The House met at 12 o'clock noon and took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, November 6, 1941, at 11 o'clock a.m. (and 12 minutes p.m.) the Poet Offices.

The following nominations were submitted:

Mr. Short. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Cooper.

Rev. Walter A. Maier, Ph. D., Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., offered the following motion:

Merciful God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praise and thanks be to Thee for the privilege of assembling in this free and representative session. Hundreds of millions of our fellow men are deprived of these blessings, and the grinding of masses across the sea, crushed in the clutches of political despotism and spiritual anarchy, asks us to guard on our own shores the endowed, or free, or free expression, free worship, with all our energies and resources, if necessary with our lives.

O Father, keep these legislators keenly mindful of the vital truth that our national preeminences are neither automatic nor irrevocable. More than ever before Thy divine benediction is sorely needed during these torn and twisted years. Thou, the God of our fathers, didst make America great, and only Thou canst keep us great in spirit, in service, in truth. Guard us against arrogant pride. Instead of parading our Nation's wealth and power, let us contritely confess our own sins. Bring us down on our knees in humble repentance.

As the bloody conflict gather swiftly and ominously, help us understand that every war, be it ever so necessary and justified, is always a visitation from Thee. Prevent us from glorifying bloodshed, from seeking individual or corporate profit through the suffering and death of the Nation's youth. In these Chambers of the Capitol, where legislative decisions help chart our country's course, may we never, we beseech Thee, permit personal prejudices and passions to supplant unbiased judgment and unswerving devotion to the truth. Show us that righteous warfare may be exalted, that sin is a reproach to any people.

Keep the will of the Congress in harmony with Thy divine will.

Above all, O Christ, give grace and power, bring men together within our boundaries to Jesus Christ, Thy Son, the only but all-sufficient Saviour of all mankind. In Him, the sin-bearing Redeemer, and in His renewing spirit let them find pardon, peace, and perpetual blessing. We ask it in His glorious name. Amen.

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

HON. J. JOSEPH SMITH

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

November 4, 1941.

S. Sam Rayburn, Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Speaker, I have today transmitted to the Governor of the State of Connecticut my resignation as a Representative from Connecticut in the Congress of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

J. Joseph Smith.

Fifth Congressional District, Connecticut.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. Rankin of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may sit during the sessions of the House during the rest of the week.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FLOOD CONTROL

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

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. The Speaker pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. Short. I would love to, but I cannot because of my limited time.

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts. I just wanted to know what a Missouri minute is. I am curious about it.

Mr. Short. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the Members have read about the recent devastating floods that have occurred in certain Midwestern and Southwestern States. These excessive waters from the mountains and off the rolling plains have washed away farmlands and towns, the lost life and property; and even millions of dollars of damages have resulted. Not only have crops been destroyed and livestock drowned, but homes have been washed away, and these floods have even taken their toll in human life. I think the town of Hinsdale, Kansas, alone experienced over $3,000,000 damage before last.

The floodwaters of the Arkansas between Fort Smith and Little Rock are the highest in history.

I firmly point this cut to say, Mr. Speaker, that floods are no respecter of regions or of persons. We read about these floods one day, in New England and the next day in California. Of course, we are always confronted with them in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys, that drain that portion of the United States between the Appalachian Mountains and the Rocky Mountains. For if any of our States long escape these recurring disasters.
FRANK'S WAR

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. When President Franklin Roosevelt gave orders to Frank Knox to shoot it was an undeclared war by the Government of the United States without the authority of Congress in so doing. And when history is written, this undeclared war by Franklin Roosevelt and Frank Knox will go down as a great blunder—an error against the integrity of the American people and the American form of government. We criticized Italy for not declaring war on Ethiopia. We criticized Japan for not declaring war on China. We criticized Germany for not declaring war on the countries she ravished. Now the two Franks have actually declared war on Germany and France they and France will have to declare war on little Finland, who is now fighting Russia, and we take Russia as one of our bedfellows and allies. Such a new war is experienced in all history. The greatest error that America will ever commit will be when we have to take the initiative in a war 3,000 miles away and possibly on two oceans.

The headlines in Sunday's papers stated, "Fight to finish now promised by Knox." What right or authority does a man in such high position in our Government have to make a statement of that kind? What right has the President of the United States to send our Navy over to Europe as he is doing? And since the Reuben James was sunk the other day near Iceland with the loss of life, it seems to me it is committing murder on the men in our own Navy contrary to our own form of government. Who is responsible for the loss of these lives? I see no individual other than the President of the United States for permitting these ships to go into the danger zones of the Contraband of War Act. Where this act forbids our own ships to enter, now he sends them there armed. When a person looks for trouble he can easily get it, and we certainly are looking for war in doing the things that the President of the United States, Franklin Roosevelt, and the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, are doing in the orders they are giving to our Navy.

Also in Monday's headlines Lord Beaverbrook's paper in England says the sinking of the Reuben James was a war declaration; they would like to get us into this war by writings in their own papers in order that we take the initiative and do for them what they are afraid to do for themselves. Why was not England ordered to make a landing on the continent, since Russia is doing such valiant fighting against Hitler on the north? It seems to me that President Knox now wants America not only to furnish the material but to furnish the men to do the fighting. And now, with the aid and assistance of the two Franks, they are going to do everything they can in order that we become involved in this war. The greatest catastrophe that could ever happen to the American people will be when we get involved in non-declaration warfare in Europe and Asia in the year 1941, the year of the undeclared war of the Franks.

HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to pay a deserved tribute to Hon. Josephus Daniels, who has recently indicated his purpose to retire soon from his post as Ambassador to Mexico.

As an individual, as Secretary of the Navy, and as Ambassador to Mexico, Mr. Daniels has rendered outstanding service to his country and to his nation. As Secretary of the Navy, in most trying times, Mr. Daniels rendered outstanding service to his country and to his nation. As Ambassador to Mexico, by the strictest application to his duties and intelligence, he has rendered valuable service to his country.

He now retires and turns back his post to President Roosevelt who called him to that high responsibility, after a service so eminently satisfactory as to merit the highest estimate of the President and the Nation.

Press reports convey the information that Mr. Daniels feels compelled to return to the State of North Carolina, relinquishing his post as Ambassador to Mexico, in part at least through consideration of his wife's condition of health. This is not a matter of the departure of a great man. I have no doubt but that this noble woman, Ambassador Daniels' wife, has contributed in large measure to the success of the Administration and the Government which he has so well filled; and no one knows it better than he.

North Carolina is proud of Mr. Daniels record.

SALE OF ELECTRIC POWER BY CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 41 of the Sixty-third Congress, known as the Raker Act, and signed by President Wilson December 19, 1913, grants to San Francisco certain rights for the development of its Hetch-Hetchy water and power system.

And under date of July 19, 1932, pursuant to the suggestion of Solicitor Edwards, of the Department of the Interior, and in perfect good faith, San Francisco entered into a contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for the sale of electric power.
Almost 17 years later, on April 22, 1949, the United States Supreme Court ruled this contract conflicted with section 6 of said Raker Act, which reads:

That the grantee is prohibited from ever selling or letting to any corporation or individual, except a municipality or a municipal water district or irrigation district, the right to energy sold or given to it or him by the said grantee.

Today I am introducing measures to permit the city to conform to the decision of the Court, and in fairness to the citizens of my home community, I ask a careful and earnest review of this whole proposition by the Congress.

M R. SMITII of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMTTH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vary the rules as to time and to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to quote from an excerpt from the Grand Island Daily Independent.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business tomorrow on the Speaker's desk and any special orders heretofore entered into I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief editorial from the Grand Island Daily Independent.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the November 1 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record by the inclusion of a radio address which I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record by the inclusion of a radio address which I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record a letter recently addressed to Senator O'Mahoney with reference to House Resolution 146.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record by the inclusion of a radio address which I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record by the inclusion of a radio address which I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record by the inclusion of a radio address which I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record a letter recently addressed to Senator O'Mahoney with reference to House Resolution 146.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record by the inclusion of a radio address which I recently delivered.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it is solely for the purpose of keeping the record straight that I have asked the privilege of taking this statement.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most incredible things that has happened in recent years is the article by Joe Davies in which he states that the army and navy of the United States, by a vote of the Army, decided to give to the United States the naval base of Secaucus, New Jersey, because of the attitude of the United States toward Fascism and the United States' desire to aid the nations fighting Fascism. I am sure that Mr. Cox would like to rewrite this statement.
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better and should not be willing that the uninformed think differently.

Now, Mr. Speaker, mark these words: but it now appears that they indicated the

The implication is that the American magazine—the December issue—in which former Ambassador Joseph E. Davies writes his article, that Mr. Hopkins falls into the error of portraying Joe Stalin as a straight-talking, kindly, smiling man, whose eyes grew dark and whose very manner grew icy with an "impossible hate" of Hitler when both of them were in Russia.

The implication in Mr. Davies' article is one which I do not believe he meant to convey, but which, unfortunately, is conveyed by reason of appearing in the same issue of the magazine in which the Davies article appears, that implication being that Joseph Stalin has in some way become a kindly person vastly concerned with the welfare of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, no amount of printer's ink can ever conceal the blood that drips from the hands of Joe Stalin—the blood of thousands, women, and children; the blood of thousands upon thousands of intellectuals, clerics, the very cream of the Russian race who have been assassinated under the Stalin regime.

No amount of make believe, no amount of apologies, Mr. Speaker, can conceal or ever distort the naked fact that Joseph Stalin deliberately and wantonly double-crossed and betrayed the British to give Hitler the go sign in his war. Nothing can ever erase from the pages of history the shameful rape of little Finland by Stalin's hordes. Nothing, no amount of propaganda, can ever clothe Joe Stalin, in the minds of the American people, with the robes of a Christian gentleman concerned with the perpetuation of freedom and democracy anywhere in the world. No amount of casuistry, of spurious reasoning, or of fallacious argument can ever make Joseph Stalin and the Government of Russia the champion of the four freedoms which Mr. Roosevelt has declared must be carried to all the peoples everywhere in the world.

To my mind the crowning insult to the intelligence of the people, the most insolent and amazing mockery of the truth is perpetrated in this article from the pen of the former Ambassador to Russia. I want to quote you a few paragraphs from this article by Mr. Davies. He says in one paragraph:

"I recently went through my diary, and with the permission of the State Department, read some of my reports as American Ambassador to Moscow in 1937 and 1938. Suddenly I saw the picture as I undoubtedly should have remembered it in Russia. Many of the world construed the famous treason trials and purges from 1938 to 1938 to be outrageous excursions of barbarism, ingratuity, and hysteria. And now, Mr. Speaker, mark these words: but it now appears that they indicated the amazing farsightedness of Stalin and his close associates."

"Practically every device of the German "fifth column" as we now know it in America, and even in the United States was disclosed in the testimony of the Soviet Quislings. But the Russians were acutely aware of the menace as early as 1935. As fast as the Germans and Japanese built, the Russians destroyed. That, in brief, is the real story behind the Russian purges— one of the reasons for the magnificent Russian resistance to the Nazi juggernaut."

"I attended the treason trials probably more astoundingly than any other member of the diplomatic corps. But all of us there at the time, including the magnates of the press and the able newsmen correspondents, seemed to have "missed the boat." I certainly did. There were two counts in the indictment in this trial. The first had to do with the internal revolutionary activities of the defendants, and the second charge that they had conspired and cooperated with Germany and Japan to betray Russia."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me quote a word or two further:

"Another reason why we in Moscow failed at the time to grasp the full significance of the treason trials was that we all seemed to be thinking in terms of the struggle for power that was going on at the time between the communists, or the "ins", and the "outs"—Stalin, on the one hand, and on the other the late Trotsky."

"One of the primary issues between Trotsky and Stalin was the question of which policy the Soviet Union should pursue. Stalin, the practical realist, was convinced that his primary job was to develop a socialist democracy and make communism work in Soviet Russia."

"God save the mark. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge of Davies or any other individual could find it in a dozen volumes, such as Eugene Lyons' Red Decade or Louis Fischer's The Roots and Politics, that Joseph Stalin assassinated every individual he could lay his hands on in Russia who wanted to establish and maintain a socialist democracy there."

"After reviewing at length the so-called treason trials at which some of the most intelligent and influential members of the Soviet Government tried to outdo one another in self-accusation, Mr. Davies, who, mind you, was American Ambassador to the Soviet Government at the time, and who had ample opportunity to learn better and know better, produced a swelling that spectacle whole. He seriously says in effect that he believes all of those self-accusations. He carefully conceals the fact which he could hardly escape knowing, that a number of writers exposed at the time and since, that those confessions were extorted by the device of torturing the loved ones of those men if they would not agree to confess in public."

"This former Ambassador resembles to the American people that those confessions by those generals and commissars who were brought to public trial were only those who had been tortured into confession and who had been warned, and who knew that unless they offered themselves up—living sacrifices on the altar of this bloody-handed Moloch—their relatives, even down to the dismembered, would find the most unspeakable means—tortured to death."

"It is common knowledge among informed persons who have followed the course of this despot Stalin that thousands upon thousands died of torture in dungeons and under the incredible brutality of the OGPU because they would not confess."

"Yet in the light of this bloody evidence, in the light of this overwhelming mass of evidence of the inexcusable brutality and depravity of this despot, Stalin, here is what this former Ambassador, Mr. Davies, has to say, not only in condemning but in approving of the Stalin policy, of atheism, torture, terrorism, assassination, starvation, sadism:

"Many commentators have concluded that the purges seriously weakened the Red Army. I believe that the exact opposite is the truth. The house cleaning of traitors eliminated some of the higher commanders—"

"All of them, in fact—"

"but it brought about the promotion of younger and frequently more imaginative men who, while lacking the experience of their predecessors made up for it in initiative and loyalty."

"Well, Mr. Speaker, on that basis we should immediately follow Mr. Davies' ideas, we should immediately shoot, poison, club to death, or slit the throats of our older commanders and make way for the promotion of younger and frequently more imaginative men."

"Mr. Davies says further:

"The purges also gave the average soldier a greater sense of security and a conviction that his fate was now in the hands of more trustworthy officers than "the Trotskyite traitors who had met the fate they deserved."

"Well, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming a notorious fact that the morale in our own Army is very low. It is becoming a notorious fact that many men in the ranks disapprove of their officers for one reason or another. Maybe we had better follow Mr. Davies' way and shoot or slit the throats of those generals and commissars only to make possible the promotion of younger and more imaginative officers but also to satisfy the dissatisfaction of those men in the ranks who disagree with the policies and the attitudes of their commanding officers. This would kill two birds with one stone."
And now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the most astounding part of this incredible article by this former Ambassador:

The extensive military and industrial preparations that were launched immediately after the smoke of the purges cleared away go far to explain the Russians' resistance today and the withstand German science and German panzer divisions.

But this "all out" program could easily have been carried on without Stalin and his associates. Can it be possible that a man residing in the indescribable luxury of millions here in Washington today could write such words which advocate, if they mean anything at all, the adoption of a policy in this country and other liberty-loving nations of Joe Stalin's bloody policy of torture, terrorism, assassination?

Why, Mr. Speaker, if we were to follow any such advice, perfectly patriotic people who differ with you and me on our foreign policy would be taken into dungeons, be tortured, their loved ones would have to beg, beggar them until they publicly flagellated themselves by public confessions and self-accusations, and then they would be shot.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, the reason I am speaking these words today is because, along with numerous other earnest citizens of this Nation, I perceive a deadly dangerous trend toward the defamation of this bloody-handed dictator, Joseph Stalin, as a great champion of liberty and a great Christian liberal.

One of the greatest dangers that confront this country in this hour is that communism will become popularized in the United States of America.

Mark you, I recognize that it is the part of good sense and good strategy for us to give material aid to Stalin and his Soviet despotism while he is fighting the Nazis, but we should help him to destroy Nazi-ism in the world, but we should devoutly hope and do everything we can practically to bring about a condition in which communism and the Third International and Joseph Stalin will be rendered innocuous as a threat to liberty and civilization in the rest of the world.

Seeing as I do that it is the part of wisdom for us thus to aid Stalin at this time, I am raising my voice today to warn against the Nation becoming hypnotized by the propaganda of which this article is a quack measure in attempting to popularize communism in this country, and to whitewash a despot like Stalin. There is not a bit of difference between Stalin brutality and Hitler brutality. There is not a bit of difference between Stalin atheism and Hitler atheism. There is not a bit of difference between the enslavement of workers and farmers under Stalin and the enslavement of workers and farmers under Hitler. There is not a bit of difference between the utter depravity and the sadism and the utter revolt against culture of Stalin and Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, America wants no part of either communism or Nazi-ism in this free, enlightened Nation of ours. So far as I am concerned, wishing as I am to help Stalin destroy or expand the nation which deduced to expand must denounce as I now denounce any effort to popularize communism in the United States or to adopt any of its unspeakable policies in this land of the free.

I denounce this article by Mr. Davies as an ill-advised, utterly fallacious, wholly untrue, and despicable piece of cheap propaganda which should not find one believer among the readers of this country. Mr. Speaker, can we not strengthen our defense by aiding Russia without having to accept the Russian way of life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including therein an article by Bill Cunningham on a separate air force. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost will be approximately $115.50.

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

There was no objection.

ARE WE FOLLOWING A STALIN'S PARTY LINE?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, conceding the justice of all the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Cox) has said, may I ask this question: Conceding the difference in method and degree, what is the difference in principle between the policy pursued by Joe Stalin, as just outlined by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Cox) and the policy pursued by the New Deal during the last few years?

Stalin had as his purpose the elimination of his opponents. He did it by sentences to Siberia, by executions. The New Deal is eliminating its opponents by purge, by persecution, by a denial of the liberty and the freedom to which we have been accustomed.

Stalin made Russia; and it was Vice President WALLACE who advocated making America over, and who wrote:

"We may hope that such action can be taken as readily as it was in Russia."

Apparently WALLACE did not want any bloodshed at all. Guy Rexford Tugwell had a somewhat different idea. In his Industrial Discipline, published in 1933, he wrote:

"Planning will necessarily become a function of this Federal Government; either that or the planning agency will supersede the Government."

Business will logically be required to disappear. This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis—it is literally meant.

Just what is the difference, except in method, between the purpose of Stalin and the purpose of WALLACE and Tugwell? Stalin made Russia; Tugwell made what?

Tugwell wrote—I repeat:

"Business will logically be required to disappear."

Still more recently—in fact, on September 26, 1941, Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau said:

"We can't continue to live the way we are and be the arsenal of democracy. Business as usual should be cut the window, but it isn't out yet. Some people are willing to find some way to beat this, but we will find a way to reach them."

Returning now to Tugwell: In his program of making business to disappear, Tugwell evidently approved of what Stalin was doing in Russia, for he wrote:

"The future is becoming visible in Russia."

Moreover, he had no compunctions in removing his political opponents, for he wrote:

"Perhaps our statesmen will give way or be more or less gently removed from duty."

It may be that we should thank Tugwell and his friends for adopting so mild a program. There is no doubt, however, about what Stalin was doing in Russia, for he wrote:

"The future is becoming visible in Russia."

And so I ask the gentlemen of the majority to look again at our domestic structure, take note of what is happening here, and tell me the difference, if any there be, in the principle which was followed by Stalin and that which is being followed by those who would wipe out here in America all who disagree with them.

Joe eliminated his political opponents. The administration seeks to do the same thing and characterizes as unpatriotic all those who disagree with its purpose or its method.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a
The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today the Speaker received a letter from our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut, the Honorable J. Joseph Smith, tendering his resignation as a Member of this body.

I take it most of the Members are aware of the fact that the gentleman from Connecticut has been appointed to a Federal judgeship in his native State. I want to say, simply as one of the minority members of the Committee on Military Affairs who has served with the gentleman from Connecticut for the past 6 years, that I think he is one of the finest and ablest young men that I have ever known. He is well educated; he has a judicial mind and temperament; he is ruggedly honest and will make a good judge. Much as we regret to lose him from our Committee on Military Affairs, we all rejoice with him in the new honor that has been well conferred upon him, and we wish him Godspeed in his new work.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to join with the gentleman from Missouri in what he has to say of our friend the gentleman from Connecticut, J. Joseph Smith, who is leaving us; and to say that I, too, served side by side with him on the committee for a number of years, as my colleague knows. The gentleman from Connecticut is a man of excellent judicial temperament and will, in my humble judgment, make a most excellent Federal judge.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 6, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a.m. Thursday, November 6, 1941, to continue hearings on proposed amendments to Securities Act, 1933, and Stock Exchange Act, 1934.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, November 6, 1941, at 10 a.m., to consider House Joint Resolution 242, to authorize the Maritime Commission to sell or charter vessels of the laid-up fleet, and for other purposes.
orado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin for power and irrigation (Reps. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING:
H. R. 5695. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. JENNINGS:
H. R. 5923. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROLPH:
H. R. 5959. A bill providing section 6 of the act entitled "An act granting to the city and county of San Francisco certain rights-of-way through certain public lands, the Yosemite National Park, and Stanislaus National Forest, and certain lands in the Yosemite National Park, the Stanislaus National Forest, and the public lands in the State of California, and for other purposes," approved December 19, 1913 (38 Stat. 422); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:
H. R. 5965. A bill to reserve certain public domain lands in California and Nevada for the use and benefit of the Indians of the Fort Mojave Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:
H. J. Res. 244. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee on Priorities and Allocations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROLPH:
H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution suspending the clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions referred as indicated:

By Mr. TOLAN:
H. R. 5962. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 17 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:
H. R. 5696. A bill for the relief of Louis H. Deaver; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHELBEL:
H. R. 6099. A bill for the relief of Seymour J. McGeehee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2004. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of A. S. Strain, of Topeka, Kan., and others, urging immediate enactment of a just and adequate old-age pension law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2005. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Muncy, Pa., favoring price-control legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2006. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Cascade County Trades and Labor Assembly of Montana, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antilynch bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2007. Also, petition of the American War Mothers, Mrs. Virgil Stone, Wyoming, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to strike breakers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2008. Also, petition of the Legion Rank & File, Inc., Portland, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation increasing the minimum pay of enlisted men of the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2009. Also, petition of the Kentucky National Pensions Recovery Boosters, Inc., Newport, Ky., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2010. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newport, Campbell County, Ky., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2011. Also, petition of the Hiawatha Council of Richmond, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENEATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, October 27, 1941)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

God of our fathers, known of old not only by declaration of the Scriptures or Prophets' words but chiefly by what men are and have within them of the true and everlasting: We beseech Thee in these momentous days to enlighten us with Thy word, make us attentive and quick to discern the changes and to present to us a covenant, even as in former times, by putting Thy law in our inward parts and by writing it in our hearts.

Thus do Thou reveal to us that evil is its own retribution, virtue is its own reward, and by this law indwelling us help us to realize that every selfishness is punished and every charity is blessed with eternal increase.

Add to our sense of Thy presence, dear Lord, persistence in hope despite the forbidding aspect of the times; increase in us persistence in love, when love seems unrequited, and the deeper meaning of Thy Spirit never fail to speak movingly even though our ears are sometimes dulled and our hearts deadened by the world's great news.

We ask Thy help in the Saviour's name, because Thou art and the world is Thine. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, November 5, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BISHOP] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] are necessary absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to division of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories thereto entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Hiram Johnson of Newark, N. J., praying for repeal of the neutrality law; to the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of