President Roosevelt should be subjected to the following charges:

He has repudiated the platform pledges made by his party and upon which he was elected to office.

He has committed the country to unsound monetary experiments, condemned by nearly all recognized economists, and in consequence has disrupted American foreign trade, with serious and permanent injury to agriculture and industry.

He has delayed economic recovery by forcing upon the country dubious measures of reform which, by penalizing thrift, strike at the national economy, and by political subsidy under the guise of relief, break down the morale and self-reliance of great numbers of our citizens.

He has held out false and illusionary hopes both to the unfortunate and to workers by advocacy and passage of laws which are not only impossible of administration but which are known to be almost certainly unconstitutional.

He has debauched the Civil Service by the employment and preference in Federal emergency agencies of a vast army of political spoliers without knowledge or training for the posts they hold.

He has remained indifferent to his promises of balancing the Budget, or reducing national expenditures, and has encouraged extravagances and the wasting of public funds which have placed the American people under a burden of debt that now threatens the solvency of the Government itself.

He has, in public utterances, been disrespectful to the Supreme Court of the United States and has sought by deliberate attempt to "alibi" the failure of the "new deal" by placing the blame falsely on the courts.

Lest I be accused of unfairness in this indictment, let me, after the fashion of the sorely tried colonials, also draw a "bill of particulars." Because these acts have been performed smilingly and with an engaging good nature, we must not be misled as to their ultimate consequences for the Nation. So that public vigilance may be aroused, it is of the highest importance that the people thoroughly understand the inward purpose of this program which Mr. Roosevelt sponsors.

The present administration's record, in violating the pledges of the Democratic national platform, has been so glaring that it requires little elaboration here. Never in the whole history of this country has there been so callous a betrayal of solemnly pledged principles or the suborning of a great party as has taken place during the past 2 years. Yet it must be obvious that no two-party system of government is rendered meaningless if those declarations made to the electorate are to become merely so many "scraps of paper" once victory at the polls has been achieved. Dishonesty and hypocrisy in political life must not be permitted to go unanswered any more than they can be condoned in business or professional life.

No one better understood the importance of fulfilling
campaign pledges than a former great leader of the Democratic Party, William Jennings Bryan. With almost prophetic insight of the present situation, as he spoke before the Ohio Constitutional Convention in 1912, he declared:

"Laws should be authorized dealing criminally with candidates who pledge themselves to specific measures and then, by official act, repudiate those pledges after election. Platforms should either be made binding or they should be prohibited. A platform has no meaning unless it is intended as a pledge, and a violation of such a pledge involves a greater degree of moral turpitude than the offenses against property rights which we now punish severely. A pledge publicly given by a candidate, and a platform promise not openly repudiated, should be binding in law as well as in conscience."

I here and now invite the leaders of both the Republican and Democratic Parties to see to it that this proposal is enacted into law. The first-hand demonstration of the socialist doctrine of seizing power by "boring from within" other party organizations which we are now witnessing must be ended. That door should be closed and bolted against further misadventures. If the American people wish to embrace socialism or communism, let it be, not by any backstairs route such as is in progress, but by a frank and direct show-down on the issue itself. I, for one, am confident of the verdict.

When we turn to the Roosevelt monetary program with its substitution of "halooney" dollars for sound currency which has been pledged in the Democratic platform, no words of mine can adequately describe the chaos and confusion that have characterized our national policy. We have sabotaged all international exchanges, forced all foreign nations to adopt defensive monetary measures against us, and ended by completely wrecking American foreign trade.

The objective sought was the so-called "commodity dollar"; actually the search was for rubber money—something that would be low in value when applied to the payment of debts, but which became something quite different in the purchase of goods. In other words, we have been attempting to do business with two different kinds of money, an "internal" dollar and an "external" dollar. With the Warren-Pearson theory, which stands condemned practically unanimously by all other economists, prices were to rise by the same percentage that gold was depreciated. Let me show you what really happened.

Exchange value for gold currencies did at once increase by the amount that the dollar had been devalued, but commodity prices, being influenced by the pound sterling rather than the dollar, have lagged far behind. Thus commodities, prior to the beginning of the Government's gold purchases in January 1934, rose only 18 per cent compared to a gain of 48 per cent for the franc. Before the price for gold was finally fixed, francs rose 7 per cent further and commodities 8 per cent. Thus from February 1933 to the present the total gains were 68 per cent for gold, in terms of francs, against merely 33 per cent for commodities. But for agricultural products which the world bought from us, prices to foreign purchasers, largely as a result of AAA policies, rose from 150 to 250 per cent. The result was to reduce farm exports to the lowest level in 50 years!

Mr. Roosevelt himself grudgingly admits the failure of this "bold experiment." But what is not yet recognized is the insuperable obstacle that has been erected to the recovery of foreign markets for our agricultural exports. The advantages of bargaining, which the debts owed by European nations to the American Government once gave us, are now hopelessly compromised, while price differentials, raised against our wheat and cotton, place us at a permanent disadvantage. Similarly the export of manufactured goods has been hurt by the unavailability of dollar exchange for foreign purchasers. This has been utilized instead by the Treasury in support of our fantastic silver policy through its price-lifting operations abroad.

The crying need of the world today is for stabilization of international currencies. Only thus can there be any lasting revival in our exports, upon which nearly one-fourth of our farm population and at least 5,000,000 workers in industry are dependent. There can be no stabilization because no foreign nation, with the memory of the last London Monetary Conference still fresh in mind, cares to trust the word of this administration. The world depression is prolonged because the President still stubbornly refuses to give up his hope of support by the inflationist bloc in Congress, which might be lost were the dollar's value finally fixed.

Likewise we are at last learning the truth about the banking crisis which culminated with Mr. Roosevelt's inauguration in March 1933. The revelations of Prof. William Starr Myers, of Princeton, show an unbelievable picture of a President-elect deliberately refusing cooperation to the patriotic appeal of the outgoing President in saving the Nation's banks. On February 17 President Hoover, by special letter delivered through the Secret Service, laid the facts of the situation before Mr. Roosevelt. What would you or I or any patriotic citizen have done under the circumstances? It seems to me that love of country could have given only one answer, and that unequivocally. But what did Franklin Delano Roosevelt do?

On March 1, nearly 2 weeks later, while the Nation trembled on the brink of a financial precipice, he replied in effect: "I am awfully sorry not to have acknowledged your letter sooner, but my secretary said the reply I had prepared, thinking it merely a draft."

No one can possibly be misled by such a transparent and weak excuse. If Mr. Roosevelt did not wish to join with President Hoover in meeting the crisis, why did he not have courage to say so directly and give his reasons. But Franklin Delano Roosevelt did not intend to cooperate in the slightest degree. He was perfectly prepared to see happen what did happen—the closing of every bank in the United States—so that the magnificent gesture of reorganizing them might be his. In the light of such facts, does not the luster of that first "hundred days," to which the President's admirers are so fond of referring—perhaps in comparison with another equally famous hundred days—now appear to be slightly tarnished?

In the field of social policy, Mr. Roosevelt must be judged strictly by his handling of the great problem of unemployment. Its financial implications for the Government's own credit, together with the problem of rehabilitation for these millions of depression victims, transcend all other is-
sues. Yet the plain facts are that the number of those on relief is today as great, if not greater, than a year ago. In reality the Relief Administration continues to temporize by "taking the leaves" and other "boodogging" makeshifts. What the unemployed demand are permanent jobs, not Mr. Hopkins’ hastily improvised expedients.

By a series of measures, both in a misdirected zeal for reform, business men have been rendered timid and afraid. They have been harassed by innumerable regulations and permits, such as I have described as being exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture. Men and women now look upon the holder of the scales of justice, but as their enemy. The Roosevelt "new deal" has set up the untenable proposition that government is the great leveler. If we continue to look upon those who have to give to those who need, we will soon prevent those who have, having, and those who need, getting.

Now, no nation has ever succeeded by penalizing the thrifty and industrious so that the slothful might be continued in their laziness. Yet what other interpretation can be put upon the administration’s relief policies when Governors of western agricultural States are compelled to suspend the scales of justice? The waste in spending the dole so that workers may be recruited for the vast fields?

Mr. Roosevelt has declared, and properly, that there must be no political exploitation of human misery. Acting upon that principle Congress in April voted to the Executive that principle nearly $5,000,000,000 for what was to be the final assault upon unemployment. Three and a half million men, assault upon unemployment, the President promised would be put immediately to work. The President promised would be put immediately to work. Yet months have gone by seemingly without the turning of the additional wheel. What is the impression made on the public when it is disclosed that promises for expenditures public when it is disclosed that promises for expenditures public when it is disclosed that promises for expenditures in making it productive. The Government by taxation wealth is divisible. Wealth is something more than mere figures on a balance sheet, raw materials, or brick and mortar. The richest farm is merely a place to grow weeds until the energy of some able, industrious man has been applied in making it productive. The Government may take Mr. Ford’s property, but the public thereby is the loser. In Mr. Ford’s hands it is kept continuously at work. It provides high wages for scores of thousands of workers, purchasing supplies and materials that create employment in hundreds of other communities. The finished products finally emerge to end the isolation of rural communities, speed commerce and industry, and bring pleasure to untold millions. But Mr. Ford’s property, transferred to the control of the present administration, without his genius, immediately loses its productive character. In the Government’s hands, whatever value remains becomes something to be fritted away by a thousand greedy and impractical spenders.

I cannot conceive of the American people being deceived by any such nonsense, or dividing on the proposition of envying one another’s goods, or permitting themselves to pull down each other’s houses. The real issue raised by the administration is whether as a nation we have lost our resourcefulness and courage and, in the psychology of despair, embraced a near communism, with Government doles exchanged for those things our forefathers held to be more precious than life itself. I cannot believe that a nation, born in a struggle for high principles and which has never hesitated to sacrifice blood and treasure in upholding those principles, will now ignominiously surrender to a Hitler form of national regimentation. What the country needs today is 50 Henry Fords in every field of endeavor, bending their genius to the creation of new industries which will put men back to work. Before such an attack the depression and the “new deal” both would fade as mist at under a summer sun.

And so I could go on ad infinitum, with the sins and transgressions of the Roosevelt administration, with its political sophistries, with its Socialist subversion of American ideals and institutions. I shall pass over the breaking down of the civil service, which, under Theodore Roosevelt, had been so largely removed from politics and made an efficient agency of government. Not since Andrew Jackson’s time has Washington been so overrun with job hunters. More than 120,000 loyal “new deal” adherents, not necessarily Democrats, have been attached to the public payroll since March 1933. Not least among these are the 200 young lawyers, followers of Felix Frankfurter, placed in key departmental positions, and the administration’s 300 press agents, with salaries aggregating a million dollars a year, operating the greatest propaganda machine ever constructed. It is an interesting commentary that the waste in moneypapaper with which the newspapers are bombarded costs the taxpayers $300,000 a year.

I shall pass over also the flagrant extravagances that have attended these “new deal” experiments. In 2½ years Franklin Delano Roosevelt has spent more money than was expended during the first 124 years of the Nation’s history, or from George Washington’s time down to that of Woodrow Wilson! Each month Treasury disbursements equal the cost of the Panama Canal. These expenditures run
from a mere $18,000, used in efforts to grow mushrooms in abandoned West Virginia coal mines, to $90,000,000 allocated by the President for Professor Tugwell's rural resettlement project. For this newest relief agency the famous McLean mansion in Washington has been taken over as headquarters and a staff of approximately 7,000 persons is being engaged. The average salary of these employees will be $3,000 per year. Thus, out of the ninety million, $20,000,000 at once goes for overhead. Assuming a cost of $5,000 per family for resettlement, it requires no mathematician to discover that exactly 14,000 families, or 2 for each Government employee engaged, can be assisted to the "more abundant life."

These things would be ludicrous indeed were they not so tragic. How long can this game of frenzied finance continue without involving the country in complete ruin? At ready more than 50 per cent of the people's savings, as represented by deposits in the Nation's banks, are invested in Federal Government obligations. There is today not even the pretense of balancing the National Budget. Is not the situation brought home to the American people. But neither can I be a party to the prevailing Pollyanna philosophy which seems to believe that, through some kind of political wizardry, we can escape from economic realities.

The crisis is already here. It is your duty and mine, as patriotic citizens anxiously concerned for the future of our country, to see that a thorough realization of the present situation is brought home to the American people. If the present course is continued, inflation or repudiation and national dishonor are the inevitable consequences. Resolutely we must turn away from such dangerous shoals. Under new and courageous leadership the ship must be headed about and set again upon its true course. To this high duty, with the vigorous and determining action that is thus required, we must dedicate ourselves today.

Important as are these collateral issues, the most serious charge against Franklin Delano Roosevelt is that covert undermining of the Constitution which is now under way. The attempt is being made to "alibi" the failures of the New Deal by attacks upon the Supreme Court. I have shown Mr. Roosevelt's great mental elasticity when confronted with questions of constitutionality. Let us assume for a moment that in the highly important cases to come before the Supreme Court this fall the administration should lose. Let us examine the possibilities that may arise should the TVA be denied its announced function as a "yardstick" for the electric-power industry—should the processing taxes, which Secretary Wallace has set up as "internal tariffs," to equalize price levels between agriculture and industry, be declared invalid as restricting commerce between the States—should the Wagner industrial disputes measure be held unconstitutional.

In such an eventuality the "new deal" is at once stripped of the political nostrums through which, like hypodermic injections, its sought to restore the Nation's economic health. The pretense of a "planned economy," which, by bureaucratic license, seeks to regulate all economic activity must then be abandoned. A situation arises without parallel in American history. With the experiment of regimentation revealed to the public for what it really is—a disastrous and monumental failure—the issue is joined between utopian dreams and the actuality of economic law. Faced with such facts, how is the administration to justify itself to the people?

Now, the implications from such a contingency—from an unprecedented impasse between the executive and judicial branches of the Government—would be grave enough under any circumstances. How much more serious must they be when the administration, so challenged, is seeking reelection? When its asks, as it must, public ratification either on its record, or by "alibiing" that record?

Is not the strain placed upon the Constitution, to which unintentionally and carelessly Congress has contributed, plainly evident? The Supreme Court is to be dragged into politics, not because it has performed its sworn duty in saying "no" to hastily conceived and imperfectly drawn legislation, but because it is charged with having thwarted the public will. It must be made the scapegoat to hide administrative incompetency. nor can the Court defend or explain its own acts; it can speak only in the decisions it hands down. It must remain aloof from political battles which may be decisive for the Nation's whole future.

The dangers to the Republic from any such distorted controversy cannot be minimized. They rise above partisanship; they must be repelled by all believers in constitutional government. They become particularly serious because the inference is drawn by many competent observers that this attack upon the Court is to be led by no less a personage than the President himself. In a recent article widely published throughout the United States, Mr. Mark Sullivan, the distinguished political commentator and historian, declares:

"The common assumption is that Mr. Roosevelt hopes to make the Supreme Court and the Constitution less popular next year than they are now. The Court will be obliged to find unconstitutional the measures now being forced through Congress. Such decisions by the Court can be expected to offend groups of voters. The sum of these groups, offended by decisions handed down by the Supreme Court next year, might give Mr. Roosevelt the support he does not have now, both for his project of changing the Constitution or curtailing the power of the Supreme Court, and also for reelection to the Presidency.

"However, beneath this assumption about Mr. Roosevelt's motive lie some solid conditions which tend to support the assumption. The 'new deal' cannot go on to fruit except by giving the Government greater power to compel the individual. That means the 'new deal' cannot go on except by depriving the courts of their independence, by depriving them of their present function of holding the scales even between the Government and citizen."

Now, these are sober and measured words. They can-
not be dismissed as partisan or inconsequential. When fundamental principles established under the Constitution are involved, as I stated in the beginning, there are no differences between Republicans and Democrats. Interpretations of basic law cannot be made on the basis of current economic theories. Nor can there be any difference of opinion in this connection. We cannot proceed blindly down a road, ignoring all the danger signals that have been set, to end up in that catastrophe predicted by Mr. Roosevelt himself when as Governor of New York he said:

"It was clear to the framers of our Constitution that the greatest possible liberty of self-government must be given to make all the laws for the whole Nation. It would inevitably result in the dissolution of the Union itself."

The President himself has put the constitutional issue before the American people in the plainest possible terms:

"Any national administration attempting to make all the laws for the whole Nation would inevitably result in the dissolution of the Union itself."

With that statement I rest the case against Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In conclusion, let me add one further word. I should like to recall to you the warning of Daniel Webster, which, more than any words of mine, seems to sum up the present national crisis:

"It is hardly too strong to say," declared Mr. Webster, "that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intention, real or pretended. There are men in all ages who mean to exercise power usefully, but who mean to govern; they promise to be kind masters, but they mean to be masters. They think they need but little restraint themselves. Their notion of the public interest is apt to be quite closely connected with their own exercise of authority. They may not, indeed, always understand their own motives. The love of power may sink too deep in their hearts even for their own security and may pass with themselves for more patriotism and benevolence."

"** Are we under the domain of law, or has the effectual government of the country, at least in all that regards the great interest of the currency, been in a single hand? ** The results are now before us. These pretended reforms, these extraordinary exercises of power from an extraordinary zeal for the good of the people, what have they brought us to? ** Everyone knows that all the benefits of this experiment are but injury and oppression; all this reform but aggravated distress."

---

**Can You Choose a Title?**

By WAYNE DAVIS, Professor of Psychology, University of Virginia.

*Before the Institute of Public Affairs. An excerpt from an address titled, "Adult Interest as Related to Education."

One other book seems to me to deserve considerable interest in this brief survey of the reading interest of the American adult. This is the volume of *Haldeman-Julius* entitled "The First Hundred Million." All of you are familiar with the Little Blue Books, priced 5 cents each, which have been widely listed in full-page advertisements. Perhaps you have purchased some yourself. Up to 1928 Haldeman-Julius had sold 100 millions of these books. This is a commentary in itself upon American reading, but in addition the publisher has presented a candid and detailed analysis of his sales records.

Haldeman-Julius makes a good argument for the point that his sales really show reader interest. People, he says, do not buy 5 cent books for gifts or for ostentation, and with this view we can hardly disagree. They buy them to read. The 1260 titles in the Blue Book series are admirably written, and each must be for at least 20 titles. All subjects, all titles are priced alike and least 20 titles. All subjects, all titles are priced alike and least 20 titles. All subjects, all titles are priced alike.

The leading books on self-improvement in order of popularity are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to Improve Your Conversation</td>
<td>77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Improve Your Vocabulary</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Write Letters</td>
<td>53,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of Skin and Hair</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Faults in English</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Self-Taught</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Self-Taught</td>
<td>46,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Make All Kinds of Candy</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Psycho-analyze Yourself</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Fight Nervous Troubles</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top sales figures were reached by sex books and that books on self-improvement were second in popularity. Here are some of the best sellers in the field of sex:
It is interesting to note that of the readers of the N. Y. Times Book Review who order Little Blue Books through the advertisement carried by that publication, 54% bought one or more books on sex, love, marriage or a related subject. Of the readers of the N. Y. Graphic, a tabloid, who sent in orders, only an additional 8% or 62% included sex books in their order for twenty or more of the little volumes. 31% of the orders from the N. Y. Times included books on self-improvement whereas of the Graphic orders only 22% listed such items. No doubt it is encouraging to educators to find self-improvement coming out so well in a poll of this sort. This high popularity of books on sex among purchasers who must be for the most part adults suggests the probable success of educational efforts in the field of sex education for adults, a kind of education not undertaken at present by universities.

Haldeman-Julius conducted some very interesting experiments upon the effects upon sales of changes in titles. The following are comparisons of the sales of a book under each of two titles. In most cases the first title was used in 1925 or 1926 the second in 1926 or 1927. In no cases, were changes made except with respect to the title.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Mystery of the Iron Mask</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mystery of the Man in the Iron Mask</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The King who Enjoys Himself</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lustful King Enjoys Himself</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten O’Clock (Whistler)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Art Should Mean to You</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen, Pencil and Poison (Oscar Wilde)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Story of a Notorious Criminal</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Art of Controversy (Schopenhauer)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Argue Logically</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casanova and His Loves</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casanova, History’s Greatest Lover</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent Medicine and the Public Health</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Truth about Patent Medicine</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Introduction to Einstein</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einstein’s Theory of Relativity Explained</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Introduction to Nietzsche</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Understand Nietzsche’s Philosophy</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Haldeman-Julius says it is almost impossible to find general rules about titles, but the facts he has cited suggest that others of us might increase interest in the wares we have to sell by being more experimental about the titles under which we offer them.

“T’m no good at preaching.

It’s true that, for myself, being a doctor, and particularly a country doctor, I’m perhaps closer to the realities of life and death than most people. But I could never say—Be a country doctor and you will find happiness. I will say this: A man needs work he can respect. He needs someone—some person or persons—to love. He needs a God he can believe in. You don’t have to be a country doctor to find those things in life, but... it helps. Thank you.”

Extract, final paragraph of an address, “The Quintuplets,” by Dr. Allen Roy Dafos, broadcast over WEAF August 29, 1935.