HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Son of God, incarnate, O Son of Man, divine, we need Thee in the kingship of our hearts; clear our vision and bless us with Thy presence afresh. Grant us such energy of mind and vigor of heart that the tasks awaiting us may be a challenge to our powers. May our labors be so squared with the Golden Rule that they shall wisely fit into the notable structure of our Republic. We pray Thee that the mists of doubts and uncertainties which so often hide Thee may be dispensed in the light of a strong, happy faith. Heavenly Father, help us to place our hands in Thine and walk with Thee in holy trust and serene peace. We wait, again our ranks are broken; he has ended his journey and completed his honorable task. Give the blessing of abiding comfort to the family circle with thoughts that overleap the flight of time and give vision of destiny immortal. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 27, 1939, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

House Joint Resolution 306, Neutrality Act of 1939.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report (to accompany H. Res. 320):

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 320, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

House Resolution 320

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 306, the Neutrality Act of 1939, with Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the amendments of the Senate be, and the same are hereby, disagreed to and a conference is requested with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. MOUTON asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein the Navy Day speech delivered by the Honorable Charles Edison, Acting Secretary of the Navy.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered to the Virginia Grange at Winchester last week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address recently delivered by Hon. John W. Hanes, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

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

There was no objection.

COMPARATIVE PRINT OF NEUTRALITY BILLS

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I know we are all very much interested in the bill (H. J. Res. 306) which the House passed on June 30, 1939, which the Senate has amended and passed and which has just been sent back to the House. I know the people of America are much interested. I refer, of course, to the proposed amendment of the present Neutrality Act. I believe it would be valuable and enlightening not only to the Members of the House and of the Senate but also to the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if there should be inserted in the RECORD in parallel columns the present Neutrality Act—approved May 1, 1937—the pending bill (H. J. Res. 306), as it passed the House on June 30, 1939, and that same bill (H. J. Res. 306) as amended and passed by the Senate last Friday, October 27. To be of value, I believe these three documents should be printed in parallel columns and in large type; that is to say, in the same type as that in which the body of the RECORD is ordinarily printed. This would involve, however, a departure in this case only from the usual format of the RECORD. As we all know, the RECORD is ordinarily printed with two columns on a page. In this particular case there would be three columns on a page.

There has been a great deal of interest in this suggestion. I have mentioned the matter to the House members of the Joint Committee on Printing. I have also taken the liberty of mentioning the possibility to the chairman of the Joint Committee, the junior Senator from Arizona, Senator HAYDEN, and have been assured by Senator HAYDEN that there would be no objection over there to whatever the House wishes to do with this suggestion.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the present Neutrality Act, the bill (H. J. Res. 306) as it passed the House, and the bill as it passed the Senate, be printed in three parallel columns at this point in the body of the RECORD, in the issue of the RECORD for today.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Colorado that I believe it would be enlightening to the Members to have this material printed as suggested by the gentleman from Colorado. As a member of the Committee on Printing, I should like to see the cooperation of the Members of the House in this respect.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it proper, in order to conform to the established rules of practice in the House with reference to the matter covered by the request of the gentleman from Colorado, to state to the gentleman that in the conference he had with the Chair this morning relative to this matter the information was not disclosed that the request would require a change in the usual format of the RECORD. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that it would be contrary to the law with reference to printing of the RECORD to submit the request.

The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Colorado that he submit his request subject to the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I so amend the request, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Just for the information of the gentleman, may I say that it is my recollection that the Committee on Foreign Affairs have had the bill printed just in the form in which the gentleman suggests. Of course, this has not appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but my understanding is that the Committee on Foreign Affairs have had the various forms of the bill printed in three columns, just as the gentleman has suggested. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] can probably give us further information about this.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. That would not serve to inform promptly the many thousands of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD throughout the country. It is with that idea in mind that I have made the suggestion. I have understood, too, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs do not have printed the bill as passed by the Senate. Perhaps they have, but I have not as yet been so informed.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I may say for the information of the gentleman and of the House that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has already had printed and there will be distributed this afternoon comparative prints of the present law, House Joint Resolution 306 as it passed the House, and the Senate amendment. Of course, the number of copies we can have printed for the use of the committee and of the Members of the House is very small.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Is the print to which the gentleman refers in addition to the print which the committee had made previously, containing the recommendation of the Committee on Foriegn Relations of the Senate?

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman that the previous print contained the present act, the House bill and the bill as passed the House, and the Senate bill as presented to the Senate.

Mr. MAPES. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. BLOOM. In this pamphlet we have the House bill, the present law, and the bill as amended and passed by the Senate last Friday night.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman had printed as a document the same print that the gentleman from Colorado is asking to have inserted in the RECORD? Is that correct?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; if the gentleman's request is complied with, they will take the pamphlet that was printed by the Foreign Affairs Committee and insert it in the RECORD.

We have received many, many requests for the comparative print, and we are unable to see that they get out in time. If this request is complied with, the matter will be distributed throughout the country, and the Members then will have a sufficient number of copies to last them during the debate.

Mr. COX, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. MICHENER rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS] has submitted a unanimous-consent request. Does the gentleman from Georgia reserve the right to object?

Mr. COX. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman from New York intend to have this pamphlet messengered to the offices of the Representatives during the day, or where can they be obtained?

Mr. BLOOM. They will be sent around to each Member sometime this afternoon.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] how many copies will be available for the use of the Members of the House?

Mr. BLOOM. One thousand copies altogether. The trouble will be that the Members will take a copy and keep it in their offices or bring it over here one day and the next day they will not have any copies.

Mr. SWEENEY. The number that the gentleman requests is too small. Why cannot we enlarge that so that every Member may have an ample supply?

Mr. BLOOM. I am not allowed to do that, under the rules.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. The pamphlet or the document referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is frankable, is it not?

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair it would be frankable.

Mr. MICHENER. The same as a speech if printed in the RECORD would be frankable, as suggested by the gentleman from Colorado?

The SPEAKER. A speech?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; or an extension of remarks.

The SPEAKER. Yes; that is true. It would be frankable in either event.

Mr. MICHENER. My next question is whether Members of Congress or anyone else may secure copies of the document to which the gentleman from New York has referred to be sent out the same as we send out a speech, and be sent out at the same rates, comparatively?

The SPEAKER. They could be sent out by the Members if they paid for the printing of the document.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the point, whether or not the one document could be secured and sent out broadcast under a frank, the same as the other.

The SPEAKER. Undoubtedly, the document in any form would be frankable.

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

The SPEAKER. Just a moment, please. The Chair desires to make a statement to clarify the matter. As the Chair understands the situation the Committee on Foreign Affairs was merely authorized to have a thousand copies of the document referred to by the gentleman from New York printed. The Senate is entitled to share in the distribution of the 1,000 copies, the remainder going to the House. That document would undoubtedly be frankable. If any Member desired to purchase through the Printing Office or have printed additional copies of the same document, they would be frankable if the request of the gentleman from Colorado is granted. Of course, his statement together with the document would be frankable.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not propose to object; but for the sake of accuracy and the RECORD, I would like to know when the Committee on Foreign Affairs has met to pass on this question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot answer that question.

Mr. FISH. I would like to propound the question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BLOOM. The Committee on Foreign Affairs got out these pamphlets without any meeting. I did not think that was necessary. I assumed we had the right, or the chairman had the right, to publish this pamphlet for the benefit of the Members of the House.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to the proposal of the gentleman. I just want the gentleman from New York to state it is his own proposal and not that of the committee.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DICTATORSHIP AND DEMOCRACY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order granted for today and as I understand the House will adjourn out of respect for the death of a Member of the House, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak today about the struggle between dictatorship and democracy, about the battle to maintain human liberty.

AMERICA'S WORK FOR PEACE

If the pages of history could, in future, record that a Europe on the brink of war was saved by American statesmanship from that catastrophe, those would be the most truly happy pages that have ever been written in all that long narrative of human struggle. It is my earnest hope that all of us will

seize upon every possible opportunity to contribute whatever we can to prevent the impending destruction of civilization on the European Continent. The idea that any good purpose can be served by a military victory seems to me absurd. If a long war takes place, not only will there be constant danger of its spreading to other parts of the world but the only forces that can possibly hope to gain will be those which feed on disintegration, degradation, and utter collapse. Perhaps it is realization of this fact that has given pause in this hour to the combatants and caused them to refrain on both sides from striking blows that would make peace impossible. And while I believe passionately that America should not, under any circumstances, participate in that war, I believe quite as passionately that if America's help can be instrumental in bringing about a decent lasting peace we should not hesitate to do all things to that end. Our President could ask no greater honor or no more worthy place in history than to be the one who brought peace when there might have been war. Perhaps he may yet accomplish that.

THE REAL DANGER

I say these things the more earnestly because I believe the real issue is today obscured and seldom mentioned. For it is not enough merely to say that dictatorship has challenged democracy; it is also necessary to ask why this is so. It is not enough to complain of Hitler's obvious ruthlessness when dealing with smaller and relatively helpless states; it is also necessary to examine the purely economic measures that have been taken within Germany herself. It is not enough to consider ways and means of defending democracy by force of arms, for in all probability that just cannot be done and certainly unless the democracies mend their economic ways in some important particulars the end result will only be a deeper and wider world depression than ever. What must be done is to find the real danger that confronts democracy today. I am convinced that that danger is to be found in the fact that democracy, carrying the incubus of nineteenth-century-finance capitalism, still suffers from unemployment and depression whereas dictatorship has for some reason succeeded in putting its people to work and achieving something like full production. The price of this latter achievement is one too heavy for an American to be willing to pay if that price includes succumbing to a Stalin or a Hitler dictatorship. But I am convinced that the price for the abolition of unemployment is a very small one indeed, convinced that it does not include succumbing to any dictatorship at all, and convinced that the very future of democracy depends not on the outcome of a war but on the adoption by the democracies of a sound economic policy which will do away with unemployment. As a measure of keeping America out of war, I am of the opinion that the Neutrality Act with or without an arms embargo is of minor consequence. The way to keep America out of war is to keep America absorbed in a great national effort to end unemployment in this country.

It is not Hitler's or Stalin's destruction of their people's freedom that we need fear. It is their claim of putting all their people to work. And even if Hitler should be destroyed, if the problems of unemployment and poverty in the midst of plenty remain, will not the survivors of the war ask with one accord, "What price victory?"

THE PRESENT INCREASE IN PRODUCTION

Let us consider for a moment the present ridiculous situation. We are witnessing an improvement in business in the United States. After years of the most earnest effort to increase production for the purpose of meeting the truly desperate needs of the American people we now find that production is actually on a sharp increase because a war is in progress in Europe. Steel production is the highest on record. The Federal Reserve Index of production stood at 110 for September. In other words, although the wheels of our industry would not turn to meet basic human needs in America, they have proven very responsive to the demands of another continent for the weapons of destruction. We are about to achieve a tawdry prosperity by the astonishing method of shipping the mineral wealth and the soil fertility of America to Europe. The reason for this tragic contradiction of the most elementary common sense lies, I believe, primarily in the fact that, although nations know well enough how to expand their credit to finance war, they have not yet put into operation any workable or scientific method of creating the money and credit necessary to make the human demand of their people an effective demand in the market place. And, furthermore, it cannot be emphasized too strongly or too often that the increase in production which has taken place has not been accompanied by even half as large a percentage of increase in employment. This means, to me at least, that we have got to revamp in fundamental fashion our system of distributing buying power in this country. Increased production simply does not any longer mean corresponding increases in employment.

WE NEED THE SIMPLE TRUTH

The old patterns of political thought and the old dogmas of political and economic systems are today either completely discredited or at least lacking in any dynamic appeal.

The battle between communism and fascism in Europe has turned into a Russo-German pact, and from this we learn that the hierarchy of both systems is forced to concern itself primarily with power, more power, and the maintenance of power. Those who have tried to draw sharp distinctions between these two systems are baffled and frustrated as they should be. No longer can an antifascist front be a rallying point for the forces of the left or an anticommunist front for the forces of the right. The old cry of "let business alone" is almost exactly the same as that of some sections of the labor movement. Great movements have arisen in this country advocating one sweeping change, such as a national old-age pension; but in all other matters clinging to a most conservative philosophy. The most ardent opponents of communism are progressives and radicals who have seen the inner workings of the Communist machine at close range. There is gradually emerging a "small business" movement which may turn out to be a more bitter opposition to monopoly than labor has ever been. In democratic nations conservatives and liberals unite together to save liberty. In totalitarian nations built on destruction of the labor movement and the preservation of private property we have seen private property rights reduced to a mere pretense under the overshadowing power of the state. In totalitarian nations built on dictatorship of the proletariat we have seen the proletariat itself denied freedom and the right of protest and reduced to a state similar to that which it suffers in Fascist countries. Yet only the totalitarian nations have eliminated unemployment, and economic inequalities within their borders are less sharp than in the so-called democracies.

To add the final and ultimate element to the confusion, war—the complete denial of all order—has broken out and threatens to destroy the whole structure of European civilization.

There remains for us one reliance—the one that has not yet been tried either by Communists, Fascists, Nazis, Conservatives, Reactionaries, or Liberals. That reliance is the truth—the truth about all things, including the mistakes of one's own school of thought and the strength of the systems one has been taught to despise. It is to that truth that we must turn.

DEMOCRACY REQUIRES EMPLOYMENT

Liberty and democracy are like stately flowers. Regimentation and dictatorship are like tough, rank weeds. The reason is that all men love liberty, but they desire more than liberty to see bread in their children's mouths and to know that their own constructive labor has put it there. The flower of democracy can only grow in soil that has been moistened by the sweat from the brow of a people constructively and steadily employed and hopeful for a brighter day. The weed of dictatorship need fear no lack of moisture. For its soil is moistened by the blood of men who would be free.

NEED OF THE WORLD

The central truth about this struggle of democracy and dictatorship is this: The whole future of human civilization, the whole chance of the survival of human happiness and

art and peace, and above all religion, depends upon the raising up among the nations of the world of at least one people who will demonstrate the way to preserve liberty and at the same time to conquer the economic problem of the machine age and—without war or the help of war—to make the machine the servant of mankind instead of his dumb, ruthless master. America will lose her manifest destiny unless she becomes that people.

Apparently it takes great and terrible events to rouse men out of their smug complacency and their cynical assumption that great changes for good are impossible in their time. Those great and terrible events are here—now, today—and the spirit of liberty waits to see whether the complacency and cynicism of the United States Congress will be burned away by the fire of those events before war engulfs the world.

The great division between people in America today is between those on the one hand who would use this war as a convenient escape from the necessity of attacking and solving our domestic problems, and those on the other hand who are willing to take those bold steps which can and will give us an economic order in which neither loss of freedom nor the sacrifice of young men will be required to end the greatest social crime in all history—poverty in the midst of plenty. As a matter of cold, hard fact, I believe we are going to have to take the second way anyhow, for I do not believe a war-trade boom will even come near to putting our unemployed people to work—even if we should be foolish enough to allow one to develop.

WE MUST PREVENT PROFITEERING NOW

I believe it is most important for us to provide before it is to late a tax program which will effectively prevent a false and unhealthy boom based upon war orders. Between 1914 and 1917 profits in certain lines of American industry rose from 80 to 150 percent above pre-European war levels. The desire to maintain these profit margins was one of the most powerful influences that drove this country into war. To permit this to happen again would be nothing short of criminal. Entirely aside from what may be done about so-called neutrality legislation, our clear duty is to prevent in every possible way the dislocation of our economy through a war-trade boom.

There are several possible ways to do this. The most direct one would be by the establishment of peacetime quotas for our trade with foreign nations. The Senate, unfortunately, has decisively defeated such a proposal. Another way would be by direct price control. We may indeed have to come to something of that sort to protect consumers, but I freely recognize there would be most serious opposition to it. The remaining method is by excess-profits taxation sufficiently severe to discourage overexpansion of war industries and to leave small incentive for exorbitant increases in prices. Incidentally the additional revenue is badly needed to finance necessary governmental measures to combat unemployment.

To allow profiteering means to permit certain producers to take far more than their share of currently produced income. Someone else—either another group now, future taxpayers, or the Nation as a whole—must pay the price.

To allow profiteering means to obscure under a cheap, gaudy cloak the real conditions of our country's economy. The greatest danger to our democracy today is that we will be content to use that cloak instead of facing our problem like men.

A BETTER STANDARD OF LIVING IS THE WAY TO REEMPLOYMENT

Therefore, we have got to have a dynamic program to end unemployment for our democratic people in America, and this is our one paramount duty in this struggle for freedom. Such a program would do far more to combat un-American activities than any other measures that could possibly be taken. In devising such a program, we cannot be dogmatic and we cannot go to any systems of economic theory for our direction. We cannot cast measures aside simply by pinning labels on them. They may be exactly what we need. We have got to be hard-headed realists for once, and everybody has got to admit where he has been wrong. We have got to study what has been done in other nations to determine how they have overcome unemployment. And we cannot be afraid of their economic measures, even if we do not like their politics. There is one main thing that has got to be accomplished, and that is to get our people back to work and to start making a full use of our abundant resources. Generally speaking, there is only one way we can do this decently, and that is by raising the standard of living of our own American people to a point where their demand for goods will require full production to meet it. In the past America got full employment by sending her unemployed out into the virgin lands of the West and by the general method of geographical expansion. More recently some of the nations of Europe have achieved it by instituting huge armament programs. During the World War America had full employment for a few brief giddy years, because we were supplying materials to warring nations.

Indeed, since the coming of the machine age there has been no extended period when full employment was achieved by any capitalistic nation except when it was either operating on a wartime economy or expanding its export trade and sending the wealth of its own people to other nations, there, in many cases, to be used for the business of destruction. There is a great truth in the challenge of a prominent American industrialist when he says:

> If we have to have a war to create and maintain a workable financial system, there must be something tragically wrong with our financial system. It is time then to turn back to Congress the control of that system.

When Baron Rothschild said, "Let me control the money of a nation and I care not who makes its laws," he spoke prophetic words. For he put his finger on the key to our present ridiculous dilemma where our peculiar financial system forbids cotton garments to American cotton pickers while it turns the cotton into dynamite for European consumption, takes the steel and foodstuffs and materials for homes that is needed by our own people and whirls them abroad into the outstretched arms of warring nations. There is more than one cause of this condition, of course. But I am eager that we see clearly how ridiculous it is. Nations know how to create credits for war, how to tax for war, and how to plan for war, and when they do so they have full employment; why then cannot we learn to create credits for peace, to tax for peace, to plan for peace, and for a higher standard of living for our people, and thus to get full employment just the same. And may I point out to those who may feel that my argument is an argument for the restriction of export trade that unless you are willing to take the measures necessary to give all our people work in peaceful pursuits, to give us a money and credit system that will sustain that employment, and to institute such tax measures and such measures of control over monopoly power as will enable full production to take place and will give us a balance between capital goods and consumers' income—unless you are willing to do these things you have no right to argue for a restriction of the export trade. What I am arguing for is a healthy economic condition at home wherein the people are able to consume what they produce and then for a foreign trade which will be based on the mutual advantage of two nations each trading its surplus for products from abroad which it needs for its domestic economy.

OUR CENTRAL TROUBLE

Basically our trouble is that we have too much money in a few hands, not enough in others, we have more idle funds available for investment than can possibly be invested profitably under present conditions and too little buying power in the hands of the millions of our people to either enable them to live decently or to form an adequate consumers' market for the new investments in capital goods that ought to be but are not being made. The thing is a vicious circle and it must be broken. We must understand that we are up against no temporary condition.

THE MONEY ILLUSION

We have got to realize that in an age of highly technical production it is absolutely necessary for the flow of money and credit in the markets of the Nation to bear a scientific relationship to productive capacity. And we have got to realize that if industry and agriculture are to be free and if our economy is not to suffer periodic spasms of collapse it is

absolutely necessary that control over the creation of the money of the Nation be taken out of the hands of private bankers and placed in the hands of Congress, where the Constitution says it belongs.

For unless we do this our industry and agriculture must continue to be the slaves of private finance, and we can never achieve a condition where our economy will be protected against the sharp inflation and deflation of values which has been so disastrous in the past. Indeed, most people do not stop to realize that the real worth of our food, our houses, our property, and wealth of every sort changes but slowly and over long periods of time. People gain the same nourishment from bread and the same shelter from a house in depression as in prosperity. Yet the prices of these things may be many times as high in a boom as in a depression. This is because the buying power of the dollar has changed, and, since all values are measured in dollars, we think the values of real wealth have changed. If we would end unemployment, we must end this ridiculous illusion and, having reestablished prosperity, must thereafter maintain a constant stable relationship between the flow of goods and the flow of money, or, to put it another way around, we must maintain a stable buying power in our dollar.

Following out this line, it is, I believe, plain to be seen that the New Deal has been basically right in what it has tried to do. It has tried—and with marked success over considerable periods—to increase the volume of active buying power of the people because there was idle productive power lying around and not being used. Two adjustments of this general program are, I believe, necessary. The first is that enough new money or credit must be put into circulation over not too long a time to actually bring about full use of productive capacity. The second is that so long as an additional volume of money or national credit is needed by the national economy as a whole and so long as this money or national credit can be matched by increases in the production of goods, just that long no real inflation is possible, and the new money or national credit should be put into circulation directly by Congress and not borrowed into circulation by means of bond issues.

A PLAN OF ACTION

If I could do only four things right now, here is what they would be:

First. Passage of a tax and pension bill which would actually accomplish the vitally necessary shift of about $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000 annually from the idle hoards which seek but do not find profitable investment in new capital goods into the consumer buying power of the aged, the disabled veteran of war or industry, the widowed mother all over the land. Do this and the standard of living of our people will be raised to the level where there will be room for the profitable investment of the balance of the Nation's savings.

Second. Passage of necessary legislation to give us a long-range public-works program to afford employment for all unemployed persons in the creation of such social capital as hospitals, highways, forests, power dams, reclamation dams, and low-cost housing. As quickly as private employment began to absorb the unemployed, this program would be curtailed. As quickly as unemployment increased, again it would be expanded.

Third. Passage of legislation which will break up monopoly control wherever possible, or if that is not possible, then compel monopoly industries to produce at a fair price up to the limits of consumer needs or else—in cases of essential public services—provide for public ownership, either by municipalities or by the Federal Government.

But most important perhaps, because most immediately effective, I would exercise the sovereign right of this Nation to utilize its own credit and to create its own money on the basis of its wealth in order to bring about full employment of our people within 6 months' time. It could, I am convinced, be done. I would put every dollar of this money or credit into circulation without any increase in the public debt. But I would not put out one single dollar beyond what was calculated to be necessary to match the resulting increase in production. There cannot be inflation as long as increasing volume of money is matched by increasing production. The moment we achieve full production and full employment the expansion should cease. A considerable portion of this expansion should, I believe, be accomplished by making credit available on fair terms to small-business men. The rate of interest should not only be low; it must be low enough to induce our businessmen to go ahead. All such credit would finance increased production, upon which, indeed, the credit itself would be based.

Another portion I would use for Government investment in such things as conservation, power development, low-cost housing, and reforestation; in short, in a public-works program wherein tangible and substantial additions to the wealth of the Nation would be made in fields where it is not profitable for private enterprise to venture. Principally, however, the expansion we need is expansion of the consuming power of our people. I would institute a national old-age pension and expand the social-security program, and, until such time as the productive capacity of our Nation had been put to work, I would use the sovereign power of the Nation to create its own medium of exchange as one source of funds for this purpose. Once our people are back at work creating either consumers' goods or capital goods or social capital, once our power to produce is all at work, then we must stop our policy of expansion and add to the volume of money and credit in circulation only to the extent that normal increases take place in our national productive capacity. But when that time comes, with everyone at work and a national income of over a hundred billion dollars being turned out, it will be entirely possible without an excessive tax burden to carry on such a program as I have outlined upon the basis of a balanced Budget.

When it is said that all other reform waits on monetary reform, I believe that is true and that we cannot have today both a balanced Budget and the absolutely essential measures to meet the unemployment problem. To do both these things—to beat unemployment and balance the Budget—will become entirely possible the moment we start exercising the constitutional duty of Congress to issue the Nation's money and regulate its value. The gentlemen who complain of increasing Government debt forget that so long as our present debt-money system is in effect Government debt must be increased whenever private agencies fail to increase their debt. For it is only on the basis of somebody's debt that we can today obtain any increase in our medium of exchange at all.

If it is objected that we now have over $5,000,000,000 of excess reserves in the banks—as we have—and that expansion of national money and credit might bring about a bank credit inflation, then I reply once again that this is only further proof of the necessity of monetary reform and of requiring dollar-for-dollar reserves behind all demand deposits in our banks. Now is the time of times to institute this change.

SIMPLE PROGRAM

We can win the fight for freedom and democracy and we can defeat dictatorship only if we win the battle for jobs and full production. Boiled down to its simplest terms, the way we can do this is as follows:

First. Increase the volume of credit for competitive production and social investment and the volume of money in the hands of consumers of goods in sufficient amount to secure full production and full employment.

Second. Establish and maintain a sufficiently effective and scientific tax program and pension and social-security system so that once full production has been brought about it can be maintained with a balanced Federal Budget and a dollar of stable buying power.

Third. As soon as unemployment appears, put every unemployed person to work, creating needed social capital.

The one serious obstacle in the way of this program, upon which the hope of democracy depends, is fear of debt. That fear must be removed. It can be done in only one way. That is by means of such reforms in our monetary and credit system, as I have outlined in this speech and tried to incorporate in my bills, especially H. R. 4931. And the heart and soul of this reform lies in the exercise by Congress of the sovereign right of the Nation to issue its own money and create its own credit without the sale of bonds or the contraction of debt, but upon the soundest security in the

world—the productive power of the people of the United States. Most of the basic legislation to make possible a program of this kind is at the moment before the Congress. As exhibits A and B, I submit my own bills, H. R. 4931 and H. R. 5910, which would make possible the carrying out of a monetary and credit policy such as I have outlined.

Do we care enough about democracy and freedom and our country to do these things? Are we deeply enough stirred over the plight of millions of our people who are in need while factories and mills work feverishly on war orders to do these things? Are we really in earnest about this struggle against dictatorship? If we are, we will fight first and hardest on our home front and we will set our teeth and vow here and now that whatever things are necessary to banish unemployment from this great land of ours, those things we will do.

The democratic way out of unemployment—the way out that will leave our economic system even freer than it is now—the way out that will be a fulfillment of the basic principles of our constitutional democracy lies along the road of governmental action to effect and maintain an equation between the power of the Nation to produce and the power of its people to consume.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an address which I delivered last night over the National Broadcasting Co. network.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter which I have received from the Consumers Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter written by Secretary Hull.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INCREASING NAVAL DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am filing today a resolution asking for the appointment by the Secretary of the Navy of a special board to investigate the need of increasing the naval defenses of the United States and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein an estimate of the approximate cost of doubling the present size of the Navy, and other information along that line.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the Members of the House for a short period in order that I may discuss a matter which I believe is of vital interest to the people of this country. Much has been said on the floor of the House as well as on the public platform throughout the Nation concerning the question of building up the naval defenses of the United States, and for the past few years the House Committee on Naval Affairs has been giving unstintingly of its time and study to these same needs of the Nation.

The Members of the House, I am sure, are quite well acquainted with the purpose and results of the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1922, when representatives of the various naval powers of the world gathered in Washington and discussed the question of reducing their respective naval armaments and the stopping of the naval race that was threatening their economic and financial structures and leading to bankruptcy and ruin.

The people of the world were extremely happy when these representatives entered into an agreement placing limitations on the tonnage of naval armaments for each of the countries affected. The representatives of the United States were foremost among those pleading for real, substantial reductions, and the results of the conference clearly show that the United States made the greatest sacrifices of any of the nations involved. In accordance with the provisions of the Washington treaty, the United States scrapped 4 dreadnaughts, 15 predreadnaughts, 7 new battleships building, 4 battle cruisers building, making a total of 30 ships scrapped under the agreement. These ships represented a total tonnage scrapped of 755,380, for which the people of this country had already paid $277,695,994.

The Washington treaty brought great hope to the hearts of the people of the world that the naval-armament race had been brought to an end and that sanity prevailed once more in this particular respect. For a period of years after the Washington conference disputes arose when some of the nations concerned by the agreement attempted to circumvent the spirit of the conference by embarking on a major program calling for the building of certain types of ships which were not included in the agreement and which would, of course, place them in an advantageous position over the other nations. For the most part, these difficulties were ironed out and the ratio of tonnage inspired by the Washington agreement was maintained until 1936, when one of the agreeing countries, namely, Japan, declared she no longer wished to continue a party to the pact.

We are now well aware of the complete break-down of the naval disarmament pact when other nations invoked the escape clause, declaring that they, too, no longer wished to be parties to the agreement. After a lapse of 14 years we saw in evidence the beginning of another race among the great naval powers of the world. In view of these developments the Seventy-fifth Congress authorized an increase of 20 percent in the tonnage of the United States Fleet. This race in recent months has been going on in great earnest, and today hovers like a dark cloud over the people of the world.

In the light of world-wide turmoil, with war and threats of war hanging over our heads, the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, Members of Congress, as well as citizens throughout the Nation, are wondering just how effective the United States Navy would be even with the authorized increase in strength in any possible emergencies that might arise. The United States Navy today, in my opinion, is equal in efficiency to any of the great powers of the world, but we have a tremendous coast line on both sides of the country to protect as well as our insular possessions, and the question is, How well are we able to do that with the present fleet if attacked on both shores at the same time?

It may be said by some that there is no likelihood of this thing happening because it did not happen before. But it can happen. Things have happened during our lifetime that no one would have dreamed about. We ought to be able to meet these difficulties if and when they ever arise.

We have on the statute books of our country a neutrality law which, in substance, says and means that we do not intend to become involved in any war, any place, with any belligerent nation. The very purpose of the act is to make us strictly neutral. If that is the policy of the United States, as we know it is, we should remember that we can expect no help from other countries when danger threatens us. Admiral Leahy, former Chief of Naval Operations, has informed us that we have a Navy that can afford protection to one coast at a time; and, to use his own words in speaking before the House Naval Affairs Committee 2 years ago:

> If both coasts were threatened, there is not sufficient strength in the proposed navy to guard both coasts.

That statement has interested many Members of the House and people throughout the country and has resulted in many speeches being made in favor of enlarging the present fleet. I have before me letters from the Acting Secretary of the Navy giving information relative to the approximate estimated cost of doubling the size of the present fleet. I have sought this information, not because I have any definite opinion that it should be doubled but simply for the purpose of presenting these figures for the interest of the Members of the House.

These figures show that the approximate estimated cost of doubling the size of our fleet is $3,600,000,000. In addition to that, the cost of additional shore facilities necessary to take care of maintenance requirements for the proposed expansion program is about $622,500,000. The increase in personnel is estimated at 105,792 officers, warrant officers, and

enlisted men. For the benefit of the Members, I am placing these communications and figures from Acting Secretary of the Navy H. R. Stark in the RECORD. They are as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 19, 1939.

Hon. GEORGE J. BATES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BATES: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of September 26, 1939, requesting an estimate of the cost of doubling the size of the present fleet, including necessary auxiliaries. I regret that, due to the increased amount of work occasioned by the present situation, there has been a delay in replying.

To make an accurate estimate of the cost of doubling our present fleet is impracticable, as it would depend on a number of unknown factors, such as the characteristics of the different types which might be built, the cost of materials and labor during the estimated building period, and the rate at which the program would be completed, i. e., the additional building facilities which would be required. However, the approximate estimated cost of reproducing exactly all ships and aircraft in commission on June 30, 1939 (excluding the cost of doubling the 109 destroyers, 38 submarines, and 18 auxiliaries then out of commission) is as follows:

Combatant ships	$3,000,000,000
Auxiliary ships	450,000,000
Planes	150,000,000
Total	3,600,000,000

The above figures do not include the cost of maintenance, nor do they include the cost of additional shore facilities.

Based on the assumption that a 50-percent increase in personnel ashore and a 100-percent increase in personnel afloat would be required, the estimated additional personnel which would be necessary is:

Officers	7,050
Warrant officers	1,418
Enlisted men	97,324

Sincerely yours,

H. R. STARK,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, October 27, 1939.

Hon. GEORGE J. BATES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BATES: Supplementing my letters of October 19 and 25 and replying to your oral request for information as to the shore facilities necessary to complement the hypothetical increases in ships and aircraft, I am pleased to furnish the following information:

Estimated cost of shore facilities (exclusive of shipbuilding facilities) which would be necessitated by the increase in ships	[1] $517,500,000
Estimated cost of shore facilities to complement the increased number of aircraft	[2] 105,000,000
Total	622,500,000

Sincerely yours,

H. R. STARK,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

[1] This expenditure is not in addition to the funds required to make good the deficiencies in the present shore establishment since we are now required to make provision for possible operation of the present fleet on either coast.

[2] These facilities are not in addition to the requirements recommended by the Hepburn board.

I personally do not feel there is any necessity for the doubling of the present Navy fleet, or bringing about such a tremendous expenditure of public money. We are confronted with certain realities and due consideration must be given to all the facts involved, and to that end I am filing a resolution today which provides that the Secretary of the Navy shall be authorized and directed to appoint a naval board consisting of not less than five officers to investigate and report upon the need of increasing the naval defenses of the United States, including such naval bases, naval stations, and other shore activities as may be necessary to complement the forces afloat and in the air. The Secretary of the Navy is further directed to cause the report of the board to be transmitted to the Congress during the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

There is a vital need for such a board to study the question of expanding the present fleet to such strength and efficiency that it would be forbearance against any nations desirous of attacking us. The findings of such a board would help us determine the size of the fleet and shore activities needed in the light of world conditions, and our desire to safeguard our shores and our vital interests; also to promote peace.

Our geographical position in the world, with the obvious danger to the splitting of our fleet in the event of a destruction of the Panama Canal, makes it necessary that for our complete protection we give serious consideration to a substantial enlargement of our present fleet in order to meet any exigencies that may arise in the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans.

At present our main Navy force is on the west coast, with a few war craft in the Atlantic. The Panama Canal defenses are being greatly strengthened, but this does not mean that this important artery is invulnerable, and should the Canal be destroyed or damaged, the fleet would have to go by the long voyage around the Horn in order to reach the Atlantic.

The world situation is fraught with danger, and we cannot remain impassive while the highwaymen in Europe and Asia take everything they want at pistol point. This is but one of the many questions and conditions to be taken into consideration by the special Navy board provided for in my resolution, relative to the need of a fleet in the Atlantic and the Pacific competent independently of carrying out the policy of the United States in those waters and adequately safeguarding our shores and insular possessions.

In view of the naval building program other nations are engaged in, it is imperative that we see to it that we are not put to any great disadvantage in the naval defenses of the United States, particularly in view of the extended coast line that we must defend and which is much longer than that of any other nation.

The extent of the defensive coast lines of the principal naval powers follows:

	Miles
United States	3,800
Great Britain	1,860
Japan	1,440
France	1,100
Italy	1,380
Germany	720

This is the approximate coast line of the countries which it would be necessary to defend. It does not include possessions.

For the information of the Members of the House of Representatives, I have had tabulated a schedule of the naval strengths of the various countries of the world. The same is listed below:

Naval strength of various countries from information received up to July 1, 1939

[Source: U. S. Navy Department]

CAPITAL SHIPS

Nation	Under-age		Over-age		Total		Building and appropriated for		Grand total	
	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Estimated tons	Number	Approximate tons
United States	14	438,200	1	26,100	15	464,300	8	300,000	23	764,300
British Empire	18	495,500			18	495,500	9	335,000	27	830,500
Japan	10	301,400	1	7,080	11	308,480	3	121,000	14	[1] 429,480
France	7	163,945			7	163,945	4	140,000	11	303,945
Italy	9	99,498	1	9,232	10	108,730	4	140,000	14	248,730
Germany	5	82,000	2	26,000	7	108,080	4	150,000	11	258,080
Russia [2]	3	69,878			3	69,878	3	105,000	6	174,878

[1] Best obtainable due to fact that Japanese Government does not give out data.
[2] Best obtainable due to fact that Soviet Government does not give out data.

Naval strength of various countries from information received up to July 1, 1939—Continued

[Source: U. S. Navy Department]

Nation	Under-age		Over-age		Total		Building and appropriated for		Grand total	
	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Approximate tons	Number	Estimated tons	Number	Approximate tons
AIRCRAFT CARRIERS										
United States	5	120,100			5	120,100	2	34,500	7	154,600
British Empire	7	127,700	2	20,900	9	148,600	7	138,000	16	286,600
Japan	11	146,520			11	146,520	2	25,000	13	171,520
France	2	32,146			2	32,146	2	36,000	4	68,146
Italy										
Germany							2	38,500	2	38,500
Russia [2]	1	9,000			1	9,000	2	24,000	3	33,000
HEAVY CRUISERS										
United States	17	161,200			17	161,200	1	10,000	18	171,200
British Empire	15	145,620			15	145,620			15	145,620
Japan	12	107,800	5	45,250	17	153,050			17	153,050
France	7	70,000			7	70,000			7	70,000
Italy	7	70,000			7	70,000			7	70,000
Germany	2	20,000			2	20,000	3	30,000	5	50,000
Russia [2]	3	24,030			3	24,030	5	40,000	8	64,030
LIGHT CRUISERS										
United States	17	137,775			17	137,775	8	60,000	25	197,775
British Empire	24	185,945	23	108,690	47	294,635	25	146,500	72	44,135
Japan	15	97,555	8	35,080	23	132,635	5	[1] 44,000	28	[1] 176,635
France	11	79,729			11	79,729	3	24,000	14	103,729
Italy	12	74,488	2	6,430	14	80,918	14	56,344	28	137,262
Germany	6	35,600			6	35,600	4	28,000	10	63,600
Russia [2]	3	17,034	2	11,960	5	28,994			5	28,994
DESTROYERS										
United States	54	84,190	167	189,300	221	273,490	43	68,380	264	341,870
British Empire	107	154,114	71	79,245	178	233,359	37	37,350	215	270,709
Japan	75	106,798	36	34,950	111	141,748	9	[1] 14,900	120	[1] 156,648
France	70	120,286	1	915	71	121,201	30	46,776	101	167,977
Italy	100	111,936	30	21,227	130	133,163	12	15,200	142	148,363
Germany	32	42,844	12	8,237	44	51,081	10	18,110	54	69,191
Russia [2]	23	25,024	14	15,883	37	40,907	10	26,295	47	67,202
SUBMARINES										
United States	22	34,435	67	48,740	89	83,175	25	35,250	114	118,425
British Empire	45	52,469	10	4,450	55	56,919	18	15,690	73	72,609
Japan	40	59,261	19	17,602	59	76,863	3	[1] 6,000	62	[1] 82,863
France	75	72,709			75	72,709	27	24,252	102	96,961
Italy	98	77,248	7	2,456	105	79,704	28	30,986	133	110,690
Germany	50	19,709			50	19,709	21	11,573	71	31,282
Russia [2]	[3] 114	[3] 59,897	[3] 8	[3] 4,368	[3] 122	[3] 64,265	[3] 19	[3] 12,158	[3] 141	[3] 76,423

[1] Best obtainable due to fact that Japanese Government does not give out data.
[2] Best obtainable due to fact that Soviet Government does not give out data.
[3] Estimated.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I had 10 minutes granted to me under a special order for today. In view of the change in the program, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we are advised that tomorrow the amendment to the Neutrality Act, that has just passed the Senate after 5 weeks of deliberation and debate, will be submitted to the House of Representatives for consideration. This legislation is of Nation-wide and even world-wide significance. It involves one of the most momentous problems that has ever challenged the membership of Congress, as well as the minds of our people. It deals with the policy of our Government toward countries that are at war or may become engaged in war.

Mr. Speaker, immediately following the roll call on this measure at the other end of the Capitol the distinguished leader of the other branch of Congress announced that, in his judgment, the House would be through with the bill and it would be back for final consideration by Thursday, and not later than Friday, of this week. We are further given to understand today, through the press and other sources, that House debate will be limited to only a few hours, and no opportunity will be given to amend the bill.

Mr. Speaker, does that mean that this membership is not to be consulted? Are we to become subservient to the body at the other end of the Capitol—rubber stamps on such important legislation? They saw fit to strike out most of the provisions of the measure that was passed by this House last summer, and wrote their own version. I am not criticizing that action. Now we are informed through the press that the leadership of this House expects its membership to accept that measure in its entirety after only a few hours' debate and with no chance to offer amendments.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of the position the Members may take concerning the repeal of the arms embargo, as well as other sections of this bill, a move to bring the resolution to a vote without giving the membership a chance to offer amendments, or even fair opportunity to be heard on the measure, is undemocratic. It is a "gag rule" of the worst kind. On a number of occasions protest has been made against the invoking of a gag rule in this House, but to use it at this time on a measure of such importance is wrong and should be resented by the people of this country. It is a reflection upon Congress itself. Such procedure should not be tolerated. It is not fair treatment to the Members of the House or the people they represent.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is too important to be handled in such a manner. The question involved transcends all politics and party lines. I have no patience with any Member of the House or anyone else who suggests that this is a partisan issue. It is not. It should not be treated as such.

I believe a great majority of the membership are in accord with and approve many of the provisions of this resolution. They want to support many of its safeguards. But, Mr. Speaker, here is a bill that was written by the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee as a substitute for House Resolution 306. Approximately 30 amendments were afterward adopted on the floor of the Senate. Now we are told we must take this bill in its entirety or not at all. We must either vote it up or down, and we must do it right away.

Since the other branch of this Congress has seen fit to write entirely new provisions into the House bill, is it not only fair and decent that we should be entitled to vote upon these provisions separately? What possible objection could be made to doing it? There are a great many Members in this House who will gladly support many of the provisions of this resolution. There are a number of us who believe, for example, that the embargo on death-dealing instruments of war should be retained and who also favor the so-called cash-and-carry provisions on other commodities. We have no way of expressing our views in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, here is a measure that grants additional powers and authority to the executive department of government in a time of national emergency. Congress has heretofore surrendered more authority to the President than was ever given a Chief Executive in the history of our country. It may be that the majority of the membership want to do this very thing. But they should have a chance to approve or disapprove such action. There are some of us who believe this measure places too much responsibility in the hands of one man in the time of world crisis. Do you realize that under the provisions of section 1 of this resolution the powers granted the President are discretionary, and not mandatory? It is within his power to invoke its terms. He may do so or he may not. It is left to his judgment, and his judgment alone.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution describes and determines the policy as well as the attitude that the United States will take toward warring nations of the world. There are those who support this measure who believe we are obligated to render assistance on one side of the present conflict. There are others supporting its provisions who believe we should remain entirely neutral, and that this measure will preserve that neutrality. Certainly that issue is entitled to reasonable debate.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution grants to the munition makers of America the right and authority to sell death-dealing instruments of war. Under this bill we may manufacture and sell bombing planes, lethal and all kinds of poisonous gases, used for the wholesale destruction of life not only of soldiers of war but innocent men, women, and children. This resolution provides that the United States can become a great arsenal for the warring nations of the world; and yet, Mr. Speaker, we are told that on a measure of such grave importance to the people of this country, we may discuss it for a couple of days and then vote it up or down.

Mr. Speaker, is it fair that 96 Members of the other branch of this Congress should spend 4 weeks' time in the discussion and formulation of this bill, and that the House of Representatives, with 435 Members, also representing 130,000,000 people of this country and likewise responsible to them for their actions on this legislation, should be allowed 2 days, or possibly 3, during which to debate it? Do we not have a right to expect a reasonable length of time during which to express our views? Do we not have a right to change its provisions, as the majority thinks it should be done?

This bill contains eight Senate amendments adopted for the purpose of freeing American shipping and exporters from earlier restrictions that had been imposed. Newspapers today state that "the shipping interests won an unexpectedly big victory and secured from the Senate more than was first believed possible." Is it not proper that these concessions should be carefully examined and fully debated?

Mr. Speaker, I know it is the will of the great majority of the membership of this House that no steps shall be taken and no move shall be made that might aggravate the situation between the United States and other countries, leading us in the direction of war. The people of this country are almost unanimous in that feeling, and I know that this Congress will do everything it possibly can to prevent our becoming involved in the present European conflict.

My plea this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is to the leadership of this great deliberative body—that sufficient and reasonable time be granted during which we may have free and open debate on this important resolution. Give the membership of the House a fair opportunity to offer amendments to this bill. Let it be known that whatever measure shall pass this Congress shall be the result of fair, careful, deliberate consideration, without restraint of any kind. And may the result of such legislation, so far as possible, keep our country from becoming involved in a world crisis.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to make. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on neutrality which appears in the American Mercury, the November issue, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE BETRAYAL OF AMERICA

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, the second request is to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point and include an article that deals with the Neutrality Act and other things concerning neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that a person reads a more subversive or vicious piece of legislation than House Joint Resolution 306, or the Neutrality Act of 1939. It appears to be an alliance with Great Britain instead of a Neutrality Act, for it favors England with money, war material, and help. I would be quite willing to believe that this legislation was drafted by agents of the invisible government under the direction of No. 10 Downing Street.

Should the Neutrality Act pass in its present form, the United States will become a convenience for the British Empire. I realize that objectors may take exception to my statements, but I do not care, for I have reached the point where I am indifferent to criticism. I realize that the truth must be told about the Neutrality Act, and for proof of my assertion, I refer all dissenters to the act itself, which is a fine example of fraud. Anyone who could express hilarity after passage of this kind of legislation, I believe would, without the slightest hesitation laugh at the funeral of a member of his own family. Enactment of such legislation means nothing else but the death of this Republic.

The deception begins in section 1 (a), wherein it is stated that the purpose of the Neutrality Act of 1939 is "to preserve peace, promote security, and to protect the lives of our citizens." This act does not fill any one of these worthy objectives, for if enacted, it will promote strife, abolish peace, and destroy the lives of our citizens. Unfortunately, the lives which are liable to be destroyed will be between the ages of 18 and 30 years, and with these we may include the lives of many defenseless men, women, and children. This is an important matter that should concern every Member of this House, because in passing this resolution as it stands, we start the youth of America marching to the battlefields of Europe. You might want to assume such responsibility, but I do not. I shall therefore vote against the power given to the President in this Neutrality Act and against repeal of the arms-embargo clause.

May I ask you to study carefully the neutrality legislation I introduced in the RECORD on October 25, 1939, page 878. The act I inserted in the RECORD for your consideration will not only assure neutrality but will also increase income on exports 40 percent. This will benefit our merchants and farmers, to which I am sure no one will object. The act which I inserted in the RECORD carries no provision to fine and imprison our own citizens, but instead levies fines and imprisonments where they rightfully belong, namely, on the international exploiters and warmongers. It is high time that Congress begins to levy fines and imprisonment on someone else besides such of

our citizens as still have the courage to work and to pay the expenses of this Government. Yes; the people who have sent us here as their Representatives to look after their interests.

If House Joint Resolution 306, the present Neutrality Act, is passed as it is, it is my firm belief that such action on our part will bring about civil war in the United States, which may well terminate in the ultimate destruction of those in the invisible Government who sponsored this legislation and who are the silent promoters of the present war in Europe.

As the first step in consideration of this so-called Neutrality Act of 1939, please ask yourself, Who is it that wants war? It certainly is not the people that want war, and it is their wish that we must consider, as we are their Representatives in Congress.

Have any of your constituents asked you to vote for war, so that their children may be sent forth to drown in the Atlantic or die in the trenches of Europe? Are there any Members of Congress who want war? I do not believe so. Have you ever stopped to think, or have you tried to identify those whose greatest ambition is to aline this country in war on the side of England? I have not found anyone that wants war except those who harbor hatreds toward Hitler, and strange as it may seem, they are the same people who approved of Stalin.

Is it logical or reasonable that all Christian civilized nations, such as the United States, England, Canada, Australia, France, Germany, Austria, and other European nationalities, must engage in internecine conflict or war of extermination, so that this group of haters may get even with one man? Shall we sacrifice millions of our young men from 18 to 30 years of age to appease personal hatreds of a small group of international exploiters? I think not. I do not believe that there is any one person worth such sacrifice, whether he be king, prince, or dictator.

Let me now carry this argument a little further, for I want to call your attention to the fact that this same group that now hates Hitler was pro-German during the World War, and it is the same group that ruled and directed Germany's military machine before and during the World War. It is the same group that brought about inflation and exploited the German people, and it is the same group that furnished the money that brought about revolution in Russia and eliminated the Russian Army when its aid was needed to win the World War. This same group of internationalists paid and promoted the bloody invasion of Hungary, in which the invaders destroyed life and property with utter disregard for civilized warfare or even decency. It is this same group that has spread and nourished communism throughout the whole world and that sponsored the "red" revolution in Spain. It is the same communistic group which is now concentrated south of us in Mexico, waiting to strike when the time is ripe.

Please ask yourselves if you are justified in giving the President the power set forth in this Neutrality Act, and are you justified in repealing the arms-embargo clause, when you know it is for no other reason except to aline the United States with Great Britain in another war as senseless as the World War. In considering this remember that there are no hatreds among the common people of the nations of the world, and for that reason no desire to destroy either life or property. Is it not time that we, the common people, learn a lesson—yes; a lesson in self-preservation instead of fighting for the "invisible government"? Let us marshal this personnel into an army of their own and ship them some place to fight it out among themselves. It will be a blessing to civilization.

This contemplated war will not save the world for democracy because we have that now in the fullest measure; it is fully entrenched within the Government itself and in many organizations. We need no further evidence of that than the recent exposé of the League for Peace and Democracy, with its many members employed in strategic positions within the Federal Government, to further the cause of democracy and communism. No; this war will not be fought for so-called democracy or communism, for it is here, and is an evil that we will eventually be called upon to destroy or else be destroyed by it.

If the present agitation in Europe should terminate in an active war, its purpose will be to place all Christian civilized nations under the domination of an international government that expects to rule the world by the power of money and the control of fools who sit in the chairs of governments. I do not believe this will happen here, for the people are too well informed about this evil blight that is keeping the world at odds, and which is spreading dissension and hatreds by confusion and international intrigue. Let us shake off this evil, put our shoulders to the wheel, and push the carriage of state back on the road to sound constitutional government. Do not forget, if attack comes, it will be delivered by the Communists within the United States and next by the Communists who are waiting beyond our borders. Let us, therefore, give undivided attention to the Communists within our midst, for they have no place within a republican government. We should not tolerate foreign or hyphenated groups that, for reasons best known to themselves, cannot or will not assimilate to become Americans. For our own preservation we must get rid of those who cannot subscribe to the fundamental principles of this Republic, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

I shall now discuss the Neutrality Act of 1939 and try to give you my version of this document.

I have already discussed section 1 (a), and shall therefore proceed to section 2 (a) and (b), which I shall quote:

SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles of materials to any state named in such proclamation.

(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

It is now my desire to call your attention to the fact that section 2 (a) does not apply in subsection (f), (g), (h), in sections 4 and 9, but section 2 (b) is never suspended but remains instead like the sword of Damocles, suspended over the heads of all who cross the Chief Executive. This section, therefore, becomes an instrument which may well terminate in legal persecution of patriotic citizens.

(c) This subsection makes it unlawful to cause or attempt to export or transport articles or materials until all right, title, and interest has been transferred to someone outside of the United States. This section makes it necessary to observe many regulations, to keep records, and render a multitude of reports all for no other purpose than to relieve the British and French Governments from claims introduced by our own citizens, through the Government of the United States.

(d) This subsection applies to insurance on articles or materials which, when so insured, shall not be deemed an American interest, and therefore, not subject to collection from a foreign government through the Government of the United States. In other words, subsections (c) and (d) allow the British and French Governments full use of all articles and materials they require free from obligation of paying insurance on the same in case of war loss. No nation could ask for more than that. It means that we will finance the war, furnish articles and war materials, meet our own losses without the slightest possibility of collecting from the nations to which such liberal privileges are granted. It is also well to bear in mind at this point that if cash were paid for all merchandise all regulations and transfer of title as set forth in subsections (c) and (d) would not be required. So it means, therefore, that Great Britain and France will operate on a credit and not on a cash basis.

(f) This subsection allows transportation by American vessels over lakes, rivers, and inland waters, and also transportation by airplane to Canada and Mexico. Furthermore, it allows transportation in American vessels wherever they want to go, because subsections (a), (c), (g), and (h) do not apply as set forth in their respective sections. It further provides shipment of war material to American forces located in foreign countries in connection with their operation and maintenance.

Subsection (g) allows transportation in American ships west of the sixty-sixth meridian from the North Pole to the South Pole. It allows transportation in American ships "to any port on the Pacific or Indian Oceans, including the China Sea, the Tasman Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Arabian Sea; or (4) to any port on the Atlantic Ocean south of 30° north latitude." This subsection is very liberal, because it allows water-borne commerce south of latitude 30° north, which will include the west coast of Africa and the east coast of South America, south of latitude 30° north. American ships may also proceed to the east coast of Africa, entrance to the Red Sea, and to Australia.

The important question which now arises is, How shall we enforce the safety of our shipping without becoming involved in war with such nations as challenge our rights to such trade routes? This procedure is, of course, directly opposed to international law, and protection of our ships cannot be accomplished with our Navy, because it is too small to cover such large expanses of water. It appears to me that this legislation as drawn in regard to commercial zones and routes is based entirely upon wild speculation instead of common sense.

The unfortunate part of the whole act is that it is so confusing and overlapping that nearly anyone who engages in transportation will find himself either in jail or operating under such fines that life will be unendurable.

It is just about impossible to enforce any part of this act except the penalizing of our own citizens, and it is quite possible if the war lasts long enough that we will find all the honest people in jail and the dishonest at large.

How is it possible for the President to set aside combat areas when the nations at war do not know where such areas may be from one day to another? However, in this section—3 (b)—individuals, incorporations, and officers of American vessels that transgress in combat areas that have been so proclaimed by the President are subject to a fine of $50,000 and imprisonment for 5 years. In addition to that, citizens traveling as passengers in such zones may be fined $10,000 and imprisoned for 2 years.

I may also call your attention to the fact that there is some discussion of arming our merchant ships with defensive weapons. The newspapers seem to have information that such rifles will be 5- or 6-inch caliber. If this is the case, they will have a striking distance of from 8 to 10 miles, which means nothing except that merchant ships so armed will be sunk without warning if intercepted by a submarine. I mention this so that we may be prepared for such losses, and when they come the responsibility must be placed entirely upon those who voted for the Neutrality Act and the Government itself for arming merchant ships. Such losses will not be cause for war, but will, instead, be the best reasons for impeaching a worthless administration and the retirement of "yes men" or "rubber stamps."

According to this act, no one has any right except the Executive and the powers he favors. American republics are coddled in section 9, which I quote:

> This joint resolution shall not apply to any American republic engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war.

This section, I believe, would be objectionable to South American republics, and little attention would be given to us if such republics became involved in war.

I shall not quote more of this act, because it is drawn for one purpose alone, and that is not neutrality. If enacted as it is, incidents will come about which the subsidized press will pounce upon in order to stir public sentiment in favor of war on the side of England. How any Member of Congress, knowing this, can vote for such legislation leaves one wondering if it is not just about time for the people to take charge.

The Neutrality Act of 1939 is not only unconstitutional but it cannot be enforced without involving the United States in war. Congress has given the President more power in the Neutrality Act than the Constitution gives to Congress itself. This act, and other legislation of this sort, is in reality responsible for the steady disintegration of the Government.

The question may be asked: What right has Congress to pass laws that may be used for persecution of our own people? What right has Congress to nullify the Constitution? When Members of Congress enact legislation that deprives the people of their rights, they also rob themselves of the same rights, for I do not doubt that many of them will be retired to private life. It is therefore better that we use a little common sense and protect the people's rights as well as our own.

All power granted to Congress by the Constitution is to be found in article I, section 8, and Congress has no right to exceed this power without the people's consent. The people have reserved the greater power to the States and to themselves in the ninth and tenth amendments. Furthermore, careful reading will reveal that additional rights are reserved in amendments 1 and 4—yes, rights that Congress cannot suppress.

The question may be asked: Where in the Constitution lies the right to create emergencies that may suspend the Constitution itself? Where in the Constitution are provisions to be found that give Congress the right to pass the present Neutrality Act? Some day Congress will be asked to explain its attitude to the people.

There is considerable difference between this Neutrality Act and the Bloom Neutrality Act that we passed in the last session of Congress. The present Neutrality Act gives the President and his appointees extraordinary power for which there is no precedent or constitutional authority. If this act is passed as it is, it will bring about incidents that are liable to lead us into war or civil strife.

I am inclined to believe that it will be the latter, for the people in the United States are not going to stand idly by and let this administration lead its youngsters to slaughter in Europe. The people have a perfect right to object to it, and should object to such procedure for the general welfare of the people and for the security of our Republic.

If our ships are sunk by submarines the people will know that such destruction is directly the result of the enactment of the Neutrality Act of 1939. For such losses no one is responsible except those who vote for the passage of this legislation.

The Neutrality Act of 1939 is not an act to bring about or maintain peace, it is instead an act to lead the United States into war in defense of the invisible government and on the side of the British Empire. It is the betrayal of America.

UNITED STATES NAVY DEFIED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I place in the RECORD, proof—not a statement by myself—but proof from the Acting Secretary of the Navy that a picket line in Detroit held up delivery of United States property, equipment, and patterns of the United States Navy, not for 1 hour, but for days. Listen and be shocked and amazed.

UNITED STATES NAVY DEFIED

Billions of dollars have been appropriated for national defense. The President has declared a limited national emergency exists. He called Congress in special session. The Army and the Navy are straining every nerve to produce ships, airplanes, motor transportation, and munitions. A comprehensive plan for the drafting of American citizens for war service has been prepared. A bill to take over private property in the event that war comes is in the making.

BUT THE NAVY WAITS WHILE THE PICKETS MARCH

But in one instance at least the United States Navy has been defied and stopped dead in its tracks in its effort to prepare us for national defense or for war, if war comes. The Department of the Navy was challenged and that Department took a licking. This is not a hoax. It is the statement of a fact. I realize you will not believe it until you have read the official admission.

On the 12th day of October 1939, on the floor of Congress, I made the statement that delivery of parts necessary for the

production of aircraft had been refused the Navy by a labor union which had called a strike against the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation.

At the same time I introduced a resolution asking the Navy Department for certain information. The resolution was introduced so that the information might be given officially.

In that resolution I asked certain questions. Very courteously, very completely, the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Charles Edison, has transmitted that information to me through Congressman VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs.

I quote from the answer of Acting Secretary Edison, which is dated October 20, 1939:

The resolution (H. Res. 314) requesting information from the Secretary of the Navy on certain matters in connection with a strike of employees in the plants of the Bohn Aluminum Co., at Detroit, Mich., was referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for report.

The questions in the resolution are set forth below, the answer to each appearing immediately thereafter:

(a) Whether the Navy Department did have a contract with said corporation;

At the time the said strike was called the Navy Department did have a contract with the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, of Detroit, Mich., for the manufacture of special bearings for aircraft engines. In addition, the corporation was also engaged in the manufacture of special bearings and castings for manufacturers with whom the Navy Department had contracts.

(b) Whether a strike which interfered, or would interfere, with the activities of the Navy Department occurred;

A strike actually occurred in the plants of the said corporation which did interfere with the activities of the Navy Department.

(c) How long such strike continued;

A strike was called at the corporation's plant, No. 1, Detroit, Mich., on August 29, 1939. At the time the strike was called plant No. 1 was engaged in the manufacture of special bearings for aircraft engines for manufacturers with whom the Navy has contracts. On September 15, 1939, a second strike was called at all of the seven plants of the corporation in the Detroit district in sympathy with the strike at plant No. 1 (bearings). At the time of calling the second strike plant No. 2 was engaged in the manufacture of castings for airplane engines in process of manufacture at the Naval Aircraft Factory, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.; also castings for a manufacturer with whom the Navy has a contract for a special type of marine engine.

The duration of the strike in plant No. 1 (bearings) was from the 29th of August to October 8, inclusive, 41 calendar days. The duration of the strike in plant No. 2 (castings) was from September 15 to October 8, 1939, inclusive, 24 calendar days.

(d) Whether the delivery of bearings or parts which had been manufactured for the Navy, or of plans, specifications, or equipment, or any of them, was delayed.

The delivery of completed castings, bearings, and parts, also those in process of manufacture, was delayed for the duration of the strike.

(e) What, if any, representations were made by the Navy Department to the corporation looking toward the ending of said strike.

No representations were made by the Navy Department to the corporation looking toward the ending of the strike.

(f) What, if any representations were made by the Navy Department to the union or its representatives looking toward the settlement of the strike.

On September 28, 1939, the United States Navy resident inspector of naval material at Detroit, Mich., informed the regional director of the United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Detroit, Mich., of the seriousness of the delay in the delivery of the material due on contracts, also the urgent need of the shipment of patterns and requested that he instruct his representative in charge of the picket line at the corporation's plant No. 2 to allow a representative to pass through the picket line to pick up Government-owned patterns and ship them on a Government bill of lading.

The regional director of the United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations sent three representatives of union local, No. 208 to discuss the removal of the patterns with the inspector of naval material. The representatives of union local, No. 208 were given full access to the files of the Navy contracts and they were informed that the delay in releasing patterns for delivery were seriously jeopardizing the manufacture of airplane engines at the naval aircraft factory. At the end of the discussion the union representatives stated that as the strike situation stood at the present time their answer was emphatically "No" and that they would not let patterns or inspected castings be removed. No further action was taken by the Navy Department to remove the patterns and castings. The Navy Department kept in touch with the strike situation at the Bohn plants through its field representatives, and through the United States Department of Labor, but took no steps looking toward the settlement of the strike.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES EDISON,
The Acting Secretary of the Navy.

THE C. I. O. HAMSTRINGS THE NAVY

The foregoing statement is concise; it is conclusive; and it shows clearly that the great United States Navy Department, the Acting Secretary of the Navy, was defied and the property of the United States Navy held by the pickets of Union Local No. 208 of the U. A. W., Congress of Industrial Organizations.

ROOSEVELT MAY BE COMMANDER OF THE NAVY, BUT C. I. O. GIVES THE ORDERS

Under the Constitution the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Navy. The President asked for billions to build, among other things, airplanes and motor vehicles, and yet, when a local labor union refuses to deliver special bearings for aircraft engines, holds up production at the naval aircraft factory in the navy yard at Philadelphia, refuses to deliver castings to a manufacturer with whom the Navy has a contract for a special type of marine engine, the President, so far as we have been able to learn, does nothing about it.

And the Navy, when it asked the pickets to release patterns for delivery, the holding of which was seriously jeopardizing the manufacture of airplane engines for the Navy, was told, in substance, to go chase itself, or, as stated by the Acting Secretary of the Navy, it received, in answer to the request, an emphatic "No" and, to our shame, be it said, no further action was taken by the Government.

I am not criticizing the Navy, for the Commander in Chief of the Navy, the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, is responsible for this situation, not the Navy, which he made possible by his coddling of John L. Lewis, of the C. I. O., and his tacit acceptance of the support for a third term of the Communists, headed by Earl Browder, now under indictment.

NAVY INSULTED—DEFIED

How humiliating it must be to the officers of our Navy, those men who have gone through training at our great Naval Academy at Annapolis; who have devoted their lives to the service of their country; who are willing to fight their ships and go down with them on any of the seven seas; who beyond question are able to meet openly and wage successful battle with any foreign foe; yet who must here at home, because of political expediency and the red tape which binds the Navy Department, submit to insult and defiance by members of a picket line.

Why talk about national defense, about fighting for American honor or American rights, when here at home the President of the United States permits the wholesale violation of civil liberties, puts the Navy Department to the humiliation of being defied by pickets who will neither themselves work nor permit anyone else to work until their demands have been granted.

Where is the American spirit which defied the Barbary pirates; which brought forth the statement "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute"?

The C. I. O. and its affiliates are controlled by John L. Lewis and his executive committee. How much longer will the President of the United States submit to the indignity of having the laws of the United States Government set at naught by this would-be dictator and the Communists within his organization?

If the President, instead of designating the exposure of Federal officeholders who belong to the American League for Peace and Democracy, which has the support of the Communist Party, which believes in the overthrow of our Government by force, as a "rather sordid procedure," would insist that those members either resign or be kicked out of Government service, the whole atmosphere would change and no longer would a labor organization successfully hinder or delay our plans for national defense.

Before we police Europe, let us clean out the Communists who would overthrow our own Government. Let the President quit playing politics; let him deny that he is seeking a third term and turn his efforts toward a sensible solution of our own domestic problems, the most important of which is ridding our country of those subversive organizations which would overthrow this Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an article by Paul S. Smith, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Ed Sullivan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter by Roger Babson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the current issue of the magazine Asia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a copy of a broadcast recently made by myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including an article by Henry Frasier.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HARTFORD COURANT

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this moment simply to call the attention of the Members of the House to the anniversary edition of a newspaper published in my district—The Hartford Courant. Yesterday the Courant celebrated its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary. It is interesting to note that this newspaper printed the text of the Declaration of Independence as news; numbered George Washington among its subscribers; and, at one time, employed Israel Putnam as war correspondent. The celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Hartford Courant is a notable occasion in journalism.

As part of its anniversary edition the Courant published a 108-page rotogravure section containing many interesting articles—both photographs and word pictures—such as the development of transportation in the past 175 years, the development of moving pictures, the development of radio, while other pictures portray the political development over that long period. A great deal of space is devoted to the industries of Hartford, Conn., and, as you would expect, the special edition contains interesting information about the numerous insurance companies which have their home offices in Hartford.

Knowing there are several Members of the House whose ancestors came from Connecticut, I have secured a sufficient number of copies of this anniversary edition so that I can furnish them a copy, if they wish it, as well as send each New England Member of the House a copy. If any other Members of the House are interested in having a copy of this historical edition, I will be glad to send one to his office upon request.

The Hartford Courant has, as any good newspaper would, wielded a good deal of influence in the lives of the community which it serves. We of Connecticut are proud of The Hartford Courant.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do this just to make a statement, Mr. Speaker. Several Members had time to speak today, but on account of the death of one of our Members they have each agreed that they will not speak. We are going to have resolutions with reference to this matter shortly. Therefore I must serve notice that I shall be compelled to object to any further requests to proceed for 1 minute.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a telegram from the department commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include a statement on What War Really Means to Animals, by the American Humane Association, of Albany, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who had time to address this body today. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may insert what I had to say at this point in the RECORD and to include excerpts from remarks by George Washington and Thomas Jefferson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think it most appropriate to open a speech to the House of Representatives with quotations from two of America's greatest men—George Washington and Thomas Jefferson.

For more than a century the people of the United States followed the leadership as outlined in the Farewell Address of George Washington and the Inaugural Address of Thomas Jefferson. We had no European involvement except of the most minor kind for over a century. Unfortunately European politics mixed its slimy hand into American affairs. We departed from the sound teachings of Jefferson and Washington and we have been in trouble ever since.

Washington said:

HONEST FRIENDSHIP WITH ALL NATIONS

> Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns.

Jefferson's immortal words have become a household saying. I am honored to repeat them here:

> Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none.

Washington and Jefferson, of the Founding Fathers of the American Republic, knew their Europe. Had the statesmen of the United States some 20 years ago understood their Europe as did Washington and Jefferson, America would not have become embroiled in the World War, and this Nation would have saved itself billions of dollars. But of far greater importance, eclipsing altogether the money involved, it would have saved the thousands of precious American lives destroyed in that conflict. And it would have avoided pain and anguished suffering of tens of thousands of the flower of American youth who even today lie wracked and broken men in our veterans' hospitals dotting the country.

It is my conviction that today we are nearer war than we were in the first years of the World War. Only the most careful and meticulous conduct of those entrusted with American government can guide our footsteps away from European battlefields. Hence, I am going to base this speech of mine on the wisdom of Washington and Jefferson, and with the forbearance of this House, shall make it largely a speech of quotations from their mouths and writings. All quoted here, it seems to me, bear profoundly on the stirring tragedy today being enacted in Europe and on the danger of our own country becoming linked with that tragedy.

EQUAL JUSTICE TO ALL MEN

In his Farewell Address of September 17, 1796, George Washington said:

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote, relation; hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise for us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties, in the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities?

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible.

* * * * * * *

Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure. * * *

Jefferson stressed his warning to the infant American Republic against the dangers of improper alliance with foreign nations. In his inaugural address of March 4, 1801, delivered in the opening hour of his administration, he said, in part:

It is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principles, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad.

LET US HASTEN TO RETRACE OUR STEPS

There were other ringing sentences in Jefferson's First Principles of American Political Conduct which come down to us through the years:

The supremacy of the civil over the military authority; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus—

And of these Jefferson said:

These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our great sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith—the text of civil instruction—the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

Let us search our hearts in this solemn hour when the fate of a nation of 130,000,000 persons hangs on the action we shall take here. Let us, each to himself, ask the question: Are we keeping faith with the political creed of America, fashioned nearly 140 years ago by the author of America's Declaration of Independence? Are we to remain true to the faith—written by Jefferson—that has brought this Nation to its present stature? Is our creed to be Jefferson's creed—"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none"?

Or are we to embrace an alien precept and depart from this straight and narrow path we trod until that fateful April day of 1917, when we entered into the very alliance Jefferson foresaw as a prime contributing factor to national suffering and regret?

What prompted Jefferson to stress the danger inherent to improper European or foreign alliances? I have often wondered. It is only within the past fortnight, however, that I, to my own satisfaction, have found what I believe to be the answer. He saw the danger first-hand. Let me quote from some of his letters in support of this belief.

DOES NOT JEFFERSON'S STATEMENT FIT?

To John Adams, in 1794, he wrote:

I have seen enough of one war never to wish to see another.

Again in 1822, to Adams, he wrote:

The cannibals of Europe are going to eating one another again.

Russia and Turkey were at it then. How do they stand today? Does not Jefferson's statement fit well in the present relations as between Russia and Turkey?

Even a year earlier than his first letter to John Adams, from which I have just quoted, Jefferson addressed this language to Gouveneur Morris (in April 1793):

No country perhaps was ever so thoroughly against war as ours. These dispositions pervade every description of its citizens whether in or out of office.

Was not Jefferson's appraisal of American sentiment in 1793 accurate even for American sentiment in 1939?

And to Robert Livingston, Jefferson wrote in 1801:

I do not believe war the most certain means of enforcing principles. Those peaceable coercions which are in the power of nations, if undertaken in concert and in time of peace, are more likely to produce the desired effect.

Let me read you something next from a letter written by Jefferson in 1811 to William Wirt. What Jefferson said then, to my mind, applies with peculiar emphasis to conditions facing this Nation today as we meet here to decide our attitude and conduct toward a Europe again at war.

I quote:

War against bedlam would be just as rational as against Europe. * * * For us to attempt to reform all Europe and then bring them back to principles of morality, and a respect for the equal rights of nations, would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

EUROPEAN INTRIGUE SAME AS 150 YEARS AGO

How well Jefferson understood the hidden motives and deepening intrigues that swayed the masters of the Europe of his time is revealed in interesting detail in one of his letters to Mr. Cutting. Before I quote it, permit me to assert my conviction that there is no whit less of intrigue and of double-dealing in that war-torn continent in 1939 than there was when Jefferson wrote 151 years earlier.

I now quote from his letter:

I think it now pretty certain that an alliance is entered into between England, Prussia, and Sweden, to which Holland is to accede, so as to make it quadruple. The Prussian Army is on its march toward Holstein, under the command of Prince Frederick of Brunswick; a poor head. There is also said to be an army of 60,000 Prussians in Silesia, ready to be used to overawe Poland, should it take side with Russia. Of this last fact, however, I am not sure. It would seem, then, as if Prussia meant to enter into the war, or is it only to induce Denmark to withdraw to leave Russia and Sweden to fight their own battles? If it does not produce this effect, will England lie by, and only engage in case France should move? These are points uncertain as yet; one thing is certain; that this country will make no move which may entangle her in war, 'till after her etats generaux. The Notables meet on Thursday next to decide on the form of composing and calling the etats generaux. What will be their form, cannot yet be foreseen; much less what they will do.

Mr. Speaker, the immediate cause of the present European war was Poland. If we will look back over our shoulders to the dimming day of Jefferson's letter to Mr. Cutting, we find that same Poland involved in the general European conflict then. Let me read briefly, in support, from a letter written by Thomas Jefferson, November 29, 1788, to John Jay.

Jefferson wrote:

The Turks have retired across the Danube; this * * * they count here among their coldest winters. * * * All enterprise must be suspended between the three great belligerent powers. Poland is likely to be thrown into great convulsions. The Empress of Russia has peremptorily demanded such aids from Poland as might engage in the war. The King of Prussia, on the other hand, threatens to march an army on their borders. The vote of the Polish Confederacy for 100,000 men, was a coalition of the two parties, in that single act only.

The party opposed to the King, have obtained a majority, and have voted that this army shall be independent of him. The are supported by Prussia, while the King depends on Russia. Authen-

tic information from England leaves not a doubt that the King is lunatic; and that, instead of the effect, is the cause of the illness, under which he has been so so near dying. I mention this, because the English newspapers, speaking by guess on that as they do on all other subjects, might mislead you as to his true situation; or, rather, might mislead others, who know less than they do, that a thing is not rendered the more probable by being mentioned in those papers.

LET US BE RATIONAL IN DELIBERATIONS

Mr. Speaker, the King of England, Jefferson wrote in 1788, was a lunatic. Let us, in our deliberations on the measure before us, try to be rational.

Again demonstrating his intimate knowledge of European intrigue, Jefferson, in a letter to Dr. Currie dated Paris, December 20, 1788, said:

The war in the north appeared at one time likely to be quieted, but new dissensions in Poland threaten to embroil Russia and Prussia. In this case Prussia will previously make her peace with the Turks by ceding the Crimea to them. * * *

Intrigue. Intrigue. Intrigue. It was rampant—as now—when George Washington was General of the American Army and before he became President of the United States, as witnessed by the following quotation from a letter addressed to Washington by Jefferson, December 4, 1788:

The campaign between the Turks and the two Empires has been clearly in favor of the former. The Emperor is secretly trying to bring about a peace. The alliance between England, Prussia, and Holland (and some suspect Sweden, also) renders their mediation decisive wherever it is proposed. They seemed to interpose it so magisterially between Denmark and Sweden that the former submitted to its dictates, and there was all reason to believe that the war in the northwestern parts of Europe would be quieted. All of a sudden a new flame bursts out in Poland. The King and his party are devoted to Russia. The opposition rely on the protection of Prussia. They have lately become the majority in the confederated diet and have passed a vote for subjecting their army to a commission independent of the King, and propose a perpetual diet, in which case he will be a perpetual cipher. Russia declares against such a change in their constitution, and Prussia has put an army into readiness for marching at a moment's warning on the frontiers of Poland. These events are too recent to see, as yet, what turn they will take or what effect they will have on the peace of Europe. * * * In this event it will much favor the present wishes of this country (France), which are so decidedly for peace, that they refused to enter into the mediation between Sweden and Russia, lest it should commit them.

Such expressions penned by Jefferson could be extended here to the point of tedium, but the foregoing are illustrative of scores—perhaps hundreds—of passages in his contemporaneous writings. I shall not attempt, Mr. Speaker, to consume the time of this House in further similar citations.

A LITTLE RELATIVE OF MUNITIONS MAKERS

But this I do desire to emphasize: From these letters of Jefferson it is patent that the Europe of his time was precisely the Europe of the present day insofar as the intrigue and double-crossing are concerned. One who reads Jefferson's letters will find that the countries involved were the same as the countries involved today, and the things they were doing were exactly the things they are doing today. They had been the same for centuries; they are the same now; they will be the same, Mr. Speaker, when the last man within range of my voice shall have long since been gathered to his fathers.

Read the letters of Jefferson. They explain with crystal clarity why both Jefferson and Washington arrived at the common thought that it was essential to America to write in its primary creed a resolution to have no alliances with European nations. That was the cornerstone of the firm foundation laid by these outstanding Americans upon which our present national greatness rests. No American can read these letters written to Jefferson and come to any other rational conclusion.

Remember that every sordid interest that can make a dollar out of war will be busy—every dealer in things that are to be sold for war purposes will be busy. I have here a case in point. This is a letter from a man who writes me on the letterhead of the American Uniform Cap Co.—"Military caps our specialty":

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHANNON: I am writing you as our Representative from Missouri to vote to repeal the Arms Embargo Act so that we may sell to foreign countries so as to protect our democracy and keep us out of war. Thank you very kindly.

Very truly,

Thus you see he is a little relative of the munitions makers—by the profit route. He wants his bit, but, like the bomb makers, he assures you he is against war; but, like them, he is not opposed to getting a profit out of war—a little blood money, if you please.

FRIENDS OF TODAY ARE FOES OF TOMORROW

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, nothing is binding in Europe—the friends of today are the enemies of tomorrow. What they celebrate today they hide tomorrow, and what they are today planning to celebrate they cancel tomorrow—if it is expedient to do so.

Hitler had arranged to have an immense celebration—to celebrate the battle of Tannenberg. There was to be a great outpouring, and just 2 days before it was to take place the trade between Stalin and Hitler was made. It would have been unbecoming for Hitler to stage a celebration that would have been offensive to his new friend Stalin. He had done enough to that friend in the previous 4 years—he had abused him worse than any pickpocket ever was abused on this earth. So you see, whatever they do, whatever they say, counts for nothing. It would have been unwise to have offended Stalin by a celebration at this critical moment of a battle generaled by Von Hindenburg which squelched the Russian Army in the late World War.

Mr. Speaker, it seems unthinkable that 2,000 years after the birth of the Prince of Peace we are meeting in the Capitol of the United States of America for a purpose which may eventually lead to that article of savagery we call conscription. Without conscription, no country under the sun could raise mammoth armies. Human beings who inhabit the world would not organize otherwise among themselves to go out to kill each other. Government must organize them. And government makes orders conscripting the young men of one nation to go forth to kill young men of other nations.

TRAINED DESPERADOES FOR WAR

The mere training of these young men, I contend and have always contended, is destructive of everything in them that is good and fine. I really believe every man who received that training and was sent forth in the World War was scarred, at least mentally, and such scars never heal.

I visualize that which any man can visualize—for it can be seen in every section of the United States. Here is a father who would not even shoot the bird that flies in the air, a mother who would not even kill the fowl to be served for dinner. Their boy is so gently reared that he would not even go to the moving-picture show a few blocks away without first telling his parents. Yet, when he reaches the age of 18 or 19 something suddenly happens. The barbarous act of conscription is made to apply to that gently born and gently reared boy. He is seized, taken away, and given training.

He is given a bayonet; he is placed before a bag—a sandbag or something similar—painted red—he is made to stand before it and stab it again and again, so that he becomes familiar with the color of blood. Day after day he receives this training. Then he is given other training so that he may be prepared to meet his fellow man in mortal combat without arms.

What sort of training, Mr. Speaker? He is taught to take his two hands and is shown how to grip with them the throat of another man—to choke him to death—some other man whom his government calls his enemy. When everything else fails, he is taught how, with his index finger, to gouge out the eyes of his fellow man. Having thus trained him, his government, cruel and brutal, sends him out, a thoroughly trained desperado, for the purposes of war.

Should he escape death he is honorably discharged from the service after a time and his government sends him back home. But the government never sends back the same man it sent away. Havoc has been wrought. That gently reared boy, as he walks the streets, may look like a man, but he is never the same man he was before he was conscripted.

CROP OF HELL AND HAVOC IN EUROPE

Practically all of us who live in the United States spring from European ancestry. The original founder of the American family almost invariably was one who ran away from a

European home or was aided in every possible way by his parents to get to this country so that he might avoid militarism and its crop of hell and havoc in Europe. Within a quarter of a century we have seen grown up a group in America who have given aid and comfort under cover to the taking of this ancestor's descendants back to the hell of Europe. It is a most damnable thing to send his progeny back into that inferno from which he escaped.

Should I, knowing Europe and its centuries of war history, cast a vote that would in any way contribute to sending an American boy to his death in Europe's present blood holocaust, then I myself would put the brand of "murderer" on my own brow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on neutrality by William J. Gross, editorial writer of the Fort Wayne News Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have learned that the Army is putting its soldiers back into wartime khaki. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Boston Post of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include three observations of international jurists on the proposed embargo repeal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of Colorado obtained permission to extend his remarks by including a comparative print of the present neutrality law with the act as passed by the House and as passed by the Senate.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the untimely death of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON], who is now making his eternal pilgrimage to that bourne from which no traveler ever returns, I ask unanimous consent that in lieu of the hour which was granted me to address the House this afternoon I be permitted to address the House for one hour on tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal, and the disposition of all the business before the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman ask that he be permitted to speak for an hour tomorrow?

Mr. SIROVICH. After the disposition of all the business before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls to the attention of the gentleman from New York that there is already one special order for tomorrow.

Mr. SIROVICH. Following the special order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know whether if a rule is brought in the address of the gentleman from New York will precede or follow the consideration of the rule.

Mr. SPEAKER. Under the request it would come after all legislative business for the day has been completed and after the special order already entered. It would not interfere in any way with the legislative program or the special order heretofore made.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, that would depend a good deal on how late we are going to run tomorrow night on the regular legislative program.

Mr. SIROVICH. That is right.

Mr. RAYBURN. I believe we will have a reasonably long session tomorrow. If the gentleman desires permission to speak after that, I certainly have no objection.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a radio address I delivered last night in Washington.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, before making the real announcement which I am going to make, I wish to take this opportunity to make a short statement which I deem should be made at this time in order to get it into the RECORD.

Tomorrow it is presumed we will have a very important vote with reference to the proposed Neutrality Act. Several of the Members from Ohio will have another very important duty to perform, and we will not be here to vote. Personally, I want the RECORD to show at this time that if I were present I would vote against the proposed rule, as I understand it to be. Although I confidently expect to be here when the vote is called on the real merits of the Neutrality Act, but for fear I may not be here, and in order that my position may be known with reference to that section of the neutrality law which deals with the embargo, I wish to announce that if I were here to vote when it is presented, I would vote to retain the embargo, as I did before.

THE LATE CHESTER C. BOLTON

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty today to bring to you and to the Members of the House of Representatives the news of the passing of one of our most distinguished and most beloved Members. Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON passed away early yesterday morning at his home in Cleveland, Ohio, where he had been ill for some little time. It was thought that he was making fair progress in his recovery when the sudden turn for the worse carried him away.

Mr. BOLTON was born in Cleveland on the 5th of September 1882. He had lived in Cleveland all of his life. He was identified with that great city and its activities in many ways.

Mr. BOLTON was a man of great capacity. After graduating from Harvard University he proceeded immediately into the business field, and was identified with the financial and commercial activities of Cleveland. Early in his career he showed a great interest in public affairs. He identified himself actively with Republican politics and was elected to the State Senate of Ohio in 1922. He served three terms in this capacity, and was president pro tempore of the State senate and also Republican floor leader. In 1928 he was elected as a Representative to Congress, succeeding Senator Theodore E. Burton, where he served until January 1937. He was elected again to Congress in 1938. His service in Congress was conspicuous. His opinions on intricate legislative questions that involved the welfare of the country were highly respected by the membership of the committees on which he served and by the membership of the House. Mr. BOLTON'S first service in Congress was as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. He was later advanced to membership on the Appropriations Committee, where he served with distinction until his death.

Mr. BOLTON also rendered very valuable service to the Republican Party. Early in his career as a Congressman his organization genius was recognized and he was honored with a place on the Republican Congressional Committee. He served as chairman of this committee during the campaigns of 1934 and 1936.

Mr. BOLTON was a captain in the United States Army during the World War and served with honorable distinction and was advanced to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

He brought to his public service preparation of a thorough education and an honesty of purpose that was recognized by all that knew him. Of him it can truthfully be said that he was a man of good judgment. He was respected for his fine ability; he was honored for his strict integrity; he was loved for his fair and courteous attitudes toward his fellow men.

He leaves a wife, Mrs. Frances Payne Bolton and three sons, Charles, Kenyon, and Oliver. Funeral services will be held at Trinity Cathedral on Tuesday afternoon, October 31, at 2 p. m.

Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the Chair I recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], minority floor leader.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness I rise to join in this tribute to a warm personal friend and a beloved colleague. No one serving in this House was held in higher esteem than was our late colleague, CHESTER BOLTON. We revered him because of his high character, his broad tolerance, and his fine patriotism.

CHESTER BOLTON entered the public service solely because of a desire to serve his day and generation. He wanted to make our land a better country and gave liberally of his money and his time toward this end. Two incidents which I recall in particular indicated the unselfish character of CHESTER BOLTON's services. In 1936 I was the eastern director of the Republican campaign. CHESTER BOLTON was the chairman of the Republican congressional committee. He had a hard fight on his hands in his own home district. Because of his prominence in the counsels of the Republican Party, the local fight was waged a little more bitterly than ordinarily. Notwithstanding his personal danger, he neglected his home territory and traveled all over the country performing what he believed was his duty. As a result of his sacrifice, a brilliant career came to a temporary end. He worked beyond human endurance and long illness followed the arduous work he performed.

He was later reelected to the House in 1938, and his return was welcomed by all, regardless of party affiliation. I recall well his last day here with great vividness. It was one of those August days when we had a bitter contest on the floor. CHESTER was in poor health. His physician had ordered him to remain at home, but he felt his duty to his country and his district demanded his presence. He insisted upon remaining until the vote was taken, shortly before midnight. I counseled him to go home, realizing that was the best place so far as his health was concerned, but he had a duty to perform and he insisted on performing it. He remained to the end of the fight, and that unquestionably contributed to his breakdown. It can truthfully be said he was just as truly a martyr to his country as any man who ever fell on the field of battle. We all loved CHESTER. We might differ with him but we never could question his sincerity, his rugged patriotism, and his unshakable belief in the principles for which he stood. Men of his courage and high purpose are missed in these days of world confusion and chaos.

In this hour of sorrow consolation comes to us in the thought a well-spent life never dies. CHESTER BOLTON will linger in our memories as one who was a real American, one who was devoted to his country, and one who left the world a bit richer for his stay.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will pardon me if I make an announcement similar to that made by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], because of the fact I am to accompany the funeral party to Cleveland. I will not be here tomorrow, and I want to make the statement now that I am opposed to the rule which will be brought forth from the Rules Committee unless the rule gives to the House ample time to debate this very important subject, Neutrality. Unless it permits at least 2 weeks to debate this issue, I cannot be for the rule, and I want the RECORD to so show in my absence.

Mr. Speaker, joining my colleagues here today is a sorrowful task, in paying tribute to the memory of a friend who has passed to his eternal reward. To those who knew CHESTER BOLTON he was one of the outstanding citizens of Ohio; yes, one of the outstanding citizens of the country. My personal acquaintance with him goes back many years ago when I was a young lawyer in Cleveland. At that early date he exhibited a degree of kindness and friendship rare in many individuals today. I watched his public career as a member of the General Assembly of Ohio, where he covered himself with glory in the field of important legislation. I watched him when he came to Congress. I served with him during the major portion of five terms. He gave and received cooperation in many important battles in this House.

He was not a bitter partisan. Men on both sides of the aisle loved CHESTER BOLTON. He will be best remembered because of his simplicity of character, his honesty, and his faithfulness to public service.

He was a man endowed with a portion of the world's goods, but a man who gave freely to charity without ostentation. We know of his charities in our community. The State of Ohio—yes, the Nation—well knew of his charities. The crippled children of the Nation, the tubercular victims, and shut-ins will miss CHESTER BOLTON more than we will miss him. Certainly his constituency in the Twenty-second District of Ohio will miss his constant attention to even the small details that he gave to his office.

Mr. Speaker, I hope at some future time I may be privileged to extend my remarks further on the life and career of this great man. An outstanding American has fallen. I take this opportunity to publicly express my sympathy to his fine wife and his three splendid sons in the passing of a good husband and father.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the death of CHESTER BOLTON Ohio and Washington have lost a statesman and a patriotic public servant, but I have lost a friend.

When I came to the Ohio Senate as a new member CHESTER BOLTON was an old member and he befriended me. He was thoughtful, helpful, and considerate. When I came to Congress as a new Member CHESTER BOLTON was an old Member. He befriended me. He was thoughtful, helpful, and considerate. So while we are mourning the loss today of a statesman, I am mourning the loss of a friend. No man ever faced danger in battle more courageously than he did in his service here during the past session. His example of service at a time of danger is one we can all emulate. His loss to me and tc others as a friend is one that cannot be replaced.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROUTZOHN].

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROUTZOHN].

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, as I learned this morning of the passing on of our colleague, CHESTER BOLTON, there came to me, and would not be denied, the verse of John Boyle O'Reilly entitled:

THE REAL GOOD

"What is the real good?"
I asked in musing mood.

"Order," said the law court;
"Knowledge," said the school;
"Truth," said the wise man;
"Pleasure," said the fool;
"Love," said a maiden;
"Beauty," said the page;
"Freedom," said the dreamer;
"Home," said the sage;
"Fame," said the soldier;
"Equity," the seer.

Spake my heart full sadly,
"The answer is not here."

Then within my bosom
Softly this I heard:
"Each heart holds the secret.
Kindness is the word."

Another poet has admonished us that only the art of being kind is all this old world needs.

I have known CHESTER BOLTON for a number of years, not intimately, perhaps, but I know I knew him well. CHESTER BOLTON knew and lived the art of being kind. I shall cherish in my memory the many kindnesses he and his good wife have bestowed, and the love he bore his fellow man.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the House of Representatives and the people of America lost a great leader. The Honorable CHESTER C. BOLTON, for 9 years one of the most distinguished Members of the House, was called from our midst yesterday in his native city of Cleveland. I cannot tell you how untimely was his passing. Here, surrounded by the many complex problems of our day, we need men of CHESTER BOLTON's caliber. From the time of his election to Congress in 1928 he was recognized as one of the best-informed and one of the most painstaking Members of this House. I feel a sense of the deepest personal loss, for I was one of his many good friends.

Congressman BOLTON was a truly great statesman. He was not concerned with his private political advancement. Public office was not a goal in itself for him. Rather was he interested in the service he might render through his election to positions of importance in the State. He looked at public affairs with a vision of their effect upon the entire Nation.

It was only 6 weeks ago that he passed his fifty-seventh birthday. From the time of his birth in Cleveland, on September 5, 1882, he was clearly predestined for great achievements. The quickness of his mind and his capacity for careful study were evident in his undergraduate years at Harvard College. But unlike so many university graduates of his day, CHESTER BOLTON came out into the world determined to take his place in the hue and cry of a political career.

By 1923 he was universally respected throughout his community and won election to the State Senate of Ohio. For 5 years I knew him intimately in the deliberations of the senate. I watched him winning the admiration of his colleagues and the enthusiastic following of his people. In 1928 he was elected to the Seventy-first Congress. He returned continuously until 1936, and in 1938 his constituents sent him back to us again. The applause which greeted his reelection in 1938 echoed throughout Ohio. Everywhere his reputation for absolute integrity and unceasing devotion to the public welfare had earned him the praise of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the work of Congressman BOLTON in this House, on its important Rivers and Harbors Committee, will remain in the memory of his people for years to come. It was work typical of CHESTER BOLTON, far above sectionalism, far above partisanship.

Congressman BOLTON was more than a Representative of the Twenty-second Congressional District of Ohio in this great House of Representatives. He looked beyond the boundaries of his own district in considering the problems of his country. His breadth of vision compelled even his opponents to respect his views.

I knew CHESTER BOLTON well, as fellow worker in the Republican Party, as State senator, as Congressman. No man in American public life has ever brought a keener mind to bear upon our Nation's problems. No man in American public life has ever brought a more rational, intelligent, or analytical approach to our many difficulties. It is to the glory of our people that they recognized the sterling worth of our friend throughout his lifetime. He was a fine citizen, a fine man. For more than 20 of his 57 years he devoted himself to the interests of the people of Ohio. In Congress he was singled out as an outstanding Republican on the floor of the House. When leadership was needed, he furnished it. When he felt the need for a decisive course of action, he did everything possible to chart that course.

Yet despite his concern for the important matters pending before the Nation, he always had time to give to his family and his friends. He was a fine husband, a devoted father. So long as his health permitted, he gave of himself to every worthy cause. No one was turned away from his door without assistance. He was generous. He was foresighted. He was kind.

All of us, wherever we may live, must join in mourning his departure. We extend to his family our deepest sympathy, knowing that our own sense of loss must be infinitely magnified in those who knew him best. CHESTER BOLTON is no longer with us, but the people of Ohio, the citizens of America, will remember for long years to come the work he did in our behalf.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, fifteen to twenty other Members have asked that they be permitted to add to these eulogies. I ask unanimous consent that all the other Members from Ohio, both Democrats and Republicans, who wish to extend their remarks on this subject, may be permitted to do so in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to whom I shall next yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman modify his request to include all Members of the House?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, I modify my request and ask that it apply to any Member of the House who wishes to extend his remarks on this subject. I also ask that Members who have already spoken on this subject today may be permitted to revise and extend their own remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve in the House for 10 years with CHESTER BOLTON. He served on the Deficiency Committee in the trying days from 1933 to 1937. No man ever showed greater patriotism, greater courage, or higher character. His work was intelligent, it was serious, it was devoted, and it was loyal. I wish to add my small tribute to the type of man Ohio sent here and to the service he rendered to the people of the United States. It was of the highest type.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I arise to pay tribute to the memory of one of Ohio's illustrious sons, CHESTER C. BOLTON, whose untimely passing has brought grief to us all.

It has been my privilege to know CHESTER BOLTON more than 25 years. I have watched his career develop. As a young man he took an active interest in the welfare of his city and county. His ability, his honesty of purpose, his high sense of duty, and his exceptional intelligence were soon recognized by his neighbors and he was elected to represent a great district in the Senate of Ohio. There his qualities of leadership were again quickly recognized and he was chosen as majority floor leader of that important legislative body. Serving with distinction and honor to himself, and with great benefit to the people of Ohio, he made a place for himself that shall endure as long as the State government of Ohio lives.

Again the office sought the man, and he was elected to the Congress of the United States to represent one of the largest districts in the entire country—the Twenty-second of Ohio—with more than 600,000 population.

I need not speak to you who have served in the Congress with CHESTER C. BOLTON of the great contribution that he has made to his country as a Member of this body. By the sorrow you have shown here today, and by the honors you have conferred upon him in the past, you have demonstrated the great respect and affection in which our departed colleague has always been held by the individual Members of this body.

CHESTER BOLTON was truly a man. Gentle and gentlemanly always, he still had the courage of his convictions and maintained courageously the ideals in which he believed and for which he fought. Ohio gave him to the Nation. Ohio now takes him back to her bosom. Another illustrious son

has given his all to his country. Ohio and America are better for his having lived.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were privileged to know CHESTER BOLTON held for him the highest regard as a man and as a public official. He always had the courage of his convictions and no one could ever doubt his sincerity. His devotion to his duties doubtless had much to do with the undermining of his health. Many years of his life were devoted to the public service. Those of us from Ohio are familiar with his record while serving in the Senate of the Ohio General Assembly. His years of service in this body endeared him to all with whom he came in contact. He had the reputation among us of being an industrious, hard-working member of the great Committee on Appropriations, the duties of which are, perhaps, as arduous as those of any committee in this House of Representatives.

Mr. BOLTON was always tolerant of the opinion of others, ever ready to defend principles in which he believed without being opinionated, and with a wholesome respect for the views of those who differed from him. No words that could be uttered would properly portray the nobleness of his character. In my many years of association with him, never did I hear him speak ill or unkindly of another.

The House of Representatives has lost in his passing a man who always fulfilled the best traditions of this Chamber. Ohio mourns the loss of another native son who gave freely of his time and efforts to the interests of her people and the Nation loses the service and devotion of one of its most patriotic sons.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues to express my deep sorrow for the loss of our friend and statesman, CHESTER BOLTON. Although I had known Mr. BOLTON as a public official for several years, I had not met him until a little over a year ago. He was a man busy with the duties of public life, but he was never too busy to burden himself with the interest and devotion to the welfare of his fellow men. Many have pointed out that he was very interested in charities and gave freely to local, State, and National charitable organizations. CHESTER BOLTON will be remembered long by his community, State, and Nation for these benevolences. But there are many men who will remember CHESTER BOLTON because of the benevolent and helpful spirit that assisted his fellow men on the road up the ladder. He was always interested in the problems of his colleagues and his friends and he was effective in solving their problems and in lifting their burdens. His devotion to his country was genuine and his activity in and out of the Halls of Congress was effective. We have, indeed, lost a great American, but in our hearts he shall live on.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest compensation that comes to a Member of this House is the delightful friendships and fellowships he forms during the period he is permitted to serve as a Member of Congress. It was, however, my privilege to know CHESTER BOLTON before coming to Congress—and to know him was to love him.

In CHESTER BOLTON the State of Ohio and the Nation has lost one of her most loyal and able public servants; and the district which he serves, as well as the House of Representatives, has lost one of its most loved and distinguished leaders.

Mr. BOLTON has served his country in peace and in war, and he gave himself freely to the service of his community, State, and Nation.

As a new Member of Congress, I can truthfully say that he was most considerate, patient, and sympathetic in helping us to become accustomed to our legislative duties.

It is therefore the high example and the faithful devotion both to this family and to his country which will set a standard for years to come for others to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer in memory of my colleague CHESTER CASTLE BOLTON.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of October 30, 1939]

CHESTER CASTLE BOLTON

The career of CHESTER CASTLE BOLTON, cut short by his untimely death yesterday, was an impressive refutation of the idea that when a wealthy man goes into politics he is just playing around.

Mr. BOLTON entered public life under the handicap of that tradition. He speedily proved by his energy and ability that the rule did not apply in his case. Here was no dilettante, but a conscientious and serious-minded public servant ready and willing to work hard and to give his best to the task at hand.

Fifteen of his relatively short span of 57 years were spent in legislative service at Columbus and Washington. Previously he had been councilman of his suburban home town of Lyndhurst and had answered his country's call in wartime and won merited promotion as a soldier.

It was the political fortune of CHESTER BOLTON to enter national politics at a time when his party was about to go into eclipse. While this was an obvious hindrance to advancement it increased his immediate opportunity to become an able and useful party leader. In the little group of Republican Congressmen who survived the Democratic landslides of 1930 and 1932 he stood out in zeal and ability. By the 1934 campaign he was chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee.

While always a faithful party man Congressman BOLTON never permitted partisan interests to intrude where they did not belong. He construed the title of "Representative" to mean exactly that. Faithfully he represented all the citizens of his district, the Twenty-second Ohio, one of the most populous in the Nation.

But this did not imply that he looked upon the Congressman's function as that of Washington errand boy. He took his job too seriously to permit so parochial an attitude. It was a point of pride that he had succeeded Theodore E. Burton in the twenty-second. He measured statesmanship by the Burton pattern.

Typical of this conscientiousness was an independence which rose above expediency. Convinced that prohibition was a failure, BOLTON ran on a wet platform in 1930, though his district was considered overwhelmingly dry. He attacked New Deal measures at a time when most of his fellow Republicans were afraid to speak out.

Several years ago when BOLTON was a political freshman in the Ohio Legislature he was described as "the kind of politician who shakes hands even when he does not have to." Which is another way of saying that this man of aristocratic birth and breeding had not lost the human touch. It is that characteristic which will long be remembered by those political faiths who called him friend. To a name long honored in Cleveland he brought new distinction through a career of useful public service.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, again the grim reaper has struck and has taken from this House one of its most beloved and respected Members.

The Honorable CHESTER C. BOLTON was a man of high purpose, unquestioned integrity, and fierce loyalty to the country which he loved so well. During his life his activities covered many fields and he obtained prominence in all those endeavors to which his sympathies and enthusiasm impelled him. As an energetic and civic-minded citizen of the city of Cleveland he was in the forefront in all movements which tended to the improvement of conditions in his home town. He was a leader alike in financial, philanthropic, and political affairs. Although a man of considerable wealth, his outstanding virtues were those of simplicity, kindness, and humility.

It was my privilege to serve with him during the entire time he represented the county of Cuyahoga in the Ohio Senate as well as during the current term of Congress. His passing is to me a great personal loss.

He will long be remembered by those who knew him as a sincere, forthright, and forceful public servant to whom service to his city, his State, and his country was the guiding principle of his life.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to become acquainted with CHESTER BOLTON until after our election to the Seventy-sixth Congress. Although our friendship has been of short duration, I can readily appreciate and understand the reasons which have prompted so many Members to pay tribute to his memory today. It does not require years of acquaintance to discover sterling qualities such as he possessed. He has been a true friend, particularly to the new Members of Congress, who always found him willing to counsel with them upon matters in which his years of experience might be helpful. In his passing Ohio has lost one of her most distinguished citizens. The Nation has lost one of her most valued servants. His devotion to the duties of his office no doubt hastened his end, but he was not one to shun responsibility for personal reasons. He has earned the affection and esteem of his colleagues and the gratitude of the Nation. I join with other Members of the House in expressing our sorrow, and desire to express my heartfelt sympathy to his devoted family in their bereavement.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, my affection for CHESTER BOLTON was deep and abiding, and it is most difficult for me to express my sadness at his passing. He was my warm personal friend from the day of his entrance into Congress until his death. His many kindnesses to me will always be held in grateful memory.

He was always generous in thought and deed. I never heard him say an unkind thing about anybody. Meanness and bitterness were not in him. It is tragic that he had to go in the prime of his life and at the height of an honorable and useful career, but he died as he wished to, in the service of the country he loved.

I shall miss his friendship and companionship and remember him always as the highest type of the American gentleman.

My heart goes out to the splendid woman who was his wife and his three fine sons in their great loss.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, a sense of great sorrow overcomes me on being apprised of the death of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, a Member of the House of Representatives from the great State of Ohio. I am convinced that the opportunity to know our fellow Members in this House comes only through our contact in committee service. When we approach the work of Congress in the committee room and we appraise the value and characteristics of our coworkers, this appraisement, like the schoolboy's estimate of his companion, is rarely ever wrong.

I served with Mr. BOLTON for one session on the Appropriations Committee, and my acquaintance with him was slight until this time, although we had both been a Member of this body for a number of years. Just a few days' work with him unfolded to me his fine character, his splendid intellect, his profound knowledge of the problems of this Government and his love of its fundamental principles. It was said by a great English statesman, in reference to one of his coworkers, that "he would not do an unjust thing for an earthly prize or motive," and I hazard nothing when I pay this same tribute to our departed fellow Member, Mr. BOLTON. What I most admired in the service and life of our distinguished Member, Mr. BOLTON, was the great character which stood out and adorned his personality. There was no deceit in this gentleman, and he was fearless and approached every official problem with a sense of responsibility to those whom he represented, and with a deep love for his country and its destiny. It was this great and lovable character, "the diamond which scratches every other stone," which made him a power in the council of his fellow men and fitted him so well for that final judgment: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things; I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, words do not come easily when we speak of the passing of CHESTER BOLTON. Our hearts are heavy with the loss of an understanding friend, a courteous colleague, a modest, unassuming gentleman, a good citizen, an able legislator, and a good soldier.

There was no touch of the demagogue in CHESTER BOLTON. He rendered great public service without ostentation, never losing the common touch. He served State and Nation with distinction and zeal, and his native Ohio and the United States have suffered an irreparable loss in his passing.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound feeling of sorrow that I have learned of the passing of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, who so ably represented the Twenty-second District of Ohio in the House of Representatives.

When I came to Washington for the beginning of the Seventy-second Congress, Mr. BOLTON was one of the first Members with whom I became acquainted, and, as a new Member, I was deeply impressed with his courtesy and kindness.

While we were on opposite sides of many political questions, I always found him unusually tolerant of the views of others, and I have never on any occasion doubted the integrity of his motives or the sincerity of his efforts as a representative of the American people.

In his position as a member of the Committee on Appropriations it was my privilege to consult with him at various times, and I always found him to be most diligent in the performance of his many difficult tasks.

By the death of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, Ohio and the Nation have lost an outstanding public servant and a great citizen, whose passing will be mourned by all who knew him.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 20 years of friendship lead me to join in the expressions of regret and tribute voiced here concerning the untimely death of the Honorable CHESTER C. BOLTON. I subscribe to every word and thought expressed by the dean of our State delegation, Mr. JENKINS, and others who have spoken. This sad news falls as a heavy blow to all of us who have had the rare privilege of his friendship, both in and out of Congress. Our thoughts of condolence and sympathy reach out to Cleveland today in the hope that they may help comfort and sustain his family in this hour of distress and sorrow.

CHESTER C. BOLTON attended the public schools, prepared for college at University School, Cleveland, and was graduated at Harvard University with an A. B. degree in 1905. Was later awarded the honorary degree of master of civil laws at Kenyon College, 1930. Upon leaving Harvard he entered the employ of the Bourne Fuller Co., Cleveland, later a part of the Republic Steel Corporation, with which company he was associated until 1917, advancing from a clerkship to the position of assistant treasurer. He served as a private, Ohio National Guard during 1905–15 and attended the Plattsburg, N. Y., military training camp in 1916, receiving a commission as captain in the Reserve Corps.

Commissioned captain in the Ordnance Department of the United States Army in the spring of 1917. In March 1917 he was assigned as secretary to the Munitions Standards Board and later was assistant to chairman Frank Scott—of Cleveland—of the General Munitions Board and chairman of the clearance committee of the War Industries Board which was formed to coordinate the purchase of war supplies by various departments and boards and to adjust questions of priority. Ordered to active duty as captain of ordnance in May 1917, he was transferred to the General Staff and appointed aide to Benedict Crowell—quod vide—Assistant Secretary of War, and detailed to the Requirements Section of the Purchase, Storage, and Traffic Division of the General Staff, for a time in charge of that section, under Gen. Hugh S. Johnson—quod vide.

In January 1918 he was promoted to rank of lieutenant colonel and was sent to the Army War College, where he took a course of general field instruction and upon graduation was assigned to duty as assistant chief of staff of the One Hundred and First Division at Hattiesburg, Miss. Following the signing of the armistice he was sent to Washington, where he remained a member of the General Staff of the Army until receiving his honorable discharge in December 1918.

Mr. BOLTON'S political career dated from 1918, when he was elected to the Lyndhurst village council. In 1922 he was elected to the Ohio State Senate, in which he served until 1928, being majority leader and president pro tempore in 1926 to 1928. He was chairman of the senate taxation committee in 1924–26 and of the joint taxation committee in 1925–26, the latter committee making an extensive study of taxation laws in a large number of important States of the Union. This study served as a basis for tax legislation in later years. He sponsored legislation for reforestation work in Ohio which was enacted, and introduced in the senate the resolution creating a battle monuments commission which also become law and which resulted in the erection of a bridge commemorating the Thirty-seventh Division at Eyne, Belgium. He also served as chairman of the committee on banks and trust companies, as chairman of the utilities committee, and as a member of the committee on military affairs, the committee on manufacture, and the committee on commerce, fish, and game, and the committee on soldiers and sailors home.

Mr. BOLTON was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1928, and later in the same year was elected to the Seventy-first Congress from the Twenty-second Ohio District, defeating his Democratic opponent by a vote of 151,565 to 65,742. He was reelected to the Seventy-second Congress by a vote of 91,222 to 55,868 for his nearest opponent; to the Seventy-third Congress by a vote of 141,296 to 98,427 over his nearest opponent; and to the Seventy-fourth Congress, receiving 97,535 votes to 88,551 for his nearest opponent. Upon entering Congress he became a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House in 1929, and was in addition assigned to the Appropriations Committee in 1932, serving on both committees until the end of the Seventy-fourth Congress. For several years he was considered the representative of the Great Lakes States on the Rivers and Harbors Committee. During his entire service on the Appropriations Committee he was ranking minority member of the Subcommittee for the War Department, and in addition served 2 years on the Deficiency Subcommittee and 2 years on the Independent Offices Subcommittee. He also served as a member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources from 1930 to 1936; as a member of the Migratory Bird Commission for the House of Representatives from 1932 to 1936; as a member of the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentenntal Commission, 1935–36. He was defeated by a narrow margin in the landslide of 1933, but was reelected to the Seventy-sixth Congress in November 1938 by a vote of 109,494 to 87,635 for his opponent. He was reassigned to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Subcommittee for the War Department.

In March 1933 he was selected as chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee, in which capacity he inaugurated an active policy of making the public conscious of need for best qualified men in Congress, and established a field force for that purpose. During his congressional service he constantly supported welfare and relief measures as such; ardently advocated maintaining American standard of living through a tariff policy adequate enough to make up the differential between wages at home and abroad; a believer in States' rights and responsibilities, civil service, balancing expenditures with Federal income, conservation of natural resources and of wildlife, and efficient military and naval preparedness to guarantee peace; but at the same time opposed to Government competition with private business and favored reasonable Government regulation of business, resisted the delegation of legislative powers to the Executive, and vigorously opposed extension of bureaucracy and regimentation. He was always concerned with unemployment problems and is credited with securing veterans' welfare, particularly the disabled; arranged for additional beds for veterans at United States Marine Hospital, Cleveland, and in the award of new building for hospitalizing veterans in Cleveland area, which award was never carried out. He was foremost in obtaining change of Federal Government's policy under which development and maintenance of inner harbors on the Great Lakes became Federal responsibility, as had been the practice in cases of seaboard ports; secured cooperation of public schools in his district toward helping prospective candidates qualifying; sponsored legislation, and with cooperation of Congressman CROSSER, of Cleveland, secured Federal participation in the Great Lakes Exposition, 1936.

Served as a member of, and personal guarantor for the Cleveland committee, which successfully brought the Republican National Convention to that city in June 1936; was chairman of the local arrangements committee, having complete charge of the convention activities, including provisions for seating, radio, press, and wire accommodations, housing of delegates and visitors, as well as financing the city's responsibilities.

Mr. BOLTON was prominently identified with philanthropic activities and civic movements in Cleveland. Following his discharge from the Army, and upon his return to Cleveland he was among those urging the adoption of the suggestion made by Mr. Samuel Mather that the War Chest organization be used for community-fund purposes. He served on the community-fund council as a member of its original organization. He has also been a trustee of the Associated Charities in Cleveland, of the Welfare Federation, chairman of the committee for Ohio, national antisyphilis campaign of the American Social Hygiene Association, and other civic enterprises. He was a trustee of Lakeside Hospital, Western Reserve University, Lakeview Cemetery, Western Reserve Historical Society, Cleveland Museum of Art, and a member of the Case School of Applied Science Corporation, as well as a member of the vestry of Trinity Protestant Episcopal Cathedral and its executive committee. He was a director of the Standard Tool Co., the Perry-Payne Co., the Payne-Bingham Co., which he has also served as president, Lakeside and Marblehead Railroad Co., Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., and the Lamson and Sessions Co. Previously he had also served on the board of directors of the Lake Erie Bolt & Nut Co., the Cleveland Trust Co., and other business concerns in and about Cleveland.

He was active in the work of the American Legion, having served as chairman during its fund-raising campaign, as a result of which effort he was made a permanent life member of the Cuyahoga County Council; was a member of the reception committee of the American Legion in 1919, which met Marshal Foch, and traveled with him over the country. He was delegate to American Legion conventions on numerous occasions. At the time of his death he was a member of the Society of Colonial Wars, Sons of the American Revolution, and of various clubs in Cleveland, New York, Washington, Boston, and Palm Beach. He served as president of the Union and Mayfield Country Clubs, Cleveland; also as director of the City Club of Cleveland, a trustee of the Euclid Avenue Association, and a member of the Cleveland Committee, Council on Foreign Relations.

His diversions were hunting, golf, and the raising of purebred Guernsey cattle, and 10 years—1922–32—he was president and a director of the Ohio Guernsey Breeders Association; also a director of the American Guernsey Cattle Club.

Representative BOLTON was married September 14, 1907, to Frances Payne, daughter of Charles William Bingham—quod vide—industrialist and banker, of Cleveland. Three children blessed this union: Charles Bingham, Kenyon Castle, and Oliver Payne Bolton.

CHESTER BOLTON'S record in Congress began in 1928. He was sent back successively for three more terms. After an absence of 2 years he was returned in 1938 as the Representative of the Twenty-second Ohio District. His was a record of outstanding achievement, as we all know, marked by discernment, fairness, and patriotic ideals. Useful works like those which stand to his credit are bound to endure. Countless individuals have shared in the benefits. He was a part and parcel of the civic progress of the great city which proudly claims him.

Cleveland has lost one of its leading citizens. Ohio has lost one of the most able representatives the State has ever had. The Nation suffers the loss of CHESTER BOLTON'S fine qualities of statesmanship, unfortunately, at a time when they are most needed. Those of us who served with him have lost a friend.

His public service as a private citizen, in the Ohio Legislature, and in the Halls of Congress stands as an enduring monument to the cause of good government.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to speak of one whom I have known so intimately over so long a period of years as I have known CHESTER BOLTON.

I have known and loved his family since school days. I have known and loved him for over a quarter of a century. I have shared with him the associations of college, the associations of the World War, the association of the great Committee on Appropriations, the associations of Congress as a whole. There are few Members of Congress to whom I have been personally closer.

In a position which might well have led to a life of ease, CHESTER BOLTON, true to his own creed and to the traditions of his family, devoted his life to the service of the community, State, and Nation.

A lieutenant colonel during the World War, majority leader and president pro tempore of the Ohio Senate, elected five times a Member of Congress, delegate to the National Republican Convention, chairman of the National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, he was destined to play an ever-increasing role in the national life of his party and to serve for 8 years in the National House in one of the most trying periods in the history of the Nation.

He gave of himself without limitation in the service of his country. In his endeavor to create for the people of America a better nation as he saw it, he refused to spare himself even when confronted by serious ill health, and by the threat of death itself. If ever a man laid down his life in the service of America, it was the honored and beloved colleague whose untimely loss we mourn at this time.

CHESTER BOLTON was a rare individual and an outstanding public servant. Charitable institutions throughout the country will long remember his helping hand. Those of us who have known him here will not forget him. We shall always recall his marked ability, his high character, the warmth and generosity of his friendship.

To associate with him was to admire him; to know him well was to love him. His death deprives many of us of a friend who cannot be replaced. It deprives America of a devoted public servant whose ability and experience it can ill afford to lose in these difficult times.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when I received word this morning of the passing last night of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, of Cleveland, I was profoundly shocked. I knew of his illness, but did not realize that the end of earthly things for him was so near.

I knew Mr. BOLTON first as a member of the Senate of the State of Ohio. In my first term in that body Mr. BOLTON was the Republican floor leader and president pro tempore. I supported him for that high post, and during that term of 1927 and 1928 he made a most honorable and distinguished record as a great floor leader of that body. We were very closely associated in the work in that session of the Ohio Senate, and I learned to know and appreciate Mr. BOLTON for what he was—a sincere, honest, and most able public servant, who set and maintained for himself a high standard of integrity and morality in private life and in public service. The friendship that grew out of that association, I am pleased to say, has lasted through the intervening years, and when I came to Congress the first of this year it was a rare pleasure to associate again in legislative work with Mr. BOLTON.

In his passing Congress and the people of the United States have lost a high-minded and most able legislator—earnest, conscientious, and sincere, and we, his friends, will forever treasure in our memories recollections of a man great in heart and mind and a true friend.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, it seems that only after they are gone do we come to appreciate the true worth of our fellows.

In the untimely death of CHESTER C. BOLTON, I have lost a very dear friend, and the Nation has lost a useful, able, and devoted public servant.

It is said that death loves a shining mark. Our late colleague was an outstanding Member of this body. His innate ability and brilliant mind caused his counsel to be eagerly sought and highly valued.

While an ardent Republican who served his party well, he was not a bitter partisan. His friends were legion. The pleasing character of his personality endeared him to all with whom he came in contact. Of him it can truly be said that none knew him but to love him.

To live in hearts we leave behind,
Is not to die.

His circumstances were such that he might have chosen a life of ease, but instead he dedicated himself and applied his boundless energies to the service of his fellow men. There is no doubt but that his end was hastened by his unselfish devotion to duty in the face of failing health.

The philanthropies of our colleague were many, but in keeping with his nobility they were performed without ostentation.

Though CHESTER BOLTON has been called from amongst us in the prime of his life, he has left indelible footprints in the sands of time.

The measure of a man's life is the well-spending of it, and not the length.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of CHESTER C. BOLTON shocked the membership of the House into a realizing sense of the personal loss each one of us has sustained.

The death of such a man constrains us to ask once more—

What inexorable cause
Makes Time so vicious in his reaping?

So long as I live, Mr. Speaker, I shall cherish the memory of my associations with many Members of this body who have gone—

For some we loved, the loveliest and the best
That from his Vintage rolling Time hath prest,
Have drunk their cup a round or two before,
And one by one crept silently to rest.

Not least precious will be the remembrance of the hours and days spent in the companionship of CHESTER C. BOLTON. As I knew him, he would be the first to resent and the last to wish that any tribute I might pay him should be fulsome or panegyric.

He was a man's man, suaviter in modo, fortiter in re; one of the kindest, most generous and considerate, yet most resolute men I have ever known. I could say a great deal more but I feel that I have said about all that he would care to have me say. I should and I will say that he set his mark high in the honor roll of his day and generation and, going, left a record of good deeds and worth-while accomplishment of which his family, his friends, his State, and his country may well be proud.

He has passed that dread, dismal barrier we call death and entered into that "undiscovered country" we call "beyond." What is there "beyond"?

Hear what the wise and good have said. Beyond
That belt of darkness, still the years roll on
More gently, but with not less mighty sweep.
They gather up again and softly bear
All the sweet lives that late were overwhelmed
And lost to sight, * * * all are raised and borne
By that great current in its onward sweep,
Wandering and rippling with caressing waves
Around green islands with the breath
Of flowers that never wither. So they pass
From stage to stage along the shining course
Of that bright river, broadening like a sea
As its smooth eddies curl along their way.
They bring old friends together; * * * old sorrows are forgotten now,
Or but remembered to make sweet the hour
That overpays them; wounded hearts that bled
Or broke are healed forever. In the room
Of this grief-shadowed present, there shall be
A Present in whose reign no grief shall gnaw
The heart, and never shall a tender tie
Be broken; in whose reign the eternal change
That waits on growth and action shall proceed
With everlasting Concord hand in hand.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, while out driving, I was discussing with a friend of mine the outstanding leaders in the House of Representatives. I remarked to him that I regarded the Honorable CHESTER C. BOLTON, of Ohio, as being not only one of the ablest Members of the House, but one of the fairest and most considerate. About that time we approached the Capitol and observed the flag at half mast. I stopped and asked a policeman, "Who is dead?" And he replied, "Mr. CHESTER BOLTON, of Ohio."

This news came as a painful shock to me, not only because of the high esteem with which I regarded him as a conscientious legislator, but because of our friendship that began when we first met, and which increased during his years of service in the House.

Someone has referred to these friendships that grow up between Members on the different sides of the aisle here as the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics. If the friendships which CHESTER BOLTON'S life and service inspired in this body were to burst into bloom, this Hall would be buried beneath an avalanche of flowers.

There is no place in the world where a man has his measure taken more critically or where he more quickly finds his level than in this branch of the Congress of the United States. It is undoubtedly the most critical body, in sizing up its own membership, to be found in all the world, and justly so. For Members know that when sizing up one of their colleagues they must determine whether or not they can rely upon his judgment, his honesty, his integrity, and his ability in deciding whether or not to follow him on questions of great national interest, especially on those questions that rise above the scramble for party vantage or the noisy clamor of men for place and power.

CHESTER BOLTON and I did not agree on those fundamental issues that separate the two great political parties, he being a Republican and I a Democrat. But when it came to questions that transcended party lines and party policies there was no man in this House on whose judgment and integrity one could more safely rely.

From the standpoint of personality and deportment he was one of the most ideal legislators I have ever known. He never carried over from one day to another the bitterness of a conflict but came to the House every morning as fresh and as affable as if it were his first day.

He reminded me of the words of Walter Malone, the great Tennessee poet, in his verse on Opportunity, in which he said:

> Weep not for precious chances passed away,
> Wail not for golden ages on the wane;
> Each night I burn the records of the day,
> At sunrise every soul is born again.

Abler Members of the House and abler men throughout the country will pay their tributes to our departed friend in more eloquent and more appropriate terms. I merely wished to come in all humility and place a wild flower upon his bier.

If I were called upon to state my estimate of him in one sentence, my expression would be, "CHESTER BOLTON, a friend, a gentleman, a patriot, and an honest man—'the noblest work of God.'"

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 319

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHESTER C. BOLTON, a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That a committee of six Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee Messrs. CROSSER, JENKINS of Ohio, SWEENEY, WADSWORTH, BENDER, and MARSHALL.

The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 31, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1110. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the secretary, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of the activities and expenditures of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of September (H. Doc. No. 494), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 320. Resolution requesting a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306; without amendment (Rept. No. 1473). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. COLLINS introduced a bill (H. R. 7609) to authorize the foregoing of the accumulated expense account on loan cotton still in the ownership of the original borrower; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

5839. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Helmer E. Danielson and M. L. Boardman and other residents of Warren County, Pa., urging retention of present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5840. By Mr. LEAVY: Resolution of the Washington Good Roads Association, adopted at the forty-first annual convention at Walla Walla, Wash., opposing the withdrawal of any lands in the State of Washington along the range of the Cascade Mountains for national-park purposes, and pointing out that such a withdrawal would be disruptive of the present State unity and would result in a great loss to the State of Washington and to the Nation in the orderly development of the natural resources of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5841. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Virginia L. Remke, conference secretary, first district of the American Legion Auxiliary, Wheeling, W. Va., urging that the United States remain neutral in the present world crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5842. Also, petition of Joseph F. Becke, adjutant, Wheeling Post No. 1, the American Legion, Wheeling, W. Va., urging the continuation of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5843. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ralph Williams, of Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5844. Also, petition of J. Staiger, New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5845. Also, petition of Rev. Joseph L. Gingrich, Second Brethren Church of Long Beach, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5846. Also, petition of the Church of Christ, Gulfport, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the protection of conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5847. Also, petition of Lorenzo Muccio, of Bronx, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1939

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

O God, who art ever present in that hidden life which we all live, in our unspoken thoughts, in the feelings that come and go yet leave no trace, in the great conflicts of the soul in which we are sometimes conquerors and are sometimes worsted, to our secret shame: Help us to realize that each moment of life is momentous because Thou art in it, for, interfused with Thee, are we not led even when we seem to drift; taught, when we think not of learning; and crowned, when we strive worthily, whether we win or no? We pray,