today, are we going to be ready to send our grandchildren 25 years from now?

Are we so much interested right now that we want to contribute 5,000,000 of the finest and the strongest boys that the great mothers of America have produced?

Are you mothers and fathers so deeply interested that you want to furnish your sons?

Well, start selling ammunition and that's what you'll have to do.

Don't you realize the money you get for your ammunition will be covered with blood? And, as time goes on, this blood will be the blood of your own children.

Has blood money ever brought anything but misery to those who got the money?

Look what happened to the billions of dollars we made out of the last war.

It brought us a situation where even today, 20 years later, there are 10,000,000 of us out of work.

And if we allow ourselves to handle any more of this stinking blood money, there'll be 20,000,000 of us out of work—maybe for the next 50 years.

But that isn't all. Let's go back to cases and look at this thing from a personal viewpoint.

It's all very well and high sounding to say that the Government declares war. To say we have nothing to do with it. We enter the war—but who are we? Well, "we" right now are the mothers and fathers of every able-bodied boy of military age in the United States. "We" are also you young men of voting age and over, that they'll use for cannon fodder.

Now, you mothers, particularly!

The only way you can resist all this war hysteria and beating of tom-toms is by asserting the love you bear your boys. When you listen to some well-worded, some well-delivered war speech, just remember it's nothing but sound. I tell you that no amount of sound can make up to you for the loss of your boy. After you've heard one of those speeches and your blood's all hot and you want to bite somebody like Hitler, go upstairs where your boy's asleep.

Go into his bedroom. You'll find him lying there, pillow all messed up, covers all tangled, sleeping away so hard. Look at him. Put your hand on that spot on the back of his neck—the place you used to love to kiss when he was a baby. Just rub it a little. You won't wake him up. Just look at his strong, fine young body because only the best boys are chosen for war. Look at this splendid young creature who's part of yourself, then close your eyes for a moment and I'll tell you what can happen.

You won't actually see it, but I have seen it, and I can describe it to you. You can easily imagine it.

But, first, you have a 50–50 chance of never seeing your boy again if you let this embargo on arms be raised and your boy is conscripted and sent overseas to fight.

If you ever do see him again, 50 times out of a hundred he'll be a maimed and helpless cripple all his life.

Why, you say, that can't happen. That wasn't true in the last war. But the last European war saw us fight just about 150 days and we had more than a quarter of a million casualties. Try to get out of this war inside of 1,500 days.

Now, get this picture of your boy while you're standing there in the dark of the bedroom where he's peacefully sleeping—trusting you.

That boy relies on you. You brought him into this world; you cared for him. Now I ask you, Are you going to run out on him? Are you going to let someone beat a drum or blow a bugle and make him run after it? Thank God, this is a democracy, and by your voice and your vote you can save your boy. You are the bosses of this country—you mothers, you fathers.

And now for that other picture I said I'd give you—that other picture that can be the picture of your boy:

Somewhere—5,000 miles from home. Night. Darkness. Cold. A drizzling rain. The noise is terrific. All hell has broken loose. A star shell bursts in the air. Its unearthly flare lights up the muddy field. There's a lot of tangled rusty barbed wires out there and a boy hanging over them—his stomach ripped out—and he's feebly calling for help and water. His lips are set tight. He's in agony.

There's your boy; the same boy lying in bed tonight; the same boy who trusts you. Do you want him to be the next Unknown Soldier? The last one had a mother and a father. He just didn't appear.

And listen, you mothers and fathers. I've had the heart-rending experience in my time of sitting with some of your sons as they've gone over. I've listened to the pathetic little last messages they've wanted carried back to you. I've accepted and delivered the poor little keepsakes they've wanted you to have.

Do you want your boy, tangled in barbed wire or struggling for a last gasp of breath in stinking trenches somewhere abroad—do you want him to cry out, "O mother, O father, why did you let them do it?"

Think it over, my dear fellow Americans. Think if all this is worth it.

Can't we be satisfied with defending our own homes, our own women, our own children?

There are only two reasons why you should ever be asked to give your youngsters.

One is the defense of our homes. The other is the defense of the Bill of Rights—and particularly the right to worship God as we see fit.

Every other reason advanced for the murder of our young men is a racket, pure and simple.

And yet, if you sit still and allow this thing to go on, if you allow this hysteria to mount, this propaganda to take hold of you; if you allow this embargo on arms to be raised; if you allow our national pockets to jingle with blood money, I tell you that you can prepare to say good-bye to your boy.

I beg you, don't let them do this. I beg of you to sit down this very minute and write a message to your Congressman and your Senator or to our President.

That's your right, your constitutional right of appeal. That's your privilege.

Keep this arms embargo on tight. They've been fighting for a thousand years in Europe—since the dawn of history, really. Don't let them dot those blood-drenched fields with the bodies of our American boys.

Good night.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, steal into our hearts like the rhythm of unearthly peace; perfect our trust and strengthen our power of faith. We rejoice that night reigns not in Thy universe; above the center of all power, all human sight, and sense, Thou art the eternal noon. As time's ceaseless river is set toward the deeps of the eternal sea, O, let the love of Christ purge away the leaven of strife and struggle; let them not stain the face of sincere appreciation. Lift us above empty moralities and inspire us with a life fresh in the spirit of brotherhood. Look down in mercy upon our beloved Speaker and the Congress; preserve them in mind and body. Blessed Lord, these walls echo with a nation's history. Today we look back to where statesmanship was born and abides. We render tribute to a son of genius who has gone the way that leads to the expanding view which finally brings us all to the splendor of a glorious dawn. In the name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. CHANDLER, of Kentucky, as a member of the Joint Committee to Investigate the Adequacy and Use of Phosphate Resources of the United States, authorized by Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. M. M. Logan, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's desk I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT], who is detained at home, I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks and include therein a short funeral address delivered at the funeral of the late Senator Logan and a short editorial on the subject of Senator Logan's death.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks

by including an address made by the Honorable James A. Farley, Postmaster General of the United States, at the dedication of the North Beach Airport, New York City, on Sunday, October 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE ARGENTINE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we listened yesterday to the very interesting remarks of our able colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who discussed the proposed trade agreement with Argentina.

It is my belief that no Government policy is more ruinous to American agriculture and dairy interests and to the livestock growers than this policy of trade agreements with South America. The fact that hearings are now going on downtown illustrates the point I have tried to make before—that Congress ought to stay in session and that the responsible leadership of this House ought to bring in a bill and permit us to vote on it doing away with legislation that permits these reciprocal-trade agreements.

As I have said, hearings are now being conducted in connection with a proposed trade agreement with the Argentine. These hearings are important, but everyone realizes that the new dealers and experimenters have their minds already made up so that the protest that we make to the committee, which is conducting these hearings, will undoubtedly be ignored. The only effect that the reciprocal-trade agreements can have is to sell American agriculture down the river.

The policy of the new dealers is to curtail American agriculture and buy agricultural products from South America. I recall sometime ago the episode when beef was purchased from the Argentine instead of patronizing our cattle growers out West.

Minnesota is predominately an agricultural State. It is built on an agricultural foundation. Livestock and dairying contribute to its prosperity.

I have received, in today's mail, a communication from W. S. Moscrip, of St. Paul, emphasizing the unfairness of these reciprocal-trade agreements, and calling attention to the fact that they discriminate against our dairy and agricultural interests. I also have other protests against this proposed trade agreement. For example, the milk producers are directly affected, and if these trade agreements are to be continued in force and new ones made, it is only a question of time until South America will furnish our milk, butter, cheese, poultry, and other products of the farm.

Of course, as I have indicated, the New Deal policy is to make trade agreements, and at this time I simply call attention to the fact that they are all done at the expense of the dairy and agricultural interests, not only of Minnesota, but also of other States.

I might say that this question was an issue in the campaign of 1938, and I promised the people of the Eighth Congressional District, that I would raise my voice in opposition to the ruinous policy which the new dealers are carrying on against the farmers of the State of Minnesota. In their behalf, I protest this new trade agreement. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders today.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a speech delivered by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson before the American Legion National Convention on September 27 last.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Shelbyville Republican, of Shelbyville, Ind., on the 17th of October last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an article from the Christian Century on the subject of the poll tax.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to protect the domestic fox- and fur-raising industry.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein what purports to be the first prayer ever offered in the National Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. IGLESIAS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore made such time as may be required has been set aside to pay tribute to the life and public service of the late Thomas B. Reed, former Speaker of the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

THE LATE SPEAKER THOMAS BRACKETT REED

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. SMITH] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a memorial address he delivered in the Maine Legislature in 1903 concerning Thomas Brackett Reed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks concerning former Speaker Reed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this day, the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Brackett Reed, has been set aside by the House for services to honor his memory. As a New Englander and one who occupies a position he so ably held, I am glad of the opportunity to pay tribute to this great son of Maine.

First, may I note Congressman OLIVER, of Portland, who represents the old Reed district, and Congressman BREWSTER, of Maine, are unable to be here because they are joining in a great demonstration in Portland, the city of his birth. Congressman CLYDE SMITH, of Maine, arrived here this morning to join in the services, but has contracted a heavy cold, which prevents his attendance.

I am sure that while none of the Members from Maine are here at this moment physically they are here in spirit.

Thomas Brackett Reed was a great American, an intellectual giant, and one of the ablest and most forceful figures ever to walk across the American political stage.

No man ever had a finer knowledge of parliamentary law than Tom Reed. His rules of procedure will be a guide wherever there is free speech and an orderly assembly of free men and women.

New England has contributed many great political leaders to the country. Reed, unlike the others, was distinctly a product of the House. Here in this famous Chamber he

served for 22 years. During most of this time he was either minority leader or Speaker.

He came first to the House in 1877, at a time when our country was emerging from the shadows of the unfortunate War between the States. A new spirit was coming into the country. It preached a unified patriotism; it was the spirit of courage, faith, and optimism. America was on the march. Its frontiers were being pushed rapidly westward. Expansion industrially, agriculturally, and commercially was in evidence everywhere. America was growing up and becoming a world empire. These new times and new conditions brought new problems and the man we honor today was for 22 years a dominating influence in American life.

It would not be possible to record all of the achievements of the notable man from Maine. The contribution of any Congressman to his country must chiefly be in the confines of the committee and conference rooms. This seldom makes it possible to record the most brilliant service. However, the merit and ability of a Member is quickly appraised by his associates.

That Tom Reed was an outstanding leader is eloquently indicated by his frequent election to positions of leadership and by the cold judgment of his fellow Members.

Speaker Champ Clark, a great Democrat and a great American, said of Reed at the time of his voluntary retirement, he was "far and away the most brilliant figure in American politics."

Former Senator James E. Watson, of Indiana, who served in the House with Reed, said in his memoirs:

> Speaker Reed for a time was the most admired and most hated man in the country. This was because of his adoption of the so-called Reed rules. That act worked a revolution in the parliamentary procedure of the House.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] served as Parliamentarian under Speaker Clark, and I have in my hand a telegram which he sent, and I would like to read it:

> Much regret cannot reach Washington in time to participate in commemorative ceremonies for Speaker Reed, perhaps the most eminent Speaker who ever presided in that position; and exercises most timely and appropriate.
>
> CLARENCE CANNON, M. C.

These quotations reflect the sentiments of his colleagues.

Reed twice was prominently mentioned for the Presidency. He was a candidate in 1892 and again in 1896, when he undoubtedly was the outstanding leader in the Republican Party. If he had come from any other State than rock-ribbed Republican Maine, he might have achieved the high office of President.

It is a fine custom which prompts this country to honor the men and women who have ably and constructively served their day and generation and passed on, leaving their footprints on the sands of time. This practice cannot fail to inspire us all to render more unselfish service to humanity.

A great American was born 100 years ago. He brilliantly served his country and passed on. May the name of Thomas Bracket Reed ever be written in letters of burning gold in the records of our country as an inspiration to the men and women who will come to this great people's forum with ardent hopes to be of service to America. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would not feel that I had done myself justice if I did not take an opportunity to say a word about the life and character of Thomas B. Reed. I was a mere boy when he was Speaker of this House, but I remember reading of him. I was always inspired when I read about Mr. Reed.

I think he was one of the boldest, one of the most fearless, and one of the ablest statesmen America ever produced. He came into power in the House of Representatives at a time and in the backwash, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] stated, of the great War between the States, when partisanship was pretty rife at times.

He inherited a code of rules, as did his great successor, Mr. Cannon. I have always admired Mr. Reed and Mr. Cannon for one thing especially, and that is they had the ability, they had the confidence in themselves to believe that they could exercise well all the power that went with the great office of Speaker under the rules of the House of Representatives.

When I used to look upon Mr. Cannon in this House, a man who in many ways was like Speaker Reed, I always thought that I looked upon a man with iron in his backbone and brains in his head.

I recall one time talking with Speaker Clark about the many men with whom he had served in the House of Representatives, and I asked him if he could name the man he considered the most brilliant one with whom he had ever served. He said, "I would rather name two than one. If I had to name the two biggest-brained men with whom I ever served I would name Reed, of Maine, and Bailey, of Texas." Mr. Bailey was minority leader in this House while Mr. Reed was the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Reed had a great life; he had a full life. If he had not been quite so sturdy, and if some politicians had not had in them fear of his being elevated to a higher and more powerful office, in my opinion, he would have been President of the United States. One incident that makes us know that he had a sharp tongue was his reply when he was asked at about that time if he thought he would be the Republican nominee for the President. He said:

> They could go farther and do worse, and I think they will.

[Laughter.]

It is reported that when Mr. Reed sat where the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is now sitting, an orator on the floor of the House one day in controversy with the Chair finally said:

> Mr. Speaker, I would rather be right than be the Nation's President.

The Speaker said:

> The gentleman need not worry; he will never be either.

[Laughter.]

These are characteristics of this great outstanding man, and to the men who followed him in the position of Speaker of this House he set a very high mark to aim at. In the many years it has been my privilege to serve in this House every man who has occupied that chair, whether he be a Republican or whether he be a Democrat, has measured up in fairness, in ability, and in patriotism to the high standard set by Speaker Reed and such men as he was. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate today the centenary of the birth of a Speaker of the House of Representatives, the late Thomas Brackett Reed, of the State of Maine. In a very humble way I wish to add my tribute of respect and honor to the memory of one of the greatest Speakers who ever occupied that chair. All of our Speakers have been great men as well as good men. Without those qualifications, no man could be elected to that exalted office. At another time, some years ago, I took occasion to voice my judgment about the office of Speaker and the men who have occupied that chair, and I have never had any reason to revise my former opinion. In that address delivered on the floor 3 years ago I made the following statement, and I ask your indulgence while I repeat it:

> In my humble opinion, the Speaker of this House holds in his credentials of election the supreme testimonial of exalted character, unimpeachable integrity, and superlative ability. He is no accident. He must prove his fitness for this great office through a long series of years in the fierce furnace of political debate, the fisticuff of parliamentary strategy and maneuver, and by his ability to manage strong and intelligent men under the most trying and difficult circumstances. That, in my opinion, was what led the beloved Nicholas Longworth to declare on this floor, "I would rather occupy that chair than any other office in the world."

Among the distinguished men who have occupied the chair no one ever transcended Hon. Thomas B. Reed in strength of character and ability. He was cast in heroic mold. He

was a giant in mind, soul, and body—a titanic figure in the intellectual, political, and physical world.

"The front of Jove himself,
An eye like Mars to threaten and command,
A combination and a form, indeed,
Where every god did seem to set his seal
To give the world assurance of a man."

Speaker Reed was a sincere man. He hated demagogues, and they often felt the sting of his wit and satire. He despised sham and hollow pretense. He loathed the theatrical in politics. He was no publicity hound. He was no poseur for poularity. For him no catering or fawning for applause.

He would not flatter Neptune for his trident,
Nor Jove for his power to thunder.

It was my fortune, or misfortune, if you like, to have been a constituent of Jerry Simpson during all of his congressional career. That was out in what is known as the Big Seventh which at that time had 36 counties within its boundaries. At the time of Simpson's first election I was a freshman in Iowa in the present district of our distinguished colleague, Mr. GWYNNE. Jerry Simpson's fame had preceded his election, for Victor Murdock, afterward a Member of the House, had fastened onto him for all time the sobriquet of "Sockless Socrates." Like most freshmen I talked too much, probably bragged a little about living in his district. At any rate I was soon known as Old Sockless, which soon degenerated into simple Old Socks. That stuck to me during all the 4 years of my college life. I had reason to remember Jerry Simpson.

Times, like everything else, have changed since those gay nineties. It is a far cry from the slovenly Jerry Simpson with his threadbare campaign coat, his battered slouch hat, and his traditional innocence of hose which in the Kansas language are known as socks, to the fastidious and meticulous agricultural Apollo who now decorates the landscape of the Big Seventh and so ably represents the people of that corner of the earthly paradise known as Kansas. I have reference, as you no doubt know, to our handsome, distinguished, and beloved colleague, Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

Jerry Simpson was a contemporary of Thomas Brackett Reed. While they were very good friends, they never ceased to snipe at one another, and each became the target of the other's shafts of wit and satire. It was no one-sided game, for while Simpson may have been shy of hosiery he had plenty of gray matter under that old slouch hat. On one occasion when there occurred a colloquy between the two, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has said, Simpson very dramatically exclaimed:

I would rather be right than President.

To which Mr. Reed replied with his characteristic drawl:

The gentleman from Kansas need not worry, he will never be either.

A new Member, meeting Mr. Reed in the corridor one day and seeing that he was so large, said to him, "How much do you weigh?" Mr. Reed very calmly looked the fellow over and said, "Two hundred pounds." The new Member expressed some doubt and incredulity about it, and Mr. Reed replied, "No gentleman ever weighed more than 200 pounds." [Laughter.]

In repartee Reed's mind worked with the celerity of an electric flash. In exchange of wit he had no peer in the House. In dry sarcasm and withering satire he had no competition in his time.

Mr. Reed made few lengthy speeches partly because he did not like long speeches and partly because he thought anyone ought to say everything worth saying in a short speech. He put whole arguments and treatises in a brief trenchant sentence. Never did anyone better illustrate the trite saying that brevity is the soul of wit. His ideas about long speeches and his aversion to them occurred during the debate on his decision regarding his right to count a Member present whether he answered to a roll call or not. A distinguished Member of the House and a former Speaker had made an exhaustive address on the power, right, and authority of the Speaker to count a Member present when he refused to answer a roll call. Mr. Reed in one devastating sentence liquidated all the subtle and technical arguments of his opponent when he said:

The gentleman from Georgia has consumed an hour and a half endeavoring to prove to the House that he is not here.

That fight concerning the decision of Speaker Reed to count a quorum precipitated one of the fiercest parliamentary battles that ever raged on this floor. The press, the pulpit, and the bar joined, and during the controversy Speaker Reed received the sobriquet of "Czar Reed." However, the main point is that the Speaker by the sheer force of his character and personal power triumphed in his contention which was upheld by the Supreme Court and afterward unanimously adopted on motion of the Democratic leader who had opposed the Speaker's decision. Imitation is still the sincerest form of flattery.

But bitter was the fight and bitter the feeling engendered, but through it all Speaker Reed maintained that masterful dignity and serene poise that only those possess who know their cause is just and who have the strength and fortitude to wait for the vindication which comes with the invincible argument of time and the iron logic of events. He was accused of trying to wear the crown of a despot and of cheating the House of its rights. He was denounced on the floor of the House as "the worst tyrant that ever presided over a deliberative body." He was proclaimed as "a usurper in defiance of parliamentary law," but through it all with stoic calm he faced the storm and serenely replied:

The House will not allow itself to be deceived by epithets. No man can describe the action and judgment of this Chair in language that will endure unless the description is true. What is done has been done in the face of the world and is subject to its deliberate judgment.

For the first time in the history of the House of Representatives the Speaker was denied the courtesy of the thanks of the House to the retiring Speaker. In the solitude of the Speaker's room Tom Reed realized the bitter irony of human grandeur.

He who ascends the mountain tops shall find
The loftiest peaks most wrapped in clouds and snow,
* * * * * * *
Round him are the icy rocks and loudly blow
Contending tempests on his naked head,
And thus reward the toils which to those summits led.

But never in the history of the House of Representatives did justification of a ruling and vindication of a Speaker come on such swift wings. In the Fifty-third Congress the House was hopelessly and helplessly floundering around trying to legislate under the old rule, but the House was paralyzed. It was completely bogged down under the lethal curse of a bad rule, until finally the Democratic leader, who had opposed the former Speaker's decision, rose and said:

This is a question of whether this House of Representatives of the people of the United States shall have such rules for its government as will enable it to do the business that our constituents have sent us here to do. We have tried the old system; we have been here a month without doing 2 days' actual business; and our constituents are tired of it, and I hope this House is tired of it. I will hail the adoption of this rule as the dawn of a new era in American legislation.

No vindication could possibly have been more complete, no triumph more thorough. But in that hour of glorious victory this great man rose with quiet dignity and said:

Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to address the House upon the general subject. This scene here today is a more effective address than any I could make. The House is about to adopt the principle for which I contended in the Fifty-first Congress and is about to adopt it under circumstances which show conclusively to the country its value. No words that I can utter can add to the importance of this occasion. I congratulate the Fifty-third Congress upon this wise decision it is about to make.

It was thus that this truly great man accepted his vindication with modest dignity and without bluster or boasting.

It was a generous thought which prompted the House to forget for a few minutes wars and rumors of wars to summon from the past the shadow of this colossal figure and recall

again the events of his brilliant career and to remind a careless public of the life and services of a great national character who at the height of his career was the most commanding and dominant personality of the Republic. To us who yet remember the struggle over the counting of a quorum, it seems but yesterday yet, to use a trite phrase, a great deal of water has run under the bridge since his huge figure strode these halls and corridors. He was Speaker when first the biennial appropriations amounted to $1,000,000,000. That seemingly insignificant sum in our day raised a great furor, and a billion-dollar Congress became a term of political reproach. Speaker Reed calmly replied that this was a billion-dollar country, being seemingly the first who discovered that fact which has become so obvious in recent years.

It has been just 40 years since Speaker Reed resigned from the House of Representatives, but there is not a Member here who served with him in the House. This reminds us of the transitory character of our service here. I came first to the House in the Sixty-eighth Congress. There are less than 50 Members remaining who were Members at that time. I have been here in 7 successive Congresses and have served under 6 Speakers, all great and good men, 4 of whom have gone to the land of their dreams—gone to join that highly select group of distinguished statesmen who have shared the honor of presiding over this forum of the people fashioned for us by our fathers in the Constitution.

Peace be to their ashes, and sweet be their rest. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the thought which is uppermost in my mind today goes back to my boyhood days. Prior to Speaker Reed's occupancy of that great office, I had never paid any attention to or had any ideas about Congress. He attracted my attention as a young man. He started me to thinking about Congress and its activities and the caliber of its membership. I admired his temerity, his courage, and his real greatness. I felt then, as I have felt ever since, that he has been an inspiration not only to all subsequent Speakers and to the Members of this House but to the youth of our country. His influence has radiated throughout our American public life. His official career has inculcated patriotism, courage, and honesty. His life is an incentive to all public officials to conscientious and loyal service to our country. This House owes him a perpetual debt of gratitude, and our Nation will always gratefully revere his memory.

My home on the Pacific slope of the Rocky Mountains is a long way from Maine. But I can assure you that the people of the West will always have a profound admiration for that great American Thomas B. Reed.

When I came to the House March 4, 1909, Uncle Joe Cannon was Speaker of this House. He and Walter I. Smith, of Iowa, and James A. Tawney, of Minnesota, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, were the Committee on Rules; and those three Republicans appointed both the Republican and the Democratic members on the committees. I joined in the memorable House rebellion and furious fusillade of denunciation in depriving Uncle Joe of all of his powers except merely to preside over the House. He and Speaker Reed had many traits in common. Both were vehemently denounced and vilified. But history will record them as two of the greatest Speakers this House has ever had, and that this House and our country are better off for their courageous public careers. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is pleased to recognize our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should be entirely recreant to the significance of this memorial service did I not ask the privilege of making a very brief statement in honor of the life and service and character of one of my very great predecessors in the office of Speaker, the Honorable Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine.

To the student of our system of American politics it is always a very fertile field for the inquiring mind to study the biographies, as well as the life and times and the political implications and issues involved in the lives and services of the Speakers of this great body. I often go out in the Speaker's lobby, in my quieter and more meditative periods, to look up at the pictured likenesses of these great predecessors of mine who have sat in this chair, who have presided over the deliberations of this body during all the years of our system of constitutional government and who have wrought so largely in the development of representative government here, but also with reference to the destinies of the political issues which were involved in periods when they presided. It should be an inspiration to all of us who love America and her great traditions to go out at times and look into the faces of those men and to remember the times in which they served and the issues with which they were faced. Among all that galaxy of great names whose portraits hang in that place in greatness of intellect and power of party leadership, and, I believe, in innate and pure patriotism, as he conceived his duty and the issues of the times in which he served, none stands higher in the history of this Government and of this body than the great man who was born 100 years ago, Thomas B. Reed.

Mr. Reed has been suggested as somewhat typical of the political development of leaders of his day and generation, and if you will observe the portrait hanging next to him out here in this lobby, you will see a lifelike portraiture of that other great Speaker, Uncle Joe Cannon, of Illinois, with whom many of us here in this body served before his departure, and both of those great Americans and great Republicans were absolutely typical of the highest development in the history of this country and of this body of party government. Looking back upon the methods that they employed when they were in positions of power as compared with our more recent and more tolerant and more liberal policies here in the House of Representatives, it is rather hard to imagine the stern hand with which they absolutely wielded their party power in the House of Representatives and though theoretically now, looking back upon what in retrospection may have been thought of their methods and views, we must necessarily admire the grip they had on their parties and their firm determination to rule this House in large measure according to their view of their public and their party duties.

Reference has been made here by two of the speakers who have preceded me to the very laughable incident that occurred here when Mr. Reed made his retort to the gentleman who would rather be right than President, and it so happened I was a young law student here in Washington at that time and I sat in the gallery up there and saw and heard that very interesting political incident, and that retort on the spur of the moment was absolutely typical of the lightning imagination of that great and fertile brain of Thomas B. Reed.

It is a pleasure to me to say these few words in appreciation of my personal recollection and of my historical appreciation of a great American, a man who, I say, has written his record and his achievements and his intellect and his patriotism so large in the annals of this representative body. I am pleased that the Member from Maine, who is unfortunately absent upon this occasion, has asked the indulgence of this House for these brief tributes to the memory of a great American, and I am sure they will be most cordially received on both sides of this Chamber. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when I was a child, I lived in Saco, Maine, and Thomas Brackett Reed was my Representative in Congress. He was a great friend of my father, who admired him for his clear thinking, his contagious humor, and his ability as a statesman.

The first letter I ever wrote was to my father, which he cherished always and carried in his pocketbook until the day of his death. It was written while he was on a visit to Washington and was very short and childlike. I remember it clearly. It read: "Dear father, I know you are having a fine time in Washington with Tom Reed." Little did I realize

then that nearly 50 years later I would stand in this House and attempt in a small way to eulogize the great man who was then my idol.

I have heard my father speak so often of the incident of Speaker Reed's counting the quorum which at that time was the topic of the day and the subject of controversy everywhere. It was a turning point; epochal. It was a line of demarcation between archaic, obstructive methods, and an era of orderly business and progress in parliamentary procedure. It took a man of the heroic mold and courage of Reed to draw that line.

Thomas B. Reed was a great man, both physically and mentally. He was a kindly man. He never used his marvelous ability as a debater, his quick wit, to hurt or maliciously belittle his adversary. He was never cruel or bitter in debate.

While stories of him are legion and much of him has been written, there are only three men connected with the Capitol today who served in any capacity during his service. One is Mr. Joseph J. Sinnott, the present efficient Doorkeeper of the House; another, Mr. Andy Smith, whom you all know, the courteous and obliging CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Clerk. The third is William Tyler Page, who is now on the eve of his fifty-seventh year and 10 months of service in this House in many capacities, and incidentally, this is the eve of his birthday anniversary. No one knows more of congressional procedure than he, serving as he has under 13 Speakers of this House. Perhaps Mr. Page learned some of his own great courtesy from Thomas B. Reed. I asked Mr. Page to tell me of his impressions of Mr. Reed, and he told me:

When you beheld Thomas B. Reed you looked upon a great, big man, big in every way, in intellect as big as his colossal physique. He combined all the attributes of a Solon, a Seneca, and a Demosthenes. He towered above his fellows as a Hyperion to a satyr. I first saw Mr. Reed when I came into the House Chamber on the day I entered into the service of the House in 1881, nearly 58 years ago. He was speaking. I was awe-struck and fascinated. I had never before seen such a giant figure, nor heard a man speak with such force, nor as easily. The impression of him I received that day was indelible, and as I grew older my admiration for him increased. Someone said: "History is past politics; politics is present history." If this be true, and I believe it is true, then Thomas B. Reed, in the best sense of the word "politics" as the science of government, made history in a big way.

It is peculiarly appropriate that we should be noting the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of our former Speaker at this time when the world is shaken with war. Mr. Reed was so strongly opposed to war. As he expressed it:

War solves nothing. It is a senseless, brutal waste, and a great danger to our Republic, in that its democratic principles are likely to be destroyed.

He opposed our entry into the Spanish-American War. He was just as firm against our participation in the Philippine Insurrection and our acquisition of the Philippine Islands. As an abolitionist of the old school to whom the selling of men was most abhorrent, he characterized the purchase of the islands as just this. In an ironical letter to the clerk of the Commitee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives he wrote:

Thanks for the statistics which I hope to find use for. * * * I have got to hunt all over your figures even to find out how much each yellow man cost us in the bush. As I make it out he has cost $30 per Malay and he is still in the bush. Why didn't you purchase him of Spain f. o. b. with definite freight rate and insurance paid?

Mr. Reed knew about war. He was in the Navy during the latter part of the Civil War. He was firmly opposed to this country entering into entangling alliances with foreign nations. Were he here today he would be in the thick of the fight to keep our country neutral and at peace, for he was very anxious to maintain the democracy of the United States

He was very far-seeing and often far ahead of his times in his beliefs. He felt that women should have suffrage and the right to hold property, and is remembered for his remark that "After all, women are people, are they not?" His viewpoint upon this subject is perhaps best expressed in the following quotation:

The equal rights of women have just reached the region of possibilities. Men have only just left off sneering and have just begun to consider. Every step of progress from the harem and the veil to free society and property holding has been steadily fought by the vanity, selfishness, and indolence, not only of mankind, but of womankind also.

As a debater and parliamentary leader he won a place in the Nation's history. As a man whose expressions and thoughts were recorded and repeated most widely he exerted a great influence upon the country and upon his time. To my mind, nothing he said so well typifies his greatness and his rule of living as the following:

If we ever learn to treat the living with the tenderness with which we instinctively treat the dead, we shall then have a civilization well worth distributing.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, although I did not begin my service in this House until 21 years ago, 17 years after the death of Thomas Brackett Reed, and was therefore not privileged to have been one of his contemporaries during his eventful career here, covering a period of 22 years, in 6 of which he presided with great distinction as Speaker of the House, yet, like many another of the young men of that era, I learned, through my reading of congressional proceedings and from the lips of prominent Tennesseans who did serve with Mr. Reed, of his outstanding ability and courage, and of his achievements which made history in congressional procedure.

Hence it is, sir, that I feel a just sense of pride that I have the honor here today, on this the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Brackett Reed, to pay tribute to a monumental figure, one of the greatest, if not the greatest, statesmen of the nineteenth century.

I deem it not amiss but appropriate to bring into this picture the names of some of the men from my State of Tennessee who served a part or all of the time Mr. Reed served in this House, from the Forty-fifth to the Fifty-fifth Congresses, inclusive.

From some of these contemporaries of Mr. Reed I learned at first hand of his matchless equipment and public career. Not from members of his own political party alone but from his erstwhile political enemies as well did I receive an appraisal of this remarkable man, because when the record was fully made, when passion and prejudice had subsided and results recorded, those who had regarded him as an arch enemy conceded his ability and greatness and were as vocal in their praise as they had been severe in their condemnation of his political acts.

Among those men from Tennessee, whose names are writ high in its political annals, were the beloved and long-time Senator Isham G. Harris, the able Senator William B. Bate, and the redoubtable and eloquent Edward W. Carmack, who also served with Reed in the House, where he was a doughty opponent.

Then there were Members of the House, names familiar to Tennesseans, my predecessors, Leonidas C. Houk and his son John; William C. Anderson; Henry R. Gibson, who died recently at the age of 100 years; and Jacob M. Thoraburgh, who was colonel of a regiment in which my father served in the Civil War; also Augustus H. Pettibone; Benton McMillin, who served with Reed on the old Rules Committee; J. D. C. Atkins, one-time chairman of Appropriations; Casey Young; W. B. Whitthorne; James D. Richardson, a minority leader and compiler of the messages and papers of the Presidents; Zach and Alf Taylor; Benjamin A. Enloe; Joseph E. Washington; Henry Clay Evans; Rice Pierce; Josiah Patterson; Walter P. Brownlow; John A. Moon; John Wesley Gaines, and Thetus W. Sims.

The 2-year period from 1889 to 1891 covered by the Fifty-first Congress, when Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine, for the first time was Speaker of the House, was a history-making period. It was the turning point in legislative proceedings. It was epochal and, in a sense, revolutionary. Much legislation awaited action. The Republican Party, with a scant majority of six at the beginning of the session, was confronted with the choice of one of two things—either impotency and the charge of a do-nothing Congress or else

cut the Gordian knot of a system of filibustering which the old rules permitted and enter upon an era of businesslike proceedings. It was up to Speaker Reed to make the decision as to which course would be pursued. He said himself that he hesitated to upset the old order, because, when his party was in the minority, he had found filibustering a handy weapon against a tyrannical majority. Confronted with the responsibility of the speakership and with a small majority, he decided to take the "bull by the horns," the effect of which was a bloodless revolution in the manner of doing business in the House.

Reed was a picturesque character, elephantine in physique and of heroic mental stature as well. Reed was dubbed "the mentor of the Republicans and the tormentor of the Democrats." Politically courageous, an excellent parliamentarian, a natural leader, feared by his enemies, beloved and followed by his friends, although his personality was not such as to invite ready friendship; but men of his own party followed him devotedly in whatever direction he might lead, because they had confidence in his integrity, in his judgment, and in his sagacity. They followed in spite of their own inclinations. Hence there was solidarity; there was the authoritative voice of a leader whom men followed. Knowing this, Reed, when once he had determined upon his course of action, hewed to the line, and his associates backed him up to a man.

In the first place, he operated for 2 months without any rules. He proceeded under what he called general parliamentary law, a term which he coined and which has been used ever since. This term was virtually none other than the parliamentary practice of the House of Representatives itself with respect to certain general principles which Speaker Reed applied to the then existing conditions. In effect, the system meant that the Speaker exercised his judgment and discretion as to what he would allow to come before the House in the absence of written rules. Nevertheless, a parliamentary technician could not legitimately find fault with the Speaker's interpretation of general parliamentary law.

The first necessity was to augment the slender Republican majority, without which the party would be harried throughout the entire Congress and perhaps sometimes outvoted. Conveniently the means to that end were at hand. Some 30 or more election contests were pending. To consider them elections committees were set up and operated under a full head of steam. These cases were decided primarily on political grounds, not judicially. The political exigencies of the occasion precluded judicial investigation and determination which has characterized election cases during the last 30 years. Reports came in rapidly, each recommending the ousting of a Democrat and the seating of a Republican.

The Democrats, as was to be expected, resorted to the time-honored practice of filibustering, a strategy employed by both parties when in the minority. This filibustering, unlike that indulged in by the Senate by marathon speeches, was of a different character. It consisted of pyramiding allowable motions of a dilatory nature, provoking roll call upon roll call to consume time, upon which members of the minority party would refrain from answering, thus breaking a quorum. This style of dilatory tactics would be employed not only in election cases but upon legislation to which the minority objected. And it was this practice of long standing that Reed was determined to stop that required courage of the highest order.

Reed realized that he might be creating a Frankenstein that would return to harass him and his party when they should be in the minority. But the demands of the country for something more than a do-nothing Congress were so great and so much important legislation awaited action that Reed decided the wisest course was to make rules and practices which would transform the House of Representatives from an inert body to one of business methods. So as one by one the Democrats were unseated and supplanted by Republicans, the Republican majority in the 2 months under general parliamentary law increased in the House to workable proportions. In some instances Democrats who held prima facie title to seats, and who with their colleagues stepped out of the House momentarily to avoid being counted to make a quorum, found themselves upon their return divested entirely of their seats and Republicans sworn in to take their places.

It had been a common thing until Reed's time for a minority, political or numerical, to hold up the House in a filibuster by dilatory tactics and by refraining from answering a roll call for the avowed purpose of breaking a quorum. On one occasion the House was held for 2 weeks continuously impotent in the filibustering shirt of Nessus.

That was when the first attempt was made to put through a so-called Force bill which was obnoxious to the South. Such proceedings were farcical. The old rules gave privilege to certain motions, made certain motions preferential to others, and by the use of these allowable motions they could by adroit manipulation become a veritable labyrinth. Upon each one would be a roll call, a time-consuming device. On these roll calls men would sit in their places, refuse to answer, and break a quorum. Then would follow a call of the House, which would develop the fact that a quorum was actually present. The farce would be carried still further by sending for absent Members. Motions were made to fine them, and that would go on ad infinitum day and night without cessation until a responsible majority through sheer physical exhaustion would capitulate to the minority.

But Reed swept all of these methods into the discard. He counted a quorum when a quorum was actually present. Nothing more nor less. It was said that he even counted hats and cloaks in the cloak room which fell within his vision, but that was not true. He did nothing of the kind. He simply directed the clerk to note the names of the Members present who had refrained from voting but who were actually present who, together with those who had answered, made what Reed called a constitutional quorum. The first time he did this it provoked a storm of protest, and a dramatic scene was enacted which probably never had its counterpart.

> "At once there rose so wild a yell,
> As all the fiends from Heaven that fell,
> Had pealed the banner cry of Hell."

The entire Democratic side of the House arose as one man and flung epithets at Reed, some of which are unprintable. Such epithets as czar, tyrant, scoundrel, autocrat, despot, were mild in comparison with others of a very decided personal nature. Some men were so incensed and outraged at being shorn of what they called their rights that they actually attempted to mount the rostrum and do bodily violence to Speaker Reed. These men were met at the steps by the Sergeant-at-Arms and his deputies, and with difficulty, made to desist.

An uproar continued for the space of 10 minutes except that on the Republican side—every man sat still in his seat. While this was going on Speaker Reed, with his giant-like form erect, stood like Ajax defying the lightning. His gaze turned directly upon his assailants with his eyes steadily fixed upon each and every one from left to right. Under that gaze his opponents fell back one by one into their seats exhausted, and when the last man had subsided Reed, in his inimitable down east nasal drawl, said quietly, while resting both hands upon the big end of the gavel, "The House will be in order." Whereupon his Republican colleagues arose as one man and cheered him lustily for 5 minutes. The ax had been laid at the root of the tree, and the most obnoxious feature of filibustering was forever laid low.

Reed then proceeded quietly to read a manuscript decision in which he quoted as authority that eminent Democrat, David B. Hill, of New York, when lieutenant governor, presiding in the New York Senate. Having brushed aside this parliamentary cobweb Reed, with his associates on the Committee on Rules, of which he was chairman, brought in written rules which made impossible a recurrence of the scene just described. These rules also did away with the privilege of certain motions which had been instruments in the hands of the minority; also prohibiting the Speaker from entertaining a dilatory motion. With these rules, following the historic decision of Reed, the majority was equipped for the transaction of business.

That was a busy Congress. A tariff bill was passed, the McKinley bill. Speaker Reed's quorum-counting device was

upheld by the Supreme Court in *U. S.* v. *Ballin* (144 U. S., p. 1). The case was brought on the ground that Reed had counted a quorum on the passage of a bill providing for the classification of worsteds. The Court said that it could not go beyond the Journal. The Journal showed the presence of a constitutional quorum. That set the question at rest forever and the new rules, now in vogue, furnish a method agreeable to all whereby a quorum can be procured and a vote taken simultaneously, known as the automatic roll call.

The Reed Congress had been all but annihilated in the election in 1890. That had been a billion dollar Congress, the first in history. Reed's reply to the charge of extravagance was that it was a billion-dollar country. In his valedictory Reed said we were too close to those events justly to appraise them, but that history would vindicate his course of action. So bitter was the partisan feeling against Reed that the Democrats refused to vote for a resolution of thanks offered by Reed's Republican colleagues, one of the comparatively few times a Speaker was denied a vote of thanks unanimously.

In the succeeding Congress, the Fifty-second, the Republicans had but a vestige or remnant of their power. Eighty-nine Members of that party, only, were elected. At first the Democrats who had so severely criticised the Reed rules and the Reed procedure refused to adopt the Reed rules, but gradually they did adopt them because they found it necessary, if they were to do business, to resort to the same methods which they had so severely condemned.

Among Mr. Reed's many attributes was a high sense of humor. He loved a good joke and delighted in telling one. He was seldom outwitted in debate. But upon one occasion he was floored completely by a shaft of humor, which he appreciated, although at his own expense.

"Tom" Reed and "Sunset" Cox were good friends. But they often clashed parliamentary swords. One day Reed was larruping Cox unmercifully. His sarcasm and wit were plied in his best down-east drawl. The entire Democratic membership crowded over to the Republican side to better hear Reed's every word, leaving all Democratic seats vacant. Cox was not present. Noticing his absence, a friend hurried to the Ways and Means Committee room, where Cox was engaged, and told him of Reed's attack upon him. Presently Cox entered the door leading to the Democratic side and strolled, unobserved, to his seat, an oasis in the desert of empty chairs. Reed had the House spellbound. Cox, utterly alone, heard Reed's bitter invective until Reed stopped for breath. Then, quick as a flash, Cox was on his feet, his diminutive body hardly reaching above his desk, calling for recognition.

As soon as he uttered in strident tone the words "Mr. Speaker" every eye in the space was turned from Reed to him. Not waiting to be recognized by the Speaker, Cox, pointing his finger mockingly at the giant figure of Reed, cried, "Mr. Speaker, a Reed shaken with the wind." Not another word. The applause and laughter following, in which Reed joined, was tumultuous.

When "Tom" Reed was Speaker of the House, the Chaplain was the blind and eloquent orator Milburn. Milburn got into the habit of praying against gambling in stocks and bonds. Dunham, a stocky, swarthy Member of the House from Chicago, was a prominent member of the Chicago Stock Exchange. So regular and persistent were the Chaplain's daily attacks upon "bucket shops" that Dunham, whose name had figured prominently in certain doings in the Chicago "pit," went to "Tom" Reed and objected vehemently to what he said was getting to be "personal." Speaker Reed only smiled and, in his inimitable drawl, said, "Aw, Dunham, do not mind that; it is only the Chaplain's way of telling the Lord all the news."

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Brackett Reed died in Washington, December 7, 1902. On the next day Mr. James S. Sherman, of New York, afterward Vice President of the United States, offered, and the House adopted, the following resolution:

Resolved, That the following minute be spread upon the RECORD of the House of Representatives:

"Hon. Thomas Brackett Reed died in Washington December 7, 1902. For 22 years he had been a Member of this House; for 6 years its Speaker. His service terminated with the Fifty-fifth Congress. Within this Chamber the scene of his life's great activities was laid. Here he rendered services to his country which placed him in the front rank of American statesmanship. Here he exhibited characteristics which compelled respect and won admiration. Forceful ability, intrinsic worth, strength of character brought him popular fame and congressional leadership. In him depth and breadth of intellect, with a full and well-rounded development, had produced a giant who towered above his fellows and impressed them with his power and his wisdom. A distinguished statesman, a lofty patriot, a cultured scholar, an incisive writer, a unique orator, an unmatched debater, a master of logic, wit, satire, and most famous of the world's parliamentarians, the great and representative citizen of the American Republic has gone into history."

Mr. Speaker, to this fine and deserved tribute nothing can be added and nothing taken away.

Thomas Brackett Reed, a colossal figure, whose deeds will live eternally in American history.

Mr. Speaker, when I resolved a few days ago to take advantage of this occasion to pay my humble tribute to a great American, I conferred with my good friend, Hon. Tyler Page, who is recognized and esteemed by both sides of this Chamber as an infallible monitor on matters that have transpired in this House during the past half century. Mr. Page knew Tom Reed and had the good fortune to observe him in action. I am indebted to Mr. Page for many of the facts I have outlined in this address, and I desire to make acknowledgment accordingly. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the spring of 1897 is something more to me than just another year, for its is indelibly marked in my memory, and the picture of the city of Washington which hangs on my mental walls as of that date is fixed and unchanging.

I would not be human did I not egotistically admit that I have a photograph taken of me as I came down here on that last of February in order to be present to assist in arranging for the inaugural parade as one of the deputy grand marshals under Gen. Granville M. Dodge at the inauguration of President McKinley. To those who realize, as Hazlett did, that "there is a feeling of eternity in youth which makes us amends for everything; to be young is to be as one of the immortals," no apology need be made for my having had my photograph taken or for the foregoing personal allusion.

Upon arrival in Washington I found time to visit the House of Representatives. I saw and I heard in action the intellectual and physical giant, Thomas Brackett Reed, the "czar," whose anniversary we are observing.

My boyish admiration for him and for his accomplishments has lost none of its ardor with the passing of the years. I still like to read his speeches and to refer to his parliamentary rulings and decisions which he made, and which made history.

There is not a fairly intelligent college student in New England today—I might well say the country—who does not know, or whose father before him did not know, at least one or two anecdotes which wrap themselves around the personality and individuality of this man Reed. No one will ever forget the story of the telegram received by him from an absent Member of Congress, summoned to help make up a quorum, who wired, "Wash-out on line; can't come," to which the inimitable Thomas B., as Speaker, replied, "Buy another shirt and come on the next train."

Another unforgettable one—a matter of record—was when Representative Springer, of Illinois, concluded his peroration with that oft-quoted saying attributed to Henry Clay to the effect that he would rather be right than be President, whereupon Representative Reed rose to remark, "Well, the gentleman never will be either."

Underneath the glove of geniality, affability, and good fellowship there rested, however, the hand of steel. I intend to speak only briefly with respect to his career as a Congressman.

You recall, as has been suggested, that he claimed that the code of rules of the House was a systematic outrage on government by a majority, and that "the only way to do business inside the rules was to suspend the rules. The object of the

rules," he said, "appeared to be to prevent the transaction of business."

As one of the leaders of the House after the election in 1888, he was the natural selection for Speaker, except for the fact that he came from one of the smallest States, remote from the center of population, and so the argument founded on geography, "logically not appealing but often convincing in our politics," was against him. Some of you students of political history will recall that among his opponents for the speakership were McKinley, of Ohio, and Henderson, of Iowa. Strong men. Representative Lodge, of Massachusetts, was for him and all of New England was solidly behind him. In the end his skillful and born leadership of his party in the House became the controlling reason, together with the recognition of the fact that since he had borne the brunt of the fighting to him should come the recognition of victory, and he was elected on December 2, 1889, receiving 166 votes as against 154 for Representative Carlyle.

Now 166 votes measured not only the Republican strength but it also was the necessary number to constitute a quorum. Subsequently a Republican Member died, leaving the Republicans with less than a quorum. This made history from a parliamentary standpoint. In order to do business a quorum was necessary. That the Republicans could not command a quorum under the existing rules was obvious. Something had to be done, and Reed did it. He made up his mind upon the policy which he should pursue. He did not propose to surrender; and if his party failed to sustain him, he had determined, and he had so advised Elihu B. Root that he was determined, to resign the Speakership and to retire from the House. And so there came a day when only 163 Members of the House answered to their names on a quorum roll call. Instead of ordering another roll call, Speaker Reed calmly said, "The Chair directs the Clerk to record the names of the following Members present and refusing to vote," and he proceeded to name a number of Democrats, among whom were Carlisle and several of the other Democratic leaders then present and who were present when their names were called, and who had refrained from voting. Of course, there was an uproar. No such pandemonium or explosion was ever before witnessed in any legislative body. Passionate remonstrances followed the calling of the names by the Clerk, as directed by the Speaker, and he was denounced bitterly and caustically, as was his course as a revolutionist and revolutionary.

The tumult absolutely stopped the business of the House, but the Speaker remained as calm as a cucumber, and at intervals of calm and quiet he would add to his count the name of some other Member present who had refrained from voting. In the midst of this tumult, one Member, whose name the Clerk had been directed to call, rose and said, "I deny your right, Mr. Speaker, to count me as present, and I desire to read from parliamentary law on that subject." Whereupon the Speaker raised a hearty laugh by coolly saying in reply, and with his customary drawl, "The Chair is making a statement of fact that the gentleman from Kentucky is present. Does he deny it?"

At last the tumult subsided and Speaker Reed gave the House the right to overrule him by an appeal to be taken from his decision. He stated his reasons briefly but so clearly that no number of words added to it could more clearly define it. He held, referring to the constitutional power of the House to compel the attendance of absent Members, that—

> If Members can be present and refuse to exercise their function—to wit, not be counted as a quorum—that provision would seem to be entirely nugatory. Inasmuch as the Constitution only provides for their attendance, that attendance is enough. If more was needed, the Constitution would have provided for more.

His biographer, the Honorable Samuel W. McCall, has the following to say with respect to what happened when this ruling was made:

> This ruling was followed by a scene of disorder even greater than that which had preceded it, and for 3 days the House was a perfect bedlam. The Speaker was denounced not only in parliamentary but in unparliamentary terms. All the old weapons in the arsenal of obstruction were brought into play, and one after another Reed ruled them out of order. Some of them he declared were not even subject to an appeal from the Chair. One Member—Breckinridge of Kentucky—shouted: "The Speaker's decision is clearly corrupt." Reed was accused of being a czar and of usurping jurisdiction. His decision was pronounced revolutionary, which was doubtless correct when it is compared with the decisions made by Speakers for a great number of years. There was little difficulty in showing in the argument which followed that the Speaker had overruled all the precedents, and that he, himself, in common with all the Members of the House who had borne any important part in its proceedings, had recognized the opposite procedure. He did not pretend that he was obeying the precedents of the House, but admitted that he was overruling them. He simply reverted to the terms of the Constitution and claimed that the quorum established by that instrument was a present and not a voting quorum. During those 3 days of wild excitement apparently the coolest man in the House was the Speaker.
>
> The debate was noteworthy in point of ability, Carlisle, Crisp, and Turner distinguishing themselves on the Democratic side while McKinley, Cannon, and Butterworth led on the Republican side. Perhaps the ablest speech of the debate was made by Butterworth. He argued that a representative was chosen to serve not merely his own constituency but the whole country, and that he had no warrant to attempt to paralyze the action of the House, but that the country had a right to require that he should be in his place and perform his duties. "For that reason the Constitution provides that those who are here may, by force, bring the rest of the Members into this Hall, not merely to serve their own constituents, but to serve that broader constituency, the people of this country whose servants they are." What was the object of the power to compel Members to attend?
>
> To leave the House in precisely the same condition as before they were brought in, a condition which rendered it necessary to bring them in to change and improve it? Was this authority conferred by the Constitution only to enable us to go through the farce of bringing in the absentees and learning after each Member has been seated in his place that, while under the Constitution he is actually personally present to make a quorum to do business, yet when an attempt is made to do the thing which required his presence, he at once by merely closing his mouth becomes constructively absent? Or he may, in fact, while present, arise in his place and assert that he is absent, and we must take his word for it. What an absurdity on the face of it, no matter how sanctified by age. It is the weapon of the revolutionist. It is the weapon of anarchy.
>
> At last the question whether the Speaker's decision should be overruled was submitted to the House. A mere handful of the Republicans voting with the Democrats would have overthrown the Speaker and his ruling. But his party stood with him to a man. After much filibustering the ruling was sustained.
>
> Thus was established the most important landmark in the parliamentary practice of the House. It seems difficult to believe that there should ever have been any other construction put upon the Constitution than that the power to compel the attendance of absent Members in order to secure a quorum was for the purpose of enabling the House to transact the business of the country, and not simply for the purpose of permitting those who were present to look upon the faces of those who had been absent. Not merely did the Supreme Court subsequently sustain the constitutionality of Reed's ruling, but within a brief period, by the endorsement of his party antagonists, it was destined to become the settled law of the House. In the two next succeeding Congresses the House was controlled by the Democrats and the ancient practice was reestablished. At an important juncture they found themselves unable to procure a quorum from their own ranks. And as Reed had established the new precedent, so there came to him the distinction of forcing his antagonists to ratify it. After his retirement from the Speakership he had become the leader of the Republicans upon the floor. He inaugurated a determined filibuster and under his lead the Members of his party declined to vote. For weeks the House was unable to make the slightest progress in the transaction of business. It was bound hand and foot. The deadlock was at last broken by the adoption of a rule providing that a Member who was present might be counted for the purpose of making a quorum, whether he voted or not. The fact that the counting under the Democratic rule was to be done by two tellers made no difference in the principle involved, and ever since that time the rule of a present instead of a voting quorum, as established by Reed, has been the rule of the House, no matter by what party it has been controlled.
>
> The ruling has resulted in saving a great amount of the time of the House and has facilitated the transaction of its business. It has done away with a system which might in critical times produce a paralysis of our popular representative assembly, and it has conduced to party responsibility. This achievement stands as a signal triumph for Reed's clearness of vision; and in the strength with which he maintained his position against tremendous pressure and in the face of the precedents of a century, and in the serene courage and self-control with which he bore himself amid those violent and stormy scenes without parallel in the history of Congress, it furnishes convincing proof of the greatness of his character.

Mr. John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, once said of him that he was "that ever memorable genius, the ablest running debater the American people ever saw."

Henry Cabot Lodge said:

I fully appreciate the truth of Emerson's doctrine of the force of understatement; but I cannot express my own belief in regard to Mr. Reed without also saying that, in my opinion, there never has been a greater or more perfectly equipped leader in any parliamentary body at any period.

"The mentor of the Republicans and the tormentor of the Democrats," as has been suggested, he was characterized once on this floor by Lafe Pence, from Colorado; his fame as a Representative in Congress rests on his quorum-counting rule, and upon his wit, humor, and sarcasm. Champ Clark well said that Reed was the best short speechmaker he ever saw or heard. He rarely spoke at length; generally stopped in 5, 10, or 15 minutes. His speeches were strong in proportion to their shortness, of dynamic quality; and, as Speaker Clark said—

It is not in the constitution of man to digest too much mental dynamite at one time.

Lowell says, you remember, that "in general those who, having nothing to say, contrive to spend the longest time in doing it."

Senator John Tyler Morgan, of Alabama, gave him the nickname, "the Great White Czar," which characterization was apt and stuck; for, standing 6 feet 3 inches, with a No. 12 shoe, and weighing close to 300, with a massive two-story head, flaxen hair, large brilliant black eyes, he was a marked man in a crowd.

A statesman, he said in answer to a correspondent, is a successful politician who is dead. Whereupon he was asked, "Why don't you die and become a statesman?" To which Reed replied, "No; fame is the last infirmity of noble minds."

Jonathan Prentice Dolliver once told him that if he had spent his many years in Congress formulating great measures for his country's good, instead of making sarcastic epigrams about people he disliked, he might have been President. Shortly thereafter, in alluding to two of his colleagues in the House, Reed said:

They never open their mouths without subtracting from the sum of human knowledge.

In his invaluable work, My Quarter Century of American Politics, Champ Clark says of him:

He was opposed to the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands; he was opposed to our War with Spain; and he was so thoroughly opposed to our policy touching the Philippines that his conscience would not permit him to remain in public life, which he so much adorned. So he resigned to practice law in New York, and in the few years remaining to him amassed an ample competency, but which he did not live long to enjoy.

Mr. Reed came back to Washington on or about Tuesday, December 1, 1902, in order to attend the Gridiron dinner which was to be held on the following Saturday. Let Samuel L. Powers tell the story:

The Gridiron dinner took place in the large ballroom of the Arlington Hotel on the Saturday evening following. It was known that Mr. Reed was at the hotel and that he was ill, but it was not understood that he was seriously ill. There was a large gathering of some 400 persons, including the President, the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, Justices of the Supreme Court, Ambassadors, Senators, Representatives, and Governors of several States. Just as the clock struck midnight the clerk of the hotel opened the door, touched me on the shoulder, and said, "Mr. Reed has passed away; I think you better speak to the presiding officer." At that time Justice Brewer was making a speech. It was a thoroughly convivial occasion, as all such dinners were.

When I notified the president that Mr. Reed was no more, he arose and requested Justice Brewer to be seated. He then announced the death of the great commoner and stated that Mr. Reed had come to Washington for the sole purpose of attending this banquet. He said there was one song that Mr. Reed was always very fond of, that the audience would sing that song, and that would close the dinner.

After the singing of the song this large assemblage moved out of the hall; there was hardly a word spoken; there was many a wet cheek, and there was a feeling in the breast of everyone that the life of one of our greatest Americans had closed.

I have seen the marble statue of him, erected to his memory by the appreciative constituency of Maine, sitting on the crest of the hill in that most beautiful section of Portland. The figure is, as has been said, giantlike and majestic, seeming hardly larger than life to those who knew him, standing silhouetted against the sky as if to typify the high background against which shine the deeds of his public life. This monument was unveiled at Portland on August 31, 1910, and upon that occasion, in his address at the unveiling, the Honorable Samuel W. McCall paid this tribute to his memory:

Beyond his brilliancy as a debater, his resplendent wit, and his skill as a parliamentary leader, his title to remembrance rests upon his quality as a statesman. He had a great ambition, but it was not great enough to lead him to surrender any principle of government which he deemed vital. Like Webster, like Clay, and others of our most conspicuous statesmen, he was disappointed at not reaching the Presidency, but he could fitly aspire to that office, for he was of the fiber and nurture out of which great Presidents are made. He probably would not have been a continuously popular President, but our great Presidents never have been. He had that supreme quality which was seen in Washington breasting the popular anti-British feeling and asserting against France our diplomatic independence; in Lincoln bearing the burden of unsuccessful battles and holding back the sentiment for emancipation until the time was ripe for freedom; in Grant facing the popular clamor and vetoing inflation; and in Cleveland alienating his party while he persisted in as righteous and heroic a battle as was ever waged by a President.

A great nation cannot make up its mind in a moment. What first appears to its fancy is not likely to appeal to its final judgment, and the severest test of the disinterestedness of the statesman under our sysem is his readiness to risk unpopularity and defeat in order to protect the people from their first impulse and give them an opportunity to form a real opinion. Reed's faith was in what he called the deliberate judgment of the people, but he declared that "the sudden and unreflecting judgment of the noisy who are first heard is quite as often a voice from the underworld."

This distinction is vital, since the cause of democracy has nothing to hope from the statesman who weakly yields to the temptation always to be popular and who panders to the noisy passions of the moment rather than consults the real interests of the people. Reed recognized no divinity in an unthinking clamor, whether raised by one man or a great mass of men. The people could no more depend on inspiration to guide them in performing their public duties than in their private affairs. In each case reflection and work were equally necessary. He showed his reverence for representative government by the calm dignity with which he bore himself during more than two decades of service. He was sometimes compelled to struggle to maintain himself but he scorned to make the struggle upon demagog lines or to swerve from the straight path upon which he moved with so much majesty. He was not prigged up with the commonplace sort of greatness, with a padded and theatric make-up staged to strike the imaginations of little men or to set wagging the puffing pens of little writers. He was no self-advertiser and ran no press bureaus to trumpet his real or imaginary virtues. He sought no mere noisy and ephemeral fame, but he lived upon a plane visible at history's perspective, and he grandly wove his life into the texture of his time.

And so you rear this statue. And you do well to rear it, for although his memory is one of the treasures of the whole country, it was you who gave him to the Nation. He was the product of the sky and soil of Maine, lightened by her sunshine and hardened by her storms. As a representative acts well or ill he reflects credit or discredit upon those who have chosen him. By this test how signally he honored you. But you equally honored yourselves when, amid all the shifting popular vagaries and the following of false gods, you permitted yourselves to be guided by the better genius of popular government and kept this heroic figure for so long a time in the service of his country. And when he returned his commission to you he could truthfully say, as he proudly said, "No sail has been trimmed for any breeze or any doubtful flag ever flown." That noble phrase gives the keynote to his character as a statesman. The only colors he was willing to fight under were those that represented his own principles. He never sailed just for the sake of sailing, but to make progress upon a straight course. He did not take his inspiration and direction from the winds, but from the stars.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

MARBLE BUST OF THOMAS BRACKETT REED

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER], I am pleased to introduce at this time a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 315

Resolved, That the sum of $2,500 is authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House for the procurement of a marble bust of Thomas Brackett Reed, for 22 years a distinguished Member of this House from the State of Maine, and for 6 years its Speaker, the expenditure to be made under the direction of the Committee on the Library.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was graciously extended the privilege of addressing the House for 20 minutes this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that that time be transferred to tomorrow afternoon, after the disposition of business on the calendar and the other special orders already made.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my application for time to speak today and have the same time for Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from four important laws and decrees that have been passed and issued by the nations of the world with respect to embargoing arms. The cost exceeds the amount allowed for printing ordinarily and I have an estimate from the printer and ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend the remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a short editorial from a trade magazine known as Better Castings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by placing in the RECORD a statement I made before the Committee on Reciprocity Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the special orders heretofore made, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] may have 20 minutes in which to address the House on Tuesday next, after the special orders already set for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, if the people could only understand the changes which are constantly taking place in the Nation, as a result of propaganda and the activities of a group which does not have our interest at heart, I would not fear the final outcome, for our people would be safe and our Nation secure. It is in the knowledge of these subversive activities that I have suggested, since the first week in Congress, that we resume the responsibility of the Government.

Let me quote from my first address to the House on January 20, 1939:

> I do not look upon such public interest and reaction lightly for there are definite causes for such mass protests. It is said where there is smoke there is fire, and I believe it is well for Congress to remember that our Nation is smoldering. Someday it may break into a destructive fire of public upheaval.
>
> Someone is responsible, and it is not the people. It is not industry, commerce, business, labor, agriculture, professional, or any other earning group. It is not President Roosevelt, ex-President Hoover, or any other President, for no legislative power is delegated to the Chief Executive. Responsibility cannot be placed on departments, or upon subdivisions thereof, and it cannot be blamed on a particular administration.
>
> The blame for all must be placed on the majority in Congress which has supported unconstitutional legislation; upon those who have treated lightly their oath of obligation to preserve, to protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. The people themselves are also to blame for not having elected to office men who embrace the Constitution as the greatest instrument ever drafted for the protection of the people.
>
> I am not interested in the enactment of laws. We have too many. I am, however, interested in the people who have labored and helped to create and build the wonderful structure we live in. For 2 years I shall use every effort to warn the people to protect themselves and their rights by sending men to Congress who will adhere to and support the Constitution instead of destroying it by enactment of unsound and unconstitutional laws.
>
> We, the Members of Congress, should bear in mind that Congress represents all the people in all the States; that when laws are enacted to help one group, they hurt another. If laws are enacted to punish one group of the people, it is a pain in the neck to all the people. We must stand together or hang singly. When the people's rights are restricted or removed by laws, one by one, when the last is removed, Congress has, by such legislation and confiscation of rights, transformed our Government into a legal despotism. I want every man, woman, and child to understand that and never forget it.
>
> It is now in order for someone to introduce a resolution that Congress resume its rightful position to the people, as provided for in the Constitution. That would be the manly and the proper thing to do, instead of passing the buck and blaming someone else for our own mistakes.
>
> Congress cannot evade responsibility by general accusations, because the people are too intelligent, and they are doing their own thinking. If I am right, and I believe I am, let us begin now to get business going in a businesslike manner so that our idle people may be gainfully employed. We cannot increase consuming power by Federal spending. It just does not work—never has and never will. All business must either be run by the people or by the Government. There is no middle road. To expect business to operate and to furnish money to the Government so it in return may use such money to foster or enter into competition with its own benefactor—business—can only end in idleness, poverty, suffering, and revolution. Yes; and horoscope entrepreneurs. The people are ill from technicalities, graphitis, and statistics. The people are sick of laws, restrictions, and regulations; and, Mr. Speaker, I am in accord and in sympathy with them.
>
> The people should now take the law into their own hands by insisting that all departments in the Federal Government adhere to the Constitution; that all laws enacted in conflict with the Constitution be repealed, one by one, so that the people's rights may be restored. That will start the wheels of industry going, furnish employment, increase consumption, build prosperity, and return the American smile to our people.

Mr. Speaker, that was my credo on January 3, 1939, when I took an obligation, with other Members of this House, "to preserve, to protect, and to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies," and I have not changed today.

During the first session I spoke and wrote on many subjects, often bluntly but never with anything except the interests of my people and my country at heart.

Today I speak with no hatreds toward anyone or any nation. I speak instead as a servant of the people and with respect to this Republic to which I have dedicated all my efforts.

During the period I have been a Member of the House I have not seen one newspaper which has taken up a battle for constitutional government; for the rights of the people and business to operate free from Federal meddling and interference; for liquidation of the many Federal corporations which have been created by special acts of Congress and also under State corporation laws; for repeal of the Gold Reserve Act, which robbed our own people of sound money. Yes, an act that reduced the sales price of American commodities to foreign nations 40 percent, or from $1

to 60 cents; an act that allows a foreign government stable money and our own people "hocus-pocus" money.

No, the newspapers said nothing about this act that sold our Nation to the money changers and placed our people in slavery, to entrench greed. The newspapers do not give publicity to a Federal employment list large enough to administrate the whole world. Does any newspaper come out against immigration of fanatical Communists that are now undermining and destroying our Nation? No, indeed; no mention is made of this. But let three or four Members in Congress come out in support of sound government and against the steady incoming stream of Communists, and they are at once called Nazi, Fascist, and anti-Semitic. If the same Members oppose the administration's "must" legislation, such as the present Neutrality Act, they are accused of being anti-English, antiracial, anti-Roosevelt, and anti-administration. I often wonder if the objectors have sworn fealty to the President instead of the Constitution of the United States. One seems to risk his life and reputation when he attempts to expose those engaged in subversive destruction of our Government. In face of these acrimonious attacks one is nearly afraid to mention the Constitution of the United States, let alone naming those who have used it for a doormat for the British Government.

Since publishing in the daily RECORD, October 11, 1939, a letter that anyone can buy for two cents and a half, I have been subjected to abuse and slander, when I should, instead, receive gratitude from the Nation, if it is true, and from the friends of Col. E. M. House if it is untrue. Publication of this report is an act of justice to those concerned, for it will set this matter right.

While I have received one letter that questions the authenticity of the report and another that calls me "dumb," I have also received others, and here are excerpts from one of them:

DEAR SIR: Do not back-pedal on this issue. There is every reason to credit it. * * * Officers from Great Britain, sent over here in the World War period to recruit our men, money, and munitions. Taking just New York City, at that time the British, with their tanks, behaved in New York as if they already owned it. * * * Being on active recruiting duty, this came directly under my eyes.

Now, Mr. THORKELSON, you can investigate a thing of real concern to our country as regards the use intended for the large sum set aside, and being expended by Nicholas Murray Butler for alleged world peace. If you cannot do it, then it is up to the Dies committee to let the public have the facts as regards that money.

When a student at Columbia I protested against the British crown over our flag on the flagstaff and suggested that it should be removed. My professor agreed with me. He remarked, "That is not as brazen as the Carnegie Foundation Fund; the document sets forth it is with the hope that one day America will be back under the British flag * * *."

For God and our country help America to get back to America and shake off all of these designing leeches.

I have quoted a few brief excerpts from this letter, deleting the names and personal references, simply to show what is in the minds of the people, and what information they might have.

I shall now quote from the biographies of Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie. Please understand again that my quotation is for one purpose, and that is to show the internationalists' trend to ultimately bring the United States into one union under British dominion. It might seem presumptuous to bring out these facts, yet I believe the American people ought to know them before it is too late.

The beginning of the undermining of America was brought by Cecil Rhodes, who in 1877 left money to establish scholarships at Oxford for the purpose of training diplomats to foster the reunion of Britain and America. In the first draft of his will, which is quoted in the book, Cecil Rhodes, by Basil Williams, or the book, Cecil Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millen, he stated:

"Directed that a secret society should be endowed with the following objects: 'The extension of British rule throughout the world; the colonization by British subjects of all lands where the means of livelihood are attainable by energy, labor, and enterprise; and especially the occupation by British settlers of the entire continent of Africa, the Holy Land, the Valley of the Euphrates, the islands of Cyprus and Candia, the whole of South America, the islands of the Pacific not heretofore possessed by Great Britain, the whole of the Malay Archipelago, the seaboard of China and Japan, the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire,' 'The foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible and promote the best interests of humanity.' "

A new will was made:

"He substituted English-speaking peoples for actual Britons; he came to realize his limitations and reduce his scheme to a mere beginning of it, the scholarships; but yet the thought behind each successive will remained the same—the world for England, England for the world." (See p. 145, Cecil Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millen.)

Other quotations:

Page 377: "But the essence of the will, as the world knows, is the scholarship foundation. In the end all that Rhodes can do toward extending British rule throughout the world and restoring Anglo-Saxon unity and founding a guardian power for the whole of humanity is to arrange for a number of young men from the United States, the British colonies, and Germany to go to Oxford. There are, accordingly, rather more Rhodes scholars from America than from all the British dominions put together."

Page 378: "If the Union of South Africa could be made under the shadow of Table Mountain, why not an Anglo-Saxon union under the spires of Oxford?"

Mr. HOFFMAN. Where did you say that was?

Mr. THORKELSON. That is in New York. By the way, that is where the Communist Party was organized when Felix Frankfurter was up there, a member of the Civil Liberties Union. That is recorded in a House document as well.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Organized in New York?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought the Communist Party originated in Russia.

Mr. THORKELSON. No; I do not think so.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is that the place where the alien Communist leader, Sam Ginsberg, alias General Krivitsky, went when he illegally entered the United States several years ago?

Mr. THORKELSON. I do not know.

In 1893 Andrew Carnegie wrote his book, Triumphant Democracy, the last chapter of which is the Reunion of Britain and America. (The 1931 edition of this book is devoid of this last chapter.) The following is a quotation from the original book:

"Regarding those I should like Britons to consider what the proposed reunion means. Not the most sanguine advocate of imperial federation dares to intimate that the federation that he dreams of would free the markets of all its members to each other. This question cannot even be discussed when imperial conferences meet; if it be introduced it is judiciously shelved. But an Anglo-American reunion brings free entry here of all British productions as a matter of course."

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. I just wanted to digress for a moment, if the gentleman will permit me. I would like to know how this Ginsberg got into this country in the first place. I understand that for 17 years he acknowledged he was a leader in the Russian secret police. Is he legally here or illegally here? If illegally here, why is he not put out?

Mr. THORKELSON. I might tell the gentleman that I have a list of several hundred that are criminals who came into the United States and have been convicted of crimes in foreign countries. Under the present authority that is now in control, I can give you the initials of them and the crimes for which they have been convicted.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. That gentleman was issued a passport by the former Premier of France, Mr. Blum, and he should be deported immediately because the law prohibits their entrance and requires their deportation.

Mr. THORKELSON. I thank you very much, but let me please proceed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. When you get through, will you yield for a question?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think that anybody who is here illegally should be deported and we ought to take steps to see that they are deported, Ginsberg or Lipshitz or anyone else.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. DICKSTEIN is chairman of the Immigration Committee and I am sure he knows of a lot of them.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is exactly what I would like to ask you a question about.

Mr. THORKELSON. Just a moment. By the way, I can call your attention to a gentleman by the name of Friedlander. Do you know him?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. THORKELSON. You do not know him? You do not know he perjured himself in Bermuda?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I wish the gentleman would give me that information.

Mr. THORKELSON. I will give it to you.

To continue:

"The richest market in the world is opened to Britain free of all duty by a stroke of the pen. No tax revenue, although under free trade such taxes might still exist. What would not trade with the Republic, duty-free, mean to the linen, woolen, iron, and steel industries of Scotland, to the tinplate manufacturers of England? It would mean prosperity to every industry in the United Kingdom, and thus, in turn, would mean renewed prosperity to the agricultural interests now so sorely depressed.

"In the event of reunion, the American manufacturers would supply the interior of the country, but the great population skirting the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific coast would receive their manufactured articles chiefly from Great Britain."

And still another quotation:

"Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams, but it shall never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked-for and undesired separation of the mother from her child is not to bleed forever. Let men say what they will; therefore, I say, that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again the reunited state—the British-American union."

1914: Andrew Carnegie took over the controlling group of the Federal Council of Churches by subsidizing what is known as the Church Peace Union with $2,000,000, and the Church Peace Union, or the board of trustees, has always exercised a dominating influence in the Federal Council. This endowment has provided sufficient annual income to run the budget of the Federal Council and its cooperating organizations. Among the associated groups are the World's Alliance of International Friendship Through the Churches, Commission on International Friendship and Good Will, National Council for Prevention of War, and American Civil Liberties Union. (See Pastors, Pacifists, and Politicians, pp. 5–6, published by the Constructive Educational Publishing Co., 5421 Ridgewood Court, Chicago.)

I have purposely quoted Cecil Rhodes and Carnegie to show that there has been a deliberate attempt for years to put the United States into the British union.

I can readily understand why a Britisher wants the United States in the Empire, but I do not understand why an American would want to be there. These Anglophiles are found in our colleges and other institutions of learning. These are found in the various leagues of peace, for democracy, for conciliation, nonsectarian antileagues, and other organizations along similar lines. As fronts for these leagues we find these Anglophiles, and I believe I am safe when I say that a goodly proportion of them do not understand the principles of our own Government. All of these organizations seem so plausible that most of us fall in with them without actually realizing the danger.

Who would ever believe that the League of Nations, for world peace, was in reality intended to be a world policing body? Who would ever believe that the League of Nations was to be the internationalist's government or the invisible government of the world? Anyone who advanced such an idea would be ridiculed. But in spite of this, that was the real purpose of the League of Nations. These high-sounding and idealistic organizations are always to be suspected, for there is usually "a nigger in the wood pile." There is always something within them working for an interest opposed to our own.

It is for that reason that I have advocated that we adhere strictly to the Constitution of the United States, and that we take our bearings from this instrument instead of fooling around with queer people and queer ideas.

In my remarks in the RECORD I have attempted to acquaint the people with conditions throughout the world, for I believe it is very important, particularly at this time, that we should know facts and that such facts should be stated without fear or favor. I shall refer briefly to the report that was inserted in the daily RECORD October 11, 1939. Mr. Speaker, I ask first the unanimous consent of the House to have the name "British Consulate, New York City," and the names of the writer and the addressee deleted from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAVENS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. I have had an opportunity to read letters written by Mr. E. M. House, and at no place does he sign his name "Col. E. M. House," and I believe that should be significant. It is my desire, however, to have the remainder of this report retained in the RECORD for I believe it may make better Americans out of the so-called Anglophiles.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield right there? Who wrote it anyway? What is the use putting something in if we do not know who wrote it?

Mr. THORKELSON. Because the substantive matter of the letter itself deals with facts. For instance, in one part of the letter it mentions that a number of officers in our own Army and Navy were decorated by the British Government. I have looked that up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a matter of history, is it not?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why put it in the RECORD again?

Mr. THORKELSON. I find that much of the substantive matter in this letter is authenticated, but for the sake of sparing someone's feelings, for the sake of eliminating the name of Col. E. M. House, I shall give you the real E. M. House who worked with Wilson.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But he is not responsible for this letter, is he?

Mr. THORKELSON. I do not know if he is responsible for this letter or not. It was printed by the Washington Publishing Co.

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

Mr. THORKELSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. You say you are leaving the address and name off the letter? Was the item in parentheses that is printed in the letter a part of the original letter?

Mr. THORKELSON. You mean the heading of it?

Mr. MILLER. No; the item in parentheses.

Mr. THORKELSON. No. That is the publisher's notation.

Mr. MILLER. I just wanted to ask this one question. Certainly there is no personal feeling. Do you not think, knowing all the existing circumstances, now that you have agreed to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the name of Col. E. M. House and the title, in all fairness, you should go the whole way and take the letter out?

Mr. THORKELSON. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the fact it is going to cost the Government $600—the gentleman says it is a matter of history, anyway——

Mr. THORKELSON. If the gentleman will excuse me, we have spent about $13,000,000,000 this year and are now $1,000,000,000 in the red as a result of the first 3 months' operations of this year, which indicates a probable increased debt of $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 by the end of the fiscal year, I say if we can spend $300 and awaken the American people to what is happening in this country it is money well spent—money spent for a worthy purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the gentleman says all this information is now in the possession of the public. Why not save a little? We never can get them to cut off $1,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 at a time, but we can save in these lesser ways.

Mr. THORKELSON. If it is a question of the $300, I would be glad to write a check for it and give it to the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Coming from a Congressman, I doubt if it would be a proper contribution.

Mr. THORKELSON. I think it would be perfectly proper for a Congressman to share the expenses of Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the gentleman can save the same amount by just withdrawing that. He would be ahead $300 himself.

Mr. THORKELSON. I choose not to withdraw it, because there are facts in that letter.

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

Mr. THORKELSON. I hope the gentleman will not insist on my yielding now but will let me finish reading my manuscript. At its conclusion I shall be pleased to yield to any question, and I shall try to answer him. I want to tell the gentleman something about Mr. House. This information may be found in this book written by a former Assistant Attorney General. This book is to be found in the Library. Its title is "Woodrow Wilson, Disciple of Revolution."

Mr. THOMASON. Will not the gentleman yield for a brief question right there?

Mr. THORKELSON. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. THOMASON. I hold no brief for the late Colonel House, for I believe his name and fame will live long after many of us are forgotten. My principal interest right now is in the preservation of an honest, truthful CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now that the House letter has been, I think, proven to be a spurious document by the letters I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 333, in extension of my remarks, does not the gentleman feel that in justice to himself and his colleagues in this House and to a truthful RECORD that the entire letter ought to be expunged? Because, if the gentleman will recall, he said when he referred to that letter and the signer of it that it was the Col. E. M. House who was the intimate friend and associate of the late President Wilson. So, in the interest of fairness and justice, not only to a dead man but to an honest RECORD, does not the gentleman think that letter should be expunged from the RECORD?

Mr. THORKELSON. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that I believe the letter was signed "Col. E. M. House." Edward M. House, the friend of President Wilson, never signed his name "Col. E. M. House." This is supposed to be a report that came from the British secret files, and I do not believe that the House who was adviser to President Wilson ever was engaged by Great Britain and sitting in the British consulate. It must therefore have been someone else.

The reason I want to have that letter in the RECORD is because I want the American people to know what the British think of us. I want to have that letter in the RECORD to give that information to the American people so they will not be so foolish as to fall for this British propaganda that is saturating the United States today just like it did in 1916 and 1917.

Mr. THOMASON. Do I understand the gentleman's alibi now to be that he is——

Mr. THORKELSON. The gentleman has no alibi.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman now admit——

Mr. THORKELSON. The gentleman does not admit anything.

Mr. THOMASON. That it is not the Col. Edward M. House whom the gentleman from Connecticut spoke of in such high admiration yesterday? Does the gentleman now admit that he is not the man who wrote that letter? If so, I say that in all fairness the letter should be expunged from this RECORD.

Mr. THORKELSON. I never said that this Colonel House was the Edward M. House, President Wilson's adviser. As a matter of fact, I said "Disregard both the writer and the recipient of the letter."

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

Mr. THORKELSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I admit that British propaganda is being spread in this country today just as it was prior to our entrance into the World War. If this be so, why is the gentleman now swallowing the British propaganda and supporting the repeal of the arms embargo, something which British propaganda is trying to get us to do?

Mr. THORKELSON. May I reply that I am opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo, and I am also opposed to the never-ending supply of British propaganda urging its repeal.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. I understood the gentleman to say that the letter he put in the RECORD signed "Col. E. M. House" did not purport to be the Colonel House of the Wilson administration.

Mr. THORKELSON. I said, "Do not take the writer into consideration. Do not consider the origin of the letter, but read the substance of it." I said that in my remarks. There was no reason to assume that it was the Edward M. House who was connected with the Wilson administration. I do not know who it was. My letter was inserted in the RECORD for one purpose alone, and that was to give information to the American people. I think they are entitled to it.

Mr. THOMASON. May I ask one more question? Did not the gentleman say the other day in response to my question that it was the Col. E. M. House, the friend and intimate of Woodrow Wilson? The gentleman said that, and the daily RECORD will show it.

Mr. THORKELSON. Well, look the daily RECORD up.

Mr. Speaker, I may say at this time that the part of the report which refers to the decorations bestowed upon a number of American officers is correct, and so stated in Whitaker's Almanack of 1919 and 1920. Reference is also made to this, as the report states, in the New York Times, August 15, 1918. So this part of the report is authentic, and evidence may be found in the Congressional Library.

It is my desire to call my colleagues' attention to this supplementary paragraph attached to that report, which I shall not contradict:

> This was 20 years ago. Is it any wonder our Congressmen promise the people one thing and then go to Washington and do something entirely different? Things in the United States are far worse today than when this document was written, and each set of candidates we put in office helps just that much more to sell out this country to the internationalists.
>
> For further proof of this plot read the book, Woodrow Wilson—Disciple of Revolution, by Colonel in the United States Army and Assistant United States Attorney General until 1933, Jennings C. Wise. Six hundred and seventy-four pages of hitherto unpublished truths of the goings on behind the scenes of government and not generally known.

This secret-service report, as it is called, was printed by the American Publishing Society in 1938, I believe, and no doubt they have good reason for printing it and further substantiation. Issue has been taken to the use of the date 1937 in a parenthetical editor's note in the report.

The author of Woodrow Wilson—Disciple of Revolution is a well-known writer whose record is listed in Who's Who in America. He served in various capacities in the United States Government and was Assistant Attorney General. He also holds the Distinguished Service Cross.

The papers have criticized me for incorporating this secret-service report in the RECORD, and my colleagues here in the House for inserting it as it was printed, with names attached. May I ask the Members to understand that I do not resent criticism of any sort, for in criticizing I must expect to be criticized. However, inasmuch as I seem to be a victim of circumstances, and as I have mentioned a Mr. House, I shall now give you a synopsis of Mr. Edward M. House, as set forth in Woodrow Wilson—Disciple of Revolution. I suggest that you read this book. You may not be so gullible after reading it and so willing to defend anyone's character until you actually know whereof you speak:

> Among the internationalists there were, as shown, Democrats of eminence, as well as Republicans, just as in the case of the pacifists. The former included Col. Edward M. House, of Texas, who owed his title to service on the Governor's staff. His father had emigrated from England and been prominent in the Texas revolution. A man of some affluence, with a taste for politics, and known in Texas as "a silent worker * * * ." It was during his stay in Texas that he wrote his first book, a political romance entitled "Philip Dru: Administrator." The character of it is significant—the story of a young West Point graduate who made himself dictator of the United States, rescinded the Constitution, reformed the currency, enacted labor laws providing for workmen's compensation, abolished the tariff, and placed the courts under his personal control. The colonel admitted that his hero was a Socialist of the Blanc school, while no one can read the book without seeing the influence it had exerted upon his views.
>
> The author of this strange novel was shrewder than the "apostle of peace." He had seen the trend of events and had, in some way, broken into the sanctum sanctorum of the internationalists, whose

whole scheme seems to have been disclosed to him. In consequence, he made Dru, as American premier, lead the United States into a league of nations similar to that which Marburg had in mind, a league in which the supreme council possessed the power not only to regulate the domestic affairs of the constituent states but to enforce universal peace. As finally published (1913), the book seems to have developed progressively with political developments in America. Starting off in a socialistic key to catch the ear of Bryan, it passed to a parliamentary refrain for Wilson and then into an internationalistic chorus for Carnegie and Marburg. It seems plain why its publication was long withheld by House. In 1911 House was not yet prepared to abandon Bryan, nor was he prepared, until after Wilson's election, to sponsor a league of nations. * * *

So, too, in the compendious compilation of House's papers by Seymour, obviously also nothing more than an autobiography, since it is admitted in the preface that it was written with House's aid; House unhesitatingly confessed that it was his purpose, in 1911, so to transform the Democratic Party through its next President as to effect a virtual revolution in the American Government. Not only that, but it was to be "socialized and internationalized."

Colonel House, as well as Marburg, was an inveterate internationalist, and he was determined that the next President should be a Democratic internationalist with dictatorial and socialistic tendencies, and a low-tariff advocate. He met Woodrow Wilson in 1911 and asked him to speak at the Texas fair that year.

In March, House wrote Wilson that he had Texas in good shape, and in April he returned to New York satisfied that he could deliver the delegation.

Woodrow Wilson was elected on November 4, 1912, by about two-thirds majority, and the Republican Party was split. On November 15, 1912, Wilson sailed for Bermuda, and until his departure House never let him far out of his sight. It is interesting to read this book, as it deals in detail with the inner happenings of Wilson's administration. I can only say it is a vast accumulation of double dealing and intrigue, led by Colonel House himself:

Before the new year House began holding conferences with the great bankers, with Wilson's consent on the proposed currency and tariff acts, selecting GLASS as the proponent of the measure. According to House, GLASS declared he knew nothing about currency matters, whereupon House undertook to coach him. House's plan, despite all protests, was to rush the Federal Reserve Act through Congress before all the patronage had been disposed of. * * *

House's part in the internationalist project, however, precluded the possibility of his holding office. On the other hand, the part he was playing was important enough. For when his authority to speak for the President in a certain important matter was challenged, Wilson said: "Mr. House is my second personality. He is my independent self. His thoughts and mine are one. If I were in his place I would do just as he suggested. * * * If anyone thinks he is reflecting my opinion by whatever he states, they are welcome to the conclusion." Thereupon Collier's Weekly gave House the title of Wilson's "silent partner" * * * (pp. 111–112).

There is little merit in the contention of some of Wilson's unreasoning adherents that the veracity of House is questionable, and that he was in reality no more than a vain little "yes man" to his chief. That he was at least as often leader as he was follower is plentifully evident from the virtual autobiography brought out under the title of The Real Colonel House, by his literary agent in 1918 during the Presidency of Wilson. In that book it is frankly stated that House's purpose from the first was to so transform the Democratic Party as to permit a virtual revolution in our form of government. Moreover, Philip Dru: Administrator, representing House's ideas prior to his first meeting with Wilson, was permitted to come out almost contemporaneously with Wilson's own New Freedom. The fact that Wilson was completely cognizant of these literary activities on the part of House, and that they continued to be close friends and allies thereafter, is evidence enough of House's real status and of Wilson's sympathy therewith.

It is hardly to be denied that it was House who brought Morgenthau, Elkus, Baruch, Rabbi Wise, and Morris into the Wilson camp. These powerful men were not of the type to deal with understrappers * * * (p. 113).

On March 6 the Cabinet held its first regular meeting. Houston, like Page, deemed it a mediocre body. Wilson declared at once that he proposed to devote himself to the "graver problems" of the Nation. No one present doubted that he had already formulated his major policies.

After the meeting Wilson laughed and joked with the "silent partner" about the Cabinet, describing the peculiarities of each of its members. A secret but readily decipherable code was now adopted. McCombs was designated as Damon, McAdoo as Pythias, Bryan as Primus, McReynolds as Coke, and Lane as Demosthenes.

It is one of the strangest facts in the life of Wilson, distrustful and suspicious though he was by nature, that he had not yet fathomed House's true character. He was, apparently, wholly unconscious of the fact that, though the constitutional Chief Executive of the American people, he was delegating his judgment, if not his authority, at least in part, to another. He seems to have been as guileless as the world at large in accepting House at his own valuation (pp. 121–122).

In 1913 the British and the American oil companies were jockeying for position and control of the Mexican oil field. Wilson wanted Huerta and England had supported Diaz. Japan also seemed to be interested in the Mexican squabble and in treaties on immigration to the United States. The Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, evidently did not have free action in regard to foreign affairs, for Mr. Houston made this observation:

Because it clearly indicated the President was going to be his own Secretary of State.

It was this attitude on the President's part that caused considerable misunderstanding and dissension in his Cabinet.

This book clearly reveals that Mr. House was opposed to the appointment of a Nationalist to any position. He was, instead, always in favor of the internationalist—so it is no wonder that we gradually slipped into the hands of the invisible government.

In 1913 House was sent over to England as President Wilson's personal representative. On meeting the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, he informed him:

That President Wilson was now convinced that the Panama Act violated the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty and that he intended to use all his influence to secure its repeal. The matter, the American urged, was a difficult one, since it would be necessary to persuade Congress to pass a law acknowledging its mistake (p. 140).

I mention this so that the Members of Congress may know how they are valuated by the roving ambassadors.

House also discussed the matter of a League of Nations with Grey. Wilson might render Britain a very great service should Germany assail the Triple Entente. The upshot was that Sir Edward Grey expressed his willingness to leave the Panama matter to Wilson, so far as was in his power. "Thus," says Page's biographer, "from July 3, 1913, there was a complete understanding between the British Government and the Washington administration on the question of the tolls * * *" (p. 140).

This meant that Mr. House obligated our help to the Triple Entente in case of war with the Triple Alliance. It is also well to bear in mind that if the truth were known a similar obligation may be in the making today. It is for that reason that I have advocated the retention of the Neutrality Act based upon arms embargo and repeal of all power granted to the President. It is the only way in which we may remain neutral.

Almost coincident with the dedication of the Peace Palace, Eliot began to urge stronger methods than arbitration. He, too, was in favor of enforcing peace in one way and another. But apparently he made no more impression upon Wilson and House than Page. Determined to press their own scheme, House, unknown to Bryan, opened negotiations on September 1 with Dumba, the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador, to determine if the dual monarchy, Germany's greatest ally, would abandon the central alliance for such a league of nations as that suggested 2 days before by Carnegie at The Hague. House and Wilson were not dealing frankly with either Bryan or Page, while seeking by roundabout methods to detach Britain from Japan, and Franz Joseph from the Kaiser, and to compel the Czar to institute those democratic reforms in Russia demanded by the American Jews and the internationalists generally.

Both the Kaiser and the Czar's government now perceived Wilson's real purpose. So, too, as one proposal of Philip Dru after another translated itself into legislation, did the press come to recognize the silent partner as the author of the book. "Whatever the book had said should be had come true," wrote Lane. "In the end Wilson had come to be Philip Dru."

Despite his belittlement by the press, Bryan had, with surprising patience, overlooked up to this time the usurpation of his functions by House. But when the silent partner undertook to dictate the Federal Reserve Banking Act, Bryan felt betrayed by a man who seemed to him to represent the interests as well as the internationalists. Thoroughly alarmed at the forces behind Wilson, and distrusting utterly the finally identified author of Philip Dru, the Great Commoner threatened openly in October to resign.

"I am afraid we have come to the parting of the ways," remarked Wilson despairingly to Tumulty (pp. 144–145).

Mr. House's visit to England and Tyrrell's visit to the United States finally terminated in an Anglo-American understanding in 1913.

Before Tyrrell left Washington it was agreed between him and House, that after the repeal of the Panama Act, House should, as

Wilson's representative, proceed direct to Berlin and urge the Kaiser, over the heads of Von Tirpitz and the naval party, to accept Churchill's proposals and the principle of the League of Nations. House was now to deal direct with all the Ambassadors (p. 150).

It is my desire to call your attention to the fact that at this time there was no ill-feeling toward Germany, either by President Wilson or Mr. House. On January 4, 1914, Mr. E. M. House sent the following letter to Mr. Page:

DEAR PAGE: * * * Benj. Ide Wheeler took lunch with me the other day. He is just back from Germany, and he is on the most intimate terms with the Kaiser. He tells me he often takes dinner with the family alone and spends the evening with them.

I know, now, the different Cabinet officials who have the Kaiser's confidence, and I know his attitude toward England, naval armaments, war, and world politics in general.

Wheeler spoke to me very frankly, and the information he gave me will be invaluable in the event that my plans carry. The general idea is to bring about a sympathetic understanding between England, Germany, and America, not only upon the question of disarmament, but upon other matters of equal importance to themselves and to the world at large.

It seems to me that Japan should come into this pact, but Wheeler tells me that the Kaiser feels very strongly upon the question of Asiatics. He thinks the contest of the future will be between the eastern and western civilizations. * * *

Your friend always,

E. M. HOUSE (p. 152).

Well might Page have been alarmed. He could not fail to see the dangerous character of the vain and ambitious schemer whom Wilson had made his "silent partner." Constantly stressing the idea of world leadership by Wilson, and thus flattering the President's vanity, Page deemed House a positive menace to the country. Yet the more earnestly he sought to discourage Wilson from becoming a party to House's schemes, the more objectionable he became to the President (p. 153).

House accomplished nothing by his visits to Europe except to alarm such countries in which he called.

Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, the British Ambassador at Washington, subsequently declared that House's visits back and forth to London and Berlin had so alarmed the militarists of Germany that they took advantage of the Kaiser's absence on his annual cruise in Norwegian waters to project the strife in which they saw their only salvation (p. 178).

Yet in 1932, when a press photograph showed Franklin D. Roosevelt, just returned from his nomination in Chicago, conferring with House at the latter's Beverley home, the author of Philip Dru, Administrator, proclaimed the Presidential nominee a more suitable leader for a new American revolution than even Woodrow Wilson had been.

In any event, Woodrow Wilson called, in 1917, not merely for the liberalization of existing governments, but for the democratization of the whole world. The least enlightened peoples, the least advanced political societies, were summoned to enlist under his banner, to make the world safe for democracy.

Whatever that oft-repeated phrase meant to Wilson, we need have no doubt that to his alter ego it implied one thing—revolution (p. 639).

The prophecy of Philip Dru, Administrator, written by Colonel House, has practically come true, and may I suggest that my colleagues read appendix C (ibid. p. 569). It is very interesting because the present administration is following out House's plan.

Mr. Speaker, in order to present these facts without interruption, may I ask unanimous consent to extend the secret report of the Balfour declaration in the RECORD?

BALFOUR DECLARATION—SECRET FACTS REVEALED

(Important and hitherto unpublished sidelights on the Balfour declaration are for the first time revealed in the series of articles by Mr. S. Landman, the first of which appears below. From 1915 until 1918 Mr. Landman acted as private secretary to Mr. N. Sokolow, now president of the Zionist Organization. He was also secretary of the World Zionist Organization from the opening of the London office at the end of 1917 until 1922.)

WORLD JEWRY—SECRET HISTORY OF THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

(March 1, 1935—Continued from last week—By S. Landman)

It was about the end of 1916 that James Malcolm, through Leopold Greenberg, first came into contact with Dr. Weizmann. This memorable interview took place at Dr. Weizmann's house in Addison Road. Dr. Weizmann had moved from Manchester to London in that year and was working on explosives for the Admiralty and the Ministry of Munitions. As is well known he had invented an important process for the manufacture of acetone and this had brought him into contact with Lloyd George, the Minister of Munitions, and Mr. Balfour, the First Lord of the Admiralty. In this talk with Malcolm Dr. Weizmann confessed his disappointment that his efforts to win over Lloyd George and Balfour to the Zionist cause had apparently made no progress, and he asked Malcolm what reason he (Malcolm) had for being convinced of success. Malcolm reported to him the conversations he had had with Sir Mark Sykes and the War Cabinet's authority for his (Malcolm's) overtures to the Zionists. Dr. Weizmann's doubts were still strong, and he asked when he could see Sir Mark Sykes. "At once, I believe," replied Malcolm, and he rang up Sir Mark, informed him that he was speaking from Dr. Weizmann's house, and asked for an appointment to bring Dr. Weizmann to him. Sir Mark fixed one for the next day, but Dr. Weizmann was prevented from going and Sokolow went instead. The interview was very successful, both parties making the best impression on each other. Further interviews took place, at which Dr. Weizmann was also present. Of course, all these interviews took place with the full knowledge and approval of Sir Maurice Hankey, the secretary of the war cabinet.

MR. G. H. FITZMAURICE

There was another man—an Irishman—who rendered most valuable service at this time to the bringing together of the Zionists and the British Government. This was Mr. G. H. Fitzmaurice, a great friend of Malcolm. Fitzmaurice had spent many years in the British Embassy in Constantinople, and was very well versed in all the problems of the Near East. Malcolm had at a very early stage discussed with him the possibilities of effecting a rapprochement between the Jews, especially in the United States of America and other neutral countries, and the British and allied cause. Fitzmaurice was finally won over and became a very devoted friend of Zionism. I first made his acquaintance about the middle of 1917, and I can say with confidence that he was one of the earliest and most discerning of our friends. I remember him saying to me in 1918: "A nation which has a Rothschild and an Einstein must win through * * *." He was, like Sykes, a devout Catholic, and amongst his intimate friends were Sir Henry Wilson and General Macdonogh, director of military operations, whom he won over to the Jewish cause. It was Fitzmaurice chiefly who helped to open for Sokolow the doors of the Vatican, with the result that the Pope granted Sokolow an audience in 1917 and thereby indicated that the Vatican was favorably disposed to the idea of Palestine for the Jews. It is of interest to record that the Zionist leaders had previously held the view that there was no way of winning the sympathy of the Vatican or of such men as Sir Mark Sykes, because they were Catholics. It is the great achievement of Malcolm that he was not only able to convince them of the justice of the Zionist cause, but even to enlist their active support.

After an understanding had been arrived at between Sir Mark Sykes and Weizmann and Sokolow, it was resolved to send a secret message to Justice Brandeis that the British Cabinet would help the Jews to gain Palestine in return for active Jewish sympathy and support in the United States for the allied cause so as to bring about a radical pro-Ally tendency in the United States. This message was sent in cipher through the Foreign Office. One of the principal under secretaries at the Foreign Office at that time was Sir Ronald Graham. He was in the confidence of Sir Mark Sykes, and during the whole time he was at the Foreign Office he was of unfailing help to the Zionists. Secret messages were also sent to the Zionist leaders in Russia to hearten them and obtain their support for the Allied cause, which was being affected by Russian ill-treatment of the Jews. Messages were also sent to Jewish leaders in neutral countries and the result was to strengthen the pro-Ally sympathies of Jews everywhere.

Through General Macdonogh, who was won over by Fitzmaurice, Dr. Weizmann was able about this time to secure from the Government the service of half a dozen younger Zionists for active work on behalf of zionism. At that time conscription was in force and only those who were engaged in work of national importance could be released from active service at the front. I remember Dr. Weizmann writing a letter to General Macdonogh and invoking his assistance in obtaining the exemption from active service of Leon Simon, Harry Sacher, Simon Marks, Hyamson Tolkowsky, and myself. At Dr. Weizmann's request I was transferred from the War Office (M. I. 9), where I was then working, to the Ministry of Propaganda, which was under Lord Northcliffe, and later to the Zionist office, where I commenced work about December 1916. Simon Marks actually arrived at the office in khaki and immediately set about the task of organizing the office, which, as will be easily understood, had to maintain constant communication with Zionists in most countries.

GOVERNMENT HELP

From that time onward for several years zionism was considered an ally of the British Government, and every help and assistance was forthcoming from each Government department. Passport or travel difficulties did not exist when a man was recommended by our office. For instance, a certificate signed by me was accepted by the home office at that time as evidence that an Ottoman Jew was to be treated as a friendly alien and not as an enemy, which was the case with the Turkish subjects.

After Sir Mark Sykes had established contact with the Zionist leaders, it was resolved to have a more formal meeting so that one of the Zionist leaders could be officially appointed to act on behalf of the Zionist movement. This meeting took place on February 7, 1917, at the house of Dr. Gaster, who had already been in touch with Sir Mark and Sir Herbert Samuel, with reference to zionism. Sir Herbert Samuel, James de Rothschild, Sokolow, Tchlenow, and Dr. Weizmann were the principal Zionists who attended there to meet Sir Mark Sykes. The result of the meeting was that Sokolow was chosen to act as Zionist representative and to negotiate with Sir Mark. Dr. Weizmann was, at that time, too fully occupied with his chemical work for the Government.

SOKOLOW IN PARIS

The plan of action decided upon by Sir Mark Sykes and Sokolow was for Sokolow to go to France and Italy and make sure there was no opposition. In the meantime Dr. Weizmann would continue to win friends in England. In connection with the visit of Sokolow to Paris, Malcolm again rendered immense service to the Zionist cause. As a member of the Armenian National Delegation, he was personally acquainted with the leading French officials in charge of near eastern affairs—especially M. Gout, M. Picot, and M. de Margerie. They were the three key men for the Zionist purpose. Malcolm went first alone to M. Picot and prepared the way for Sokolow. Sokolow had previously tried to invoke the assistance of French Jewry in getting an audience from the French Government. He had not been successful. The Alliance Israelite used every effort to dissuade him from talking Zionism to the Ministers. Even Baron Edmond de Rothschild, the devoted friend of Palestine and the Zionist leaders, could not very well ask the French Government to depart in favor of England from its traditional role of protector of the peoples of the Near East. The position was such that Sokolow doubted very much whether he would be given an audience at the Quai d'Orsay. With the help of Malcolm, however, all the difficulties were overcome and the leaders of French Jewry, to their intense amazement and annoyance, read in Le Temps that M. Sokolow had been received by M. Pichon, the Foreign Minister. Not only that, but they found M. Sokolow had actually been invited to stay to lunch. M. Jacques Bigart and M. Sylvain Levi, both of the Alliance Israelite, telephoned to M. Sokolow's hotel to make sure they had heard aright, and finished up by inviting Sokolow themselves.

I have from Malcolm an interesting story of Sokolow's first interview with M. Picot. The latter was, of course, sizing up the man with whom he had to deal, and at the very end, when helping M. Sokolow on with his coat, he said as though it was of minor importance: "By the way, M. Sokolow, may I ask you one more question? Which Government would the Jews prefer to have in Palestine, the English or the French?" Sokolow was, however, quite ready with a reply. "You embarrass me, M. Picot," he answered. "I feel rather like the child who is asked whom do you love more, your mother or your father."

M. Picot was delighted with this reply, which seemed to him worthy of the best French diplomacy.

From Paris, Sokolow left for Rome. There, thanks to the introductions of Fitzmaurice and Malcolm on the one hand and the help of Baron Sidney Soncino on the other, everything was prepared for him. The audience with the Pope was quickly arranged and also interviews with the leading officials of the Foreign Office. The return to London of Sokolow found Dr. Weizmann and his small band of helpers in the throes of a mighty struggle with Anglo-Jewish leaders. Just as the leading French Jews tried hard to keep Zionism away from their Government, so did the leading Anglo-Jews do their utmost to keep Zionism away from the British Government. Edwin Montague was a leading opponent and remained such all his life. Lord Swaythling (the son of the first Lord Swaythling) was equally vehement in his opposition. Eleven of them joined forces in a letter to the Times about May 1917, protesting against Zionist aims and objects. Sir Mark Sykes informed us that something must be done to impress the Cabinet, and the Zionist leaders were compelled to take up the challenge. It was absolutely essential to convince the Cabinet that Anglo-Jewry was Zionist in sympathy and outlook, in view of the constant denial of this, which they heard from the leading Jews.

A rapid campaign among the members of the Jewish Board of Deputies was organized, and when it was seen that a majority was obtainable a pro-Zionist resolution was introduced and carried by a majority against the wishes and speeches of the president, David Alexander, K. C., and other honorary officers. The president and Mr. Henriques resigned, thus leaving the field clear for the Zionists.

THE DECLARATION

In the meantime, the text of the declaration was being prepared. The text submitted by the Zionists was, of course, more far-reaching than the final text. On the other hand, Lucien Wolf had some time before suggested to the Zionists a text which was pale and colorless. I cannot recollect the exact words, but it was to the effect that if Palestine came under the British sphere of influence Jews should be given no less right to colonize it than anybody else. If this text had been acceptable, it could have gone forward in the name of Anglo-Jewry. Naturally, the Zionist leaders could not accept it, and nothing more was heard of it. Mr. Ormsby-Gore was of great assistance throughout this stage as a link with Mr. Balfour. It is correct to say that the text of the declaration had to satisfy many conflicting claims. The Anglo-Jewish leaders were apprehensive lest a Jewish Palestine should affect their civic rights here, and all were also genuinely concerned for the Arab inhabitants of Palestine.

The opposition of Anglo-Jewry was still considerable, and the Cabinet could not see a way through the impasse. It was eventually decided to send the draft of the declaration to several leading Jews and obtain their opinions.

Through the help of Sir Mark Sykes, three of these letters were sent to Zionists or Zionist sympathizers. Three were sent to anti-Zionists. There were thus three against three, and everything depended on the seventh or decisive letter. This was Dr. Hertz, and his reply was emphatic and favorable.

This brought us to the autumn of 1917, when all was ready for the issue of the declaration. But the Cabinet was too preoccupied with the anxieties of the Great War, which was absorbing every ounce of their strength and every moment of their time.

Meeting after meeting passed, and the item of Palestine on the agenda of the Cabinet was not reached.

Finally, at the beginning of November, Sir Mark Sykes came out of the Cabinet room very excited, exclaiming, "It's a boy." Thus was born the famous Balfour declaration, the greatest event in Jewish history for centuries.

At a meeting of Zionists held immediately afterward, Sokolow said they must celebrate this declaration with such solemnity that it would be impossible to forget it. The text was cabled through the war office and foreign office to the Jews in the remotest corners of the earth. Sheafs of cables were taken by us to the war office for this purpose.

Many heads, hearts, and hands combined to bring the Balfour Declaration into existence. The share of the British Cabinet and the Zionist leaders is already well known. It is only just that the efforts of other non-Jewish friends, such as Malcolm and Fitzmaurice, should be known and appreciated.

Is it not strange that there are two Justices on the Supreme Bench, one of whom is mentioned in the pamphlet Communism in the American Labor Movement as a member of the Civil Liberties Union, and the other one in the Balfour report as being directly connected with shaping the destinies of the United States so that she would enter the war in Europe—both of them active in belligerent movements. Yet their own organizations have turned around and passed a resolution in 1936 which I shall now read:

The Central Conference of American Rabbis reaffirms its conviction that conscientious objection to military service is in accordance with the highest interpretation of Judaism and therefore petitions the Government of the United States to grant to Jewish religious conscientious objectors to war the same exemption from military service as has long been granted to members of the Society of Friends and similar religious organizations.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that positive evidence, in my judgment, has been produced that the letter which the gentleman from Montana introduced into the RECORD last Friday, October 13, purporting to be signed by Col. E. M. House, was not as a matter of fact signed by Col. Edward M. House. I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be expunged from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what has the gentleman from Montana got to say about that?

Mr. THORKELSON. The gentleman from Montana has said all he is going to say. I said to delete the names on the letter and delete the address.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman agreeable to this request?

Mr. THORKELSON. I am agreeable to having the name of the purported signer of the letter removed, and I am agreeable to having the address on the letter, the British Consulate, removed and the addressee's name removed, but let the body of the letter stand in the RECORD as it is.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, my unanimous-consent request is that in view of the fact the letter has been proven to be spurious and the gentleman from Montana now does not claim that the late Col. Edward M. House, who was the intimate and associate of the late Woodrow Wilson, signed it, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter, in view of its falsity, be expunged from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is just exactly why it ought to stay in—because it is not the Edward M. House that was associated with President Wilson. I never said it was, and that is the reason I want the letter left in the RECORD.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in view of the circumstances, I object at this time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN] may address the House for 20 minutes on next Wednesday, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the so-called House letter, I ask unanimous consent that everything except the contents in the body of the letter be expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to read this wire here.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to make an objection, but hereafter, in view of the attitude of the gentleman from Montana, I will be forced to object to extensions of his remarks which include statements of others unless we know who signed them and whether or not he vouches for their authenticity.

Mr. THORKELSON. I may say to the gentleman that I will reserve the same right for myself. There are many articles that go into the RECORD which are taken from newspapers. May I say that most of the remarks I put in the RECORD are my own remarks. This is practically the first time I have used somebody else's remarks. You can look up the RECORD and see that that is the fact. That is more than the gentleman can claim.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What happened to my unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] asks unanimous consent that everything except the contents of the House letter be expunged from the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, unless somebody is going to vouch for the authorship of those remarks, and admit that Col. E. M. House, late of the Wilson administration, is not the author, we should know who the author of the remarks is.

Mr. THORKELSON. Will the gentleman let me read this wire here?

Mr. THOMASON. If the gentleman will say who the wire is from and will vouch for its genuineness to an extent greater than in the case of the House letter, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the request is granted, the substance contained in the body of the letter will remain, and it will show that Col. E. M. House was not connected with the writing of the letter.

Mr. THOMASON. I would like to know who the author is.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. We will find that out later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether it would fix up the RECORD if you simply strike the name "Col. E. M. House" from this letter. What preceded that, and what were the reasons for putting it in?

I do not believe you can make an honest record and leave this letter in at all. I wish the gentleman from Wisconsin would withdraw his request; otherwise I shall have to object to it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the statement just made, I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker, in order that this matter can be cleared up satisfactorily at a later date.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the reading of the telegram. I do not want to keep anything out of the record that is genuine and authentic. It is only the forged documents I want to keep out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Montana will be permitted to read the telegram.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. The telegram is as follows:

That letter signed Colonel House was originally published in 1919. Author was Dr. William J. Maloney, distinguished New York neurologist who was active in Irish Nationalist affairs. Later appeared anonymously with suggestion author was Sir William Wiseman, then British intelligence representative, now with Kuhn, Loeb. Colonel House's name did not figure and must have been added recently by Bremerton people in stupid move quite incongruous with letter's brilliance and insight. Document received publicity 10 years ago and Maloney swore to his authorship before Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, subcommittee under Senator Shortridge, January 11, 1930. Testimony appears on page 569 of committee hearings. If Library of Congress does not have early editions of Maloney's pamphlet available, friend of mine in Washington has copy you could see. Maloney lives in New York. Am sending you this information assuming you will prefer to make correction before your critics do. Maloney's pamphlet so valuable that publicity can only do good, but Colonel House's name should be disassociated.

Mr. THOMASON. Who signed it?

Mr. THORKELSON. Seward Collins sent this wire. This wire is evidently in relation to this letter. It has already come up before the Senate committee. It is already on record.

Mr. THOMASON. Who is the man who sent this telegram?

Mr. THORKELSON. Seward Collins.

Mr. THOMASON. Who is he?

Mr. THORKELSON. How do I know?

Mr. THOMASON. All right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THORKELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a history of the Italian cheese industry in the United States, this being a brief which was filed before the Federal Trade Commission.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PUT AMERICA ON A CASH-AND-CARRY BASIS BEFORE WE LOSE OUR SHIRTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the subject of my address this afternoon is Put America on a Cash-and-Carry Basis Before We Lose Our Shirts. There is a phrase going about these days that causes one to stop and think about the affairs of our own country as well as the war in Europe. This phrase is "cash and carry." Right here I want to quote from the speech of the President in Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932. I quote:

The credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

I cannot finish this quotation because all the Democrats are leaving. If they are all going out and do not want to hear this quotation—well, the majority leader says he will stay, and if he will stay, I will go on. [Laughter.] He is a prince of good fellows. I will have at least one Democrat here to hear me finish this quotation.

If it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

That was a sound statement of the President of the United States, and he does make some sound statements. He made that one before he was elected in 1932. He has forgotten it, however.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has been off the cash-and-carry basis. For 8 long years we have been on a borrow-and-spend basis, but our borrowing days will soon be over if we do not heed the warning signs that are apparent on every side.

In the first 95 days of the current fiscal year our Treasury Department reports expenditures exceeding receipts by over $1,000,000,000. By October 14—105 days after the year began—we had spent $1,204,043,875.83, according to Mr. Morgenthau's Treasury Department statement, more than we received. By the end of this year I predict we will be over $4,000,000,000 in the red. It is a terrible situation, Mr. Majority Leader, a horrible situation we find ourselves in at this time.

Do you not think we should have "cash and carry" in Government?

United States bonds for the first time in nearly 20 years have recently sold in the market below par. The money changers can no longer carry the load; and unless the Government gets on a cash-and-carry basis, the bottom will drop out of our inflated credit market some day soon and carry with it the whole financial structure of our Government and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Franklin once said, "It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright." In the last year, to cover up the growing deficits as reflected by the national debt, the Treasury Department has resorted to digging into the cash balances in the general fund. These have been depleted by more than $700,000,000 in the past 12 months.

We should have taxes and cash, not notes and debts—debts created for our grandchildren to pay. It is not honest, it is not fair, it is not just. All the money we have collected from employers and employees alike to provide social security for our people has likewise gone up the spout in the mad scramble to substitute securities for cash wherever it is possible in the financial operations of our Government; and when this social-security cash was spent, the I O U's, issued in the form of securities, were again sold to the people or listed as assets by various governmental agencies as the frenzied financing goes on; but Franklin also warned that "always taking out of the meal box and never putting in soon comes to the bottom." There will surely come a time when these Government I O U's will be unacceptable to the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if cash and carry is a good principle to apply to the sale of munitions to foreign belligerents in the present European war, it ought to be a good principle to apply to the operations of our Government now; and, Mr. Majority Leader, if it is wise to have the cash-and-carry principle applied to the sales of munitions to foreign governments, it is good, Mr. Majority Leader, that that apply now in the operation of our Government.

We ought to set our own house in order before we set out to help the world in another venture on the western front. We marched up to the western front in 1918, but it cost our people over $40,000,000,000, and is costing them millions and hundreds of millions of dollars each year now for that terrible catastrophe, and all we got out of this adventure was a war boom that was followed by the greatest depression this country has even known.

We have tried to borrow and spend our way out of that depression for almost 7 years, without even making a dent in it. The tax burden, Federal, State, and local, has increased until enterprise has been stifled, and home ownership has become a luxury only to be enjoyed by the ultra rich, and the selected few who live in houses either built or subsidized with money collected from other home owners and taxpayers.

Coupled with our adventures into the international economic field, through our trade-agreement policy that is reciprocal only in that it breaks down the wage structure for the American farmer and the American workingman as it breaks down tariff barriers abroad, we have gone into all kinds of experiments of a purely aesthetic nature. The social uplift looms largely in the New Deal planning, music, theatricals, and art, are to be substituted in the new scheme of things for the square deal and square meals earned through honest labor in agriculture and industry.

Boondoggling and labor racketeering, such as only a Machiavelli could have conjured up, have become the order of the day. Inefficiency and waste in Government administration is apparent on every side. How long, gentlemen, can this mad game keep up? Gentlemen, how long can we continue this mad orgy of spending? It will not be long, Mr. Majority Leader, before this Nation of ours will surely sink, just as was stated in the quotation I gave a few moments ago from the statement made by the President of the United States.

Now, let me quote again from the President's message to Congress on March 10, 1933:

> And on my part I ask you very simply to assign to me the task of reducing the annual operating expenses of our National Government. We must move with a direct and resolute purpose now. The Members of Congress and I are pledged to immediate economy. When a great danger threatens our basic security it is my duty to advise Congress of the way to preserve it. In so doing I must be fair not only to the few but to the many. It is in this spirit that I appeal to you. If the Congress chooses to vest me with this responsibility it will be exercised in a spirit of justice to all, of sympathy to those who are in need and of maintaining inviolate the basic welfare of the United States.

We gave him the power he asked for.

When the President made that statement I think he was trying to utter at that time the words that were in his heart, but he has gone so far afield from the things that were directly responsible for the welfare of this Nation in his spending orgy that I am confident now that if we continue on with Mr. Roosevelt in the White House for 5 years more this Nation will certainly lose its form of government, and he will be a dictator in Washington just the same as Hitler is a dictator at the present time in Germany. We must not fool ourselves by thinking now that neutrality is going to take the place in the American front page of the newspapers and get us away from the fact that we are wrecking our Nation. When we come to think of the things that we are doing, it is a terrible, a horrible thing for us to realize. Let me read to you a letter that I got from a gentleman from Kane, Pa., one of my constituents. It was written on the 14th. I have not the power to give his name, and therefore I shall have to read the letter, which is exactly my idea of conditions. I shall have to omit his name:

> DEAR MR. RICH: Perhaps it is a part of the New Deal idea to make so much fuss over what's going on abroad that the expenditures of that same New Deal will be soft pedaled, but the folly of such huge spending can't be drowned even in the Atlantic Ocean.
>
> Though I know you are in full accord with my criticism of the increased cost of government since F. D. R. is in the White House, I still must write you my encouragement to fight with all your power against any unnecessary appropriations.
>
> Fully believe that just plain common sense would get more people off relief rolls than all the schemes any government ever concocted. No doubt a part of our ills are due to excessive taxation and restriction of industry.
>
> You've no doubt seen the report compiled by the American Federation of Investors which shows that the taxes paid by 163 representative American corporations amounted to $2.73 on each share of the 602,683,000 shares of common stock, whereas the total amount paid in dividends by these 163 corporations to the 5,806,000 holders of common stock was equivalent to but $1.33 per share of each common stock.
>
> Taxes consumed 61.6 percent of the net earnings (before taxes) of the 163 companies—almost two-thirds of such earnings. Nineteen of these companies reported a deficit before taxes, while the earnings of 15 others were wiped out by taxes, leaving net deficits for the year.
>
> Now, how are we as a nation going to prosper if we throw most of our earnings into airplanes and battleships and clerkships and post offices and dams and yardsticks—which we always lived very well without? Most of those ships will be obsolete before we ever need them, and legitimate industry with competition will give us better yardstick costs than Lillienthal's T. V. A. and a "damsite" less scandal.
>
> Concerning the neutrality legislation, I've no objection to selling the world anything and everything they can pay for, because it's none of our business what they do with it as long as they pay for what they carry away. My great concern is to give no emergency powers to F. D. R. He'll abuse the powers and spend 10 times the amount of money necessary. That guy needs a couple of first national banks for a guardian.

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

Mr. RICH. I could give quotation after quotation by Mr. Roosevelt before and since his campaign. He has made more promises to the American people and fulfilled less than any man who ever sat in the White House. Just let me ask you a few questions about the promises he made. First, before I do that, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DARDEN. I want to question the gentleman in reference to the observation, in the letter just read, about the naval shipbuilding. There was one observation toward the end in respect to naval shipbuilding. That shipbuilding is carried on in both private and Government yards, and there is a check on cost.

Mr. RICH. And I say to the gentleman that we are building three 45,000-ton battleships in the Government naval shipyards, and there is not a man in the United States who knows what they are going to cost. Even the members of the committee say they are going to cost $95,000,000 each, but when it comes to getting the hearings on them they say they are liable to cost up to $115,000,000. When you have such unethical bookkeeping in the Government yards that you do not know anything about the cost of an article than whether it will cost $95,000,000 or $115,000,000, then I say there is something rotten in Denmark with the method of the Federal Government cost of operation. The gentleman knows and I know that practically everything that the Government does costs half again as much as it would cost if done by private competition. Then, again, you have set the Government up in all of these agencies that you have established—more by President Roosevelt than by any other President in the history of the Nation, or any five Presidents—and yet Mr. Roosevelt said he did not want to set the Government up in business. Why are his promises to our people broken?

Mr. DARDEN. But come back to the 45,000-ton battleships. One of the reasons that nobody can tell just what the cost will be is that they are still being designed. They are the largest ships ever to be constructed either here or abroad. They have not yet been laid down. There has never been a single 45,000-ton battleship built.

Mr. RICH. But the money has been authorized to start them.

Mr. DARDEN. The money has been authorized to start construction.

Mr. RICH. And the gentleman voted for it at the last session of Congress.

Mr. DARDEN. I did.

Mr. RICH. And the gentleman voted for all those ships to be constructed, and whenever the President says "Go ahead and start them," they will do so. If you do not know whether a ship is going to cost $90,000,000 or $115,000,000, then you ought to find out what they are going to cost before you authorize them. That any sensible businessman or legislator would do.

Mr. DARDEN. But you do know that before the money is voted each year to carry on construction; the Navy does know what the cost will be?

Mr. RICH. It says in the hearings that they assume they will cost $95,000,000. There was nobody who gave direct testimony that they would cost $95,000,000. If they cost ninety-five or one hundred or one hundred and five or one hundred and twenty-five million dollars, after they start them they will cost a great deal more. That is the way Congress has done things since I have been in Congress. It is not good business. You know and I know the way Congress has squandered and frittered away the taxpayers' money in this country is a real crime.

Mr. DARDEN. The gentleman knows that one of them is allocated to the State of Pennsylvania, does he not?

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry my time has expired, because I would like to give you some more about the expenses of this administration. I wanted to cite to you more unfilled administration promises. I will have to do that at some later time, as most of the Democrats have gone; but the majority leader is still here. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a letter I sent to the Speaker of the House on October 4 and the reply of the Speaker to that letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RT. REV. MSGR. MICHAEL J. LAVELLE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, last night, in the city of New York, Right Reverend Monsignor Michael J. Lavelle, one of the most celebrated and venerable characters in the history of the Catholic church, left this world. For sixty years, since his ordination, he served in but one parish, the parish of his beloved St. Patrick's Cathedral.

Monsignor Lavelle was born on May 30, 1856, at 356 Broome Street, down on the East Side of New York City, and he never left his native city. He attended the school of old St. Patrick's Cathedral, at Mulberry and Mott Streets. This school is around the corner from the famous Chinatown section and within the shadow of the Bowery. As a boy, living in that neighborhood, he learned for the first time how difficult life could be, how tragic its sufferings, how uncertain its rewards, how to the innocent came disappointment and to the ambitious, defeat. He saw at first hand the destitution and miseries of the unfortunates who were his neighbors and, as a result of these experiences, Mr. Speaker, he learned to understand the problems of life. His interest and sympathy in the welfare of the underprivileged of our city, regardless of race or creed, may be traced to those boyhood days on the sidewalks of New York.

To the confessional box of the Monsignor, father confessor to all New York, there was worn a path by penitent sinners from every section in the community who poured out their souls to him because from him they were sure of sympathy and through him, forgiveness. Recently, Monsignor Lavelle said that more than half a century as a confessor convinced him that the morals and the character of the people were improving. He had abundant faith in the future of the city because he felt that its citizens were blessed by God.

It is difficult to find words adequate to express the sorrow that is in my heart at the passing of this noble person. It was my privilege to have known him since my childhood and, during the years, I have always regarded him as a most lovable character and a citizen extraordinary who brought but honored glory to his church and to his city.

It was Macaulay who said that if one stopped under a doorway with Edmund Burke to escape a shower he would be impressed with the certainty that he had met a kindly man. That was equally true of Monsignor Lavelle. His vigorous and penetrating mind, always at work, gained for him an immense extent and variety of knowledge. He had the learning of a philosopher, and to that learning he added the manners of a gentleman.

His company was sought by non-Catholics as well as Catholics, for he was witty with a subtle sense of humor and a keen knowledge of proportion. He had an inexhaustible sense of discourse with constant cheerfulness and high spirits. It has been truly said that Monsignor Lavelle did more in his lifetime than any other contemporary churchman to promote understanding and good-will toward the Catholic Church on the part of non-Catholics. His charm of manner, his musical voice, his unexcelled diction, his general knowledge made him a personality at once outstanding, remarkable, and pleasing.

During all of his adult life no great cause affecting his church or his country was discussed upon which he did not spread the luster of his talents and the spell of his eloquence. The venerable monsignor was the possessor of a unique record, in that he served the entire period of his priesthood in one parish. Another unusual distinction was that of having celebrated his diamond jubilee, the sixtieth anniversary of his

ordination to the priesthood. Not more than three or four priests in the whole history of the archdiocese were ever privileged to celebrate a like event.

On June 6, 1939, at a celebration in honor of his diamond jubilee, President Roosevelt wrote him this letter:

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR LAVELLE: Please allow me the pleasure of joining with others of your myriad friends in extending heartfelt congratulations on the happy occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of your priesthood.

What a long life of varied good works yours has been, and how remarkable that your entire ministry of threescore years all has been with the great cathedral church to which you were assigned after you received the holy orders in 1879.

As the devoted pastor of a large and important congregation who has also been active in the cause of education and civic betterment and ever sympathetic to the cry of the poor and friendless, your long life has been rounded out in manifold activities in behalf of God and country and your fellow men.

I am glad to know that you enjoy such a measure of good health, and I hope that your remaining years may be many. Particularly I congratulate you on possessing that rare zest for life and work which has carried you well past the fourscore mark, young in all save years.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT.

In addition to this splendid tribute from the President of the United States, Monsignor Lavelle received scores of tributes from other prominent citizens. I shall mention only a few: His Excellency Archbishop Francis J. Spellman; Gov. Herbert H. Lehman; former Gov. Alfred E. Smith; and Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia. One of the principal speakers at the Jubilee Dinner, given at the Hotel Commodore in New York City, was Postmaster General James A. Farley, and during his address, Mr. Farley said:

Monsignor Lavelle, with that rare vision given to few, must have foreseen what was coming, for his whole life has exemplified that cooperative service which in the last decade has become so prevalent among the influential men and women of America, whether they be churchmen, industrialists, labor leaders, or public servants. He, in the distant past, was a pioneer in a field where now he numbers as coworkers many who were not born until long after his labors began. It has been his good fortune to see the struggle of a few hardy souls become the pattern for the many. He as a young man took part in the prologue of the drama that now, in its last act, is approaching the happy ending. May God spare him, so that in the epilogue he may actively be part of the successful culmination, the attainment of which will have been due to the efforts of such unselfish and tireless workers as has been this man of Christ, Monsignor Lavelle.

A purse containing a large sum of money was presented to him on this occasion. But, characteristically, Monsignor Lavelle, before accepting it, insisted that it be used only for his personal charities. This purse represented offerings from the humble citizens of his old neighborhood as well as from the most affluent citizens of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this holy man knew that his end was approaching and recently wrote to Archbishop Spellman asking him to "offer up a fervent prayer to our good God that He may be merciful to me." A humble request from a humble soul. My colleagues, the following incident, which I quote from the statement made last night by Archbishop Spellman, is typical of the character of Monsignor Lavelle:

A few days ago when, at his request, I gave an absolution and a blessing, I told him that it was my intention to have his mortal remains placed in a crypt at St. Patrick's Cathedral. He smiled with joy and with gratitude when I said that I did not feel I was creating too much of a precedent in bestowing this distinction on one who had given 60 years of his priestly service in the mother church of the archdiocese of New York.

In spite of his long priestly service in the great cathedral church of St. Patrick and of the many honors that had been conferred upon him by three of the Supreme Pontiffs, he gave a final demonstration of his humble character by a smile of gratitude at the news that he was to be so singly honored by burial within the walls of the cathedral to which he gave his life in the service of God. Time may dim our memory of him, but while the walls of St. Patrick's stand, his name will be, as the phrase goes, "Ad perpetuam rei memoriam."

He has gone to his reward having fought a good fight. From high and low, from far and near, tributes are coming, and will continue to come, sent by men and women of all religions expressing their sorrow at his passing. The sorrow of the city of New York at the passing of Monsignor Lavelle is deep and finds expression in the editorials of our press.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the Somerset Daily American.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. McDOWELL introduced a resolution (H. Res. 316) authorizing the appointment of a special committee to study various United States statutes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5804. By Mr. DURHAM: Petition of 400 citizens from Greensboro, N. C., concerning neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5805. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Plymouth, Ind., and vicinity, and members of Local Union No. B-9, International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, urging the strict neutrality of this country and retention of the present arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5806. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of residents of Elk County, Pa., protesting against any revision of the existing Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5807. Also, petition of sundry residents of Franklin, Pa., and Oil City, Pa., asking retention of present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5808. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. John P. Rice, secretary, Fairview Grange, No. 446, Chester, W. Va., urging that we do all we can to keep the United States neutral and to guard against sending our young men to the battlefields of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5809. By Mr. VREELAND: Resolution by the New York Board of Trade, expressing the hope that out of the debates and conferences in the Congress now assembled there will come an act that, while it may forbid the carriage by ships of American registry of items enumerated in the present Neutrality Act, will otherwise conform to international law and keep our country neutral without setting up artificial and impractical barriers that will cut off this country from trade intercourse with much of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5810. Also, statement of the Maritime Association of the port of New York, regarding the effect of the proposed Neutrality Act on American commerce and shipping; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5811. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Legion, Macon, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a token of peace and union as set forth in the plan of the Andersonville Memorial Association; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hast created us in Thine own image and hast revealed unto us the perfection of Thy nature and Thy purpose in the manhood of Thine