

the preparedness program; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

9038. By Mr. HESS: Petition sponsored by the Mothers of Sons Forum, Cincinnati, Ohio, signed by Josephine Mahler, recording secretary, and 15,211 other residents of Cincinnati and vicinity, petitioning the President and the Congress of the United States to avoid all commitments which may involve us in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9039. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition sponsored by the Mothers of Sons Forum, Cincinnati, Ohio, signed by Grace A. Murphy, secretary, and 15,047 other residents of Cincinnati and vicinity, petitioning the President and the Congress of the United States to avoid all commitments which may involve us in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9040. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association, urging the removal of any excise tax from ethyl alcohol used in medicinal products, and that suitable and effective measures be promulgated to prevent the misuse of such tax-free alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9041. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of the El Paso Opticist Club, El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 22, 1940

In accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 86, adopted July 11, 1940, the Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian.

Rev. Duncan Fraser, assistant pastor, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful God, who alone doth rule the universe, bless, we beseech Thee, the President and Congress of the United States, that they, knowing whose ministers they are, may perform their duties to Thy honor and glory and for the highest welfare of Thy people. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HARRISON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, July 11, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 11th instant,

The VICE PRESIDENT signed, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 3046. An act to extend to certain officers and employees in the several States and the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939;

S. 3097. An act for the relief of Katherine M. Drier;

S. 4119. An act to provide for the transfer of certain land in the De Soto National Forest to the Secretary of War for use for military purposes;

H. R. 6056. An act for the relief of Antal or Anthony or Tony Zaicek or Zaiczek;

H. R. 6884. An act to encourage travel in the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7696. An act to amend the United States Grain Standards Act, to provide for the grading of soybeans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8372. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill.;

H. R. 10100. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 582. Joint resolution making an appropriation to enable the United States Maritime Commission to establish the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

Under authority of the order of the 11th instant,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore signed, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, the enrolled bill (H. R. 9877) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate and to put into effect charges for electrical energy generated at Boulder Dam, providing for the application of revenues from said project, authorizing the operation of the Boulder Dam power plant by the United States directly or through agents, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

On July 10, 1940:

S. 1789. An act to authorize the cancelation of deportation proceedings in the case of Florence Sinclair Cooper and daughter, Margaret Lavallie, and Philip P. Roy;

S. 2111. An act to amend the act entitled "An act granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties upon the Marine Hospital Service," approved February 15, 1893, as amended;

S. 2704. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Black and Marion Rabren;

S. 2774. An act for the relief of Jose Mauri;

S. 2775. An act for the relief of Henry Gideon Schiller;

S. 2799. An act for the relief of James George Mayfield;

S. 2909. An act for the relief of Dexter and Elizabeth Shiomi;

S. 2969. An act for the relief of Louise Thorne;

S. 3021. An act for the relief of A. A. Ramsey;

S. 3146. An act relating to the citizenship of William Lawrence Tan;

S. 3587. An act for the relief of Earl P. Collins;

S. 3649. An act for the relief of Harry D. Gann;

S. 3706. An act for the relief of Alfred B. Balls;

S. 3742. An act for the relief of M. E. McGivern; and

S. 3972. An act to authorize exchanges of lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.

On July 11, 1940:

S. 182. An act for the relief of Edward Hagenson;

S. 349. An act for the relief of C. F. Cooley, administrator of the estate of Charles F. Cooley, Jr.;

S. 993. An act for the relief of J. H. Wootton;

S. 1251. An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho;

S. 1376. An act for the relief of Cothran Motors, Inc.;

S. 1531. An act for the relief of Edmund S. Dennis;

S. 2570. An act for the relief of Mary Boyd;

S. 2595. An act for the relief of Lloyd S. Harris;

S. 2768. An act authorizing the naturalization of Thomas A. Lambie;

S. 2773. An act to authorize the payment of compensation to recess appointees in certain cases;

S. 2800. An act for the relief of Edward J. Ross and the legal guardian of Betty Ross, a minor;

S. 2988. An act for the relief of Bessie Sharrah;

S. 3023. An act for the relief of Clarence E. Enders and Gertrude Ray Enders;

S. 3039. An act for the relief of Twila Snyder;

S. 3059. An act for the relief of Velvie W. Smith, and the legal guardian of Glenn Richard Smith;

S. 3062. An act for the relief of the Rodgers Tile Co.;

S. 3101. An act for the relief of certain purchasers of, and entrymen upon, opened lands of certain Indian reservations;

S. 3111. An act for the relief of Thomas L. Gardner;

S. 3280. An act for the relief of Ina May Everett;

S. 3401. An act for the relief of Charles N. Barber, former United States property and disbursing officer, Vermont National Guard, and for other purposes;

S. 3424. An act for the relief of George O. Elliott and Winslow Farr Smith;

S. 3597. An act for the relief of Vernon C. Brown and F. L. Copeland;

S. 3617. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the Ohio River drainage basin;

S. 3673. An act for the relief of Capt. David H. Passell and First Lt. Paul E. LaMaster;

S. 3748. An act for the relief of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

S. 3749. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

S. 3916. An act for the relief of Lawrence T. Post, G. F. Allen, and D. Buddrus;

S. 4032. An act to provide for the reimbursement of Philip A. Penston, pharmacist's mate, first class, United States Coast Guard, for the value of personal and household effects lost and destroyed during the hurricane of September 21, 1938, at New London, Conn.;

S. 4048. An act for the relief of Elizabeth K. Peeples;

S. 4090. An act to authorize the Attorney General to donate on behalf of the United States to H. S. Scott, D. W. Collins, Fred M. Gross, trustees, Ashland District Council, Boy Scouts of America, the log house known as the John Secrest home, located on the site of the Federal Correctional Institution near Ashland, Ky.;

S. 4126. An act for the relief of Anne Howard Lay;

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims or the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. J. W. Marks, of Stephens County, Ga.;

S. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Maryland and West Virginia and the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia as signatory bodies to enter into a compact for the creation of a Potomac Valley Conservancy District and the establishment of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin; and

S. J. Res. 283. Joint resolution authorizing Col. Donald H. Connolly to hold the office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in the Department of Commerce.

On July 12, 1940:

S. 2560. An act for the relief of Marjorie Buchek;

S. 2561. An act for the relief of Ina Jones;

S. 2717. An act for the relief of Edward J. Broggi;

S. 3256. An act to enable Sadao Tanaka to remain permanently in the United States;

S. 3412. An act for the relief of John Nicholas Chicouras;

S. 3707. An act for the relief of certain disbursing agents and certifying officers of the Indian Service, the United States Veterans' Administration, and the Treasury Department; and

S. 4097. An act to provide for the disposition of estates of American citizens who die abroad.

On July 15, 1940:

S. 134. An act providing for continuing retirement pay, under certain conditions, of officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability while in the service of the United States during the World War, and for other purposes;

S. 2289. An act for the relief of the Leesburg Welding & Garage Co.; and

S. 3647. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Paul Sanford, a minor.

On July 16, 1940:

S. 29. An act to authorize the use of certain facilities of Indian reservations, national parks, and national monuments for elementary-school purposes;

S. 2018. An act for the relief of Nile Shaw and Edgar C. Bardin; and

S. 3676. An act to withdraw certain portions of land within the Hawaii National Park and to transfer the same to the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of War for military purposes.

On July 18, 1940:

S. 458. An act extending the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to provisional, probationary, or temporary officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served during the World War; and

S. 3131. An act to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army who were physically injured in line of duty while performing active duty or engaged in authorized training between dates of February 28, 1925, and July 15, 1939, both inclusive, and for other purposes.

On July 19, 1940:

S. 3046. An act to extend to certain officers and employees in the several States and the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939;

S. 3097. An act for the relief of Katherine M. Drier; and

S. 4119. An act to provide for the transfer of certain land in the De Soto National Forest to the Secretary of War for use for military purposes.

INCREASE OF CAPITAL AND LENDING POWER OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON (H. DOC. NO. 881)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

As a result of the war in Europe, far-reaching changes in world affairs have occurred, which necessarily have repercussions on the economic life both of the United States and of the other American republics. All American republics in some degree make a practice of selling, and should sell, surplus products to other parts of the world, and we in the United States export many items that are also exported by other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

The course of the war, the resultant blockades and counter-blockades, and the inevitable disorganization is preventing the flow of these surplus products to their normal markets. Necessarily this has caused distress in various parts of the New World and will continue to cause distress until foreign trade can be resumed on a normal basis and the seller of these surpluses is in a position to protect himself in disposing of his products. Until liberal commercial policies are restored and fair trading on a commercial plane is reopened distress may be continued.

I therefore request that the Congress give prompt consideration to increasing the capital and lending power of the Export-Import Bank of Washington by \$500,000,000, and removing some of the restrictions on its operations to the end that the bank may be of greater assistance to our neighbors south of the Rio Grande, including financing the handling and orderly marketing of some part of their surpluses.

It is to be hoped that before another year world trade can be reestablished, but, pending this adjustment, we in the United States should join with the peoples of the other republics of the Western Hemisphere in meeting their problems. I call the attention of Congress to the fact that by helping our neighbors we will be helping ourselves. It is in the interests of the producers of our country, as well as in the interests of producers of other American countries, that

there shall not be a disorganized or cutthroat market in those commodities which we all export.

No sensible person would advocate an attempt to prevent the normal exchange of commodities between other continents and the Americas, but what can and should be done is to prevent excessive fluctuations caused by distressed selling resulting from temporary interruption in the flow of trade, or the fact that there has not yet been reestablished a system of free exchange. Unless exporting countries are able to assist their nationals, they will be forced to bargain as best they can.

As has heretofore been made clear to the Congress, the Export-Import Bank is operated by directors representing the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and is under the supervision of the Federal Loan Administrator, so that all interested branches of our Government participate in any loans that are authorized, and the directors of the bank should have a free hand as to the purposes for which loans are authorized and the terms and conditions upon which they are made.

I therefore request passage of appropriate legislation to this end.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 1940.

LAW OF PUERTO RICO

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 23 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith certified copies of laws enacted by the fourth regular session of the fourteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 12 to April 15, 1940.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 1940.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SPECIAL ASSISTANTS UNDER DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice," as of July 1, 1940, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STONY POINT LIGHT STATION RESERVATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of July 30, 1937, authorizing the conveyance of a portion of the Stony Point Light Station Reservation to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

GUY F. ALLEN, CHIEF DISBURSING OFFICER, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Guy F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

EXTENSION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND CIVILIAN REHABILITATION TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft

of proposed legislation to extend to the Virgin Islands the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational education and civilian rehabilitation, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND ALONG MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted at Astoria, Oreg., by the sixth annual convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, favoring the enactment of House bill 8616, to provide for cooperation with the States for the relief of unemployment, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted at Astoria, Oreg., by the sixth annual convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, endorsing the position taken by the Congress of Industrial Organizations for the solution of the problem of reuniting the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and all labor into one organization, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted at a mass meeting held under the auspices of the United Lithuanian American Societies of Essex County, at Newark, N. J., protesting against the Communist invasion of the Baltic States of Europe, and favoring withdrawal of the recognition of the Soviet Union of Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Department of Massachusetts, United Spanish War Veterans, at Northampton, Mass., favoring increased Federal investigation of "fifth column" activities in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Lions Clubs of Gibsland, La.; Frederick, Md.; Van Buren, Ark., and Lott and Waxahachie, Tex., favoring the adoption of an adequate national-defense program and the suppression of all subversive activities in the Nation, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Fred W. Klasey, precinct committeeman of Covington precinct, South Sioux City, Nebr., remonstrating against the confirmation of Ralph Kilzer to be postmaster at South Sioux City, Nebr., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Department of Massachusetts, United Spanish War Veterans, at Northampton, Mass., favoring the enactment of a compulsory selective-service law, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Theta Delta Chi Fraternity, Chicago, Ill., favoring immediate development of the Nation's military, naval, and air forces, including all necessary material, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying that a day be set aside for prayer and repentance, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of Local No. 88, United American Artists Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations, of San Francisco, Calif., favoring the adoption of an adequate national-defense program, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Democratic Youth Federation of California, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the so-called Smith Act, providing for

fingerprinting of aliens, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of members of the Yo-Ma-Co Club, of San Diego, Calif., praying for the adoption of an adequate national-defense program, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HOLT presented the petition of Cabin Creek Post, No. 80, American Legion, of Cabin Creek, W. Va., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 134) providing for continuing retirement pay, under certain conditions, of officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability while in the service of the United States during the World War, and for other purposes, and remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 409) to protect American labor and stimulate the employment of American citizens on American jobs, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 6365. A bill to correct the military record of DeRosey C. Cabell, McFarland Cockrill, James N. Caperton, Junius H. Houghton, Otto F. Lange, Paul B. Parker, James deB. Walbach, and Victor W. B. Wales (Rept. No. 1956);

H. R. 9024. A bill relating to the status of retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and to amend section 113 of the Criminal Code (Rept. No. 1957).

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 472) to prohibit the sale or disposal of the United States customhouse for the city of Detroit, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BURKE, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 719. A bill for the relief of Francis G. McDougall (Rept. No. 1958);

H. R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Carl Hurt (Rept. No. 1959);

H. R. 2490. A bill for the relief of Fulton Combs (Rept. No. 1960);

H. R. 3992. A bill for the relief of Frank Spears (Rept. No. 1961);

H. R. 5116. A bill for the relief of Thomas Miralia and Betty Miralia (Rept. No. 1962);

H. R. 5254. A bill for the relief of the captain and crew of the fishing boat *Unione No. 1* (Rept. No. 1963);

H. R. 5309. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Taylor (Rept. No. 1964);

H. R. 5562. A bill for the relief of Clyde E. Malle (Rept. No. 1965);

H. R. 6740. A bill for the relief of the estate of J. L. Fretwell (Rept. No. 1966);

H. R. 7416. A bill for the relief of Theodore R. King (Rept. No. 1967);

H. R. 7668. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Buxton Hospital (Rept. No. 1968);

H. R. 7679. A bill for the relief of J. E. Dambach (Rept. No. 1969);

H. R. 7851. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department (Rept. No. 1970);

H. R. 7957. A bill for the relief of Willie Perry (Rept. No. 1971);

H. R. 8028. A bill for the relief of Zoe Hoyt Wagner and Io F. Hoyt (Rept. No. 1972);

H. R. 8091. A bill for the relief of May C. Taylor (Rept. No. 1973);

H. R. 8217. A bill for the relief of Thomas R. Fox (Rept. No. 1974);

H. R. 8246. A bill for the relief of Clyde Caietti, a minor (Rept. No. 1975);

H. R. 8318. A bill for the relief of the Charles H. Amos Handle Co. (Rept. No. 1976);

H. R. 8459. A bill for the relief of Edna S. Gardiner (Rept. No. 1977);

H. R. 8504. A bill for the relief of Dr. A. C. Wade (Rept. No. 1978);

H. R. 8666. A bill for the relief of certain claimants on account of loss by fire for which the United States was adjudged liable (Rept. No. 1979);

H. R. 8946. A bill for the relief of Rufus K. Sanderlin (Rept. No. 1980);

H. R. 9130. A bill for the relief of Fred Shelton (Rept. No. 1981);

H. R. 9520. A bill for the relief of Edward F. Higgins, postmaster, Great Neck, N. Y. (Rept. No. 1982); and

H. R. 10034. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Interior, and the Army (Rept. No. 1983).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On July 11, 1940:

S. 29. An act to authorize the use of certain facilities of national parks and national monuments for elementary-school purposes;

S. 458. An act extending the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to provisional, probationary, or temporary officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served during the World War;

S. 2018. An act for the relief of Nile Shaw and Edgar C. Bardin; and

S. 3131. An act to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army who were physically injured in line of duty while performing active duty or engaged in authorized training between dates of February 28, 1925, and July 15, 1939, both inclusive, and for other purposes.

On July 13, 1940:

S. 3046. An act to extend to certain officers and employees in the several States and the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939;

S. 3097. An act for the relief of Katherine M. Drier; and

S. 4119. An act to provide for the transfer of certain land in the De Soto National Forest to the Secretary of War for use for military purposes.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. SHEPPARD introduced a bill (S. 4203) to provide for the employment on active duty of retired personnel of the Regular Army, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INCREASE OF CAPITAL AND LENDING POWER OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] I introduce a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I also ask that a statement of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred as requested, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4204) to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. GLASS (for Mr. WAGNER) is as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT F. WAGNER, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY OF THE SENATE

Developments in Europe have made us more aware than ever of the necessity of strengthening our ties with the countries of the Western Hemisphere in meeting the common problems of economics

and defense. Accordingly, I am today introducing a bill which will lift restrictions of existing law on loans to or transactions with foreign countries insofar as they affect the dealing of the bank with the countries of the Western Hemisphere and permit the Export-Import Bank to make loans to assist in developing the resources, in stabilizing the economies, and in furthering the orderly marketing of the products of such countries.

These additional powers are to be exercised only upon the request of the Federal Loan Administrator with the approval of the President and subject to such conditions and limitations as they may impose. The bill also increases from \$200,000,000 to \$700,000,000 the amount of loans which the bank may have outstanding at any one time and authorizes the R. F. C. to provide the bank with funds not to exceed \$500,000,000.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND OTHER INFORMATION CONCERNING CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. BYRD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 292), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed (1) to prepare and transmit to the Senate forthwith or as soon as practicable a complete financial statement for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, of each of the agencies and corporations enumerated in Senate Resolution No. 150, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, agreed to June 27, 1939; and (2) to secure and transmit to the Senate immediately a copy of the last annual report of each such agency and corporation, whether or not such report, pursuant to law, is required to be made to the Congress. The financial statements of such agencies and corporations herein required for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, shall be of the same character and shall include similar information for such fiscal year as the financial statement of such agencies and corporations for prior fiscal years heretofore transmitted to the Senate pursuant to such resolution and printed in Senate Document No. 172, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

ORDER FOR SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, PETITIONS, BILLS, AND REPORTS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment following today's session the Secretary of the Senate may receive messages from the President of the United States or the House of Representatives for appropriate references; and that petitions, reports of committees, and bills may also be received by the Secretary for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

VOLUNTARY ARMY ENLISTMENTS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, underlying the question of conscription or universal service is the primary question of whether or not enlistments are proceeding on a voluntary basis at a satisfactory pace. I have been seeking information from the War Department on that subject. I present a letter from Major General Adams, Adjutant General of the Army, and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JULY 15, 1940.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: Replying to your inquiry of July 11, 1940, and in response to your specific question, "Does the present experience of the War Department justify the belief that its personnel requirements under the national-defense program as at present authorized will be provided by voluntary enlistment through regular existing channels and methods?" it is the opinion of the Army recruiting service that under present conditions the additional enlisted personnel required under the national-defense program to raise the strength of the Regular Army to 375,000 men can be procured by voluntary enlistment within a period of approximately 5 months from the time the complete task is assigned to the recruiting service for execution. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 11, 1940, on page 14396, contains recently compiled figures furnished by me.

The importance of the time factor presents the great problem of the War Department under a system of voluntary recruiting. It is the desire of the Chief of Staff to obtain men as quickly as possible for the organization of new units and to bring existing units up to full strength.

Respectfully yours,

E. S. ADAMS,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. BYRNES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address to the Democratic National Conven-

tion broadcast by the President from the White House on July 19, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MRS. ROOSEVELT TO DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Democratic National Convention on July 18, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY AT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator BARKLEY as permanent chairman of the Democratic National Convention at Chicago, Ill., on July 16, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE 1940 PLATFORM OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY

[Mr. BYRNES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the platform adopted by the Democratic Party at its national convention held in Chicago from July 15 to 19, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FRANK O'CONNOR AT CHICAGO CONVENTION NOMINATING HON. HENRY A. WALLACE FOR VICE PRESIDENCY

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at the Democratic National Convention at Chicago, Ill., July 18, 1940, nominating Hon. Henry A. Wallace for the Vice Presidency, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GLASS NOMINATING HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago by Senator GLASS placing in nomination for the Presidency Hon. James A. Farley, of New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT SECOND SESSION, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the second session of the Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Ill., on July 15, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRECONVENTION RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a preconvention radio address delivered from Chicago, Ill., on the evening of July 14, 1940, by Hon. James A. Farley, which appears in the Appendix.]

HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Democratic National Convention on July 16 thanking Chairman James A. Farley for his services, a motion made by Mr. Farley on July 17 to make unanimous the nomination of President Roosevelt, and a statement by Mr. Farley issued on July 19, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND WORLD PROBLEMS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on July 19, 1940, on the political situation and world problems, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOCATION OF NATIONAL-DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Hon. Payne Ratner, Governor of Kansas, to the President, relative to the location of national-defense industries, and also a letter addressed by him to Mr. Knudsen, of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO ON PROPOSED PEACE PLANK

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Chicago, Ill., July 14, 1940, entitled "A Plea for a Peace Plank," which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTITUTION OF INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. SHEPPARD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the constitution of the Inter-American Bar Association and other matter relative thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

"IS THERE A SPY MENACE?"—ARTICLE BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by J. Edgar Hoover entitled "Is There a Spy Menace?" published in This Week magazine of July 14, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY FREDERIC WILLIAM WILE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Frederic William Wile on the subject of national defense, published in the Washington Evening Star of July 17, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED DEPORTATION OF HARRY R. BRIDGES

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have received many letters regarding House bill 9766, to deport one Harry Renton Bridges, complaining that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has not favorably reported that bill to the Senate. The bill to deport Bridges was not referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, but to the Senate Committee on Immigration. Had the bill been referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary it would have been reported favorably.

An enemy within the gates and hammering on the gates from within may be, if not more dangerous, equally as dangerous as an enemy outside the gates hammering from without. The recent melancholy and bloody history of Norway, Belgium, Holland, and France is evidence too convincing as to the danger of an enemy hammering upon the gates from within. All too long has the hospitality of the United States been violated by this man Bridges, who is an alien and therefore is a guest of the United States. All too long have the American people been tortured by that evil, unhappy man. I hope the Senate Committee on Immigration will, at an early date, report the bill proposing his deportation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I was very happy, indeed, to hear my distinguished colleague from Arizona make mention of the Bridges case. As we all know, a bill designed for the deportation of Bridges was introduced in the House of Representatives and was passed by that body. It came over to the Senate several weeks ago and was referred to the Committee on Immigration. At that time the chairman of that committee of the Senate designated a subcommittee of three Senators to consider the bill. I understand the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is a member of that subcommittee. Several days ago when the Senator from Arizona was interesting himself in the subject upon which he spoke a moment ago, the Bridges case, I made inquiry of the Senator from Utah, who was then in the Chamber, as to what disposition, if any, had been made of the bill. I was informed then, according to my recollection, that up to that time the committee had not held a meeting, but that they proposed to meet within a week. I sincerely trust that the Senator from Utah and the other members of the committee designated to serve with him as a subcommittee will give immediate attention to the subject, in which particularly the members of the American Legion have been primarily interested since the bill was first introduced. As a matter of fact, in fairness to the American Legion, and to give praise where praise is deserved, I may say that the probabilities are that had it not been for the activities and interest evidenced by virtually every American Legion post throughout the country, the bill never would have been introduced, and, doubtless, if it had not been for the very fine, thorough, and patriotic American activities of the Legion, the bill never would have been passed by the other House. Now that progress has been made to the extent of having brought about the passage by the other House of the bill, and since it is pending in the Senate of the United States, I believe that the American people are looking to this body certainly to give the bill con-

sideration. I hope that they will do so without delay. It appears that we are going to be here for many months to come, and that is well, because the American people are interested to have us stay here and look after their business.

As soon as I am able to ascertain when the committee will meet I shall be very happy indeed to advise other Members of this body and those who are not Members of the Congress of the United States as to its meeting, because, according to the letters I have received in the form of inquiries, many persons are desirous of appearing before the committee. We have too long coddled Communists and Nazis and Fascists and alien criminals and those who are enemies of the American Government. The people are becoming tired of such coddling and want action. I believe they are desirous of action in this particular instance. The people of America want to know whether or not we are to get rid of this man Bridges, who certainly is not friendly to our form of government and who has evidenced that fact in San Francisco on innumerable occasions. Once upon a time, not so many years ago, his activities cost the taxpayers of America a great deal of money, and particularly they cost money to the investors of America who were interested in shipping; and they were not all millionaires. I surmise, as in the case of all other corporations of that nature, that many widows and orphans had their funds invested in shipping. His activities in holding up the American mail, virtually lowering the American flag on the coast, constituted an outrage; and yet the American people have not as yet been aroused to his activities and the harm he has done to this country.

A few moments ago I met in the hall my colleague from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and my colleague from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. They asked me if I was going to talk today. I said, "Yes." "What are you going to talk about?" I said, "I am going to talk about communism, the Nazis who are overrunning the country, and un-American activities." They said, "The same thing?" I said, "Yes; the same thing." I said, "Speaking of the same thing, you will recall that almost every day for 5 long years I have spoken on the floor of the Senate urging the Congress for God's sake to pass a law providing for the mandatory registration and fingerprinting of aliens. For 5 long years I have talked about that; and, thank Heaven, the Congress of the United States has finally passed a law, for the protection of the American people, making it mandatory upon aliens in this country to register and be fingerprinted in order that we might know how many there are here, where they are, what they are doing, what they have been doing, where they came from, how long they have been here, and so forth."

So I am going to talk today about Communists. I am going to talk about the activities of the Nazi bund. I am going to talk about the Fascist organizations which we believe to be un-American. I want to say to my colleagues that if I get a chance I propose to talk about that subject every day for the next 5 years, or until such time as we can outlaw the Communist Party, the bund, and all similar organizations. I shall not apologize to my colleagues for doing so.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. That will not be necessary, because I recognize that the able Senator from Arizona, who now wishes to interrupt me, is equally interested in the subject. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, when I rose it was not to make explanation concerning myself. My philosophy of public life has been not to explain, because when you once undertake to explain you will tomorrow be explaining your explanation; but I believed it was due to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I happen to be chairman—and I am proud to have that honor—I believed it was an act of courtesy due to the members of the committee as well as due to the Senate, to say that the bill proposing to deport this evil and unhappy man Bridges, who has tortured the American people far too

long, was not sent to the Committee on the Judiciary but was referred to the Committee on Immigration. I am not to be understood as criticizing the Committee on Immigration, because I have no doubt they will give the bill careful consideration, and make a report at an early date; but I say again that the melancholy and bloody recent history of Norway and Holland and Belgium, and particularly France, demonstrates to any man who thinks into things instead of around things that an enemy hammering on the gates from within is even more dangerous than the enemy hammering from without.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator immensely for that contribution. In response thereto, I desire to say that I am 100 percent in accord with every single word that fell from his lips. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Arizona, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate of the United States, because it was his committee which gave immediate consideration to the bill which the House sent to the Senate relative to the mandatory registration and fingerprinting of aliens. When it reached the committee presided over by the able Senator from Arizona it was given immediate attention. I think the American people are indebted to our distinguished friend for the fine service he has rendered to them in immediately passing upon favorably and reporting to this body that bill, which was forthwith passed without hesitation or delay.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. It is not necessary for any Member of this body to make any excuse or defense upon behalf of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the Committee on Immigration; but, for fear that there might be some who would consider that what has been said could be construed as a criticism of the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, I should like briefly to state the situation.

When the bill came over from the House the Senator from Georgia immediately, as is the custom of committees of this body, referred it to the department involved, the Department of Justice. Within 1 day after the report came back from the Department the Senator from Georgia called a meeting of the Committee on Immigration, and a subcommittee was appointed to consider the bill. That happened just 3 days before the Republican Convention met. There have been a number of efforts upon the part of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], to arrange for a meeting of the subcommittee; but since that time events have occurred which have made it impossible for the subcommittee to meet.

I wish to assure the Senator from Arizona and the Senate that there is no desire upon the part of anybody in the Committee on Immigration to delay the bill, and particularly to give assurance that the chairman of the Committee on Immigration has acted with all possible expedition with respect to the bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, after that explanation I desire to say that I am happy to have had the opportunity of yielding to my distinguished colleague. I assure him that there was no reflection upon the part of the Senator from Arizona or myself relative to the chairman of the Immigration Committee, because we happen to know personally as well as generally that no committee of this body has a more able chairman than the junior Senator from the State of Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I know, just as the Senator from Washington has stated, that the day following the arrival of the bill here it was dispatched to the proper official of the Government for comment, according to my recollection, and that immediately after the return of the Senator from Georgia he designated a subcommittee to consider the bill, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] being the chairman thereof. There was not the slightest idea of casting any reflection upon the Senator from Georgia. We know that he is a fine chairman, and I think we know how he stands on this subject. All congratulations to him for the fine work he has done. In pursuance of that thought I may add, in fairness to the Senator from Georgia,

that I have introduced in this body a number of bills which have been referred to his committee, and I have always received prompt action in the committee so far as those bills are concerned.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the pen of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, entitled "Is There a Spy Menace?" Mr. Hoover says "Yes." This is a brief article. I happened to observe it recently in the magazine section of the New York Herald Tribune, entitled "This Week." I thought the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would find interest in the article, because we hear so much about the "fifth column," and alien enemies, and spies, and saboteurs, and so forth. I introduce it at this juncture of my remarks, because I expect to speak briefly pertaining to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD. (The article appears in the Appendix.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am brought now to the activities of the Kiwanis Club of Graham, N. C.

When I returned to Washington from Chicago I found on my desk printed resolutions. I desire to read those resolutions. They were adopted by the Graham (N. C.) Kiwanis Club. They are as follows:

Whereas the United States of America, realizing that the present war is becoming a world-wide conflict involving the Western Hemisphere without its consent, has renounced her policy of neutrality in favor of a policy of nonbelligerency, as compatible with conditions as they exist; and

Whereas our defense at this time consists in sending all possible aid to the Allies, consisting of all types of materials of war, and sustenance; and

Whereas this makes it apparent that at this time America's first line of defense is the army of men and women who constitute our industrial organizations—

The next word is "Therefore," but before proceeding with the remainder of the resolution I wish to digress to insist again, in reference to national defense, that those in authority, and particularly those connected with the State Department, give immediate attention to two resolutions I offered in this body many months ago pertaining to a subject about which I have spoken many times, which subject I first approached several years ago, to wit, the acquisition of islands in the Caribbean and in the north Atlantic and in the far North, approaching the Arctic, which are possessed by Great Britain and France.

Months ago, as many of my colleagues know, I submitted resolutions authorizing the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with the heads of the Governments of Great Britain and France to endeavor to acquire the island possessions in the Western Hemisphere belonging to those countries. Those resolutions were forthwith referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the very able chairman of that committee sent the resolutions to the State Department for comment, and, according to information which I have but recently received, the State Department has never responded to the suggestions set out in the aforementioned resolutions.

Mr. President, I approach this subject from a national-defense standpoint in view of the fact that the resolution to which I refer as having been adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Graham, N. C., mentions our first line of defense in connection with our industrial organizations, insofar as labor is concerned.

I say that we should provide for ourselves a physical first line of defense. At this session we have appropriated, according to the tabulation made a few days ago by my beloved friend the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], about \$17,000,000,000 as a total for national defense.

With the expenditure of that vast amount of money we can acquire for ourselves a real physical national defense, in the form of outposts, without it costing us anything, if we will act. Some may inquire how? By negotiating with the Governments of France and Great Britain to let us obtain

their island possessions in the Western Hemisphere, with the understanding that the amounts agreed upon, whatever they might be, shall be struck off from the several billion dollars those governments have owed us for a number of years past.

I know, of course, that we of America are in sympathy with the last democracy remaining upon the face of the earth outside the Western Hemisphere, that we are grieved over the falling of France as a result of the advance of the totalitarian countries. But the time has arrived when we must consider primarily and profoundly and seriously the interests of our own Government at home, which soon will unquestionably be in peril as a result, first, of the enemy from within; secondly, from a war of commerce in the Western Hemisphere; and, thirdly and lastly, from the enemy without.

France owes us about \$4,000,000,000; Great Britain owes us about \$5,000,000,000. I cannot recall the exact figures, but they total into the billions. Now, while we are making expenditure of \$17,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, while we are considering the Burke-Wadsworth bill to conscript millions of young men in this country for the purpose of handling the arms we are to provide, we should consider the welding of a steel band of defense around the United States extending from the coast of South America, from Port-of-Spain, the capital of Trinidad, northward through the Caribbean to Bermuda, and from there northward, approaching the Arctic, to St. Pierre and Miquelon. Then we should go westward to Alaska and should fortify the Alaskan coast, which is now being given consideration, and concerning which appropriations have been made. Then we should proceed southward through the Pacific to the Hawaiian Islands, down by Costa Rica, the Panama Canal, and as far south as the islands, just south of the Equator, which belong to the Republic of Ecuador.

If we do that, in the acquisition of those island possessions we will have done as much without cost toward the protection of the United States and the protection of the Panama Canal, as we will have done virtually in making expenditure of \$17,000,000,000.

Trinidad belongs to Great Britain. Proceeding to the Windward and the Leeward Islands, and we find a number of islands which belong to Great Britain and France. Proceeding northward and we find Bimini, only 50 miles off the coast of Florida; we find Nassau, only 150 miles off the coast of Florida; we find, further north, Bermuda, 500 miles off the coast of North Carolina; and it will be remembered that we have no outposts in the North Atlantic.

Proceeding northward toward the Arctic, we come to the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, which belong to the French. If we are to undertake the protection of Canada, as well as Central and South America, unquestionably, eventually we will want to make arrangements by which we can establish outposts in Newfoundland, because, as we know, in Newfoundland has been constructed one of the finest airports in the world for the use of planes which hop the Atlantic by way of the northern circle.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Speaking of crossing the Atlantic from Newfoundland, it was my pleasure recently to accompany a delegation from Botwood to Ireland and then to Southampton and London. We learned much of the value of air bases along the Atlantic coast.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Did the Senator fly the northern route?

Mr. LUNDEEN. We flew the northern route. Of course, these bases are tremendously important.

Mr. REYNOLDS. My recollection is that Signor Balbo, the real ace flier of the Italian air force, who recently lost his life in North Africa, when flying the North Atlantic with a squadron of planes proceeded to Alaska by way of Labrador and other points. As I was about to say, perhaps at some time we shall enter into negotiations with Canada for the establishment of some bases in that northern country. Of course, we could fly directly across the North American Continent and no doubt establish a base at Point Barrow, which is the northernmost point in the Western Hemisphere. Then we

would come to the Little Diomed Island and the Big Diomed Island. I may state at this point that information has reached me, information which I conveyed to The Assistant Secretary of War, Col. Louis Johnson, that the Russians are now fortifying the Big Diomed Island, which they own. We own the Little Diomed, and they are separated only by a mile of ocean. In addition to that, I have other information to the effect that the Russians are fortifying their coast more strongly than ever before, and that is not far from the American coast.

Before I leave a discussion of the Arctic let me point out another matter, which I hope will be remembered, and I hope that these words will reach the State Department. Two years ago I submitted a resolution in the Senate authorizing the State Department to ascertain the legal status of the possession of an island called Wrangell Island. This year I offered a similar resolution. Wrangell Island is directly between Point Barrow and the Siberian coast. Wrangell Island is the size of Jamaica. Wrangell Island within a quarter of a century will be one of the most important islands in all the world, because the time may come when we shall experience difficulty with the Soviet Union; the time will come when we shall fly directly from New York City to the capital of the Philippines, Manila, and in so doing we will fly directly across Wrangell Island; and the only stop, no doubt, will be Wrangell Island, where factories can be established and where places for the taking off of passenger planes can be provided without any difficulty or expense.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will yield in a moment. My resolution was forwarded by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] to the State Department, and I am informed that in a year no word has come from that Department. I am thoroughly of the opinion, as are innumerable others, who have been in the Arctic and have studied conditions, that that is going to be one of the most important of points if we should become involved in war with the Soviet Union. But if we should never become so involved, it would certainly be an important point from the standpoint of modern air transportation.

Now I yield to the able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wonder if the distinguished Senator, who has given so much time and research to this subject of land bases, airplane bases, and sea bases, for which he should be highly commended, and I know the public appreciates it, as well as the Senate—I wonder if the Senator would agree with me that there should be a great airplane base and sea-plane base at Dutch Harbor as well as at Anchorage and Kodiak?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, certainly.

Mr. LUNDEEN. We are now building a great airfield at Fairbanks, inland, and we are building at Nome, and one base north of Nome. I notice on the map, of course, the enlargement of the base at Sitka, and one or two others, and then going to Anchorage, but I find nothing being done at Dutch Harbor or Unalaska, which is farther west, and there should be a strong base there.

Mr. REYNOLDS. For some time we have had a Coast Guard station at Dutch Harbor and at Unalaska across from Dutch Harbor, and appropriations have been made to the extent of about \$12,300,000 for the establishment of a base at Unalaska. The establishment of a base at Unalaska is virtually the establishment of a base at Dutch Harbor, because they are just across a little body of water from one another. You can see from one to the other.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I know, but I wonder whether that appropriation provides for improvements there for a first-class air base as well as a sea base.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, it does; because that is not going to cost very much.

Mr. LUNDEEN. A recent map published in the press gave the Anchorage and Kodiak bases but did not show anything at Unalaska nor did it show anything at Dutch Harbor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Surveys have been made for Dutch Harbor.

Mr. LUNDEEN. But I am asking the able Senator, has anything been done about it except surveying?

Mr. REYNOLDS. My understanding is that only surveys are in contemplation so far, but they have in mind at the same time—and it is well that they have—the creation of establishments of defense farther westward toward Russia and Japan; in other words, the establishment of defense bases along the Aleutian Islands, which extend for about 1,200 miles westward beyond Unalaska. The island that is farthest west in the Pacific is Attu, and Attu, as I stated a while ago, is only one-half hour by plane from Japanese territory, and Attu is only about 1 hour and 45 minutes from Russian territory.

I agree with the Senator that certainly now, in view of the situation all over the world, matters being as chaotic as they are, we should in this great national-defense program provide for the establishment of bases in the section that the Senator referred to.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the Senator permit me to venture the statement that these billions of dollars we are appropriating now are being put into some weapons, and that is very well, provided we do not give them away to somebody; providing we keep them for American defense. But weapons become obsolete. They disappear. But if we acquire these bases that the Senator has so ably described here, we will have them and they will not become obsolete, and these bases, whether naval, air bases, or land bases will serve for American defense. If we acquire these island bases on the Pacific and the Atlantic, both north and south, they will be used in the interest of hemispherical defense, Monroe Doctrine defense, the American hemisphere defense, as I should like to call it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The American defense.

Mr. LUNDEEN. And that is American defense. If we build these bases we can show America some actual results, something concrete and definite, and not a lot of weapons which in a short time will become obsolete. Even a warship in a short time becomes obsolete and is taken out of service, and one wonders what became of the billions of dollars we appropriated. But if we establish bases at these points, and make them permanent, they will stay there down through the centuries for our protection.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In other words, arms soon get out of date, they are worn out, but these island possessions that I mention now, will form a steel band of defense around the United States, and will be there as long as the world remains. Proceeding southward from Attu, the most western island of the Aleutian group, we come to the Hawaiian group.

At this time I wish to state again that I think we should endeavor to bring about negotiations between the Republic of Mexico and the United States for our acquisition of the Mexican Peninsula, because on that peninsula, and particularly toward the tail end of it, as a matter of fact, we can establish both seaplane bases and airplane bases without great difficulty or without a great deal of expense.

Lying between the peninsula of Mexico and the main body of the Republic of Mexico there are deep waters capable of concealing swift gunboats and submarines and portions of battle fleets.

Farther southward we should get Goose Island, which belongs to Costa Rica, and Cocos Island, likewise one of its possessions, and as I stated a moment ago, farther south, below the Equator, some of the Dry Tortugas Islands, which belong to Ecuador now.

For several years I have been talking about the acquisition of the island possessions of France and Great Britain in this hemisphere. I am sorry indeed that my suggestions were not considered and passed upon and proceeded upon, because if they had been considered, and if actual progress had been made in carrying them out, unquestionably we could have obtained the possessions of France in the Western Hemisphere, to be credited to their indebtedness to our country, and had we done that before France fell, before she was

devoured by the totalitarian powers, there would not have been the embarrassment that perhaps we should now experience, regardless of the Monroe Doctrine. And why? Because France was then an independent republic. France then could have negotiated with us for the transfer of these islands, and no doubt would have been glad to have done so if she had been properly approached in a friendly manner.

Now, as the result of our not having taken that action, what do we find? We find that France owns Devil's Islands—I say "islands," because there are three main ones—upon which her prisoners are located, about 5 miles off French Guiana. The French owned—I put this in the past tense, because we do not know what is going to happen to them now since France was conquered by the totalitarian powers—French Guiana, north of Brazil, Martinique, and other islands in the Caribbean, and among the Leeward Islands. In addition to that the French owned St. Pierre and Miquelon.

All those islands, from South America northward, are absolutely essential to us in order to establish a real permanent defense in the Atlantic. Since we did not take advantage of that opportunity, no doubt we shall now experience embarrassment and perhaps trouble in trying to get them. We now know that we need them and we want them. We know that they are not going to be profitable from an economical standpoint. We have studied the statistics with respect to all those islands. The Virgin Islands have not been profitable from the economical standpoint, nor has Puerto Rico, but we need them for defense. The American people are demanding defense for this country, and I say we ought to have these other islands now for that purpose.

If ever, unfortunately, we are called upon to give the blood of American sons in battle to defend the shores of America, let that blood be spilt in the Atlantic or in the Pacific, and let not one drop of it be spilt upon the fertile soil of America. To assure us of that we must of necessity be the possessors of these islands, so that if fighting ever takes place by the forces of America, the fighting will occur outside the continental United States. Let us prepare for ourselves not alone an adequate national defense but such a perfect national defense that it cannot be penetrated by battleships or by airplanes. To do that we must have the outposts that the Senator has mentioned, and that I have described.

Now so much for national-defense outposts.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I will say that the Senator's able argument would apply also to the islands belonging to the Netherlands and those belonging to Denmark also, would it not?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; certainly.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I do not believe the Senator would advocate taking a defeatist position, now that events have transpired as they have, but that we should still endeavor to negotiate to get those islands, and if we do not succeed, if we run into difficulties, we should proceed in the interest of national defense and go down there with the armed forces of America and protect this country.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I make the point that we could have done it with less difficulty had we acted sooner, and, insofar as I am personally concerned, I wish to say that I would never permit the totalitarian powers abroad to come here and establish bases, or claim possession of anything in the Western Hemisphere—and let that be well understood. We could not, as a matter of fact, permit such a thing under the Monroe Doctrine.

Insofar as the resolution by the Kiwanis Club of Graham, N. C., is concerned, I left off reading at the word "Therefore." I continue:

Be it resolved, That the Kiwanis Club of Graham, N. C., petition the Governor of North Carolina, and the Congress of the United States, through our Representatives in the National Congress to—

What?—

to insure the efficient working of this vast army of American labor—
By outlawing all anti-American organizations.

At this juncture I ask to have printed in the RECORD a bill which I introduced on May 28 entitled "A bill to outlaw the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, and all organizations, groups, or individuals associated therewith, who seek to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence through the advocacy of criminal anarchy, criminal communism, criminal nazi-ism, and criminal fascism." Instead of reading the bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 4132) is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That criminal anarchy, criminal communism, criminal nazi-ism, or criminal fascism are doctrines that existing forms of constitutional government should be overthrown by force or violence or by any other unlawful means, or by assassination of officials of the Government of the United States or of the several States. The advocacy of such doctrines either by word of mouth or writing or the promotion of such doctrines independently or in collaboration with or under the guidance of officials of a foreign state or an international revolutionary party or group is a felony.

Sec. 2. Any person who—

(a) By word of mouth or writing advocates, advises, or teaches the duty, necessity, or propriety of overthrowing or overturning existing forms of constitutional government by force or violence; of disobeying or sabotaging or hindering the carrying out of the laws, orders, or decrees of duly constituted civil, naval, or military authorities; or by the assassination of officials of the Government of the United States or of the several States or by any unlawful means or under the guidance of or in collaboration with officials, agents, or representatives of a foreign state or an international revolutionary party or group; or

(b) Prints, publishes, edits, issues, or knowingly circulates, sells, distributes, or publicly displays any book, paper, document, or written or printed matter in any form, containing or advocating, advising or teaching the doctrine that constitutional government should be overthrown by force, violence, or any unlawful means; or

(c) Openly, willfully, and deliberately urges, advocates, or justifies by word of mouth or writing the assassination or unlawful killing or assaulting of any official of the Government of the United States or of the several States because of his official character or any other crime, with intent to teach, spread, or advocate the propriety of the doctrines of criminal anarchy, criminal communism, criminal nazi-ism, or criminal fascism; or

(d) Organizes or helps to organize or becomes a member of or voluntarily assembles with any society, group, or assembly of persons formed to teach or advocate such doctrines; or

(e) Becomes a member of, associated with, or promotes the interest of any criminal anarchistic, communistic, nazi-istic, or fascistic organization, or helps to organize or becomes a member of or affiliated with any subsidiary organization or associated group of persons who advocates, teaches, or advises the principles of criminal anarchy, criminal communism, criminal nazi-ism, or criminal fascism;

Shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof be subject to imprisonment for not more than 10 years or a fine of not more than \$10,000, or both.

Sec. 3. Whenever two or more persons assemble for the purpose of promoting, advocating, or teaching the doctrines of criminal anarchy, criminal communism, criminal nazi-ism, or criminal fascism, as defined in section 1 of this act, such an assembly or organization is unlawful, and every person voluntarily participating therein by his presence, aid, or instigation shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than 10 years or a fine of not more than \$10,000, or both.

Sec. 4. No owner, agent, superintendent, janitor, caretaker, or occupant of any place, building, or room shall willfully and knowingly permit therein any assemblage of persons prohibited by section 3 of this act, and if such person after notification that the premises are so used permits such use to be continued, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof subject to imprisonment for not more than 1 year or fine of not more than \$1,000, or both.

Sec. 5. Every editor or publisher of a book, newspaper, or serial, and every manager of a partnership or incorporated association by which a book, newspaper, or serial is issued, is chargeable with the publication of any matter contained in such book, newspaper, or serial. But in every prosecution therefor the defendant may show in his defense that the matter complained of was published without his knowledge or fault and against his wishes by another who had no authority from him to make the publication and whose act was disavowed by him so soon as known.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wonder if the Senator would include organizations which occupy whole pages in American newspapers advocating that we give away our weapons to foreign

powers and strip Uncle Sam of his defenses in the interest of foreign nations. I think they are un-American, pro-European, and disloyal.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much. My bill at present includes the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, and similar Fascist organizations. However, I will say to the Senator that I have in mind additional bills which will cover other organizations in the United States which are preaching certain principles in reference to neglecting the American flag and the best interests of the United States.

Continuing with the resolution which I was reading:

By registering all aliens in this country and requiring periodical reports by aliens at local police stations.

By appropriate action to be taken to insure against the continuous action of known agents, or persons, fomenting conditions calculated to hinder America in any way, during this period of national emergency; by imprisonment, deportation, or detainment in State or Federal concentration camps: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished all members of the Graham Kiwanis Club for enclosure with a personal letter to their Senators and Congressmen; that copies be sent to all civic clubs of the State and to our President of these United States of America.

Upon motion duly seconded, adopted June 17, 1940.

GRAHAM KIWANIS CLUB,
DAN M. RADER, Secretary.

In that connection, several days ago I introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 275) to provide for the national defense by prohibiting labor organizations from employing certain persons as officers or agents. I read:

Whereas it is common knowledge that "fifth column" activities in various European countries contributed largely to their defeat; and

Whereas such activities consisted in part of sabotage in key industries and propaganda disseminated among the workers of such industries; and

Whereas such activities are now being carried on in this country and will gather more momentum in the future, thus undermining our national defense; and

Whereas because of their key positions in our industrial mobilization plans, officers and agents of labor organizations should all be American citizens whose allegiance to their country is unquestioned and who can be depended upon to cooperate with the Government in stamping out such treacherous activities: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it shall hereafter be unlawful for any labor union or other labor organization which represents, or purports to represent, in any manner the interests of any persons employed by any business enterprise which is engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or in the production of goods for such commerce or for national-defense purposes, to have as an officer or agent any person who is not a citizen of the United States, who is a Communist, Fascist, or member of any Nazi bund organization, who has been at any time within the past 2 years a member of or affiliated with any Communist, Fascist, or Nazi bund organization, who is ineligible to hold public office, or who has lost his rights to United States citizenship by reason of conviction of a felony.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of each such labor union or other labor organization to use due diligence to determine whether any of its officers or agents is a person who is prohibited from being such an officer or agent under the provisions of section 1 of this joint resolution.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this joint resolution the term "labor union or other labor organization" shall include any group which is a part of or affiliated with any labor union or other labor organization which is national in scope or whose jurisdiction extends to more than one State.

Sec. 4. Any labor union or other labor organization willfully violating any of the provisions of this joint resolution shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$10,000; and each such violation shall be deemed to be a separate offense.

Of course, we know that labor organizations in the United States are highly desirous of ridding themselves of anyone who may be pointed to as being un-American or who is engaging in subversive activities; and certainly no labor organization in this country wants as an officer, agent, or representative an alien, or, for that matter, an American citizen who has been deprived of his American citizenship by reason of conviction of a felony.

Relative to subversive activities, we now have pending a bill which is designated as H. R. 10094, which is being sponsored in this body by the able junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. It is a bill to require the registration of certain organizations carrying on activities within the United States, and for other purposes. The enactment of such legislation

would mean that the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, and similar organizations, would be required to register and to provide the Government of the United States with information pertaining to their officers, their membership, and the sources from which they obtain money to carry on.

In connection with House bill 10094, I recall that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was present before the committee when public hearings were held. As I recall, Mr. G. Wilhelm Kunze, of 178 East Eighty-fifth Street, New York City, national commander of the German-American Bund, protested against the enactment of such legislation. Likewise, in reference to my bill, which would outlaw the Communist Party and the German-American Bund, he protested in the form of a telegram, which he sent to me on July 9, reading as follows:

We protest against the adoption of bill S. 4132 on the grounds that it is an attempt to enact bill-of-attainder legislation, which is expressly prohibited by the Constitution. Refer to my testimony before Judiciary Committee Monday, July 8—

That is the time which I mentioned a moment ago—

clearly showing that above bill is Government violence in the name of law. The German-American Bund has never been convicted of any crime. This bill is all vicious and un-American.

He says the bill is un-American. I say that it is not. I say that it ought to be enacted into law.

In passing, while speaking of Mr. Kunze, yesterday while in my office reading a number of daily and weekly newspapers from North Carolina, I happened to glance at an article from the pen of the publisher of the Wilmington Post, a weekly periodical at Wilmington, N. C. Under the heading "Heard on the streets, by Col. Allus Buttenin," which I assume is one of the features of his paper, he says:

[From the Wilmington (N. C.) Post of July 19, 1940]

HEARD ON THE STREETS

(By Col. Allus Buttenin)

Last week when I wrote about Mr. G. William Kunze, German bund leader, I was under the impression that he was either a foreigner or a naturalized citizen. Further investigation reveals the fact that he is a native-born citizen of the United States. This makes a difference. Therefore I apologize to every loyal citizen of the United States. Had I known that I was writing about a traitor instead of about a foreign saboteur, I would have said something different.

When Delilah betrayed Sampson, when Judas Iscariot betrayed Christ, when Benedict Arnold betrayed the Continental Army, when Quisling betrayed Norway they were but setting the stage for Kunze to betray his native land. Delilah perished ignominiously, Judas Iscariot hanged himself, Benedict Arnold was shot, and Quisling is an outcast. Kunze but follows in their path. If he wins, he will be considered by those whom he served as one branded with dishonor. If he loses, he will be shot as a traitor. His usefulness, if it ever existed, has ceased. He is either a fool or a traitor, or both. Win, lose, or draw, he will go down in history as being the ignorant tool of the greatest conspirator of all time. Poor, ignorant fool, he follows the lead of one who has plainly stated that he uses men as his tools, and upon cessation of their usefulness discards them as one discards any other useless object. He follows a will-o'-the-wisp, a false light of hope, that he may be made into a grandee, a margrave, or some other titled person who can shine in the reflected glory of the "imperator to be."

This country nurtured him and gave life and liberty to those whom he loves. Now he, a traitor, comes to the forefront and demands that liberty, upon which he fattened his slimy soul, guarantee him the right and privilege to destroy. He would destroy the very roots of that liberty under whose aegis his parents found asylum. He would defame the character of his native land so that he may shine in the glory of the leader. Just a plain, simple renegade, a traitor to humanity, the most accursed traitor.

Yet he should teach us a lesson, a lesson of preparedness against those within our midst, be they natives or foreigners, who would sacrifice the welfare of this Nation that they may attain unto power and riches. Quisling betrayed Norway, and instead of winning the confidence of his liege lord, he fouled his own nest and became a pariah, an outcast of society, distrusted of the one to whom he sold his soul. Kunze would do the same to America, to you, to me, to all who would stand in the way of his morbid desires. Yet we grant him the rights and privileges he tries so hard to kill, and we know that there are many others who have the same wizened, stunted, and shrunken mentalities which would lead them to destroy their liberties in their greed for power.

We should take Kunze, and all the others of his ilk, study them, and find what it is that makes them traitors to humanity, then discard them as useless specimens of inhumanity. Then, with this knowledge, proceed to clean house and make this land the bright asylum of the oppressed which it can be.

There is value in everything, even in Kunze, if we but find the filth in which he lives and apply the disinfectant in proper quantities, so that there can never be a recurrence of these subversive acts. But this value will be nil, it will be worse than nothing if we allow him to continue his termite actions. If we allow him and his followers to continue to bore from within, we will soon find that the dry rot of treachery has rotted our structure and that we are living in a fool's paradise. We will find that our own mental lethargy is the nostalgic poison that is allowing these leeches to suck our very life's blood. Unless we learn our lesson from these subversive movements within the body politic, we will soon find that their filth has destroyed our stamina and our blood stream is lecherous with the pus of their suppuration.

If we do not cure or cut out this cancerous growth, it is but a matter of time until death shall overtake our liberties and we will be but menials under the heel of the oppressor.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is not in the Chamber at this moment. I understand that while I was unavoidably detained the Senator from Arizona was rather critical of the Committee on Immigration for not reporting a bill to which he referred. That bill is the measure, which has already passed the House, providing for the deportation of one Harry Bridges.

The bill has been treated in the Committee on Immigration just as any other piece of legislation would have been handled. It was referred to the Departments for report on the day after it was messaged to the Senate from the House of Representatives. As soon as reports were received from the Departments, a meeting of the Committee on Immigration was called, and the bill was referred to a subcommittee consisting of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the present presiding officer of the Senate, the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH]. I know that the Senate has been very irregular in its meetings recently and that many Members of the Senate have been unable to be constantly in attendance in Washington. However, I do not undertake to make any apologies for the subcommittee or for the full committee, because I do not think any apologies are in order.

The committee has proceeded as it proceeds in all other legislative matters. Two of the three members of the subcommittee are members of the committee presided over by the Senator from Arizona. If he would have expedited the bill at the terrific rate of speed which he indicated—as I understand from a verbal report of his remarks, which did not purport to be verbatim—he might have chosen either of the two Senators who were selected to handle the bill in behalf of the Committee on Immigration.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee has always been an earnest advocate of the antilynching bill. I have always opposed that bill, but I am also opposed to lynching, whether it be legislative or otherwise. The bill in question will in due course be considered by the committee, and if the majority of the committee sees fit the bill will be favorably reported to the Senate. If the distinguished Senator from Arizona desires to expedite the bill any more rapidly than it is being handled, I suggest that he see the chairman of the subcommittee and arrange for a hearing in that forum, which in the present situation is the proper place to express his views.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, with regard to the remarks of my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I am absolutely confident the Senator from Arizona had not the slightest idea of reflecting upon the activities of the Senator. The junior Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH], who now presides, made some remarks on the floor of the Senate complimentary to the junior Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, and at that time the Presiding Officer will recall that I also made a statement in regard to the matter. I am sure that the able Senator from Arizona meant no reflection whatever upon the Senator from Georgia, because it was explained by the Senator who is now presiding and by myself that the very day the bill came to the Senate from the other House and was referred to the committee, the chairman sent it to the proper department for a report, and that as soon

as it came back a subcommittee was appointed. The able junior Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the Committee on Immigration, had always given unusually prompt attention to every matter coming before his committee.

I, too, am sorry that the Senator from Arizona is not now present, but I feel that I can speak for him after listening to him and knowing, as we all do, that he would not, for anything in the world, let a word drop from his lips that would reflect upon the junior Senator from Georgia, for I know the esteem in which the junior Senator from Georgia is held in the estimation of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, getting back now to the matter of outlawing the Communist Party, yesterday in my office—and I usually devote Sundays to reading newspapers and getting what I can therefrom in order, to be perfectly frank, that I may be able to back up some of my ideas—I happened to pick up a copy of the New York Enquirer of the issue of July 8, 1940, the editor and publisher of which is my friend, Mr. William J. Griffin. In that issue there is an editorial entitled "Presidential campaign of Communist Party is a challenge to Republic." Having glanced over that editorial, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this juncture of my remarks. I shall read only the last two paragraphs:

Browder's respect—

Browder of course is the nominee of the Communist Party for President of the United States.

Browder's respect for the highest judicial tribunal in this land, which he now desires to relieve him of the status of a sentenced felon, was evinced on October 23, 1938, when he affirmed that if the Supreme Court did not cease endeavoring to dictate economics and social security (that is, if it did not hand down its decisions in accordance with Earl Browder's conception of its functions) the number of Justices will be increased from 9 to 20, with 11 good Farmer-Labor Justices on the bench."

The editorial continues:

There has just been passed by the House a measure intended to compel the Communist Party and the Nazi bund to register with the Department of Justice.

That is the legislation that I spoke of a moment ago as being sponsored in this body by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The editorial continues:

Such legislation is absurd—

I do not agree with Mr. Griffin that it "is absurd"; it is, indeed, a step forward, and it will certainly, by bringing about registration, reveal the names of their officers and also the source of their revenue. Certainly the legislation is not "absurd." We had to start somewhere, and it is a start—

The "reds" and the "bundlers" must be completely destroyed. It will be a national disgrace if the present session of the Seventy-sixth Congress comes to a close without both of these anti-American forces having been annihilated by statute.

I send the editorial to the desk and ask that it be returned to me from the Public Printer, as I want it for future reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In conformity with the request of the Senator from North Carolina, the editorial will be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The editorial is as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN OF COMMUNIST PARTY IS A CHALLENGE TO REPUBLIC

It is ludicrous on the part of the United States to spend billions of dollars upon national preparedness against external attack and at the same time decline to take prompt and adequate measures against the forces of assault from within.

Congress should not permit its present session to come to an end without having enacted the legislation necessary for the suppression of the Communist Party.

Surely our national lawmakers have superabundant evidence as to the peril in which the Republic stands by reason of the workings of that organization here and its ramifications abroad.

In spite of this, and in spite of all the talk and action as to national defense, the party of Josef Stalin is permitted to continue its operations upon American soil. It has already named as its candidate for President of the United States, Josef Stalin's vice fuhrer, Earl Browder, who also has the distinction of having been convicted of passport fraud last January.

When it comes to insolence, the Communists are in a class by themselves. Here we find them deliberately selecting as their choice for the job of painting the White House a crimson Moscow red a man who has been sentenced to jail for 4 years and fined \$2,500 by a Federal court. In running Browder for the Presidency the upholders of sovietized America are operating behind the Constitution of the United States, impudently asserting their constitutional rights, brazenly using our fundamental charter as a medium whereby to bring about its own destruction.

A service which calls for the warmest praise has been performed by Representative ROBERT G. ALLEN of Pennsylvania, by his exposure of the methods resorted to by Josef Stalin's henchmen in their Presidential election campaign, and by the scathing attack to which he subjected the Communist Party, in a communication sent to Comrade Charles Gwynn, the party's chairman in western Pennsylvania. This important missive is published in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Its initial paragraph states:

"I have received your telegram of June 20 stating that the Dies committee is sending letters to all signers of the Communist Party nominating petitions in Pennsylvania. You state you consider this action an invasion of State rights and an intimidation of Pennsylvania citizens. If Mr. Dies wishes to send letters to the Communists in Pennsylvania, he has a right to do so. Pray tell me what is wrong with that. You suggest that Mr. Dies is attempting to coerce my constituents. I assure you that you and the members of your party are not my constituents; you are Josef Stalin's. I do not want you and you do not want me. The feeling is perfectly mutual."

Representative ALLEN then tells this minion of Moscow that his organization is not a political party working in the Keystone State, and continues:

"You are part of a foreign conspiracy working under orders emanating direct from Moscow. Your avowed purpose is the overthrow of this Government by force. You are traitors to this country, and if I had my way you would be dealt with as such. You are abusing the privileges granted by our Constitution. The result has been pure, unadulterated license. Despite your subversive activities, you have been treated with kindly tolerance in this country. In the face of a serious crisis this extreme tolerance is a luxury which we can no longer afford. If you do not like this country and its institutions, I suggest that you get out. Go to that Muscovite utopia which you are trying to establish over here."

In closing his letter, which uses language that Josef Stalin's champions fully understand, the patriotic, able, and wide-awake Pennsylvanian declares:

"I sincerely trust that the Dies committee will investigate the manner in which you secured names for the Communist Party nominating petitions. Your solicitors repeatedly lied to poor and ignorant people who thought they were signing a petition to keep this country out of war or a petition requesting jobs, etc. The whole procedure was a shameful and cowardly act for which you should be held responsible. Instead of protesting to Mr. Dies as you request, I am going to urge him to press the case against you more vigorously than ever. Let me repeat that there is no room in America for you and your kind at this time. I deeply regret that we have permitted you such unrestricted freedom as you have enjoyed in the past."

Vice Fuhrer Browder, for whose attempt to enter the White House the "reds" are campaigning in true Stalinite style, is appealing to the Supreme Court of the Republic to revoke his conviction for passport fraud. In doing this he has ample funds at his back and is making ample use of the American legal processes provided by the very Constitution which he and his followers are seeking to destroy in favor of the despotism of Soviet Russia.

Browder's respect for the highest judicial tribunal in this land, which he now desires to relieve him of the status of a sentenced felon, was evinced on October 23, 1938, when he affirmed that if the Supreme Court did not cease endeavoring to dictate economics and social security (that is, if it did not hand down its decisions in accordance with Earl Browder's conception of its functions) "The number of Justices will be increased from 9 to 20, with 11 good Farmer-Labor Justices on the bench."

There has just been passed by the House a measure intended to compel the Communist Party and the Nazi bunds to register with the Department of Justice. Such legislation is absurd. The "reds" and the "bundlers" must be completely destroyed. It will be a national disgrace if the present session of the Seventy-sixth Congress comes to a close without both of these anti-American forces having been annihilated by statute.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In further pursuance of the resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Graham, N. C., I read:

By registering all aliens in this country, and requiring periodical reports by aliens at local police stations.

I desire to advise the members of the Graham Kiwanis Club of North Carolina, to whom these resolutions have been sent, that recently the Congress enacted a registration and fingerprinting law. Of course, we know that there are aliens in this country who came here in violation of our law, who entered the country illegally, and it is reasonable to conclude that they will not voluntarily register and give themselves up to the authorities, because, on so doing,

perhaps, they can be immediately deported. It is likewise my argument, and it is reasonable to conclude, that those who entered legally, and have remained here illegally, will not voluntarily register, because they will be subject to deportation, and they will be more frightened now than ever before since the enforcement of the immigration laws has been transferred from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice. As a result thereof, we will have to wait to see how the law works out in its registration feature from September 1 until the convening of the next Congress. At that time, I wish to say to the Members of this body, I propose to introduce additional legislation which I believe will strengthen the present registration and fingerprinting law, so that we may eventually gather into the net all the alien criminals in this country we are desirous of deporting.

Speaking of deportation, in conjunction with the islands whose acquisition I mentioned awhile ago as being desirable from the standpoint of the national defense, we might use some of those island possessions which we want to acquire upon which to detain alien criminals until we can get the countries from which they came to take them back.

The resolution continues:

By appropriate action to be taken to insure against the continuous action of known agents, or persons, fomenting conditions calculated to hinder America in any way, during this period of national emergency; by imprisonment, deportation, or detainment in State or Federal concentration camps.

I prefer to employ the words "detention camps" rather than "concentration camps," because once I employed the word "concentration camps" on the floor of the Senate, and was severely criticized by many people who have not the same attitude as I have toward aliens, Communists, bunders, and others engaged in un-American activities. The resolutions from the Graham Kiwanis Club conclude:

Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished all members of the Graham Kiwanis Club for enclosure with a personal letter to their Senators and Congressmen. That copies be sent to all civic clubs of the State, and to our President of these United States of America.

Upon motion duly seconded, adopted June 17, 1940.

GRAHAM KIWANIS CLUB.
DAN M. RADER, Secretary.

I acknowledged receipt of the resolutions to Mr. Rader, and told him, in my acknowledgment, that I proposed to present the resolutions for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, in reference to communism, I have before me a very interesting ticker dispatch which was obtained in New York and is under the heading "Interpretation of war news by J. W. T. Mason, United Press war expert." I bring it to the attention of the Members of this body particularly at this time because I think Mr. Mason's interpretation is really worth something. At least, I insert it for what it may be worth, and for the further reason that I have been furnished a printed telegram dated July 16, 1940, by Mr. Gustav Danzis, of 111 East Twelfth Street, New York City, which I bring to the attention of this body in connection with the "interpretation of the war news" dispatch, and which refers to the fact that the former republics of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania have, at last, been enveloped into the Soviet fold. The "interpretation of war news," by Mr. J. W. T. Mason, reads:

[Over the ticker on July 19]

[Interpretation of war news by J. W. T. Mason, United Press war expert]

Count Ciano's arrival in Berlin today for renewal of secret conferences with Hitler coincides with Italian newspaper warnings to Stalin that if the Kremlin accepts British offers of conciliation and cooperation, Russia's fate will be the same as Poland's. Hitherto Italian and German journalistic comment on Russia's wartime forwardness has been worded cautiously. The open suspicion of Russian treachery now voiced in the Fascist-controlled press implies a Slav situation may be developing which Mussolini considers dangerous.

Only a sudden matter of serious importance would seem to justify this second visit of the Italian foreign minister to Berlin so soon after his earlier conference this month with Hitler. Italy's sus-

pensions of Russia are more sensitive than Germany's because of Mussolini's claim to paramount interests in the Balkans and the Mediterranean.

Of course, we know that in a sense the claims and interests of Russia in the Balkans and the Mediterranean are a much more serious danger to Mussolini than they are to Hitler.

At the same time there can be no doubt Germany must be much concerned by this week's overwhelming pro-Soviet plebiscites in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, which in effect give Stalin complete control over the armies of the three Baltic countries. Germany has broken the French encirclement of the Reich but a new Slav encirclement is now being strengthened.

At this point I ask that there be inserted the printed telegram to which I have referred directed to the President of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., and to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, Washington, D. C., in reference to the flagrant violations of treaties and fraud on the part of Soviet Russia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JULY 16, 1940.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Washington, D. C.

THE HONORABLE CORDELL HULL,

Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

By flagrant breach of treaty obligations by treachery and fraud Soviet Russia has taken possession of the Republics of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, overrunning all of their territories by overwhelming military forces. A pro-Soviet Government has been installed in Latvia whose only sordid task it is to provide camouflage for the actual annexation of Latvia by holding fraudulent and Russian-controlled elections on July 14 and 15 in an atmosphere of red terror, expropriation, and martial law. Soviet aggression is again on the march threatening to engulf the whole world in revolt and anarchy and we appeal to you to refuse recognition of Soviet aggression against Latvia, to refuse recognition of present usurpatory pro-Soviet Government in Latvia, and to withdraw recognition of the godless dictatorship of Soviet Russia.

Baltic American Society, Latvian Club of New York, Latvian War Veterans in New York, New York Latvian Benefit Society, New York Latvian Evangelic Lutheran Congregation, First Latvian Baptist Congregation of New York, New York Latvian Zion Congregation, Boston Latvian Lutheran Congregation.

Copies to members United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee, New York Senators, Massachusetts Senators, New York Congressmen.

Please reply to Gustav Danzis, 111 East Twelfth Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of the ticker dispatch, as I have edited it, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

At the same time Russia not only is pressing Turkey for joint control over the Dardanelles but is also trying to stimulate a new wave of communism in the eastern Balkans from the vantage ground of Bessarabia, coupled with these developments so adverse to Italian and German interests the Italian press now reveals fears that Russia is moving toward some form of rapprochement with Great Britain.

The British Government has associated its closing of the Burma road with suggestions for peace between China and Japan. Here is a possible opportunity for Great Britain and Russia to work together in the Orient, out of which might come a mutual pact of coordination in Europe, such is the way the intricacies of European diplomacy operate beneath the surface.

Certainly, Russia has now become the war's enigma for Germany and Italy—no dictator can trust any other indefinitely—it is difficult enough for two dictators to cooperate for long—when there are three, mutual faith becomes impossible—each must judge the others by his own standards of conduct—so Hitler and Mussolini are right in looking askance at Stalin uneasily trying to calculate the direction of his next ambitious move.

Especially must Germany and Italy keep close observation on Russia at the present time when the two belligerents are considering how to deliver what they hope will be a crushing blow against Great Britain—reports are circulating in Europe that the German high command lacks unanimity concerning the outcome of an invasion of the British Isles, and Hitler is said to have been advised by some of his leading generals that failure must be anticipated.

If that were to happen, and if at the same time Russia were to seek further territorial expansion, the whole complexion of the war might go into reverse almost overnight—Count Ciano and Hitler will have problems such as these to discuss this weekend in Berlin—the uncertainties of warfare were never more apparent than they are today in Europe.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in conclusion, I desire to commend the members of the American Legion. I have done so at one time upon the floor of the Senate today, when I spoke of their activities relative to their endeavor to bring about the deportation of Harry Bridges. I again am provided an opportunity to pay tribute to that great legion of World War veterans, and am happy for the opportunity. They are alive to our national-defense problem. They and each of them are interesting themselves therein, not only from the standpoint of sponsoring legislation and standing behind proposed legislation in which they believe, but physically they interest themselves in national defense.

The American Legion of North Carolina are now sponsoring rifle meets which they propose to hold annually. The first meeting is to be held at Fort Bragg, N. C., one of our Army posts, on the 28th and 29th of this month, in which they are offering cups to the winning team for marksmanship. The contesting teams will come from virtually every Legion post in North Carolina. They are preparing themselves physically, and they are getting ready for any balloonists or parachutists who may come to this country. I think the American Legion are to be commended.

I have here a letter from Mr. J. A. DuBois, chairman of the marksmanship committee of the American Legion located at Whiteville, N. C. I shall read part of the letter, which is directed to me. I shall eliminate the first and second paragraphs, as they contain personal references to me. The remainder of the letter is as follows:

The Legion of North Carolina has, as yourself, always taken a firm stand for preparedness. Since the recent tragic turn in European affairs it has reaffirmed and greatly strengthened its stand for adequate national defense.

Our marksmanship program is just a small but important part of the Legion defense program. Its objective is the organization of rifle clubs in every Legion post for the purpose of again familiarizing veterans with use and care of firearms, and to stimulate interest in the oldest and cleanest of sports, marksmanship.

The Legion program for national defense in North Carolina is not being carried out with eloquent and patriotic speeches, but with silent and determined action. The 2 days of rifle training to be held at Fort Bragg are exemplary of this determination to act and act now, not next month or next year, and in a like manner the rest of the Legion program is being put into effect. Legionnaires are not only asking others to act but they are showing by their own example what can be accomplished with close cooperation between local and Federal law-enforcement authorities, Red Cross, and relief organizations.

In addition to rifle teams amongst Legionnaires, in the past year a large number of sons of the Legion Rifle Clubs have been organized. In these clubs hundreds of boys are being taught by experienced instructors the proper care and handling of firearms, safety precautions, target shooting, and last, but not least, observance of game-preservation laws. Youth's response to this training has been enthusiastic, and marksmanship has proven its worth in the making of good sportsmanship.

Very truly,

J. A. DuBois, Chairman.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD, for the benefit of other patriotic organizations and other veterans' organizations, an enclosure in the letter in reference to the inauguration of that program in North Carolina, which I am sure is an added and a worthy feature of our preparedness program, and particularly the volunteer preparedness program on behalf of the volunteer services of the people of America.

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

TENTATIVE PROGRAM FOR RIFLE MEET AT FORT BRAGG

(The number attending and the amount of ammunition we have been issued may necessitate some changes in program.)

July 27:

- 8 A. M. Instruction in use of .30 caliber Springfield rifle.
- 8:30 A. M. Practice in firing positions.
- 9 A. M. Firing (10 rounds), prone position.
- 12 noon. Mess.
- 1 P. M. Firing (10 rounds), sitting.
- 2 P. M. Firing (10 rounds), kneeling.
- 3 P. M. Firing (10 rounds), standing.
- 5 P. M. Mess.

July 28:

8 A. M. Firing (Army record course C).

12 noon: Mess.

- 1 P. M. Post team matches. Post teams to consist of five members from a post. Three highest scores to count as team score. Range 200 yards; 10 shots (each), prone.
- 5 P. M. Mess and presentation of medals and of the Reynolds Preparedness Trophy.

I ordered a 15-inch cup with proper engraving. Many thanks.

BOARD OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND EMBALMERS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 254)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 3720, "To create and establish a Board of Funeral Directors and Embalmers for the District of Columbia and to prescribe its powers and duties."

This bill creates a board of nine examiners appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Six of the members of the board would be drawn from those engaged in the business of embalming and funeral directing within the District of Columbia. Of the remaining three members two would be selected from practicing physicians within the District of Columbia, and one from the staff of the Health Officer of the District of Columbia.

Within sixty days after approval of the bill, the board would license, without examination as to qualifications, all those now engaged in doing business in the District of Columbia, while those who would thereafter desire to enter such business would be required to qualify under such examination as might be determined by the Board. The bill also provides for suspension and revocation of licenses for cause subject to court review and for reciprocal arrangements with other States. Apprenticeship fees would be \$5 per annum, funeral and embalmer license fees \$10 per annum, and examination fees \$25, not returnable. At the close of each fiscal year, any funds to the credit of the board in excess of \$1,000 would revert to the District of Columbia, and all accounts of the board would be subject to audit by the District Auditor.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia recommend disapproval of this bill for the following reasons:

This bill is proposed, according to its preamble, "For the purpose of protecting the public health." A study of its subsequent provisions, however, appears to indicate that its primary purpose is to place certain restrictions on those desiring to enter the business of embalming and funeral directing in the District of Columbia. The first purpose is already cared for by present health laws which grant full authority to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make and enforce, through the Health Department, such regulations as may be necessary to protect the public. A second result of the bill would be to create, outside the control of the Commissioners, another independent District establishment, armed with the power to restrict membership in the guild of funeral directors and embalmers.

The present system of quasi-private examining boards in the District of Columbia, with their lack of uniformity in the appointment and pay of examiners, in the rules and regulations governing the examination and licensing of applicants, in the enforcement of the laws, and particularly in the control of their finances and accounts, has, in recent years, been the subject of no little criticism. Recent surveys of the government of the District of Columbia, including studies by citizens committees, have censured the increasing number of independent District boards of examiners. As a consequence, legislation proposed by the District Commissioners for the reorganization of the District of Columbia government provides that all these examining

boards and commissions would become advisory agencies only, and function under a single license department.

In view of these objections of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, I am withholding my approval of this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 20, 1940.

FURNISHING POTOMAC WATER TO CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 255)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 3870, "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish Potomac water without charge to charitable institutions, and so forth, in the District of Columbia', approved February 23, 1905."

The act of February 23, 1905 (33 Stat. 742), provides as follows:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and are hereby, authorized to furnish Potomac water without charge to charitable institutions and such institutions as receive annual appropriations from Congress, to an amount to be fixed in each case by the said Commissioners, not to exceed a rate of 100 gallons per day for each inmate of said institutions; and for all water used beyond such an amount, to be ascertained by water meters installed and maintained at the expense of the consumer, the institution shall be charged at the prevailing rate for the use of water in the District of Columbia, which shall be collected in the manner prescribed for the collection of water rents. The said Commissioners are further authorized to furnish Potomac water without charge to churches to an amount to be fixed in each case by the said Commissioners, and any amount used in excess of the amount allowed, to be ascertained in the manner aforesaid, shall be charged and collected as hereinbefore described. For the purposes of this act a charitable institution is one whose objects are primarily eleemosynary; and nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to include educational institutions other than charity schools wholly supported by voluntary contributions or institutions supported wholly or in part by congressional appropriations.

It is the purpose of this bill to add, after the word "churches", in the second sentence of the above-quoted paragraph, the words "and to charitable institutions which do not have inmates", and thus authorize the furnishing of free water to institutions which do not now come within the terms of the existing statute.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are opposed to the approval of this measure, in part because of the loss of revenue involved, but also on account of the difficulty of determining the institutions that would be entitled, and the extent to which each would be entitled, to the free-water privilege. The Commissioners believe not only that the approval of the bill would increase largely the number of institutions receiving water free of charge, but would be likely to result in the furnishing of free water to some agencies, the status of which, as eleemosynary institutions, would be difficult of determination.

It seems to me that in spite of the well-intended purpose of the measure that the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have taken the right position with respect thereto, and that I am therefore justified in accepting their recommendation that the bill be not approved.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 20, 1940.

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE—VETO MESSAGES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, which was read, as follows:

JULY 22, 1940.

HON. JOHN N. GARNER,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Under the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 86, the Senate adjourned on Thursday, July 11, 1940, until 12 o'clock meridian today, July 22.

On Wednesday, July 17, 1940, the President of the United States returned to the Senate by delivery to the secretary of the Senate

the following enrolled bills, together with his reasons for returning them without his approval. These bills had been presented to the President by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the Senate on the dates shown and were returned within the 10-day period prescribed by the Constitution.

Presented on July 5, 1940:

S. 2413. An act granting a pension to Arminda Bauman;

S. 3502. An act for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corporation;

S. 3769. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson; and S. 3978. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the National Reemployment Service.

Presented on July 8, 1940:

S. 1810. An act for the relief of the Citizens State Bank of Marianna, Fla.;

S. 2817. An act for the relief of J. H. Churchwell, Wholesale Co., of Jacksonville, Fla.;

S. 3351. An act for the relief of I. M. Cook, J. J. Allen, and the Radiator Specialty Co.; and

S. 3794. An act for the relief of certain Navajo Indians, and for other purposes.

I now present the President's veto messages, with the accompanying bills, for disposition by the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

ARMINDA BAUMAN—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 257)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 2413, "Granting a pension to Arminda Bauman."

It is the purpose of the bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Arminda Bauman, widow of Jacob K. Bauman, late of Troop H, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

Jacob K. Bauman, the husband of the beneficiary under the bill, enlisted in the military service of the United States November 17, 1883, and was honorably discharged July 10, 1885. The veteran served over 30 days in the Apache campaign of New Mexico. His death occurred August 21, 1936.

Mrs. Bauman's first marriage to the veteran July 21, 1887, was terminated by divorce granted July 14, 1924. She was remarried to the veteran February 6, 1926. While not entitled to service pension under laws pertaining to the Indian War service, as her second marriage to the veteran occurred subsequent to March 3, 1917, her claim for pension under the general pension law, where the marriage date is immaterial, depends upon whether or not the death of the veteran is attributable to service-connected disabilities. Mrs. Bauman's original claim under the general pension law was denied, but upon reconsideration and review by the Veterans' Administration since the passage by the Congress of S. 2413, it has been determined that the death of the veteran was attributable to service-connected disabilities and that the widow is entitled to receive a pension under the general pension law. Therefore approval of the bill is not only unnecessary but is objectionable, because it would arbitrarily place and continue the claimant on the pension rolls at a specified rate of pension, which may be more or less in amount, in the initial and subsequent adjudications, than would be allowable under the provisions of general law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1940.

EPES TRANSPORTATION CORPORATION—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 260)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 3502, an act for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corporation, of Virginia.

This bill is substantially the same as S. 1042 (76th Cong., 1st sess.) with respect to which I withheld my approval. The bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury "to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Epes Transportation Corporation the sum of \$6,537.95 in full satisfaction of all claims of such corporation against the United States, such sum (it is alleged) representing taxes (with interest and penalty) paid to the United States by such corporation on account of certain cigarettes and tobacco products which were withdrawn from bonded warehouse in Winston-Salem, N. C., by such corporation (it is alleged) for export to foreign consignees, but which were not exported due to the fact that such cigarettes and tobacco products were stolen from the trucks of such corporation en route to the intended exportation point."

The cigarettes and tobacco products were in fact withdrawn without payment of tax by the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. from its factories for exportation and were delivered to the Epes Transportation Corporation, a common carrier, under contract for transportation, in its trucks to Norfolk, Va. During transit the trucks were hijacked and the cigarettes and tobacco products were stolen. As the products were not in fact exported, the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. paid the internal-revenue tax due on such products, and through litigation it has been finally established that the tax was legally due. The transportation corporation, apparently because of its liability as a common carrier for hire, has reimbursed the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. for the amount of the tax and penalties paid by such company and now seeks reimbursement from the United States.

The Government had no dealings with the carrier. The carrier has merely made good on its contract with the shipper for proximate damages resulting from failure to perform its contract. Other circumstances might occur to damage or destroy such articles and prevent exportation and thus subject the shipper to a tax on goods that failed to reach the market at all, e. g., a railway wreck, or a fire, or bad weather, or damage in transit. The Government cannot be expected to honor claims of insurers and carriers in all such cases where they are required by the shipper to respond in damages to the extent of his resulting loss of tax exemption. Obviously the carrier's loss is primarily an incident of his business and grows out of his broad liability as a common carrier. To recognize such a claim would, it is believed, constitute a precedent and establish a policy that might eventually prove embarrassing and burdensome.

I regret, therefore, that I do not feel justified in giving my approval to the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1940.

JERRY M'KINLEY THOMPSON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 261)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 3769, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, entitled "An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson."

This enactment would release Mr. Thompson from any liability to the United States incurred by reason of the receipt by him of dual compensation from the Post Office Department and the Navy Department during the period from June 16 to September 15 of each year from 1929 to 1937, inclusive, in contravention of section 6 of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended.

Information regarding the provisions of the act of May 10, 1916, has been repeatedly disseminated throughout the Postal Service by the published bulletins of that Service, and it is my opinion that the granting of the relief here sought would not only encourage the presentation of claims for similar relief but would also tend to induce a future disregard of this and other laws enacted for the purpose of

limiting and restricting the expenditure of public funds. Moreover, the claims of many other Government employees for dual compensation have been denied, and the granting of the relief contemplated by this enactment would, accordingly, represent, it seems to me, discriminatory action of a wholly unwarranted character.

I do not, therefore, feel justified in approving the enactment.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1940.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF NATIONAL REEMPLOYMENT SERVICE—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 263)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 3978, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, entitled "An act for the relief of certain former employees of the National Reemployment Service."

The enactment would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay specified sums of money to the several persons therein named in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for accrued annual leave while claimants were in the employ of the National Reemployment Service—it appearing that the involved employees were separated from the service of the United States without having taken all of the annual leave which had accumulated to them at the time of separation.

The Annual Leave Act of March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1161), makes a grant of leave in kind only; that is, the right to be absent from duty for the prescribed period without loss of pay while retaining a status as one of the "civilian officers and employees of the United States" included within the purview of the law. There is no provision of law for payment of the commuted value of leave not taken before separation from the service. It is understood that many similar claims have been disallowed by the Government. Hence the approval of relief legislation upon behalf of the former employees named in this enactment would be giving them preferential treatment and, no doubt, would result in a flood of similar relief bills in respect to other former employees similarly situated. For the reasons stated herein I do not feel justified in giving this enactment my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1940.

CITIZENS STATE BANK OF MARIANNA, FLA.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 256)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, a bill (S. 1810) for the relief of the Citizens State Bank of Marianna, Fla.

This bill would relieve the Citizens State Bank of Marianna, Fla., from liability to the Government in the sum of \$692.09, constituting the aggregate amount of Government checks which were honored and cashed by the bank, although the endorsements thereon had been forged.

Whether the bank is liable to reimburse the Government under such circumstances is a question for judicial determination. A suit to collect this claim has been brought by the United States against the bank and is now pending. If the bank is not liable, it is reasonable to assume that the courts will so hold. If liability exists, no reason is discernible why the bank should be relieved of it by legislative action.

Similar claims have arisen against other banks which have been prosecuted in the courts and collected. I do not feel

warranted in approving legislation which would extend preferential treatment to a single institution, while other financial institutions have been required to meet the obligations that the law imposes on them in such matters.

In view of these considerations, I am impelled to withhold my approval from this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1940.

J. H. CHURCHWELL WHOLESALE CO.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 259)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 2817, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, entitled "An act for the relief of J. H. Churchwell Wholesale Co., of Jacksonville, Fla."

This enactment would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to J. H. Churchwell Wholesale Co., of Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of \$1,100 in full satisfaction of the claim of such company against the United States for remission of liquidated damages assessed against such company under the provisions of contract numbered ER-W-647-eng-38 and unnumbered contract (Invitation numbered 647-36-33) entered into by such company with the War Department under dates of September 12, 1935, and September 18, 1935, respectively, for the delivery of a quantity of sheets and blankets to the United States District Engineers Office, Camp Roosevelt, Ocala, Fla.

It appears that the contracts provided for the assessment of liquidated damages in the event of delays in delivery beyond the time specified therein; that there were delays in delivery of the articles; and that the sum here involved was properly and legally deducted from amounts otherwise due the claimant in accordance with the provisions of the contracts.

It is not unusual for Government contracts to contain provisions with respect to liquidated damages similar to those contained in the contracts executed by the claimant; and the courts have held that such provisions are to be enforced in accordance with their terms. The contracts here involved were freely entered into by the claimant and the liquidated damages were withheld in accordance with the agreement of the parties. There is no authority under existing law for the allowance of claims of other contractors under similar circumstances and the allowance of this claim would, in my judgment, be entirely unjustified as according preferential treatment to this claimant and as establishing an undesirable precedent.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1940.

I. M. COOK AND OTHERS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 258)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 3351, "For the relief of I. M. Cook, J. J. Allen, and the Radiator Specialty Company."

This bill proposes to provide for the payment of the sum of \$10,890.54 to I. M. Cook, the sum of \$9,275.34 to J. J. Allen, and the sum of \$1,500 to the Radiator Specialty Co., all of Charlotte, N. C., as compensation for losses sustained by them by reason of a fire which destroyed a building near that city, which was owned by Mr. Cook.

It appears that Mr. Cook had rented part of the space to the Works Progress Administration for use as a warehouse and offices. The available facts indicate that at the insistence of Mr. Cook the offices of the Works Progress Administration in the building were heated by portable heaters, as he

objected to the installation of any stationary stoves, for reasons which he deemed proper.

The building was set on fire on the night of December 9, 1938, by flames from a portable heater. It seems likely that if Mr. Cook had not insisted on the use of portable heaters and had permitted the installation of permanent stoves, the unfortunate occurrence would not have taken place. Under the circumstances I am unable to find any moral obligation on the part of the Government to reimburse Mr. Cook for his loss.

It seems, however, to be claimed that the night watchman employed by the Works Progress Administration was not as prompt as he should have been in endeavoring to extinguish the flames. Assuming this to be the fact, it is entirely within the realm of speculation whether he could have succeeded in subduing the fire under any circumstances. Moreover, the proximate cause of the fire seems to be the use of portable heaters, which were employed at Mr. Cook's insistence.

The other two claimants appear to have been tenants in the same building, whose personal property was destroyed in the fire. While their losses are to be greatly regretted, the facts summarized above indicate that there is no reason why the Government should recompense these two claimants for their unfortunate losses. It may well be that the facts have not been fully developed. In such event it may be appropriate to permit the claimants to bring suit against the Government in the Court of Claims or the United States District Court. A different problem would be presented if the instant bill accorded such a remedy, instead of proposing a direct appropriation in payment of the claims.

In the light of the foregoing statements I am constrained to disapprove the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1940.

CERTAIN NAVAJO INDIANS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 262)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 3794, "For the relief of certain Navajo Indians, and for other purposes."

This bill appropriates \$30,000 as compensation to the heirs of six Navajo boys who were killed, and \$3,000 as damages on account of injuries sustained by two boys, when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a train near Wingate, N. Mex.

While the record indicates negligence on the part of the driver, thereby warranting claims for compensation, it seems to me that the proposed payments in the death cases are somewhat excessive. The six children killed were between the ages of 10 and 15 years, and the two injured boys were 12 and 14 years of age. They were all wards of the Federal Government and were being educated in schools maintained by the Government. They were not wage earners, and those killed left no actual dependents. Those killed were buried at the expense of the United States, and those injured received medical attention and hospital care at Federal expense.

It is stated that the two injured boys have fully recovered, but since the record fails to disclose the extent of their injuries, it is impossible to say whether the payments proposed are, or are not, excessive.

I am withholding my approval of the bill in the belief that the Congress should, in the light of the above suggestions, and upon the basis of such additional information as it may obtain, give further consideration to these claims.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1940.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair) as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Steve M. King, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Texas.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

POST-OFFICE NOMINATION RECOMMENDED

Mr. McKELLAR. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Claude B. Doing, to be postmaster at Lansdowne, Md., which was reported on July 11, be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HARRISON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, July 25, 1940, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1940

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter A. Foote, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a Consul General of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named doctors to be assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath:

Samuel Sherman Spicer	Malcolm Judson Ford
James Barclay Donaldson	Donald Webster McNaughton
Jesse Douglas Harris	Ralph William Pagel
Frederick Hinkley Hull	William Robert Willard
Alfred Leon Holleman	Raymond Serge Roy

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Commander John H. Cornell to be a captain in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from July 1, 1940.

Boatswain Emile T. Turcotte to be a chief boatswain, to rank as such from August 1, 1940.

Machinist Martin Lentz, Jr., to be a chief machinist, to rank as such from July 5, 1940.

The following-named persons to be ensigns (temporary) in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from dates of oath:

Norman Lee Oleson
Preston L. Taulbee

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

GENERAL OFFICER

Brig. Gen. Mervin Gilbert McConnel, Idaho National Guard, to be brigadier general, National Guard of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

The following-named lieutenant colonels to be colonels in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of July 1940:

Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr.
Frank Whitehead
Robert Blake

The following-named majors to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of July 1940:

Joseph H. Fellows
Louis G. DeHaven
Lester A. Dessez
John W. Beckett

John Halla
Kenneth A. Inman
Lester N. Medaris
Frank B. Goettge

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of July 1940:

John D. Blanchard	Leslie F. Narum
John N. Hart	Ion M. Bethel
Hawley C. Waterman	John F. Hough
James O. Brauer	Robert L. Griffin, Jr.
Thomas C. Green	Edward L. Pugh
Andrew J. Mathiesen	Earl H. Phillips
Joseph C. Burger	Matthew C. Horner
Verne J. McCaul	James M. Ranck, Jr.

First Lt. Frederic H. Ramsey to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1939.

First Lt. Reynolds H. Hayden to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1939.

First Lt. Victor H. Krulak to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of August 1939.

First Lt. Harold O. Deakin to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of August 1939.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 3d day of June 1940:

Robert T. Vance	Cedric H. Kuhn
Woodrow M. Kessler	Thomas A. Culhane, Jr.
Donald E. Huey	Guy G. Narter
Clarence A. Barninger, Jr.	Alben C. Robertson
Merritt Adelman	Radford C. West
Rivers J. Morrell, Jr.	Thomas R. Stokes
Arthur J. Stuart	Ray L. Vroome

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 22, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Again, gracious Heavenly Father, in the dispensation of Thy providence we have seen the birth of a new day. We thank Thee. Be Thou unto us the wisdom that makes error difficult, the light that makes the darkness fade away, and the bread of heaven that quickens the best impulses of our souls. Consider us, O Lord, and bless the bonds of fraternity, the ties of friendship, and the affections of our homes. Blessed Lord God, the world gives peace to reward toil; give us Thine to prepare us for toil; it gives peace to exhausted energy; give us Thine to inspire action; it gives peace as a rest from labor; O give us Thine to arm us for today. Impress us that there is no armament so potent and enduring as that of the observance of moral, spiritual, and religious obligations of a great people and without that sanctuary there can be no perpetuation of the decencies and securities of any civilization. We pray for the Great Comforter that He may become our shield and buckler, our wealth and power, our preparedness, our love of liberty, and that He may forever make America unconquered and unconquerable. May no failures, no regrets, no afflictions, and no sin follow in the wake of this day. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 11, 1940, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Pursuant to House Resolution 552, on July 12, 1940, the Clerk of the House received from the Secretary of the Senate the following message announcing that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4165. An act to provide, in cooperation with the Port of New York Authority, for the construction in New York Harbor of a graving drydock large enough to accommodate the largest naval ships built or building.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10030. An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on July 10, 1940, he did on July 12, 1940, sign the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 6056. An act for the relief of Antal or Anthony or Tony Zaicek or Zaiczek;

H. R. 6884. An act to encourage travel in the United States and for other purposes;

H. R. 7696. An act to amend the United States Grain Standards Act, to provide for the grading of soybeans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8372. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill.;

H. R. 9877. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate and to put into effect charges for electrical energy generated at Boulder Dam, providing for the application of revenues from said project, authorizing the operation of the Boulder power plant by the United States directly or through agents, and for other purposes.

H. R. 10100. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 582. Joint resolution making an appropriation to enable the United States Maritime Commission to establish the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had, on July 12, 1940, examined the foregoing bills and a joint resolution and found them truly enrolled.

The Speaker also announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3046. An act to extend to certain officers and employees in the several States and the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled, "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939;

S. 3097. An act for the relief of Katherine M. Drier; and

S. 4119. An act to provide for the transfer of certain land in the De Soto National Forest to the Secretary of War for use for military purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On July 8, 1940:

H. R. 6831. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain of the public lands to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for the extraction of sodium chloride for water-conditioning purposes;

H. R. 8024. An act to provide for the leasing of restricted allotments of deceased Indians in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8499. An act relating to adoption of minors by Indians.

On July 10, 1940:

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of A. S. Tait;

H. R. 4828. An act to amend the law limiting the operation of statutes of limitation in certain cases; and

H. R. 10106. An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended.

On July 11, 1940:

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Alfred Joseph Wright;

H. R. 3161. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Gettysburg, Pa., as legal guardian of the three minor children of Dale W. Guise and Gladys M. Guise, both deceased, and Sally C. Guise and Martha G. and Arnold E. Orner;

H. R. 3171. An act for the relief of George L. Sheldon;

H. R. 5258. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Betty Lou Frady and W. L. Frady;

H. R. 7843. An act for the relief of Clifford J. Williams;

H. R. 9114. An act authorizing advancements from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works for the construction of a recorder of deeds building in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6424. An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes.

On July 12, 1940:

H. R. 7861. An act for the relief of Hannah S. Bray, Jane Bickers, and Frances Bickers.

On July 18, 1940:

H. R. 2751. An act to repeal sections 3711, 3712, and 3713 of the Revised Statutes, which relate to the purchase in the District of Columbia of coal and wood for public use, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7233. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition, control, and use of surplus real property acquired by Federal agencies, and for other purposes," approved August 27, 1935 (Public, No. 351, 74th Cong.), and for other purposes;

H. R. 7696. An act to amend the United States Grain Standards Act, to provide for the grading of soybeans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8372. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill.;

H. R. 9576. An act relating to the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of persons resident or domiciled in the Virgin Islands of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 582. Joint resolution making an appropriation to enable the United States Maritime Commission to establish the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

On July 19, 1940:

H. R. 6056. An act for the relief of Antal or Anthony or Tony Zaicek or Zaiczek;

H. R. 6884. An act to encourage travel in the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9877. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate and to put into effect charges for electrical energy generated at Boulder Dam, providing for the application of revenues from said project, authorizing the operation of the Boulder Dam power plant by the United States directly or through agents, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10100. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House during this week beginning on Wednesday. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is understood that the committee will meet at 10 o'clock Wednesday morning and the first witness in support of the military training bill will be Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, followed by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a short editorial from this morning's Washington Post commendatory of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a speech which I delivered at the National Democratic Convention on last Tuesday in Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FERNANDEZ] be permitted to extend his remarks by including a letter addressed to a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech made at Chicago by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. PATRICK was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement by Gen. Claude B. Birkhead, commander of the Texas National Guard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a patriotic book.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a brief newspaper clipping and two or three letters I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and to include in one an article on the proposed national parks in Oregon, and in the other a resolution adopted by the Townsend convention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wanted to prefer a request for some time after the legislative program, but I have no notion as to what the program may be today.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot inform the gentleman as to whether or not the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has any bills to call up. This is District of Columbia Day, and the gentleman from West Virginia is entitled to the call. The gentleman from West Virginia can answer the gentleman's question, perhaps.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in answer partially, at least, to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois, I believe it has been the rather general understanding and agreement that there would be no legislation this week of a highly controversial nature. I think this agreement was entered into between the majority and minority leaders. In view of the fact that the legislation on the District of Columbia Calendar at the present time is of a highly controversial nature I would want to go along with the leadership and the general agreement of the House and not call up those bills.

I may say to the Speaker, however, that I shall ask time under the District of Columbia Calendar, approximately 10 minutes, to discuss a matter which is of interest to the District and, I believe, the country at large.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from West Virginia as to an understanding about not taking up controversial legislation I want to say that I am perfectly anxious to cooperate in every way with the considered judgment of the

leadership of the House, but we have this sort of situation: The Congress practically unanimously feels that it should stay in Washington to take care of important national-defense items. There is an extremely urgent, vital, and necessary national-defense item that we should get up, consider in the House, and act upon. It has been recommended by the Advisory Council on Defense, and the Appropriations Committee was told a week or 10 days ago that it was necessary, and that even days counted. I am now told that we cannot get a quorum of the Committee on Rules, and that it would be impossible to get it up for consideration. To say the least, I am forced to express my disappointment.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Virginia that the House Committee on Military Affairs finds itself in about the same attitude as the gentleman from Virginia. We have the hearty cooperation of the floor leader, who has been doing everything he could to facilitate it, of course, but we have had on the calendar for several days the bill to authorize the President to call the National Guard for training. We also are conducting hearings on the bill to provide compulsory military training. Both these matters I regard as considerably more important and more essential right at this time than even the bill about which the gentleman from Virginia is talking, because that bill involves construction, whereas the bill from the Committee on Military Affairs relates to matters that will be done within the next 6 months.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am not criticizing anybody for anything; I am merely stating facts. I believe that individual Members of Congress ought to stay here and attend to the business that Congress is staying in session to transact. We are not staying in Washington this summer just for a picnic or because we like the beautiful Capital of the Nation, but because it seems to be necessary to stay here. I feel that the individual Members of Congress ought to stay here and attend to these matters of much moment.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK (H. DOC. NO. 881)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As a result of the war in Europe, far-reaching changes in world affairs have occurred, which necessarily have repercussions on the economic life both of the United States and of the other American Republics. All American Republics in some degree make a practice of selling, and should sell, surplus products to other parts of the world, and we in the United States export many items that are also exported by other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

The course of the war, the resultant blockades and counter blockades, and the inevitable disorganization, is preventing the flow of these surplus products to their normal markets. Necessarily this has caused distress in various parts of the New World, and will continue to cause distress until foreign trade can be resumed on a normal basis, and the seller of these surpluses is in a position to protect himself in disposing of his products. Until liberal commercial policies are restored and fair trading on a commercial plane is reopened, distress may be continued.

I therefore request that the Congress give prompt consideration to increasing the capital and lending power of the Export-Import Bank of Washington by \$500,000,000, and removing some of the restrictions on its operations to the end that the bank may be of greater assistance to our neighbors south of the Rio Grande, including financing the handling and orderly marketing of some part of their surpluses.

It is to be hoped that before another year world trade can be reestablished, but, pending this adjustment, we in the United States should join with the peoples of the other republics of the Western Hemisphere in meeting their problems.

I call the attention of Congress to the fact that by helping our neighbors we will be helping ourselves. It is in the interests of the producers of our country, as well as in the interests of producers of other American countries, that there shall not be a disorganized or cutthroat market in those commodities which we all export.

No sensible person would advocate an attempt to prevent the normal exchange of commodities between other continents and the Americas, but what can and should be done is to prevent excessive fluctuations caused by distressed selling resulting from temporary interruption in the flow of trade, or the fact that there has not yet been reestablished a system of free exchange. Unless exporting countries are able to assist their nationals, they will be forced to bargain as best they can.

As has heretofore been made clear to the Congress, the Export-Import Bank is operated by directors representing the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and is under the supervision of the Federal Loan Administrator, so that all interested branches of our Government participate in any loans that are authorized, and the directors of the bank should have a free hand as to the purposes for which loans are authorized and the terms and conditions upon which they are made.

I therefore request passage of appropriate legislation to this end.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 1940.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 23 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith certified copies of laws enacted by the fourth regular session of the Fourteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 12 to April 15, 1940.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 1940.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], to submit a highly privileged resolution.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I present a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 550

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to inform the House of Representatives if there is a secret pact, agreement, or understanding between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to provide military or naval support against Japan in Asia, or against Germany in Europe, in case of war between the Soviet Union and either Germany or Japan, or both.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of State be read.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 13, 1940.

The Honorable SOL BLOOM,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLOOM: I have received your letter of July 11, 1940, in which you transmit for any comment which I may desire to make several copies of House Resolution 550, requesting information from the President concerning any existing secret pact, agreement, or understanding between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to provide military or naval

support against Japan in Asia or against Germany in Europe, in case of war between the Soviet Union and either Germany or Japan, or both.

In reply, you are informed that there is no existing secret pact, agreement, or understanding of any kind whatsoever between the United States of America or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is not believed, therefore, that the adoption of the resolution in question would serve any useful purpose.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from West Virginia desire to address the House at this time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the unanimous-consent requests now being made I may address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by the President of Cuba yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the very able speech of the Speaker of the House of Representatives before the Democratic convention at Chicago. [Applause.]

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the completion of the legislative business in order for today I may proceed for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the address by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, due to the observations made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] this morning, may I ask the majority leader if there is to be any change in the program as announced last week that nothing of a controversial nature will be brought up during the balance of the week?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not that I know of.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, after the 10 minutes granted the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Previous orders have already been made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, after the previous orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be best if I yielded for all unanimous-consent requests at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address I made, also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from the Swiss Legation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Senator E. E. Patton, published in the Knoxville Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article taken from the Evening Times, of Sayre, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUTHERFORD]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

SUFFRAGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I trust that even though Members may have other matters which should consume attention at the opening of today's session, that as many colleagues as can possibly do so will permit me not to speak so much to them as to counsel with them about a certain action which has recently been taken by one of the great major political parties of this country.

For the first time in the history of the United States we have seen a political party declare in its platform adopted in convention for a clear-cut decision on a subject which has been of considerable interest to a large number of persons over a long period of time.

DEMOCRATS FOR SUFFRAGE

I refer to the action in Chicago by the platform and resolutions committee of the Democratic Party, and later by the convention delegates themselves, in adopting a plank in our 1940 platform which calls for the extension to District of Columbia residents of the privileges of the franchise. At that convention the Democratic Party went on record in affirmative language with an expression that suffrage should be extended to those persons who reside in the District of Columbia.

I know there are many of you who are conscientiously against the extension of the privilege and the responsibility of voting rights to the men and women who reside at our National Capital. I know full well there is a difference of opinion on this subject; but I do hail with enthusiasm, as one individual, the action of the Democratic Party of 1940 in declaring to the Nation that for those men and women who

live in the District of Columbia and who cannot establish voting privileges in any State in this Union that a plan shall be evolved through legislative means which will give to them the rights and responsibilities of true voting citizens of this Nation of yours and mine.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In view of the fact that the Democratic Party is in charge in the House and the Senate, and that we have a President who is the head of that party, is there any reason why you should not go right along and pass such legislation at the present session, since we are going to be here for some time? Why wait until next year? Why not go along with this program now if you have declared yourself in favor of it? Personally I shall join with you.

SENATOR CAPPER HELPS

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am very happy to have the assurance of the gentleman from Kansas of his support of legislation to bring about this desired end. I want also to pay tribute to the support which has been given through a long period of years by your distinguished Senator from the State of Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], who has had a resolution pending and who has done everything in his individual power and in cooperation with others to get action by Congress.

It will be my purpose as speedily as possible to have those individuals in the House of Representatives who are interested in this subject come together and counsel and discuss ways and means of bringing a suffrage measure to our body. I want to say that I believe it is highly significant that the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], after long service in this body, has found himself in agreement with the extension of voting privileges to the men and women who live here, and he has introduced a resolution to bring that about. In talking with him personally, he told me that he arrived at this conclusion after a considerable amount of consideration and careful thought on the subject.

NO PARTISANSHIP INVOLVED

To continue with the decision made by the Democratic Party in its platform, I only wish that the Republican Party, meeting in convention at Philadelphia, had done as the Democratic Party did in Chicago. I say this not from any partisan standpoint whatever, because I believe this is a matter which is important to both parties. There should not be, and I am certain there will not be, any consideration of any such legislation that comes before us in a partisan manner, because the subject matter goes to the basic fundamentals of this country of yours and mine.

SONS AND DAUGHTERS COME OF AGE

I cannot see for a single moment why the large population that has grown up in the District of Columbia over a period of years should not have the responsibility of the vote. The processes of democracy should function in the District just as in any part of America. There was a time in the developing growth of the District of Columbia when most of the individuals who settled in this city came as employees of the Government or as tradesmen to carry on the needed commercial life of the city, but during the last 21 years or more sons and daughters have been born to the men and women who came here, and they are now of voting age. They cannot under any legal means or any stretch of the imagination establish a bona fide voting residence in any State of this Union. Why should these young men and women as they become 21 years of age be kept from voting for a President of the United States, just as young men and young women do in the States of Kansas or Illinois or my own State of West Virginia? Why should these fine Americans not have the rights and responsibilities of voting also for representation in Congress, and later, perhaps, there should be some form of local suffrage in the District of Columbia?

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

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

Mr. MUNDT. As one who is entirely open-minded on the subject of suffrage in the District of Columbia, I wonder if the gentleman could explain to the House for our information just what is contemplated by the plank in the Democratic platform on this subject. Does it mean giving the residents of the District only the privilege of voting for a President, or does it perhaps mean giving two Senators as well as Representatives to the District, in addition?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman for raising that question. The plank simply declares for an extension of suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia. We believe that those who are interested in the subject matter in this Congress will arrive at a legislative vehicle we can use to bring about a partial suffrage, if not a complete suffrage, for the District of Columbia. I believe it only fair to say that in my discussions over the last few years with Members of this body I have found many more of them in favor of giving a vote for President to residents of the District of Columbia than for any other part of the national representation or suffrage program.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman. The thing that has worried me about this subject is giving two Senators, for example, to such a small segment of our country, geographically speaking, with regard to the location of the population, as the District would be, if it were given the status of a State. However, simply voting for President would seem to be exercising a perfectly logical constitutional privilege.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I again thank the gentleman for his contribution. I do wish to say, however, that the latest census figures for the District of Columbia show that we have a population of upward of 700,000. Of course, as the gentleman from South Dakota well knows, this is a larger population than many States have which have two Senators representing them. I say this in all good humor.

Mr. MUNDT. Yet geographically those States are larger, and the problems they face are tremendously larger than those the District has to face.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is exactly right. The only reason I made such comment is that the gentleman carried his observation not only to geographical location but to population as well.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. I happen to know that the gentleman from West Virginia appeared before the Democratic platform committee and presented the case on behalf of the people of the District of Columbia as to the right of suffrage. I compliment the gentleman upon the forceful presentation he must have made, judging by the results he obtained.

I now want to ask the gentleman if he knows whether that matter was presented at all to the Republican Platform Committee at Philadelphia, and whether it was even suggested to them that they might write a similar plank in their platform.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to say in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Washington that I do not know what action was taken by Washingtonians who were members of the District of Columbia Republican delegation at Philadelphia. In years gone by that subject has been presented to Republican conventions and has been presented, of course, to Democratic conventions, but this time we find the first real declaration in any party platform for the right of suffrage for the men and women who live in the District.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for 5 additional minutes?

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman the consent of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman has that consent, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia to proceed for 5 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman again yield to me?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. It has been suggested, I think, by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], that since the Democrats are in control of the House and since the platform contains a proposal that suffrage be granted, that it should be granted forthwith. If the Republican Party at Philadelphia had written a similar plank in their platform, then would we not be doubly sure of enacting such legislation before we adjourn?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think, of course, if we could have this plank in both political platforms, it would help us on the floor, and just before I yield again to my friend from Kansas, I want to say that you have paid tribute to me for my presentation at Chicago of the plea for suffrage for the District of Columbia. I have no pride of leadership as such, and I simply joined with other men and women in working that this would be brought about and here publicly I pay tribute to Mr. Hildreth and Mr. McConihe and others of the District of Columbia delegation who kept plugging away for suffrage in the face of the discouragement which sometimes seemed very strong against their efforts in this direction.

Mr. LEAVY. I am sure the gentleman is unduly modest, because we in the House appreciate the battle the gentleman has made for suffrage in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield again to the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I view of the fact that a bill is now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the House and has been pending there during the entire session, and probably during the entire Congress, and in view of the fact that the majority party appears to be so strong for this legislation, why in the world bother about putting it into your party platform if you are in earnest about it, and I am sure the gentleman now before the House is in earnest about it; why not go along and get it up before the House? You have a majority on the committee in charge of the measure, and why not bring it out here and vote on it and not make it a so-called partisan matter? Probably the Republicans could have done the same thing, but it just seems to me it is rather useless to take any other course when the measure is pending before the Congress and when we are right here and are going to be in session for some time. Why not come in here and vote it out? I am sure the Republicans in great numbers will join the gentleman, and it will not be a partisan matter. Let us take the partisanship out of the question entirely.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I want to do that very much. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the very distinguished ranking member on the House District Committee, knows we have always tried to consider Washington matters from an entirely nonpartisan standpoint, and from the point of view of the welfare of the District of Columbia and in relation to the entire Nation.

I now want to make this further observation. There were hearings held before the Judiciary Committee of the House on this subject during the Seventy-fifth Congress and there has been a gradual coming to the viewpoint of a certain degree of representation for the District of Columbia. I am hoping that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] will take the leadership because he holds a key position and see that there is a vote taken in the Judiciary Committee so that a bill may be brought before the House for consideration.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Of course, on this question of suffrage of the District of Columbia and self-government for the

District, we hear discussed at every session of the Congress and I have heard statements made to the effect that they once had suffrage and the right of self-government in the District and that it did not work out and that Congress took it away from the District. I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten us on that part of the program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would say that what was here only applied to local government. There was no national representation in Congress or voting for the President of the United States under that plan, as I understand it, but there was a certain amount of local government and for various reasons that was taken away from the District of Columbia residents. I would not want to go into that just at this time, because it is a rather involved subject and covers considerable territory.

Mr. PITTINGER. The statement has been made that it did not work out on account of the National Government being located here and they had to abandon it, and I just wondered if that is true.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I now yield to the able ranking minority member of the District Committee the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. To observe, as a matter of record, the persevering and consistent efforts that the gentleman has devoted to the interests and the welfare of the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Has it not been the gentleman's experience, since he has been conspicuously identified with this committee, that on numerous occasions he has had gentlemen and ladies say to him that they would be glad to live in the District of Columbia if they could only exercise the privilege the distinguished gentleman has been promoting for several years, and is it not a fact that those same gentlemen and ladies could make a very valuable contribution spiritually as well as physically and morally and intellectually to the affairs of the District of Columbia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman from New York. I am certain that what the gentleman has observed is true and I so state this to the House. If the voting privilege were extended, those men and women would exercise that right and responsibility with a great deal of intelligence and civic-mindedness. I think it is fair to say that here in the District of Columbia there are men and women who form the bulk of the population who have those attributes.

Mr. O'BRIEN. And they would make priceless contributions to the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. I shall not ask for any more time, although several gentlemen are on their feet who want to question me and add to the discussion. I value the consideration given me this afternoon, and I hope that we may speedily and favorably consider this most important subject. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman begins would the gentleman like to have a quorum to hear his confession? I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. O Mr. Speaker, I would rather that the gentleman withdraw that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the quorum call, may I say that one of the most interesting meetings I ever addressed in my lifetime consisted of only seven people, including myself. A preacher in a little country town came to see me one day and said, "If you will supply the pulpit on a

given Sunday night, it will enable me to obtain 13 days of uninterrupted vacation." I said I would do so with great pleasure. He said, "I am sure that when they find out that you are going to address the congregation, they will have to put up the standing-room-only signs." I repaired to this little town that night and found exactly seven people in the church, including myself. First we wound up the organ, as it were, and sang some of those old gospel hymns with real verve and gusto, and then in intimate fashion began to wrestle with the devil as Jacob did with the angel a long time ago, and I say to you that it turned out to be an exciting and glorious meeting. So I am not particularly disconcerted about how few or how many folks are on the floor this afternoon.

I want to address myself to the great reunion in Chicago. I notice by the Washington Daily News that the weather made the headlines today, so all must be quiet on the Chicago front. I do say, because there is such a scrambling of politics and candidates today, that I think any citizen ought to discuss fully and freely the things that are transpiring in national conventions, platforms, and headlines that are being prepared for the country, because there is such an intermingling now that it is difficult for a great many of our citizenry to orient themselves.

I was one of those who attended the Chicago convention by remote attendance. I listened faithfully to the air waves. I read the generous and copious accounts that appeared in the newspapers, and may I preface my remarks today by adding testimony to the great Speaker of the House of Representatives. As I listened to the roll call of the States, I think there was a sort of quickening of the tempo of my thoughts, and there was a quickening of sentiments, because I had somehow hoped that the great Speaker of the House of Representatives, an outstanding Democrat, a man of infinite parliamentary capacity, a man of parliamentary skill, a man who had great devotion to the fundamentals of democracy, might have been nominated for the Vice Presidency of the United States, and I still feel that way. [Applause.] I say this with no disparagement of Secretary Wallace, for I have long entertained respect, esteem, and affection for the Secretary of Agriculture.

Now, we held an unbossed convention in Philadelphia, where there were no "smoke filled room" and there were no bosses pulling the strings. We held a convention where the avowed candidates for the Republican nomination for the Presidency competed with real earnestness and vigor, and after our deliberations we nominated Wendell Willkie, one time affiliated with the Democratic Party, who, like so many Democrats of the orthodox school, was deserted by his own party. He was selected to lead the Republicans in 1940 and also lead this Nation out of the wilderness.

In Chicago they had a completely bossed and dominated convention, where master minds were constantly pulling the strings in a smoke-filled room and where all candidates had been plowed under except the President of the United States and the very genial and amiable Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace.

Mr. PATRICK. I do not want to bother the gentleman now if he would rather yield later.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will be glad to yield later.

They were nominated amid demonstrations of turmoil and dissension. So I say, in view of the fact that a quondam Republican is on the Democratic ticket and that a former Democrat is on the Republican ticket, every citizen ought to freely exercise his prerogative of commenting upon contemporary affairs.

The Chicago convention, where the embattled hosts of democracy were assembled, was unique in so many ways that it is difficult to catalog.

In the first place, it was the only party reunion in history which was convened for the exclusive purpose of selecting a Vice President. The rest of the business had been taken care of before that time.

It was the only convention in the Nation's history which was manipulated by an assistant sergeant at arms who

could not secure a berth on the Iowa delegation and who thereupon accepted a badge as assistant sergeant at arms, with a direct, open wire to the White House.

It was the first time that a party reunion was completely dominated by a candidate who did not choose to choose until he was nominated.

It was the only convention in history where delegates had to wear tags to indicate that they were not candidates for the Vice Presidency.

It was the only convention in history where they had 1 Vice President and 100 Vice Presidents on order.

It was the first convention in history where the theme song was Take Me Out to the Ball Game. [Laughter.]

It was unique in that Senator BILBO, of Mississippi, seemed to be the only Member of the United States Senate who was not an aspirant for the Vice Presidency.

It was the first time in the history of the Republic that by indirection the Republican Party selected a Democratic candidate because fear of the Republican standard bearer provoked the convention to select the incumbent of the White House as the only man who could beat Willkie.

It was the only convention in history where Vice Presidential candidates were so abundant that a delegate from Ohio nominated two of them, namely, Bascom Timmons, of Texas, and Charles Sawyer, Democratic National Committeeman from Ohio.

It was almost reminiscent of the old bank they used to tell about which had to reorganize because it had more vice presidents than depositors.

It was the only convention where the vocal superiority and laryngitcal response of a superintendent of sewers stamped a convention.

It was the first convention in history where a demonstration was mechanized, under the direction of Mayor Edward A. Kelly, of Chicago, and where Mayor Kelly's superintendent of sewers so completely forgot himself that at times there sprung from his taurian throat the unusual demand "Kelly Wants Roosevelt." [Laughter.]

It was the first and only convention in history where delegates, faced with the inevitable and inescapable threat of a third term, were like the old Gloucester fisherman who said, "I am going down to Gloucester tonight and get drunk and, oh, how I dread it." [Laughter.]

It was not a Roosevelt "blitzkrieg." It had nothing in common with the "blitzkrieg," as my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] suggested about the convention at Philadelphia. Indeed not. I think, Judge, that about the only parallel that could be found would be a reversal of the old biblical story so that "Jonah swallowed the whale." Indeed it was a great reunion.

Now let us examine for a moment some of the press comments.

Raymond Brandt, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in his special article in the Washington Star, said:

The President will dictate all that the Democrats do in Chicago.

United Press, in the Daily News, carried this headline last week:

F. D. Salis Potomac While Party Squirms.

Thomas Stokes, of Scripps-Howard, in the same paper, said:

There is a telephone line between Hopkins' room and the White House.

Another dispatch stated:

Pretty girls are distributing buttons with the words "Just Roosevelt."

This, of course, was in keeping with the romantic and sometimes fictional character of a convention.

Another dispatch said,

Farley candidacy embarrasses Roosevelt, says Hopkins, Walker, and Flynn.

Now, Mr. Alsop, of the famed team of Alsop and Kintner, author of the first American white paper, said this in the Washington Star in a syndicated article:

Barring accidents, the players should speak their lines as if the show had been on tour for years.

Said the same Alsop in another syndicated article:

Most of the platform was written at the White House well in advance of the convention.

Said the same Alsop regarding President Roosevelt's nomination:

It was a surprise party without a surprise since the humblest voter knew it months ago.

And the same Alsop had this to say:

There is constant telephonic communication between the White House and the master minds at the Blackstone Hotel.

I wondered whether there was method in the madness of Brother Hopkins that he should have selected the Blackstone Hotel in Chicago, remembering, of course, the wizardry and the legerdemain of the former Blackstone of the stage many years ago.

Then there appeared this prophetic article in the Washington Star of July 13, which was syndicated—and I ask you to listen to this because it was prophetic:

A demonstration in which real enthusiasm of the delegates will be combined with the practical noise-making of such third-term magnificos as Kelly, Hague, and Flynn. Though Garner may be put in nomination, other aspirants will not trouble to have their names mentioned. The roll will be called, the tender will be made. The President will then accept in a statement showing that he did not ask for and did not want it, and then explain that in times like these no man when called on to serve can well refuse.

That was written 5 days before the great spiritualistic medium, the permanent chairman of the convention, gave that famous indirect message to the convention which contains not a single quote from the President of the United States.

As one news writer so well put it:

The convention was so foolproof that not even One-Eyed Connelly, the famous gate crasher, could get in, and had to get a badge as assistant sergeant at arms. This really made him the colleague of Harry Hopkins, the master mind who gave the somewhat impaired Stromboli touch to the mismanaged puppet show.

Now, let me address myself for a second to the keynote speech. Considering the magnitude of the task, our beloved Speaker made an admirable, an eloquent keynote address, which was dignified and stately. Too, it was, of course, eloquent for what it did not say, and in this respect we have a full appreciation of our beloved Speaker's difficulties.

When, for instance, he spoke of the inevitable errors which a party makes and for which public indulgence is hoped, obviously it was too much for us to expect that he would recount those errors and then indicate in what respect they might be corrected. When he spoke, for instance, of the virtues of Federal deposit insurance of bank deposits we could not very well expect him to bestow the accolade upon the pioneering Senator from Michigan, Senator VANDENBERG, who had so much to do with the Federal deposit insurance in its early days.

When our beloved Speaker spoke of unemployment and relief, obviously it was too much for us to expect that he would point out that the same William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, who appeared before the Democratic platform committee in Chicago, stated no less recently than in May in the American Federationist that we had 10,000,000 people out of work despite the enormous sums that had been expended thus far on that primary economic problem.

When our beloved Speaker spoke about the Republican platform and that it was full of equivocation and subterfuge because it did not suggest the abolition of a single New Deal measure, obviously we could not expect him to indicate where the minority party had insisted upon modifications of the Social Security and Wagner Acts and many other measures to make them more workable and feasible in the interest of the general welfare.

When the Speaker alluded to the fact that there was some opposition on our side to parity payments for agriculture, obviously we could not expect him to indicate that the President himself was opposed to parity and that the Secretary of Agriculture was opposed to parity until the Congress of the United States supplied the revenues and the taxes out of which parity payments might be made; and since that was not done, and since the Congress was remiss in its duty in

that respect, obviously we could not expect our beloved Speaker to suggest that, of course; but that is the fact by the record.

Finally, the keynote speech was eloquent in that it did not mention those rather delicate and squeamish things like the deficit, the national debt, the annually recurring deficits, the need for increased taxes, and all those other things that are so delicate and fall so onerously upon the shoulders of the American people. But it was an eloquent and it was a stately address, and I salute the distinguished Speaker of this body.

Now let me turn for a moment to the permanent chairman, to the address by Senator BARKLEY. It did not meet the need of the hour. I venture the opinion that if the Republican convention had come after the Democratic convention, Senator BARKLEY would have had to recast that entire speech, because it was almost entirely devoted to Philadelphia, and to Hoover, and to 1932. Somebody should have gone up on the platform at the convention and whispered to him that Hoover was not running in 1940. The Senator's explorations in the field of history would qualify him as an expert in archaeology, because he has been going back to 1932 and 1929 so often. Somebody should have suggested to him that what the country wants is some 1940 thinking. And when I think of how Senator BARKLEY gave full emphasis to 1932 and 1929, it reminds me of the fellow who went into a restaurant and he said to the waiter, "What kind of soup do you have?" The waiter said, "Oxtail." He said, "Oh, why go back that far?" [Laughter.]

It might be suggested to Senator BARKLEY that it was not necessary to go back that far, but rather to deal with contemporary events and with the problems that do face this country despite the enormity of the expenditures that have been made.

Let me address a remark or two now to the platform which was unique and noteworthy because it was a great compliment to the Republican platform makers in Philadelphia. It followed out the handiwork of the Republican platform makers in respect of the foreign policy, aid to foreign democracies, and with regard to national defense. On the foreign policy, for instance, the Republican platform states that the Republican Party is opposed to involvement in foreign wars. Three weeks later come our Democratic brethren in Chicago and they say that this Nation will not participate in foreign war. These planks are striking in their similarity. Respecting aid to foreign democracies in countries in difficulty the Republican Party favors such aid as conforms to international law and is consonant with our defense needs. Three weeks later come our Democratic brethren in Chicago and announce that they favor material aid to democracies consistent with law and the interests of our own national defense. Here is a distinction without a difference.

One wonders about that foreign-policy plank. One wonders about the complete reversal of policy by the administration. One wonders about the quarantine speech in 1937 in Chicago and about the efforts to achieve international security and of pursuing methods short of war. What, then, has so suddenly happened here? As the New York Times remarked editorially on July 16 regarding quarantining and methods short of war:

The high hope of outspoken Democratic leadership in all these policies has now gone up in smoke.

It was a complete reversal that somehow or other struck the note that the Republican Party has been following all the while which struck the temper of the country and on the very threshold of the convention they made that change. Truly there is the greatest and speediest transformation of foreign policy in the world's history. The Republican Party should feel complimented on its influence on the Democratic platform makers in Chicago.

Now, I have always got a thrill, of course, out of any recital of accomplishment, particularly for the last 7 years. The rest of the platform with respect to achievements will, I think, receive the plaudits and acclaim of the historians as the one piece of literature containing 4,000 words which does not contain a truly practical solution of the very real and pressing problems that now confront the Nation.

LXXXVI—603

Now let us examine the record, and I hope you will indulge me if I am a bit whimsical at times. But 7 years ago President Roosevelt took over. Mr. Speaker, he really took over as the "must" legislation and blank-check appropriations and political purges and a hand-picked Supreme Court will amply testify. Now, he refuses to give back. What further proof is needed that he did not choose to choose until after all the candidates had been plowed under, after which he so reluctantly agreed not to give back control?

It brings to mind the story of the old fellow who used to take a nip once in a while and finally he was reformed. He was on his deathbed. So he said to his wife, "Mary, I wish you would go down to the old well and find that old bottle of liquor I have hidden down there under a loose board. Then, Mary, I want you to go out in the back yard and pick some nice, fresh mint leaves. Then, Mary, I want you to mix up a very cooling draft. Then, Mary, I want you to bring it up home and no matter how much I protest, Mary, make me drink it."

Yes, that was about the way it went, no matter how much I protest, make me accept the nomination. I think that was pretty nearly the keynote.

Seven years ago everybody was insisting on action. Why, even the most confirmed Tory and reactionary in the country wanted action. Mr. Speaker, they really got it. Even the Democratic Party got action in Chicago. In fact, they got double reverse, centripetal action, which was so complete and so efficacious that they are still wondering how a tornado was generated in Room 308, Blackstone Hotel, by Brother Hopkins' wind machines could pack so much force and fury.

Seven years ago there was another platform. It has not been used so much, of course. You remember 4 weeks ago Alfalfa Bill was running for Congress in Oklahoma for Congressman-at-large against our good colleague, WILL ROGERS. Alfalfa Bill stated he was running on the Democratic platform of 1932. When they quizzed him about it, he says, "Why should I not? The damn thing has never been used anyway."

I am sure the gentleman will bear me out in that matter. We had that platform which pledged a balanced Budget. It pledged a 25-percent cut in appropriations, but it did not say when. Maybe we are still leading up to it. The 1940 platform does not say anything about that either. Maybe it is a hint of a fourth term and that in 1944 there may be another pledge of a balanced Budget and a promise not to spend all the receipts and revenues for more than 2 or 3 years in advance.

Seven years ago we started out with a brain trust. They constituted an incorporated group of ideas. The last 7 years have seen them vanish. Moley was banished to News Week, Tugwell was exiled to molasses, General Johnson retreated to Scripps-Howard, and Donald Richberg went back to legal practice, Frankfurter was promoted to the high court, and that beloved Jim Farley, esteemed and respected by Democrats and Republicans alike for his fairness and his sense of sportsmanship and his political sagacity, has gone to the Yankees. Thus does the wheel of destiny spin.

Seven years ago it was almost lese majeste to criticize the President. He was truly our national hero, and I do not mind making a public confession in the Well of this House that, as a new Member of this Congress in the special session of 1933 I looked to the President of the United States, I expected things and went along with a great many pieces of administration legislation; but there has come now, of course, the "sitkrieg" and the "blitzkrieg." There came the plugged dollar and the doubleheader Thanksgiving. There came the splurge, the surge, the purge, and the dirge. There came the plowing under of little pigs and the plowing under of candidates and delegates at Chicago. There came the Blue Eagle and some alleged pinks in high places. There came the Black appointment and the amber and green light in Chicago.

Came \$100 a plate dinners and \$250 a copy convention books. Came the 1937 speech in Chicago to quarantine aggressor nations, and the 1940 Chicago "blitzkrieg" to quarantine all the Democrats. Truly there were 7 eventful years.

Let us look at some unanswered questions. Let us look at some of the real problems confronting the country as our

brethren on this side stand on the threshold of a third-term effort. Examine the keynote address, the address of the permanent chairman, the Chicago platform, and the President's acceptance speech, and you will note that after 7 years of unlimited power and authority and with untold billions of dollars to spend there are still 10,000,000 persons out of work, and no suggestion of a practical solution to meet this primary national problem, this problem that, in my judgment, is the foremost of all, until there is a solution, will prevent the solution of a great many other problems. If you have not read the Democratic platform on unemployment, I think it would be well for me to read it to you:

The Democratic Party wages war on unemployment, one of the gravest problems of our times, inherited at its worst from the last Republican administration. Since we assumed office, 9,000,000 additional persons have gained regular employment in normal private enterprise.

Frankly, I do not know what the facts are behind that figure, but I cherish grave and unmistakable doubts about it.

Continuing—

All our policies, financial, industrial, and agricultural, will continue to accelerate the rate of this progress.

By public action where necessary to supplement private reemployment we have rescued millions from idleness that breeds weakness and given them a real stake in their country's well-being. We shall continue to recognize the obligation of Government to provide work for deserving workers who cannot be absorbed by private industry.

We are opposed to vesting in the States and local authorities the control of Federally financed work relief. We believe that this Republican proposal is a thinly disguised plan to put the unemployed back on the dole.

We will continue energetically to direct our efforts toward the employment in private industry of all those willing to work, as well as the fullest employment of money and machines. This we pledge as our primary objective.

To further implement this objective, we favor calling, under the direction of the President, a national unemployment conference of leaders of Government, industry, labor and farm groups.

There is work in our factories, mines, fields, forests, and river basins, on our coasts, highways, railroads, and inland waterways. There are houses to be built to shelter our people. Building a better America means work and a higher standard of living for every family and a richer and more secure heritage for every American.

When this is all boiled down, what is it? It is a pledge to the American people to continue to spend, and then to hold a conference in Washington, after 7 long years, with 10,000,000 deserving and distressed people still upon the doorstep of unemployment.

If the administration knows what to do about this problem, why has it not done it, and why has it not given to the country a plan that is constructive? If it does not know what to do, then how can it very persuasively bid for another 4 years in authority? Administration leaders know, as every rational person knows, that only through continued monumental spending or through a revival of investment can we carry on at all. If the administration proposes to continue spending at the present rate, I am rather wondering what we are going to use for money after a little while. If, however, they agree that it requires a revival of investment, and apparently they do, why has not some plan been brought forth? If they have no plan, how can they persuasively ask the country to continue them in power for another 4 years?

If you want some illuminating reading, look at the Federal Reserve report for July 1940. You will note there that we have 10,000 fewer banks than we had in 1929. These 10,000 fewer banks have \$5,000,000,000 more deposits than they had in 1929, and we have \$7,000,000,000 fewer loans and investments by banks than we had in 1929. So that for the last 11 years we have lost 10,000 banks, deposits have gone up \$5,000,000,000, and bank loans and investments have gone down \$7,000,000,000, and unemployment still runs along at a static level of almost 10,000,000. These are the things in which I am interested, and they are the things in which the country is interested.

While social legislation and social reform is a grand thing, as is so amply testified by the support it has received on our own side of the aisle, yet why talk to a fellow about 40 hours a week when there is not a job for him? Why particularly

emphasize the right of collective bargaining until there is something to bargain about? I voted for all those measures for shorter hours and increased pay and collective bargaining, but the first and foremost problem of the country today is the 10,000,000 people who are still out of work.

Somehow, there is nothing in that platform, there is nothing in that program, and nothing in the speeches to indicate that the solution has been found. So I say to you, my good friends over on this side, in the best of sportsmanship, how can you well go to the country and ask them to continue you in power for another 4 years and give your President a third term, when for 7 years, with all the authority we have conferred, and with all the blank checks, you still have not found a solution?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with rare pleasure.

Mr. PATRICK. This is, of course, an interesting matter. We confess, that is, all the Democrats I have heard discuss this question have confessed that we have not been able to take up the slack we found when we took over. We have taken up some of it but not all of it. The point is, however, since the gentleman refers to that fact, what guarantees do the Republicans offer that they have a solution that will relieve the situation, in view of the fact that they promised prosperity and instead of that gave us unemployment and a sinking of the stomach nationally?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We propose so to relieve the situation and so inspire confidence in the business structure of the country that there will be an expansion of employment and that the billions of idle dollars that are now in the banks of the country will join in a kind of holy wedlock with the idle hands of the country and restore that type of prosperity that is sound, continuing, and durable. There is no other answer except that.

Mr. PATRICK. How are you going to do that or how is the Republican Party going to do that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. First of all, what did we have here by way of a bill to amend the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and a lot of you gentlemen voted for it, but you have a Democratic-dominated Senate, where that bill is probably reposing right now, so the employer does not have a fair and equitable chance, which is so necessary before you can get set to take idle dollars and invest them in private enterprise that will make work for despairing people. That is No. 1.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman is in a position to advise the House and the country as to who it is or as to what it is that is holding up consideration of that measure in the Senate and, mind you, let me say that there are two other bills that the House has recently sent over there, both closely related to the measure to which the gentleman makes reference, and all three having to do with the sole purpose of preventing labor racketeering. Who is it that is holding them up over there? Is it party politics that is responsible for their being held in the background, and if it is party politics, is it your party or is it mine that is strangling those three measures in the Senate at this time? Mind you, the other two measures I refer to are, first, the bill to deport Harry Bridges, which passed by an overwhelming majority in this House. It is over in the Senate and it is being held up. Is it party politics that is holding it up, and if so, is it your party or my party that is responsible for it?

The other bill I refer to is the Walter bill that is being held up. They say over in the Senate, "If it is brought to a vote here we will pass it, of course, because no honest man can be heard to advance any argument against its adoption." But who is holding it in the background? Is it your party or is it my party? Why not let the truth be made known and let the party that is responsible for holding it up take the responsibility before the country for championing and supporting influences which those measures are intended to correct.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. If you will permit me let me say to the great and able exponent of Jeffersonian democracy from

Georgia—and he is a real exponent of true democracy—that the Republican membership in the Senate of the United States is less than 25 percent of the whole membership, and is not that the answer to the question of whether it is being held up by our party or the other party? Finally, in the light of the statements that have emanated from high places in the Nation, maybe the third-term nominee has indirectly or by the expression of a very innocuous and slender wish or hope, indicated that perhaps there should be no action upon those bills.

Mr. POWERS and Mr. RANKIN rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. POWERS. Does it not seem rather strange to the gentleman that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], a good Democrat, would get up here and defend the New Deal, particularly after the Hitler conclave that has just been concluded in Chicago?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I never could tell whether my good friend from Alabama, with whom I have enjoyed some really pleasurable moments on the platform and on the air, is really persuaded in that direction at all or not.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I think you Republicans were supposed to laugh at the proposition suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS]. I would suggest that you insert "laughter" in the RECORD at that point. But referring to the statement of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], let me remind the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that over in the Senate they have different rules from what we have here.

Any Member of the Senate can rise at any time and move to discharge a committee from the consideration of any one of these bills and bring it to the floor for a vote at any time. Now your Vice Presidential candidate is a Member of the Senate, and probably will be for several years, and he has the right to rise and make the motion, and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who, by the way, almost disappeared at Philadelphia, and any other, as for instance Senator TAFT, could do likewise.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And what good would it do if they should make the motion?

Mr. RANKIN. They could at least show their faith by their works, if they had the faith.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman admits that it would be only a gesture, that there would be the great administration, with its power, to hold it in the background.

Mr. RANKIN. When we were in the minority, when we had only 23 Democrats in the Senate, we caught the Secretary of the Interior stealing Teapot Dome, and we moved to discharge him and finally drove him from power and got that great oil reservoir back into the hands of Uncle Sam.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If my friend from Mississippi, by some arithmetical legerdemain, can show that 23 equals 72 over on the Senate floor, then I shall believe that something can be done about it.

Let me address myself for a moment now to a very delicate question—the third term. At last the third-term question is directly before the people. What they propose to do about it frankly I do not know, any more than you folks do, because you cannot foretell now with any degree of accuracy what the result will be on November 5, 1940; but certainly, like Patrick Henry, we can dip into the future for a little wisdom.

It was George Washington who is first quoted on this matter and who said that "The love of power and the proneness to abuse it which predominates in a man's heart" is one of those strange human qualities.

Then came Thomas Jefferson, and, mind you, despite the insistence of memorials from 7 of the 17 State legislatures in his day urging him to take a third term, he said it would degenerate into an inheritance and he would be the last to willingly break the precedent that had been set by Washington.

Then came Jackson, in his message to Congress recognizing the danger of contravening the intention of the Constitution, urging an amendment fixing the Presidential tenure at one term.

Then came the great Democratic convention in 1896. That was the day when that flaming crusader, William Jennings Bryan, coursed through the land; and the slogan of free silver and 16 to 1 echoed from every pair of lips in the country. That was the day, and I will bet my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi, Judge RANKIN, remembers it quite well—I was born in that year, so could not remember it or know a great deal about it—

Mr. RANKIN. Bryan was the greatest statesman Illinois has ever produced.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman is more than half right. It reminds me of the farmer from Vermont who came down to attend a White House reception years ago when Mr. Lincoln was President. Somehow or other all of the guards kept pushing him to the background, and he never did get to shake hands with the President, but finally he got close enough to say to the President that up in Vermont "we believe that God Almighty and Abraham Lincoln will save this Nation." Mr. Lincoln said to him in a whimsical way, "You are half right," and so I say to the gentleman from Mississippi he is half right. But those were the days when they held meetings in the schoolhouses discussing gold and silver and the monetary question that bulked so much in the campaign of 1896.

That was a National Democratic Convention which had declared it to be the unwritten law, sanctioned by custom and usage, "That no man should be eligible for a third term of the Presidential office." That was your party speaking, not ours.

Then came the resolution in the United States Senate on the 10th of February 1928 to the effect that it was the sense of the Senate that a departure from the third-term precedent would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions. Who supported that resolution?

First there was "Dear ALBEN" BARKLEY, the permanent chairman of the convention in 1940. Who else? Well, there was Senator WAGNER, the chairman of the resolutions committee in Chicago, and there were Senator PITTMAN, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Senator HARRISON. There were Senators ASHURST and GERRY and GLASS and KING, HAYDEN, MCKELLAR, NEELY, SHEPPARD, SMITH, TYDINGS, WHEELER. Now, if you want to go in for a bit of captivating and ingenious fun, I suggest you get the roll call of the 1940 convention in Chicago and check most of those names and find out how in 12 years some of the tried, true, and trusted statesmen of the United States Senate finally went back on the resolution of 1928 and believe in 1940 that a third term will be first-class medicine for the country.

As late as 1939 our good friend, Representative Drewry, of Virginia, Senator Adams, of Colorado, and Senator Johnson, of Colorado, former Governor Clark, of Idaho, Senator Gillette, of Iowa, and a great many outstanding Democrats, stated that it is a matter of principle that there should be no third term. But somehow the wisdom of the founding fathers and the deep conviction of present-day public officials and statesmen was disdained, and there is before the people the question of breaking an ancient precedent and electing a President for a third term.

One of the most disconcerting things about the present third term is the processes by which it was contrived. I am one of those who supported the President on many occasions, as the RECORD of this House will show.

I am one of those who disagreed with the President on some matters of policy, but have cherished for him a rather deep and abiding confidence in his sincerity of purpose. I am one of those who believed firmly that the President placed country above party. But as I reflect upon the course of events which led to the final decision to stand for a third term, something of that belief and something of that faith in the President has been somewhat impaired.

After that celebrated indirect message delivered by Senator BARKLEY to the convention, after his address as permanent chairman, it should be noted that the President was not once directly quoted in that message. It was the Senator from Kentucky speaking. Here is the sentiment which he sought to convey to the convention:

First, that the President had no wish to be a candidate for a third term.

Second, that the President exerted no influence on the delegates.

Third, that he did not seek the opinions of the delegates.

Fourth, that the President has never had the desire or the purpose to continue in office or to be nominated.

Fifth, that the delegates are free to vote for any candidate.

The senior Senator from Illinois [SCOTT LUCAS], who at one time was a Member of this House, stood up before that convention the night they were nominating and balloting on Vice President and there he said:

If this were a free and open convention I would have let my name go to the convention as a candidate for the Vice Presidency.

That is the senior Democratic Senator from Illinois speaking to the convention itself when he said it was not a free and open convention.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue for just a moment and then I will yield.

Now, what does the last year of effort indicate with respect to the President's statement through Senator BARKLEY that he never had the desire or purpose to continue in office or to be nominated?

How many times when quizzed directly or indirectly by those ingenious newspaper men in Washington did he not say to somebody, "You stand in the corner and wear a dunce cap" when they got uncomfortably close on the third term.

What single thing has the President done to discourage a build-up for the third term? When Secretary Wallace, in a public address about a year ago, stated that Roosevelt must be nominated in 1940, was anything said to discourage the growing boom?

When Secretary Ickes said, "There can be no other in 1940 than Roosevelt," and started his one-man boom, was anything done to squelch or discourage the idea?

When Senator GUFFEY, that great Keystone State statesman, not only plunked out for a third term, but actually published a book in January of 1940 under the captivating title "Roosevelt Again," which I read with interest yesterday, and in which the Pennsylvania Senator said "The third term is a political hobgoblin," and that it was "a spurious issue of tradition," was anything said or done to discourage the idea?

So here is the great author from the Keystone State insisting away back in January of this year that there ought to be a third term for President Roosevelt, and to prove it, if you had attuned your ear to the convention you might have heard the stentorian voice of Senator GUFFEY saying, "Pennsylvania casts 72 votes for Franklin Delano Roosevelt." That was the answer.

Now, then, as the Presidential boom of the tall, tan, and terrific gentleman from Indiana, Governor McNutt, got under way and had begun to catch on in the country, what happened? The first thing they did was to file a tax deficiency and have him come before the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Then they took his friend from Indiana, Bowman Elder, I think, who was custodian of the 2-percent fund in Indiana and filed a deficiency of \$83,000 against him, because Governor McNutt was catching on in the country. So, like so many candidates, he had to be plowed under.

If the President did not want a third term, I ask you in all fairness, why did he allow his name to go into the Illinois primary in April of 1940? Why did he say that Jim Farley was unacceptable as a candidate because of the issue of religion? Why was there this reversal of foreign policy in Chicago, to indicate that anything would be offered so that nothing would impair the free-wheeling of the convention and the well-oiled mechanization as it plowed under all candidates to nominate "Just Roosevelt"?

Let me quote a rather pointed paragraph from his acceptance speech. The President said:

When in 1936 I was chosen by the voters for a second time as President it was my firm intention to turn over the responsibilities of government to other hands at the end of my term.

In other words, the President clearly indicated that the question of whether he turned over control at the end of 8 years was a matter of personal choice with him. But finally it is indicated to the country that he is the indispensable person; and so the ancient custom, the ancient precedent, the ancient usage against a third term has been broken.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. In a moment. I wonder some, by what logic can you argue against a fourth term if the third term is broken? By what logic can you argue against a fifth term, or by what logic can you argue against a life tenure? The Constitution says that a man is not eligible to be President unless he is 35 years of age. If you give him four terms at the age of 55 when he starts he would be 71 when he finishes, or if you give him 20 years at the youngest age at which any President has been chosen, 48, the age of Theodore Roosevelt when he became President, he would be 68 years of age. So four terms is almost coextensive with a lifetime; and if you break the precedent now there can be no argument against a fourth term and there can be no convincing argument against life tenure in the presidential office.

I now yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. We all admire the extreme fairness of the gentleman from Ohio. I think he is one of the real statesmen in the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. From Illinois.

Mr. PATRICK. Was that an Ohio man?

Mr. MASON. No.

Mr. PATRICK. You see everybody admires the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. We have all enjoyed his résumé of this convention, but let us revert to the Vice Presidency. I want to ask this gentleman from Illinois if he does not think that since he seems so outraged because the President very frankly stated that his preference was Henry Wallace—

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say a thing of that kind, did I?

Mr. PATRICK. That if the delegates wished to support the President's choice with their confidence and so accentuate the ticket that they were doing anything undemocratic or injurious to the Nation? It must be remembered that the Republicans themselves waited and created a sort of embarrassing pause between the time that Willkie chose McNary and the time that McNary accepted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did the gentleman hear me say a single thing about the President's making his choice for the Vice Presidency?

Mr. PATRICK. I interpreted the gentleman's remarks that way when he stated that Senator Lucas said that if it had been a free and open convention, he would have permitted his name to have been placed in nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That related not, of course, only to the Vice Presidency but to the entire convention.

Mr. PATRICK. But Senator Lucas was speaking only of the Vice Presidency when he made that statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I doubt it very much. He was speaking of the whole convention.

Mr. PATRICK. I was at the convention, I may say to my good friend from Illinois, and possibly I got a little more accurate idea of what happened and the atmosphere of the convention than the gentleman from Illinois did, who was not there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have some doubt about that. I attended the Philadelphia convention and became persuaded that the man at the end of the radio knew more about what was going on at the convention than did the man at the convention itself.

Mr. PATRICK. That is probably true of Philadelphia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It certainly was true of the Chicago convention.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I have listened with a great deal of fascination to the gentleman's report and analysis of the convention in Chicago. I can conceive that schoolboys in future years are going to turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this date to study how democracy reached a crisis at this convention, and read and possibly memorize the charming words of the gentleman from Illinois. I think his report and analysis will be read and reread, not only now but in future, so I would like to read into this memorable address the fact that the convention at Chicago just closed was the only convention at which the name of Thomas Jefferson was jeered by the delegates instead of cheered. We heard the name of Thomas Jefferson jeered when Senator CARTER GLASS quoted Jefferson's language showing why seeking a third term was incorrect.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. With pleasure.

Mr. PATRICK. We who were there, of course, could see and know that that was an unfair and unjust report, because it was not the name of Thomas Jefferson that was jeered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The confusion probably grows out of the fact that that was the only convention I ever heard of at which there were two sound systems instead of one. The superintendent of sewers of the city of Chicago was the only one outside of the organist who knew where to turn on the second key, and he so far forgot himself in leading his mechanized cheering squad that he said: "Kelly wants Roosevelt."

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MASON. I disagree with the interpretation that it was jeering the name of Thomas Jefferson, but it certainly was jeering the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and the statement that Thomas Jefferson had made concerning any third term.

Mr. PATRICK. That was not an interpretation. I am not going to dispute that, although I did not so interpret it myself.

Mr. COX. It was jeering the philosophy of our greatest American, or at least one of our greatest Americans, as uttered by one of the most outstanding and ablest living Americans in paying tribute to the most popular man in America, Jim Farley. [Applause.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me conclude with the statement that while some of this is whimsical, it may not be so whimsical and so funny as we move on. There are such great implications in this whole set-up so that every citizen, irrespective of what party he belongs to much necessarily manifest a deep and abiding interest in the whole question of the third term and a departure from the wisdom of the fathers and the best contemporary thinking in this day and age.

It was suggested last night when we were having a round-table discussion on the Forum of the Air with Solicitor Francis Biddle, which included my good friend Mr. Patrick, the majority leader, Mr. Rayburn, the Senatorial nominee from Illinois, Mr. Brooks, Senator Burke of Nebraska, and myself, that after all we were not concerned with what the Senate said in 1928 and we were not concerned with what the Democratic convention said in 1896, because this was 1940. It does not make any difference what party prevails, and it does not make any difference who the candidate is, nor does it make any difference how the Republican and Democratic Parties may be scrambled so that there might be the emergence of new or altered parties phoenix-like on the ashes of the old. The third term is still an important thing for the American people, for if, in the language of Thomas Jefferson, we go along with the idea that it may become an inheritance, then you have come dangerously close to the philosophy that is being articulated in Europe. Then you make a mockery of the platform which contains the word "democracy" oftener than any Democratic platform that I have ever read. So let us have deep, straight, and true thinking as we go before the people and discuss this

matter of the third term and the departure from the traditions that have been made sacred by usage and custom over 160 years of the life of this Republic.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. What could be a better way to determine that than to try it, since there is such a demand? We have a President; we have a crisis; we have a man who could not even get a second term and who could not get his nose under the tent. Why is not this a wonderful time, with a crisis on, to try it for 4 years and see whether or not the objectives that they say are there obtained?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the very question on which the American people must speak on the 5th of November 1940, and they will, in my judgment, speak earnestly and convincingly.

Mr. PATRICK. The Democratic Party is bold enough to step right out and give them a chance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think one of the older Members once related to me about somebody who was at one time a Member of the House of Representatives who, when advised of some change of sentiment back home, changed his own mind and his own position on certain legislation and finally stated, "Nobody can change his mind any quicker than I can." That is about what happened at Chicago. You had come along with the idea of rendering all sorts of aid to the distressed folks overseas and of quarantining the aggressors; you came along with international security and concerted efforts short of war; then in the message on defense which the President submitted to this Congress a week before the convention you did a complete about-face and a complete transformation on foreign policy. Yes, my friends, you certainly have a capacity for changing your mind. [Applause.]

Only one further thing is necessary to establish the temper and the mystic operations of the convention, and that is to append a few of the many editorials from the pens of experienced and competent newspapermen, who are unanimous in how the draft process was contrived. They speak for themselves.

Philadelphia Inquirer, July 16, 1940, by William C. Murphy, Jr.:

But the real battle in this convention was being fought far from the listless and comparatively small crowd which watched the opening session of the convention this morning.

It was being fought out in rooms in the Stevens Hotel, where the Democratic National Committee has its headquarters, and in the Blackstone Hotel just across the street, where a White House high command under the nominal leadership of Secretary of Commerce Harry Hopkins has set up for business.

The questions at issue were:

1. Whether the dominant New Deal group should use their overwhelming delegate strength to ram through a third term by acclamation without regard for the feelings or technical rights of other potential Presidential candidates.

2. Whether the Hopkins group here, presumably with the President's backing, should dictate the choice of the Vice Presidential candidate and give that nomination to someone ardently devoted to the New Deal philosophy of government, or should seek some Vice Presidential candidate who might promote harmony among the various groups within the party.

From an editorial in the Baltimore Sun, July 17, 1940:

MR. ROOSEVELT CONSENTS TO A JOB-HOLDERS DRAFT

Showmanship wilted in the sunlight of fact. The time when Mr. Roosevelt's statement could have been received at face value was before the delegations were chosen. Indeed, it would have been far more creditable to Mr. Roosevelt if, like Mr. Coolidge, he had given his party a year's notice. But that was not his game. The most pathetic feature of this incident was the excuse for delay given by Mr. Roosevelt to the Washington correspondents yesterday—that he considered it proper to wait until the convention was permanently organized. An absurd excuse, of course; he undoubtedly knew a year ago, perhaps longer ago, that he intended to attempt to destroy the third-term tradition. Yet it was no more absurd than the statement, as relayed by Senator BARKLEY, that he "has no wish to be a candidate again." If he had no such wish, why were Hopkins and the other White House lads working their heads off at Chicago to smooth the way for a third nomination by acclamation? * * *

By Frank R. Kent, in the Baltimore Sun:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

The four horsemen referred to are: Eddie Flynn, Senator (Joe) Guffey, Mayor (Eddie) Kelly, and Frank Hague.

These four political horsemen constitute the real power behind the "draft" movement. Combined they control more than 200 delegates in the convention—or about one-fifth of the whole. None of them is in politics for his health or for fun. They are practical to the last degree. If and when this fake "draft" business is concluded and the campaign for a third term begins, it may be helpful to the voters to understand just who are its principal backers.

Boston Herald, July 15, 1940, by Henry Ehrlich:

Probably never in the history of Democratic national conventions have the delegates from the New England States, outside of Massachusetts, arrived in a convention city with a greater consciousness of harmony and a lesser anticipation of warm excitement. The delegations from Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Connecticut are all pledged to the renomination of President Roosevelt, and settling down here today, all proposed to see their pledges through.

None has any direct information about the renomination strategy of the New Deal managers, but whether reluctantly or enthusiastically, all intend to participate in any draft-Roosevelt movement that is staged at the convention hall. And a majority of the New Englanders are willing to go along with whomever the President designates as his running mate.

Washington Star, July 15, 1940, by G. Gould Lincoln:

The twenty-eighth Democratic National Convention held its first session here today, heard Mayor Edward J. Kelly, of Chicago, demand that President Roosevelt be drafted for a third term, and recessed until tonight without a word yet forthcoming from the President himself.

The convention was rapped to order by National Chairman James A. Farley. To all outward intents and purposes, the convention is being run by the regular Democratic organization.

But over in the Blackstone Hotel, made famous 20 years ago, when, in a "smoke filled" room, Republican bosses picked Warren G. Harding for the party's Presidential nominee, sits the guiding hand of this convention—Secretary of Commerce Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins merely reflects the wishes of the President himself. It is through him, however, that the manipulation of the convention goes forward.

The Christian Science Monitor, July 15, 1940, by Richard L. Strout:

The Democratic National Convention met at 11:05, central standard time, today under conditions unprecedented in the history of American politics.

The convention is dominated by one man, President Roosevelt, who for 2 long years has declined to discuss his political intentions and who only last Friday announced his firm intention not to come to Chicago.

It met today determined to break the unwritten law of American political history not to nominate a President for a third term.

It started, furthermore, determined on making this nomination without having received—right down to the final minute—any formal word that the man it intended to nominate would accept if the honor were bestowed upon him.

Mr. Roosevelt's confidential commitment, it is understood, includes only what he will do if drafted, and drafted in the sense of receiving the nomination by acclamation. Even to Mr. Farley, in his secret conference at Hyde Park, it is understood, Mr. Roosevelt only discussed what he would do if nominated, without going into nomination plans.

From an editorial in the Baltimore Sun, July 18, 1940:

ALL IN CHARACTER

Conceivably Mr. Roosevelt could reverse his attitude toward Hitler and Mussolini and embrace dictatorship in preference to democracy. Short of that, his nomination for a third term will extend a record of reversals of principle and policy as far as the imagination dare roam in dealing with a public man. * * *

And now, standing forth before the world as the chief and most eloquent champion of democracy, he paves the way for destruction of the two-term rule. And this rule, from the time of George Washington, has been the unwritten barrier against use of the enormous powers and patronage of the Presidential office to establish dictatorship.

To men less resourceful than is Mr. Roosevelt in finding and using occasions for reversals of principle and policy, there seems nothing left to him now except sudden discovery of superlative virtues in Hitler and Mussolini and Stalin and their way of life.

From an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune, July 18, 1940:

TWO CONVENTIONS

It seems at Chicago almost as if the President had become overconfident of his power and was scornful of criticism. Either that or his sense of political showmanship has sadly deteriorated. The maneuvers leading up to the convention—all lying completely under his hand—were calculated to confuse and disgust the delegates. They were treated like puppets waiting to be jerked through their parts. And finally when the moment of the great revelation arrived, instead of the expected inspirational utterance, there turned up a trick as childish as it was absurd—a hollow pretense of "freeing" delegates who knew they were still bound hand and foot. * * *

From an editorial in the Washington Daily News of July 17, 1940, by Raymond Clapper:

WALLACE OR JOHNSON

The Roosevelt statement—coming at this late date—was just so many words. Such a statement several months ago when newspaper correspondents were pressing him for a statement at every press conference, might have carried some ring of genuine desire to retire. But it comes too late to carry with it any force of conviction. Especially so when the delegates know that for several days Mr. Roosevelt has been trying to get a suitable and willing running mate to be vice-presidential candidate on his ticket.

New York Times (Independent-Democrat), July 1940:

Mr. Roosevelt has chosen to break with the tradition which is as old as the Republic. He has yielded to a draft—to a supposedly spontaneous movement which was in fact carefully sponsored by his own lieutenants and which he could easily have resisted, even as late as Tuesday night, with a simple and straightforward statement that he would not accept a third-term nomination if it were offered him. * * * We believe that he has searched his mind and heart before making his decision; that he has not accepted this nomination because he really believes that he has been drafted, when he has seemed so carefully to plan this draft, and could so easily have resisted it. We believe that he has accepted it because he, too, believes in the doctrine of his own indispensability.

From an editorial in the Providence Journal, July 19, 1940:

THIS DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL

For if ever a man revealed himself, Franklin Roosevelt did in that message he had the permanent chairman of the convention, Senator BARKLEY, read for him. He was not, said Mr. Roosevelt, a candidate. He did not want the nomination.

And at the very moment his henchman, the man who lives in the White House with him, Harry Hopkins, was at the Chicago end of a private telephone wire to the White House, directing the procedure of the convention to assure that nomination for Mr. Roosevelt. * * *

There was something splendidly ironic in the circumstance that Mr. Roosevelt had his counterfeit message that "he did not want this nomination" delivered to those delegates, bound to his dangerous ambitions by the power of Federal patronage, through that same Senator BARKLEY—dear ALBEN—whose reelection to the Senate from Kentucky Mr. Roosevelt aided by explaining to the Kentuckians that Senator BARKLEY was an old hand in Washington who could be expected to bring back more Federal loot for them than any newcomer.

From an editorial in the Lexington (Ky.) Leader, July 1940:

ROOSEVELT GRABBED IT

Franklin D. Roosevelt grabbed the New Deal nomination from the wreck of the Democratic Party, having maneuvered the most completely boss-ridden convention in the history of the Nation into a position from which it had but one way of escape—by violating the third-term tradition and renominating himself.

For years Mr. Roosevelt had been planning the program that was carried out at Chicago, making it impossible for any other man to aspire to the nomination, conspiring to prevent the party from giving attention to any other candidacy. He took charge of the convention from its opening hour. Harry Hopkins, his favorite and most intimate adviser, who lives in the White House, was sent to oust Mr. Farley from control, and to manage the whole show to suit his master. Every Cabinet member, with the exception of Mr. Hull and the two Republicans recently appointed to head the Departments of War and Navy, was present and worked incessantly for Mr. Roosevelt's nomination. Yet he had the effrontery to send Mr. Barkley the following message, as the permanent chairman gave it to the convention:

"The President has never had and has not today any desire or purpose to continue in the office of President, to be a candidate for that office, or to be nominated by the convention for that office."

From an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune, July 17, 1940:

The one-man rule of the convention has been hardly less destructive of morale. It dramatizes the whole third-term threat. That a party ostensibly representing the people should exhibit a subordination to one man's whim and dictation unprecedented in American political history has gone far to reduce the convention to absurdity in the eyes of the Nation and stir resentment and confusion in the minds of the delegates.

From an editorial by Frank R. Kent, Baltimore Sun, July 17, 1940:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

The revolting thing about the action of administration leaders in accepting a plank drawn by the isolationists was not so much its effect, which would have been bad, but the revelation of the extent to which Mr. Roosevelt's personal representatives would have gone to keep down an opposition that would disclose how hollow was their "draft." To avert a floor fight over an anti-third-term resolution, which would have shown a formidable minority against Mr. Roosevelt's attempt, they were willing to do a craven and despicable thing. It is as significant as it is revealing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] under a previous order.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Not for a statement. I do not want it to go in at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. PATRICK. I only want to speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for a unanimous-consent request only.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with our national-defense program and to make some comment on the fact that we ought to be at work now. Request number two is to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with totalitarian forms of government and to include therein an editorial from a newspaper back in my district.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain figures on national defense and, secondly, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts and editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today at the completion of any special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial from the New York Times of July 18.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

SHALL THE PEOPLE RULE OR THE POWER TRUST CONTROL?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I said on a previous occasion, it is not my intention to say anything that would ruffle the feelings of the ex-Republicans in the House with reference to the Philadelphia "blitzkrieg".

I notice that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] mentioned the name of Wendell L. Willkie three, four, or five times in his speech, and there was not a single handclap on the Republican side. That shows the disillusionment. He ran on his picture; I told you that a year ago. They used him as a front for the Power Trust. The delegates to the Republican convention had merely seen his picture. Now they have begun to get an insight into what has been going on, and they cannot even stir up applause on the Republican

side of the House of Representatives for the newly made candidate of the newly made party they feel impelled to follow.

It reminds me of the little boy who came in one day and told his mother that he had seen a lion on the street. He had seen a little dog sheared up like a lion. She said, "Now, young man, you know that I know you didn't see any lion. I am going to break you of telling lies. I am going to lock you in that closet and keep you there until you pray God and get forgiveness for that lie. You get in there and go to praying. It will be dark, but as soon as He forgives you, you knock and I will let you out." She shoved him in the closet and locked the door and started away, when he knocked. She listened, and he knocked again. She opened the door and he stepped out smiling. She said, "What? Has God forgiven you already?" He said, "Oh, yes." She said, "What did He say?" He replied, "Oh, He said that was all right; He said He thought it was a lion when He first saw it." [Laughter.]

They had merely seen the picture of this Beau Brummell, this fashion plate of the Power Trust, this glamour boy of the utilities, before the Philadelphia convention.

He says that we went back on things that had been said before the convention, because the Democratic Party let it be known at Philadelphia that we are not going to plunge this country into a foreign war. That is what was done with reference to our foreign plank. I subscribe to that policy, and I believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people agree with me.

He says there is nothing definite about our platform with reference to a single problem that confronts the American people. In that he is entirely in error. The Democratic Party went on record on the greatest economic issue that has confronted us for the last 25 years, the greatest economic issue that will confront the American people for the next 25 years; that is, the electric-power question.

In 1871, when the German military machine, that great juggernaut, rolled down across the French Republic and left the French people broken and conquered beneath the heel of a ruthless invader, the world was shocked when it learned that there had been imposed upon those people an indemnity of \$1,000,000,000, which it would take a generation to pay; but today this utilities juggernaut, the Power Trust branch of it alone, of which Wendell L. Willkie has succeeded to the position of Mussolini as a successor to Samuel Insull, is robbing and plundering the American people of \$1,000,000,000 a year every year that rolls around in excessive overcharges for electric lights and power.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] ought to know that \$69,000,000 every year is wrung from the helpless electric consumers in the State of Illinois, according to the rates in his own town, compared with the rates in Ontario, the Tennessee Valley area, or Tacoma, Wash. That \$69,000,000 a year in 30 years would amount to more than the indemnity Germany imposed upon France at the end of the War of 1871, and I dare say now that with France again bleeding and crushed beneath the heel of this same ruthless invader, there will not be an indemnity imposed upon her comparable to the indemnity the American people are paying to this super-government, this gigantic octopus that sprawls over the Nation, runs its tentacles into every home, and exacts its tribute from every person who turns an electric switch—except a few who are served by municipal or other public systems. In 30 years these overcharges would amount to \$30,000,000,000.

Another thing, we mentioned rural electrification, which the Republican Party never deigned to discuss at Philadelphia, even before it went out of business and was superseded by this utility Fascist that is now claiming your support in the coming campaign. They talk about a third term. If you turn this country over to the Power Trust, there will probably not be any more terms; it will just be from then on, until the people who are being robbed and plundered rise in revolt. You gentlemen who now decry a third term never opened your mouths when Andrew Mellon was serving three terms as head of this Government.

The gentleman talks about Washington declining to run for a third term. Suppose Washington were here now, living at Mount Vernon, and saw this great corrupt, overpowering monopoly that is bleeding the American people to death economically, and saw that it was robbing the people of Virginia, glorious old Virginia, the home of the fathers of this Republic, of \$11,000,000 a year in overcharges for electric light and power, running its tentacles even into Mount Vernon itself. Do you suppose that Washington would say, "Let us turn down the man who has fought that thing and put the head of it in power"? No! A thousand times no!

They talk about Thomas Jefferson—the greatest statesman of all time, the man who advocated equal and exact justice to all men and special privilege to none—having declined to run for a third term. If Thomas Jefferson were in Virginia today and saw this gigantic monopoly trying to steal the water power of the Nation, building spite lines to destroy rural electrification, using every corrupt method known to try to hold the Nation's power consumers in bondage, and wringing from them in overcharges \$1,000,000,000 a year without giving anything in return, do you think Thomas Jefferson would turn down Frank Roosevelt because he had been President for 8 years, lacking a month and a half? Do you suppose he would turn him down and then take a man whose only contribution to American life has been in connection with this Power Trust Fascisti, the greatest racket of modern times? No! Thomas Jefferson would spurn such a proposal with contempt.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The difficulty with the gentleman's argument, of course, is that the President's acceptance speech had to do with his indispensability in world affairs and said nothing about what the gentleman is now discussing.

Mr. RANKIN. It is absolutely indispensable that we elect a man with Roosevelt's convictions on this great question. They talk about Andrew Jackson. I wonder if they think that if old Andrew Jackson, who is said to have possessed more courage of all kinds than possibly any other man who has ever filled the White House, whose honesty was unquestioned—if old Andrew Jackson were living now down in Tennessee on the banks of the Cumberland and had seen the State of Tennessee robbed and plundered by this identical utility of which Wendell Willkie was the head, and saw them try by every means, fair and foul, to destroy the Tennessee Valley Authority and prevent the development of the Cumberland; if he had seen them go out at night, this very utility, if you please, of which Willkie was the head, and try to build spite lines out among the farmers, until the farmers had to take their shotguns and run them away, do you suppose that under those circumstances even my genial and distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would have the courage to go to Andrew Jackson and ask him to vote for the man who had been at the head of that racket for, lo, these many years, in preference to the man in the White House now who has been fighting for all he is worth?

Let us go a step further. He spoke of my friend Bryan. I loved William Jennings Bryan. In my humble opinion he was one of the greatest men that this Republic has ever seen. I can never forget his immortal words in his last campaign for the Presidency when his voice rang across the country, "Shall the people rule or the trusts control?"

I wonder if you think that William J. Bryan, if he were here today, with his fine moral sensibilities, his spiritual inspiration, his marvelous intelligence, his powerful statesmanship, would turn down Franklin D. Roosevelt, the man who has done more for the power consumers of America than all other Presidents combined, and vote for Wendell L. Willkie, who has been at the head of this gigantic combination that has been imposing, and is still imposing, these injustices upon the helpless consumers of electric light and power.

Let us go back into Illinois. You never in your life heard me utter a word on this floor derogatory of Abraham Lincoln. I

take him as the great product of a great age. You know we Democrats have both sides of the Civil War now. We are entitled to the support of both the Confederate and the Federal soldiers, as well as all their descendants, as I pointed out the other day. Do you think that Abraham Lincoln intended for you Republicans just to transfer the Negroes from one bondage to the other and put the white people in there with them? If Abraham Lincoln were here today and could look back on those prairies of Illinois and see there how power could be generated with Illinois coal or water power and distributed at the T. V. A. rates or the Ontario rates, and see those people he tried to represent robbed and plundered by overcharges amounting to \$69,000,000 a year, I wonder if you think that Abraham Lincoln would choose Wendell L. Willkie as against Franklin D. Roosevelt in the coming campaign.

No, there are 27,000,000 of these consumers who pay this overcharge every year.

General Grant was President for 8 years. Do you suppose if General Grant were President today and could go back into his home State of Ohio and see where those people are being robbed and plundered of more than \$40,000,000 a year, so that it would take every bushel of wheat grown in Ohio to be given as a tribute to this gigantic monopoly that is rendering no service whatsoever to pay this overcharge—do you suppose General Grant would support such a ticket? Not on your life.

Do you suppose that William McKinley, if he could come back to Ohio and see what they are doing to the people of Ohio, would support Wendell Willkie in preference to Frank Roosevelt under the circumstances? Do you suppose that Teddy Roosevelt, the last Republican President who had the courage or conviction to stand up and denounce the malefactors of great wealth, if he were here today and could see what they are doing to the people in every State in the Union, when this is the supreme issue and when it is proposed to take for all time the water power of this Nation, which Teddy Roosevelt tried to save, and allow it to be gobbled up by this gigantic monopoly, so that the people of this Nation will pay tribute and remain in servitude to these utilities for all time to come—do you suppose if Teddy Roosevelt were living today that he would follow these malefactors of great wealth in preference to the distinguished gentleman who occupies the White House, and who has done so much to bring relief to the ultimate consumers of electricity throughout the entire Nation? Not on your life.

They talk about the Senate resolution of 1928. The Senate resolution was an effort to get rid of the Andrew Mellon machine in 1928, and I think all progressive Republicans voted for it.

But today we are in an emergency. We are threatened by grave dangers from within. You go to the people and ask them to stand for honest government, when some of these men are drawing salaries that make your salary and mine look like tips to the waiter, when the fourth vice president of this Commonwealth & Southern draws twice as much salary as the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

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

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want the RECORD to show that I heard it from Wendell Willkie himself at the Press Club in the Nation's Capital, that his salary was \$75,000 a year and that he turned down four efforts to give him an increase in salary.

Mr. RANKIN. And I want the RECORD to show that when he went in it was less than that, and that about the time he went in, the common stock in that outfit was selling at something like \$30 a share and as those salaries have gone up the common stock has gone down, until today the common stock is at \$1.25, and why? Because of the water in their capital structure. One man, a Member of this House, told me that they bought a small plant in Georgia and asked him to go in with them, which he refused to do. They paid \$10,000 for it, and watered the stock up to around one million. Why, Mr. Speaker, this outfit is bankrupt. The Republicans have taken the head of a bankrupt institution, which he helped to

bankrupt, and nominated him for the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is bankrupt, it was the T. V. A. that bankrupted it.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no; not the T. V. A. It is that crowd that has been watering the stock and is trying to hold up these rates to make the people pay dividends on all that graft. Why, this company in Washington, the Potomac Electric Power Co., sells electricity almost as cheaply as the T. V. A., and last year they made 64 percent on their common stock. Ontario produces and distributes one-twelfth the electricity that we do in the United States. They have invested \$400,000,000—12 times that is \$4,800,000,000. In this country \$2,000,000,000 are invested in municipal plants and Government-owned facilities. Take that from your \$4,800,000,000 and you have about \$3,000,000,000 left, and that is about what this power trust has invested, about what it ought to be—it might be as high as \$5,000,000,000. What do they claim? Thirteen billion dollars—about eight to ten billion dollars of which is nothing but wind, water, and power-trust rascality, yet they are requiring the helpless consumers of electricity to pay rates high enough to provide dividends on the entire amount in order that they may pay these enormous salaries just referred to.

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

Mr. RANKIN. I fear I have not the time. I have only a few minutes left.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, we will be able to get more time for the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. I come, of course, from a section of the country where under the New Deal we have begun to see some relief from the very abuses the gentleman refers to.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and let me say to the gentleman from Washington that if the Republican ticket is elected, the water power on the Columbia River which we have been trying to save at Grand Coulee and Bonneville will be turned over to the Power Trust, and you people will march back into the dark, so far as benefits from the Columbia River development is concerned.

Mr. LEAVY. Let me quote from a Republican Member who attended the Philadelphia convention, about whom the Portland Oregonian has this to say:

Wendell L. Willkie favors completion of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, rural electrification, and the widest use of power from these projects. The only difference he proposed was to put men in control who knew the utility business rather than politicians.

What does he mean by that?

Mr. RANKIN. I will tell you just exactly what he means. He means that the Power Trust will gobble it up.

Let me give you an example. In 1925 this Commonwealth & Southern Co. made a contract with the Republican administration to buy power at Muscle Shoals. In addition to inducing the Republican administration to turn over the Gorgas plant that was built as a stand-by for Muscle Shoals, they made a contract with this outfit to sell them this power. I have the figures here. They sold it to them at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour and they resold it in sight of the dam at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour, or about 4,800 percent profit.

Today Florence, Ala., is buying at the same point, Muscle Shoals, power at 4.83 mills per kilowatt-hour, more than twice as much as Willkie's outfit was paying, and selling it to the people of Florence at a maximum of 3 cents per kilowatt-hour instead of 10 cents and paying more money in lieu of taxes than the power company paid.

Today, when we sell this power at an average of 4½ mills per kilowatt-hour to the distribution systems throughout that country, they come back and say that we are selling it below the cost of production, when they were buying it at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour on the recommendation of the Army engineers, who knew what it was worth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the candidate for Vice President, Hon. Henry A. Wallace. I am not a man who runs around after Cabinet officers, patting them on the back or strewing the flowers of flattery in

their paths. But I have watched Henry Wallace ever since he has been Secretary of Agriculture and since the Rural Electrification Administration has been under his charge. I have been thrown in intimate contact with him; and I am frank to say that I do not believe a more honest, conscientious man ever occupied a seat in the Cabinet. I do not believe there ever was a man more conscientiously devoted to the cause of the farmers than Henry Wallace.

I deplore the statement of those men who say he was a former Republican. In 1921 his father was appointed Secretary of Agriculture under President Harding and served until his death in 1924. He saw the Republican Party come into power, and instead of bringing relief to the farmers they piled upon their backs the highest protective tariff ever known in times of peace, thereby levying a tax upon everything the farmers had to buy, from the swaddling clothes of infancy to the lining of the coffin in which old age is laid away. They pretended that such a tariff would help them when, as a matter of fact, they were shipping out more corn and more wheat than we were shipping in. Therefore the tariff on wheat and corn were of no avail. You might as well build a dam to keep water from flowing upstream as to try to help the farmers in this way.

He also saw them make refunds of income taxes on those large fortunes of men who got rich out of the war. He saw them give back to those big-income taxpayers billions of dollars at a time when agriculture was suffering. He saw them refuse to give any relief from the exorbitant freight rates that the people of the West were paying. He saw them take Teapot Dome and try to steal it and turn it over to these crooked interests. He saw them sweep away the Gorgas plant. He saw the Attorney General driven from power for corruption in office and dismissed with regrets by the head of the administration. He saw the farmers going down and down and down in the economic scale; and when his father passed away brokenhearted in 1924, Henry Wallace came out for the Democratic nominee for President and supported him that fall. He supported the Democratic ticket in 1928 and in 1932 and 1936.

He is a man of convictions, and he realizes that to go back to the old system as written into the Republican platform, and especially as left out of the Republican platform, which failed to even mention rural electrification, he realizes that it would simply mean destruction for the farmers of this Nation. He is determined to try to do something for them; and if events should so turn as to some day make Henry Wallace President of the United States, every farmer in America would know that he had a friend in the White House.

I had occasion to go to him some time ago when I was appealing for funds for rural electrification, and I got his unqualified support, with the result that probably a million farm homes will be electrified in the next year or two that never would have had electric lights if it had not been for this administration.

I know that a great bugaboo is going to be raised over the third-term issue, but when you come to put in power and perpetuate in power this utility Fascisti that is organized along lines of the Fascist governments of Europe, and realize its "fifth column," which we recognize even over the radio, reaches down into certain newspapers and other agencies of propaganda, influencing, or attempting to influence, members of State legislatures by putting them on the pay roll as lawyers, some of them living in counties where the power company did not own a line, and where they never had a case—when they realize all of these things, I submit the question of the third term is going to fade into insignificance beside the question of saving this Government from being destroyed from within.

You could not have a holding company in England or in Canada, because it is contrary to the common law. It has been found to be detrimental to the public welfare by the British courts for a thousand years.

Here it is destroying the people's faith in their Government, as well as their prosperity, and now they are demanding that you pick up a political pogo jumper who landed in the

Republican Party on the third bounce and make him the President of this Republic. And the only thing you can raise in opposition to that is the third term and the fact that Mr. Wallace in his earlier days voted the Republican ticket, of which he has long since repented, and which he will never do again. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein an editorial from the Richmond News-Leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many editorials in papers throughout the country show that the press is greatly alarmed over the slowness with which the national-defense program is progressing. We have expended billions of dollars and seemingly have practically nothing to show for it. I share the great alarm of the newspapers in that respect.

I am introducing a resolution which would require the administration to give biweekly reports to the Members of Congress on our national-defense program. We ought not to lose a second in our preparedness measures. If time is being lost, this situation should be corrected immediately.

The Congress of the United States is obviously going to stay in continuous session, much to my satisfaction. It is up to us to see that our laws are enforced. The Richmond News-Leader of June 24 published a splendid editorial which I commend to your consideration and study. From it I read the following:

A PROGRAM FOR THE CRISIS

The tragedy of a Britain that stands alone today against a dominant Germany is replete with more warnings to the United States than yet have been understood.

Heretofore the favorite jibe of Britain's enemies was that she knew how to make other nations fight her battles. Her European policy, said her enemies, was essentially that of playing one coalition against another to the end that no single power would control Europe.

By what incredible blundering did Britain lose every one of her World War Allies? How came she and France to give guaranties they could not hope to discharge? Other European powers seem to have had a just estimate of what Britain and France could and could not do against the Reich. Were the two Governments blind to their own limitations and ignorant of Germany's strength? Did Britain perceive the weakness of French morale that pathetically was disclosed within 3 weeks after Germany began total war in the west?

All the military experience of the world was summarized of old in the question, "What king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first and consulteth whether he be able with 10,000 to meet him that cometh against him with 20,000?" How did Britain and France disdain this? Did they rely overmuch on sea power? Were they content to figure on paper how their blockade should and therefore would starve Germany?

We do not know the answer, but we think we do know the moral for America. It can be presented in high words; it can be epitomized in three simple maxims: Do not start what you cannot finish; do not bite off more than you can chew; "Have faith in God and keep your powder dry."

These maxims we have endeavored to apply in specific terms to the United States:

1. Arm to the widest margin of conceivable need without an hour of preventable delay; but entrust the production of planes, tanks, guns, and munitions to experienced private industry, as far as practicable, and not to Government plants built and operated by politicians.

2. Demand regular progress reports on the output of all the essentials of war, to the end that the Nation will not be deceived as France and Britain were concerning their military resources. Every potential enemy knows through its spies the essential facts about our rearmament; let us not lull the country into a sense of false security by attempting to conceal what the country has a right to know about the state of armament, ere it endorses a vigorous foreign policy.

And I am sure my colleagues agree with me that the country is entitled to know, the country that pays the bills, the mothers and fathers, the wives and sweethearts of the men who will have to fight and who, if we are not prepared, will have to lose their lives in great numbers.

3. Prepare now for the widest selective service, military and civil, of all who are capable of helping in any emergency. This means the conscription of some millions of men to fight; it also involves the conscription of other millions to supply the fighters with everything they need in food, in equipment, and in money. There must be no exemptions. Although from the very nature of war, some men must sacrifice more than others, the effort of the Nation must be to spare none.

4. There must be no profiteering in the blood of youth and no gambling on the life of the Nation. Industries that are expanded to fill Government war orders must be protected against collapse when those orders cease, but taxation must eliminate all other war profit. In the event of a major conflict, the tax policy of the Government must be designed to take all the income every man makes, above that of peacetime, and to invest this in Government securities. This is necessary both to provide adequate war funds and to save the country from an increased demand for luxuries at a time when all industrial capacity may be required for war.

5. Toward the British Commonwealth of Nations and toward any other country that may be defending itself against totalitarian rule from without, the United States should exercise the most benevolent neutrality. Where facilities for production are increasing, priority should be given all British orders over those for our own national defense, so long as British resistance continues. Should it develop that British financial means are inadequate to pay for munitions, the United States should consider the amendment of existing laws in order to permit private or public credit in this country for the British Commonwealth of Nations.

6. While exercising this benevolent neutrality, the United States must weigh in every instance the ultimate gain or loss from the sale of Government stores to a belligerent, and in no case should the President make such sale, directly or indirectly, without the prior knowledge and consent of Congress.

While there is a difference of opinion as to the wisdom of maxim 5 of this editorial, there should be no difference of opinion regarding the sale of Government stores to a belligerent without the prior knowledge and consent of the Congress.

7. The United States must pursue a firm foreign policy in support of a reasonable interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. That doctrine must be maintained to prevent the transfer of sovereignty over Canada and over all other American possessions of European countries; but the Monroe Doctrine must not be extended to include any guarantee by the United States of the continuance of any existing Latin-American government. This Nation will seek by legitimate means to promote pan-Americanism and to preclude the domination of any American government by a foreign power. The United States do not thereby promise support of the status quo, nor do the United States intend to break the cultural ties of Latin-America or to monopolize its trade.

8. Because 5 years will be required to provide adequate armament, which neither then nor thereafter must be used for aggression against any power, the United States must employ wise diplomacy as a means of gaining necessary time. Shrewdly the Nation must "play for time," especially in the Orient. No Far Eastern commitments of any sort must be made to an extent that will prevent the retention of the American battle fleet within the triangle Alaska-Hawaii-Panama. Next only to the nonaggressive maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine is this basic policy—no commitments, military, naval, or diplomatic, that hamper the use of the full fleet for the defense of the United States, the Panama Canal, and Hawaii.

9. A higher standard of individual and of national discipline is demanded if the country is to save the Western Hemisphere from the threat of totalitarian aggression. This discipline must be industrial, governmental, and moral. Representative government must represent the ideals, and not the fears of the Nation. The individual must work harder, and must allow himself fewer luxuries. If we are willing to discipline ourselves, we can complete necessary armament, can preserve American institutions, and can contribute to the restoration of free government among men. We can afford to be calm and confident if we exert ourselves for good government and maximum industrial effort. Complacency, self-indulgence, and delay may be our ruin.

I earnestly hope the membership will vote for my resolution demanding bi-weekly reports on our preparedness program. To my mind, there is nothing more vital to the welfare of our country than the thorough and expeditious carrying out of this program. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress, of course, are concerned with the very matter to which the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has called attention, and no Member of either Senate or House but joins in her hope that this program may be expedited. As for blame, she can only lay that to the plan of an omnipotent and all-wise God. You cannot plant corn today and serve the meal on the table

tomorrow. This, of course, is a matter we all accept, and anybody who reflects seriously cannot follow the claim some newspapers are making that we ought to vote a program today and blossom forth with airplanes and ships tomorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman from Alabama agrees with me that the Congress and the country are entitled to know what is being done along the lines of furthering the preparedness program.

Mr. PATRICK. Certainly, certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me that we must not be kept in the dark on that subject.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield no further if that is all the gentleman has to offer.

I want to make a report. I was present at the convention in Chicago and saw the things in which the Republican brethren are able to read so much between the lines that simply were not discernible to those who were there. It may be that we in our partisan views have an inclination to interpret unhappily the things the Republicans did—and the same with them of us. Let us all be as charitable as we may.

It was strange to us as Democrats that the votes of the delegates of the Republican convention representing delegations from back home appeared to be determined by certain apparently organized and telegram-inspired groups in the galleries.

With all due respect to their view, that did not happen at the Democratic Convention. They came right out on the floor. Those people came there baptized in the gospel of Roosevelt and over 800 of the votes were already pledged out and out for Roosevelt. Of course, we from Alabama were heartily for the gentle, kindly, beloved Speaker of this House, but the President did no more than Willkie when he chose McNARY. The President favored the genial, capable, fearless, honest, sincere, and scholarly Henry Wallace for the Vice Presidency of the United States, and that gentleman became the choice of the convention.

The Republicans talk about doing an about-face. I believe the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was numbered among the group, and we agree with him, that said that Willkie could not beat President Roosevelt. That was before he was nominated, of course. He stated very frankly to his colleagues in Philadelphia that a man like Willkie could not beat a man like Roosevelt. That worked its way into the press and it comes with some embarrassment I know. He did not appreciate the growth of his recently acquired colleague Willkie.

I have a little thing here entitled "Growth of Willkie." Would you like to hear it?

GROWTH OF WILLKIE

Well, these are pow'ful funny days in many mighty funny ways
With individual as well as institution,

An' so it is we're glad to see the grand and glorious G. O. P.

Come forth an' throw across the stage a darn good contribution.

Convention day was drawin' nigh an' not one name across her sky

Seemed to inspire or to enthuse at public mention,

They tried out this, they sounded that; "If we but had one Democrat

To haul a little oomph an' zip into a tame convention."

Convention day was comin' on an' all was pale as early dawn

An' all they had was some dull bird like Hoover, Taft, or Dewey—

But, brother, when the meetin' broke, who shoved thru the fuss an'

smoke

To knock 'em for a lacin' loop an' make 'em all look screwy,

Who had knocked the set-up flat? Who but an off-brand Demo-

crat—

A Huey Longish lookin' bird from out in Inlanner!

He didn't look so fine an' tall among the Demmycrats, an' all—

But looks right good in t'other crowd—beneath that other banner.

B'gosh, it only goes to show how fer comparison does go.

A man can be with men of size till he looks kind of puny

But switch him over in a pen among a bunch of lighter men

An' he'll stand out until he seems a Dempsey or a Tunney.

So, as Mr. Swift said years ago, how big a man is is determined by whether he is among the big fellows or the pygmies, the Brobdignagians or the Lilliputians.

I believe as sincerely as I believe anything that the Republicans, those who were truly Republicans, went up to Philadelphia without any idea of Willkie, but they felt they had to have someone with color and decided to sacrifice Republican principles for color. The Republicans as a rule do not believe in the things laid down by Willkie and advocated by him, but they had to have color and they got it. Willkie is like a sassafras tree in the fall of the year; he has got a lot of color but very little timber so far as becoming President of the United States is concerned. He has had no experience except as the president of a corporation. What background has he?

Mr. Speaker, you know what the vital issues are which confront us now and which will confront us this fall. They will hover above us all and inspire the people to vote, when voting time comes this fall. The most important thing and the most engaging issue will be regarding our foreign relationships and international affairs. At that time, in my opinion, England and Germany will be just before or during or just after one of the greatest conflicts that has ever rocked this mud ball that we call the earth. People are going to be studying, watching, and praying over that situation.

What do the Republicans have to offer? They come forward with Wendell Willkie. What does he know about our foreign affairs? He certainly would not claim to be an authority. How is Senator McNARY grounded on international relations? We have Hull, we have President Roosevelt himself, we have Sumner Welles, and we also now have in our ranks Messrs. Knox and Stimson, pulled right from the heart of Republicanism. When those men yielded to the call of the President in a crisis the Republicans got up and read them from the party, therefore cutting them off of every opportunity they should have to serve if there was such a thing as a Republican victory possible this fall. Look how Republican hopes have been going down every day during the past week. Even the Wall Street betting is now 9 to 5 on Roosevelt. If you gentlemen believe in your man get some of that money and give Wall Street a sock on the jaw at the same time. So, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to a real application of what is before us, when it comes to the power of the people this fall, they are going to study and decide who is stalwart enough to stand up and hold the banner of America, deliver a job in international affairs as between nation and nation, who is grounded in the faith of Americanism, who knows the work and who can deliver the goods. That is what it will be.

Now coming to the matter of platform, the Republicans adopted as nearly as they could, and they did a fairly good job of it, that which they already knew the Democrats were going to adopt. The amazing thing is they have adopted and have now made a part of their platform the very things the Republicans opposed and voted against in the House and Senate. It was over their political dead bodies almost that these various things became the law of the land. Now they have the temerity to say that, "We take them as our platform."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. Does the gentleman believe that Wendell L. Willkie has changed his views on political, social, and economic questions now from what they were 4 or 5 years ago by reason of the fact he is now serving the Republican Party?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not think he has to such an extent that we should risk him at the helm of our Government. He has not been the president of anything but a corporation.

Mr. LEAVY. In New York City, before the Economic Club of New York, in a debate with David E. Lilienthal, as reported

in the *Electrical World* of February 2, 1935, page 48, Mr. Willkie had this to say:

Selling Government securities against over-built capacities on the Tennessee is in a class with the error of Insull in patriotically investing money in capacity so as to ward off the depression when it became a real threat in 1930.

May I ask the gentleman if there is but one interpretation to draw from that statement, and that is, that Mr. Willkie 5 years ago looked upon the activities of Mr. Insull 7 or 8 years preceding as patriotic activities?

Mr. PATRICK. What other interpretation could be placed upon it, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. LEAVY. Again in the same year, before the same club, the Economic Club of New York, on January 21, 1935, as reported in the *Electrical World* of February 16, 1935, on page 26, Mr. Willkie said:

I do not like to make personal references, but I want to say to you that no duty has ever come in my life, even that in the service of my country, which has so appealed to my sense of social obligation, patriotism, and love of mankind, as this, my obligation to say and do what I can for the preservation of public utilities, privately owned. All that I have observed, all that I know, and all that I read teaches me that I could do nothing nobler for the future financial stability and political good of my country or the social and economic well-being of my fellow citizens than to stand firm and unafraid against the foolish fad and fancy of the moment.

Do you blame the people in the Northwest, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, for being fearful as to what may happen to those great public projects out there, Coulee and Bonneville, in the light of such statements made 5 years ago by the present nominee of the Republican Party?

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman very heartily for his contribution.

Aesop had something to say about the same sort of a situation several thousand years ago. He stated that there sat upon a crag high above the vale below, a mighty eagle, an eagle that felt that he was secure. He had flown so high and perched upon such a firm rock—perhaps the platform of the G. O. P.—that he felt nothing could reach him. But strange to say, an arrow came whizzing through the air and struck him to the heart. He looked on the shaft of the arrow and saw his own feathers, and he said, "How sad is my fate; I winged the arrow which strikes me dead."

So from now until election day Wendell Willkie is going to find the words he has spoken in his past winging straight to his vital spot; those are the words that show what a man really is. That is what Aesop had in mind. He was not talking about eagles; he was talking about human beings.

Let us follow it further. Since he has gotten hold of things and has become the Republican candidate Mr. Willkie says he is going to see that our Government takes its hands off the throttle of business and stops regulating private enterprise. Understand, Mr. and Mrs. America were in favor of that. All did not know it was going to work as far as it did. Nine-tenths of those who were for Roosevelt originally and who oppose him now do so because they thought it would not reach as far as to them. They find that now when folks are hungry taxation reaches them. They find now that when men were given jobs that they had to help, contribute to some degree to it, and that their own little organization was regulated somewhat itself. They want to let George do it. They want you to regulate the other fellow. When they saw that the rearranging of the entire structure of the Nation struck home, and they had to contribute themselves, then they were willing to let somebody starve. That is what is the matter with those imbued with an anti-Roosevelt fever. In this day it is their own selfish zeal, circumscribed views that have cut them down to a narrower stature than they had when they were idealistically following the broad visions of a new day and a New Deal. That is how a new broom sweeps so clean. Selfishness has not had a chance to get its work in so adequately and so diligently.

There is where we stand today. It means that if Wendell Willkie, with the powers that are supporting him, and we all know who they are—and that is the reason that if there ever was a time when the slogan that "We love him for the enemies he has made" is appropriate, it is today, because we

can say, "We know Willkie by those who love him and by those who support and sustain him today." No straw was ever blown by the wind that shows more clearly in which direction the wind blows than the political straws that are seen in every sky in America today.

This is how that applies. It is one thing to say, "Pull off the regulation of business," and it is another thing to do it. They say it in general terms, but when you say, "All right, what, for example?" they say, "Oh, you must take your hand off the throat of American business life. You must quit shutting the door of opportunity and give the people confidence." But you say, "All right, in what respect, in what instance? What do you want? Where do you want it to apply?" and they will not answer. They say, "The Republicans are going to give you a New Deal of their own." "In what respect? What will you repeal? What are you going to cut out? What are you going to change?" They have no reply.

All they want to do is to kick the Democrats out and let the Republicans in on the Democratic method of doing business or on the Democratic program and the Democratic general activities except that one difference and here is the way it works out.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I will be glad to yield in a moment.

The first time you ever saw your little town traffic regulations you did not like them because you said, "Whenever I want to go on, a red light stares me in the face; I am not going to run over anybody; the other fellow might but I won't"; but it was found out that if you regulated affairs you had to stand there and let the traffic light regulate everybody, and even if the mayor's son went through, he had to go before the police court, too. Then you found lives were saved and traffic truly benefited. Now, you come down here and incline to Mr. Willkie's method of taking off the traffic lights and taking the hand off of the throttle of business and kill all regulation.

We do not say Willkie is dishonest himself, but we say his regime and the method he would thereby inaugurate would leave business wide open for the Insulls and even down to the Ponzis and strip America of that which she has worked so hard to build up during these past 7 years, which has made political enemies in high places while the people have loved the President of the United States, who has turned his face to the storm and exposed his breast to the millions of darts of those who would oppose him. He has stood up with such stalwart superiority that here today, when a Republican could not get his nose under the tent for a second term, there is a national acclaim calling on him to carry the standard for an unprecedented third term—and, apparently, he is going to get it, too.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it is generally agreed by both parties that the crying need today is employment, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with me, because it is generally conceded—

Mr. PATRICK. I certainly do agree with the lady.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That even with government regulations Mr. Willkie has had a perfect genius for putting people to work.

Mr. PATRICK. Ha, he has a perfect genius for working people, if that is what you mean.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He has given a great deal of employment to people and that cannot be contradicted.

Mr. PATRICK. He has not a thing to offer that Hoover did not have. He has the same sort of background, he has the promise that is just like Hoover's speech, and he is a great corporation man, just like Hoover was, and he comes forth and says the same thing that Hoover said. He has the same sort of philosophy, even a little more pronounced than Hoover. That is the trickle-down theory, and it may work all right for a corporation, but it does not work as a real, democratic

principle for a democratic nation. It never has and never will with a nation like America. That is where we stand and that is where we are going to stand in this country, and you can bet your sweet life that the people are going to get a little more light on it every day.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is apparently suffering from acute distress because of Mr. Willkie's nomination. May we all join—

Mr. PATRICK. May I join the Republicans in that feeling.

Mr. MICHENER. May we join in the hope it does not become chronic, and may I suggest to the gentleman that if he will just save his thunder until after Mr. Willkie's speech he will probably know more about what he is now attempting to talk about.

Mr. PATRICK. Until what?

Mr. MICHENER. I did not think the gentleman would comprehend.

Mr. PATRICK. Until what? Of course, we cannot all have that wide conception that some of you wise gentlemen over there have—

Mr. MICHENER. It is quite evident that is the case.

Mr. PATRICK. And nobody recognizes that more, I am sure, than the gentleman from his wide and high sphere looking on us humble boys down here.

Mr. MICHENER. I am just suggesting to the gentleman that if he will just contain himself and put up with his acute political suffering for a few days, Mr. Willkie will, in due season, outline just what he thinks about these things and we will be glad to hear the gentleman after that.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman is trying to give me a little fatherly advice.

Mr. MICHENER. No; not fatherly advice, just a little common sense.

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, yes; I confess that my need in that respect is abundant; and if the kind gentleman can help me to have more common sense, he will aid me where my poverty is greatest. Of course, when we are handing common sense around we are a little biased. I think that I am using common sense when that is not what the other man is thinking, and vice versa; so it is natural for a man to feel that what he is offering is common sense and that the man to whom he is offering it is not so well grounded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Let us develop a little further the very definite similarity between what former President Hoover had to offer and what the present Mr. Willkie has to offer. One of the things they have been saying, as they said of Mr. Hoover, is that Mr. Willkie is a great salesman. That is true. He is a tremendously effective salesman, but as a matter of fact it is these high-powered salesmen who have the quality of getting to the unwary and taking from them their birthright, all for a mess of pottage. I am afraid of it. Experience of that sort of thing is not conducive to the trusting of the welfare of Mr. and Mrs. America to those salesmen. You know it is not salesmanship alone but more than that. No matter how well a man is able to present his case, he must have first the fundamentally grounded thing upon which the good of the Nation rests, and the good of the people rests, and that must be more than merely going out as a salesman and selling something. It may not be all right, but at least it is workable to come and say we will sell something, and put the selling of it above the commodity itself, and as a salesman put it over. No degree of salesmanship should go along with statesmanship that puts the sale superior to the thing to be sold, and the very minute you do you are running your Nation upon economic reefs, you are doing wrong to those whom you pretend to serve, and that is the danger in this salesmanship idea.

There is another little matter they seem to get excited about. Strange to say it was the Republicans who were not excited about it before, and that is that we do have here a man offering himself for a third term, by public acclaim, it is true. Do not forget about General Grant, after he had been President twice, in 1880, running for 35 ballots ahead of all others before James A. Garfield finally got ahead of him and got the nomination. Let me see if I have here a quotation from George Washington, the author of the two-term tradition, from a letter that he wrote to Lafayette in 1778:

"I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

With the permission of the House I shall put the quotation exactly as written by Washington into the RECORD. Surely we have now the great emergency, and we Democrats think we have the man most capable of serving in this dark hour. These affairs present themselves to us; of course, they are vital to us in the light of the fact that we believe in a two-party system. You are faithful to your party, and I hope to be faithful to mine. If we did not believe in the tenets and principles of our respective parties of course we should not be identified with them and the party of each has been good to us and has trusted us to represent it and naturally that puts us in a position of extreme feeling of warmth and kindness to the party.

But no matter how acutely these things be drawn, no matter how hard the battle may wax, I hope we may never lose sight of the fact that, however high our ambitions individually or politically and as a party, we should not come to the day that we strip down and make it entirely a party affair, and try to cut down on the accomplishment of the Congress or the Nation in its march, because this or that was done under the work of the party on the other hand.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank you very kindly.

Now here we have a President who was big enough in the face of an oncoming election to reach out and take in avowed Republicans; because Messrs. Knox and Stimson, two valuable and capable men, are well grounded in international affairs. The President, unbiased and broad, that staunch patriot and true, withstood the criticism of the rock-ribbed Democrats from our own side, to select and place them in his Cabinet. Of course he did not know what political results might flow from that, but he was great enough and strong enough and patriotic enough and broad enough in his scope and vision to place that even above political fortunes, and placed them in the Cabinet.

What did the Republicans do? A man who only four years ago was acclaimed as leader and clothed with the authority to become as far as that party was concerned, Vice President of the United States, the other having adorned gloriously a place in the Cabinet; they were called in and churched; the deacons passed on them; and they were thrown out of the church, dismissed; and the hand of Christian fellowship was withheld from them and no longer were they received as members. Read out of the Republican Party because they were willing to come and serve merely under a Democratic administration. So now how embarrassed would the Republican Party be if by some miraculous turn of the people's choice—if they could forget all the order of the past, forget the closed banks, forget that we have national events to attend to, forget the starving days, forget that the Republicans are the ones who are responsible for this great unemployment situation that has been so difficult to correct, forget that the Republicans never offered any constructive program, forget that they did not offer to give any reform on any of the points that they have criticized the Democrats about, and merely say, "We are against Democrats, we are against sin; kick them out and let us in." That is their whole program. That is all they want.

Now, if the people of America were to so far forget that as to vote Willkie in, he could not, with any face, invite Knox and Stimson, the only two real experts the Republicans have on foreign and international relations, to come in and help the administration and the needs of the Nation; even if the Republican banner were trailing in the dust they could not invite them. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on this hot afternoon in the latter part of the month of July it seems to be rather the vogue for some of us to discuss political affairs, and that seems to be the topic that is currently most popular for discussion in the House of Representatives and in the popular mind in the last few days.

I think I might draw the attention of those who have remained in the House Chamber to the character of the nominees of the Republican Party since 1912 and witness how they contrast with the present nominee.

In 1912 the Republican Party honored William Howard Taft and made him its nominee for a second term as President of the United States. William Howard Taft had served his apprenticeship in public service, having been Secretary of War, President of the United States, and Governor General of the Philippines.

In 1916 the Republican Party nominated an eminent lawyer, Charles Evans Hughes. Hughes had been Governor of New York, a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and had served with distinction as chairman of an investigating committee to expose the rackets theretofore indulged in by the life insurance companies.

In 1920 the Republican Party nominated the eminent statesman from Ohio, Warren G. Harding, who had served his apprenticeship as Lieutenant Governor of the Buckeye State, and who also had been United States Senator from that State, and was in fact at that time serving as United States Senator.

In 1924 the Republican Party nominated for its standard bearer Calvin Coolidge, who had served with distinction in the Massachusetts Legislature, had been speaker of the house of that body, had been Vice President of the United States, and had been Governor of the State of Massachusetts.

In 1928 the Republican Party nominated as its standard bearer Herbert Hoover who had served his apprenticeship in public service as Secretary of Commerce, a man who had had charge of relief for the refugees of Europe and who had served competently during the years of the war in aiding the unfortunate citizens of foreign war-afflicted countries.

In 1932 the Republicans again nominated as their standard bearer Herbert Hoover. I have described his record.

In 1936 the Republican Party nominated Alfred Landon. Landon had served his apprenticeship in public service by having been Governor of the State of Kansas, and as a forceful member of the Kansas legislature.

In 1940 it remained for the Grand Old Party to nominate for the Presidency of the United States, in one of the most critical years in all of American history and in one of the most tragic in the world's history, a man who had never served any apprenticeship at any time, at any place, in any public service, whose only claim to distinction was that he was a smart, clever lawyer who possessed a practical gift for making wisecracks and pseudo-humorous remarks. They nominated a man who was characterized conspicuously by an entire absence of a record of any public service whatsoever.

Contrast him with Franklin D. Roosevelt who had served as President of the United States for two terms, who had been Governor of the Empire State—New York—who had been Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and who had served brilliantly as a member of the legislature of the State of New York. It seems to me that the Republican Party reflected upon the intelligence of the American people when it selected for its standard bearer the spear head of the power monopoly of the United States. Certainly, in my own State, Washing-

ton, the Republicans did not look with favor upon Wendell L. Willkie. Their choice was Dewey. True it is they are giving lip service to Willkie now because they have no choice. Dewey was the choice of the Republicans in my State as expressed by the delegates from the State of Washington to the Republican Convention at Philadelphia.

We in the State of Washington are sold on public ownership of power. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has time and time again dilated upon the signal success of the operation of the municipally owned power plant of the city of Tacoma, Wash., the rates of which are the lowest in the entire Nation. In the city of Tacoma, Wash., while they tax the gross receipts of the municipally owned power operations 7½ percent, they are nevertheless able to sell the power generated by that city plant at a rate lower than that charged in any other city or any other place in the entire United States. Yet they are making a profit of from \$800,000 to \$1,000,000 a year. With this they have retired their bonded indebtedness against the plant until it is down to \$4,000,000.

Wendell L. Willkie is famed for being president of a public utility holding company. In 1935 this Congress saw a great deal of excitement generated by the passage of the act known as the Public Utility Holding Company Act. At the time the death-penalty clause was being considered these galleries were packed by private power monopoly lackeys and our colleagues were deluged with telegrams allegedly spontaneously sent by citizens of the United States. Out in our State we know a lot about these spontaneous telegrams of people who rise in their righteous (?) indignation demanding that private power companies shall have better and less regulation restrictions at the hands of the Government. In 1924, in my State, we had a bill sponsored by the senior Senator from Washington, Mr. HOMER T. BONE, in which the proponents sought the right to permit the municipal power plants of my State to sell surplus current outside the city limits. The Power Trust was then operating at full velocity in our State and formed citizens' committees. These citizens' committees were nonpartisan clubs. No one seemed to find out where the money came from for this movement. Telegrams were sent to members of the legislature apparently emanating from people who were moved by sincere impulses from within in defense of private power companies. Investigation subsequently disclosed, however, that the money was all spent by these private power companies and that they were sent by the dupes or employees of the companies or their friends.

They succumbed to that method at the Philadelphia convention. We find that many of our colleagues on the Republican side of this House were very active in their opposition to the candidacy of Mr. Wendell Willkie. I recall the way they formed a bloc against the nomination of Wendell Willkie.

Now, however, we find that most of them are giving lip service to Willkie, but I am convinced that down in their hearts they look upon his nomination with misgivings. I look upon Roosevelt as embodying the statement of Edwin Markham when he wrote about Lincoln. He said that Lincoln was a man that matched the mountains, and compelled the stars to look our way and honor us. I think of Willkie in terms as Shakespeare stated:

Pray tell me this, upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed,
That he has grown so great?

What has this man done in his career of 48 years to justify the confidence of the American people in elevating him to the Presidency of the most powerful nation on earth, facing the greatest crisis in all its history? What is his claim to distinction? The fact he has been the head of a private power utility holding company the market value of whose securities has gone down continuously since he has been president of that corporation, who has enjoyed a salary of \$75,000 a year during the past 7 years while that corporation has passed the dividends on its common and preferred stock, who declined and refused to accept a cut in that salary of \$75,000, and yet denied the stockholders of this holding company dividends on its common and preferred stock. In other

words, the nominee of the Republican Party was unwilling to take the cut which had been imposed upon the lower-paid employees of that corporation and also upon its stockholders. But let us remember that the Commonwealth & Southern is not an operating company. It is a holding company.

This is the first time in the history of America when either one of the two political parties has gone into the heart of Wall Street and taken the executive of a Wall Street corporation, a concern owned by Electric Bond & Share and by J. P. Morgan & Co., and made that man its nominee for the Presidency of the United States. Wall Street does not seem to look very kindly upon its nominee, because the betting now in Wall Street is 9 to 5 that Roosevelt will be elected President of the United States. We will see during the course of the campaign something of the record of the two rival candidates. We do know Roosevelt's record. There is a saying that a man's past record is the most infallible signboard pointing the way to his political future. By that criterion the American people will judge the two nominees.

Henry Wallace has been nominated by the Democratic Party for the Vice Presidency of the United States. I am enthused about Henry Wallace as nominee for the Vice Presidency. His record as Secretary of Agriculture has shown to the American people that he is motivated by impulses of friendship for and a sincere desire to attain the solution of the problems affecting the plain people of America, a man whose heart beats in tune with the sufferings endured by the humblest citizens, a man who has gone out into the highways and byways and preached the gospel of the genuine New Deal.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Since the gentleman has been interrupted and before he gets too far away may I ask the gentleman from Washington if he observed the very delicate way and the very frequently employed instances of the method in which the opposition very frankly approaches the subject of Wall Street. When the fact was referred to that Wendell Willkie represents the Wall Street group the reference has been made to the fact that President Roosevelt had a physical office on Wall Street. May I ask if that is not the best example we have of the confusion of issues? It certainly is not the physical, concrete Wall Street of America which is concerned. It is a matter of whether or not the man has the financial, civic Wall Street gospel in him. It is like when Christ said, "Who is my neighbor?" It is not necessarily the man who has an office on the physical Wall Street but the man who is lined up with the Wall Street delegation that we have had to watch so carefully during all these 10 years and that we have had to regulate. I will ask if the gentleman was impressed by the fact that whenever identification of Wall Street was brought forth the Republican response was that Roosevelt had an office on Wall Street?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I have noted with particular interest that Candidate Willkie has been sounding off while vacationing in Colorado from the strenuous duties in Philadelphia, when he speaks of Roosevelt having an office on Wall Street. It is also stated that Willkie knows about civil liberties from personal, direct contact with the hard knocks of life, and not by reading about them in books. If that is the character of campaign that is going to be engaged in, the Democrats are ready to meet him on that issue. Mr. Roosevelt was born, it is true, in a family of wealth, but I have observed on frequent occasions that men who are proven liberals, men who have arrived at that conclusion by reason of study and conviction, are often much more to be depended on than men who have sprung from the soil, preached liberal views during their college days, then subsequently repudiated and scorned the base degrees by which they have ascended

to higher places. The charge that Mr. Roosevelt had an office in Wall Street may best be answered by the attitude exhibited toward Mr. Roosevelt by the habitues of Wall Street. Those who reside in Wall Street and have their business there are not very enthusiastic about Roosevelt's election. Most of them despise him because he has put them in their place and regulated their questionable activities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I do not want to trespass too much on the time of the House. I will merely finish the statement.

We are going into a campaign which may be summarized as a campaign between Wall Street and Main Street; between the philosophy of Wall Street and the philosophy of the New Deal—the New Deal which was exemplified in Roosevelt's immortal statement that the New Deal stands for the forgotten man, the one-third of our population who have been ill-fed and undernourished; the New Deal which may be epitomized in the assertion that the Democratic Party under Franklin D. Roosevelt will not let the people down. The answer will be made in November, when the ranks of organized labor, the humble farmer, the small-business man, the unemployed, the needy, and the indigent of America, the plain and humble citizen, and the everyday rank and file of the common people go to the polls and again roll up a decisive majority for the Democratic Party as represented by Franklin D. Roosevelt and Henry Wallace.

I welcome the opportunity to go out on the stump on the issues which will be presented to the American people; the record made by seven and a half years by the Democratic Party as opposed to the personal record of Mr. Wendell L. Willkie as the promotor-president of a holding company engaged in the manipulation of stocks and securities based on wind and water, a manipulation which brought about the panic of 1929, a philosophy which was so decisively repudiated by the American people in the 1932 and 1936 elections. The people will be chary of taking a protagonist of a philosophy the carrying out of which brought about the debacle from which this country is slowly emerging. In other words, the American people have spoken unmistakably that they want no more of this manipulation, against which we passed the Securities and Exchange Commission Act. We want no more of this unlimited promotion of stocks based on wind and water; these holding companies mounted one upon another; parasitic organizations which are taking the lifeblood out of operating companies and sequestering it for the benefit of a small and select few.

I predict that Roosevelt will carry the American people tellingly to victory in the fall of 1940, and I deny the statements that appeared over the week end at the hands of certain columnists to the effect that a few renegade Democrats were going to change the result.

It amused me very much to read in the columns over the week end that ex-Senator James Reed, of Missouri, was advocating the election of Wendell Willkie, as if that were any novelty. Ever since Reed failed of nomination as Democratic candidate for President several years ago he has been doing his best to elect a Republican to office. I remember that in 1936 ex-Senator Jim Reed formed a Democratic Landon for President Club, which fizzled out hopelessly throughout this country, and we have a few more that will shortly show up on the hustings, but against whose mouthings nobody need waste any energy.

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

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the glowing speeches that are made now about Wendell Willkie, and suggest that he check back, as I have been doing, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4 years ago and see

how much they look like, sound like and, I might add another word there, the speeches made in favor of Landon just 4 years ago.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I remember that very distinctly.

I believe the American people will submerge the spokesman of stock jobbing when they study the record of Mr. Hopson, of Associated Gas & Electric, of Mr. Insull and his Chicago utility empire, of Mr. Doherty and his Cities Service, of Clark and his Utilities Power & Light, and the various other manipulators of the public-utility holding companies of the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER, for 1 week, on account of death of a member of his immediate family.

To Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. COCHRAN, for 3 days, in order to attend the funeral of Hon. Joseph H. Brogan, President of the Missouri State Senate.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4165. An act to provide, in cooperation with the Port of New York Authority, for the construction in New York Harbor of a graving drydock large enough to accommodate the largest naval ships built or building; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Friday, July 12, 1940, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2751. An act to repeal sections 3711, 3712, and 3713 of the Revised Statutes which relate to the purchase in the District of Columbia of coal and wood for public use, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9576. An act relating to the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of persons resident or domiciled in the Virgin Islands of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, July 25, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in Room 445, House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, July 24, 1940; consideration of private bills.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold public hearings in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Thursday, July 25, 1940, on H. R. 7693, a bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Philippine uprisings and campaigns from July 5, 1902, to December 31, 1913, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1835. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission, fiscal year 1941, amounting to \$175,000 (H. Doc. No. 882); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1836. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay a claim which has been settled by them under the provisions of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia," approved February 11, 1929 (45 Stat. 1160), as amended by the act approved June 5, 1930 (46 Stat. 500), amounting to \$500, and which requires an appropriation for its payment (H. Doc. No. 883); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1837. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1941 in the amount of \$7,875.99 (H. Doc. No. 884); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1838. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 1, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey or Cadet Bayou in the vicinity of Waveland, Hancock County, Miss., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved June 20, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1839. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the employment on active duty of retired personnel of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1840. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to permit granting of insurance to certain officers in the active service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard upon application within a period of 6 months after publication of premium rates; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1841. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish certain naval hospitals; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1842. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting draft of a proposed bill which has for its purpose the extension to the Virgin Islands of the vocational education and vocational rehabilitation benefits now provided by statute to the States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and, with respect to vocational education, to Alaska; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1843. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a proposed bill to further amend the act of July 30, 1937, authorizing the conveyance of certain portions of the Stony Point Light Station Reservation to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1844. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

1845. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice," as of July 1, 1940; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1846. A letter from the chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a copy of a proposed bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1847. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting copy of the complete Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year ended October 31, 1939; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 550. Resolution requesting information from the

President concerning any existing secret pact, agreement, or understanding between the United States and Soviet Russia (Rept. No. 2800). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 10212. A bill to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

H. R. 10213. A bill to permit American vessels to assist in the evacuation from the war zones of certain refugee children; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10214. A bill to permit American vessels to assist in the evacuation from the war zones of certain refugee children; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 10215. A bill granting a pension to Maxie Moyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 10216. A bill granting a pension to Sarah D. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 10217. A bill granting a pension to Pricy Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 10218. A bill for the relief of Kula Sanatorium; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 10219. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wilhelm Wolfgang Krauss; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

9042. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the New York Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local No. 10, New York City, urging the passage of the longevity and court of appeals bills; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

9043. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the construction of a drydock in the port of New York area (H. R. 10125); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

9044. Also, petition of John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 10125; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

9045. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of David Runion, of Chester, W. Va., and other citizens, protesting against universal compulsory training and the draft; advocating a strict neutrality law and an embargo on all war material; and protesting against Sidney Hillman's appointment as leader and director of compulsory universal training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1940

Rev. Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who seest that we are set in the midst of so many and such great dangers: Grant us grace, we humbly beseech Thee, so to cast our cares upon Thee that Thy merciful providence may always sustain and defend us, both in body and soul. Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

LXXXVI—604

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1940.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, a Senator from the State of Texas, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

KEY PITTMAN,
President Pro Tempore.

Mr. SHEPPARD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore for the day.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HARRISON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 22, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 22d instant,

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9828) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of bridges across the Monongahela River in Allegheny County, Pa., reported it without amendment on July 24, 1940, and submitted a report (No. 1984) thereon.

BILL INTRODUCED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 22d instant,

Mr. GLASS, on July 24, 1940, introduced a bill (S. 4205) to permit American vessels to assist in the evacuation from the war zones of certain refugee children, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 22d instant,

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably on July 24, 1940, the nomination of Commander John H. Cornell to be a captain in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from July 1, 1940.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably on July 24, 1940, the following nominations:

Boatswain Emile T. Turcotte to be a chief boatswain, to rank as such from August 1, 1940; and

Machinist Martin Lentz, Jr., to be a chief machinist, to rank as such from July 5, 1940.

Mr. SHEPPARD also, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably on July 24, 1940, the nominations of several persons to be ensigns (temporary) in the Coast Guard of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION OF HOMESTEAD PROJECTS IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the Government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

USE OF CERTAIN LAND BY CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of a tract of land in California known as the Millerton Rancheria in connection with the Central Valley project, and for other