

the marine and war-risk insurance fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 10186. A bill for the relief of the alien, Jacques (Giacomo) Medvedieff; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H. R. 10187. A bill to correct the naval record of Miller Frederick Simmons; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 10188. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willie M. Maye; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 10189. A bill for the relief of William H. Bibb; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 10190. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Dulin; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 10191. A bill for the relief of Anthony Borsellino; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10192. A bill for the relief of Daniel R. Brown; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 10193. A bill for the relief of Dr. Michel Konne and Pauline Lucia Konne; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 10194. A bill for the relief of the late John L. Summers, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

9021. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition in the nature of a letter to the editor of the Asbury Park Press of Lorenzo Harris, an officer of the Progressive Colored Democratic Association of New Jersey, endorsing President Roosevelt for a third term; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

9022. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of Daniel Beall Post, No. 18, of the American Legion, Lexington, Miss., in behalf of adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9023. By the SPEAKER: Petition of S. Hutter, of Forest Park, Ill., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9024. Also, petition of the Mission Union Auxiliary Club, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9025. Also, petition of the Department of Indiana Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Muncie, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9026. Also, petition of the Miscellaneous Employees' Union, Local No. 110, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9027. Also, petition of the Iowa City Lions Club, Iowa City, Iowa, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9028. Also, petition of Philadelphia Lodge, No. 1472, the Order Sons of Italy in America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, July 8, 1940)

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

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

O God, the fountain of wisdom, whose statutes are good and gracious and whose law is truth, we beseech Thee so to guide and bless the Members of this Senate that they may ordain for our governance only such things as please Thee, to the glory of Thy name and the welfare of Thy people. Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

As in legislative session,

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, July 9, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. 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:

Adams	Downey	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Andrews	Ellender	Lucas	Sheppard
Ashurst	Frazier	Lundeen	Shipstead
Austin	George	McCarran	Slatery
Bailey	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Barbour	Gibson	McNary	Smith
Barkley	Gillette	Maloney	Stewart
Bilbo	Green	Mead	Taft
Bone	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Harrison	Neely	Tobey
Byrd	Hatch	Norris	Townsend
Byrnes	Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Capper	Herring	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hill	Overton	Van Nuys
Chandler	Holman	Pepper	Walsh
Chavez	Holt	Pittman	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Radcliffe	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

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

CLAIMS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate met in executive session this morning following a recess taken last evening. The Chair is advised that, as in legislative session, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] would like to take up for consideration a matter coming from the House of Representatives. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently said: The Chair has been advised by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that he has withdrawn his objection to action being taken on a House amendment in which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] is interested.

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in legislative session, laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 326) for the payment of awards and appraisals heretofore made in favor of citizens of the United States on

claims presented under the General Claims Convention of September 8, 1923, United States and Mexico.

Mr. PITTMAN. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

During the executive session the following legislative business, by unanimous consent, was transacted as in legislative session:

UNITED STATES UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] members, on the part of the Senate, of the United States University of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission, established by Senate Joint Resolution 214 (Public Res. No. 86, 76th Cong.), approved June 20, 1940.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD (H. DOC. NO. 876)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter signed by the Secretary of State, Chairman, and other members of the National Munitions Control Board, submitting, in compliance with law, a report of the operations of the Board for the period January 1 to June 30, 1940, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The original report above referred to was submitted to the House of Representatives for printing.)

FINAL HOMESTEAD PROOF OF HENRY MARTIN COFFMAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the final homestead proof submitted by Henry Martin Coffman, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

J. J. GREENLEAF

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 527) for the relief of J. J. Greenleaf.

Mr. BURKE. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BURKE, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. TOWNSEND conferees on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Lions Clubs of District 42, in convention assembled at Watch Hill, R. I., favoring enlargement of the powers of the so-called Dies committee of the House of Representatives and also the Federal Bureau of Investigation so that they may be able to investigate all organizations or individuals engaged in inciting or fomenting un-American practices in the Nation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the annual convention of the National Editorial Association in New York City, favoring the prompt adoption of measures to provide for universal compulsory military training in peacetime and compulsory universal military service in time of war, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Lions Clubs of District 42, in convention assembled at Watch Hill, R. I., favoring the adoption of an adequate national-defense program and the suppression of all subversive activities in the Nation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HOLT presented a resolution of Post No. 54, American Legion, of Princeton, W. Va., favoring the enactment of pending immigration legislation and protesting against the enactment of the bill (S. 409) to protect American labor and stimulate the employment of American citizens on American jobs, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented resolutions of Volney Wilson Post, No. 1212, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Parkersburg, and Voiture No. 1073, La Societe des 40 Hommes et 8 Cheveaux (an organization within the American Legion), in the State of West Virginia, favoring the prompt enactment of legislation to suppress all subversive activities in the Nation, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution unanimously adopted by the Fairmont (W. Va.) Junior Chamber of Commerce, protesting against discontinuance of the air-mail pick-up service at Fairmont, W. Va., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution of the Men's Club of Hedgesville, W. Va., favoring all measures for the national defense and protection of the Nation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution of Adkin District Post, No. 38, American Legion, of Gary, W. Va., favoring a session of Congress during the existing emergency in the interest of the national defense, and also that all subversive activities in the Nation be suppressed, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petitions of A. A. Mountain Post, No. 5; Huntington Post, No. 16, of Huntington; Boyce Houser Post, No. 41, and Bartlett Clemens Post, No. 37, all of the American Legion; the Rotary Club, of Weston, the Lions Club, of Weston, and Col. John Evans Chapter of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Morgantown, all in the State of West Virginia, praying that Congress remain in session during the existing emergency, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 2644) to set aside certain land in the State of Oregon for a summer camp for Boy Scouts, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1951) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4119) to provide for the transfer of certain land in the De Soto National Forest to the Secretary of War for use for military purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1952) thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on July 9, 1940, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2289) for the relief of the Leesburg Welding & Garage Co.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

S. 4197. A bill for the relief of Clallam County, Wash.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 4198. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to give protection to certain mortgagors who are required to render military or naval service during any national emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 4199. A bill to increase the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 4200. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 4201. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to the appointment of district judge, district attorney, and marshal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 4202, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. J. Res. 285. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year 1941 to provide facilities to expedite the national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER IN OPPOSITION TO INTERVENTION IN WAR

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator WHEELER before the Peace Action Committee of Missouri, at the St. Louis Municipal Auditorium, St. Louis, Mo., July 2, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOURTH OF JULY ADDRESS BY SENATOR SHIPSTEAD

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator SHIPSTEAD in Northfield, Minn., on July 4, 1940, the subject being The Fourth of July, the Nation's Birthday, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY I AM AN AMERICAN—ADDRESS BY J. REUBEN CLARK, JR.

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Why I Am an American, delivered by Hon. Reuben Clark, Jr., at Salt Lake City, May 29, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLAIN ECONOMICS—ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

[Mr. LUNDEEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article headed "Plain economics," by John T. Flynn, published in the Washington (D. C.) News of Wednesday, July 10, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

GREENLAND FROM 1898 TO NOW—ARTICLE BY ROBERT A. BARTLETT

[Mr. LUNDEEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Greenland From 1898 to Now," written by Robert A. Bartlett, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER ON THE ANNENBERG CASE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler under the heading "The Annenberg case," published in his column Fair Enough in the Washington Post of July 10, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

QUO VADIS?—EDITORIAL IN THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Quo Vadis," published in the Saturday Evening Post of July 13, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

IDAHO—THE ROCKY ROAD TO STATEHOOD

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a historical sketch of Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN INDUSTRY SPEEDS UP TO MEET TOTALITARIAN PACE

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press article published in the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of July 7, 1940, on the subject American Industry Speeds Up To Meet Totalitarian Pace, which appears in the Appendix.]

THIRD TERM FOR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open letter published by the Philadelphia Record under the heading "You are drafted, Mr. President," which appears in the Appendix.]

LXXXVI—591

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.

SELECTIVE MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

As in legislative session,

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, for a brief moment I desire to refer to that part of our preparation for national defense which is represented by the Burke-Wadsworth bill for selective military training and service. A question occurred in the Military Affairs Committee this morning with respect to the element of time. The question was asked, What is the hurry? I desire to answer that to some extent by showing that time is of the very essence of our preparedness.

From all the evidence we get in committee and outside of committee, notably in the distinguished address delivered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] yesterday, we are persuaded that we cannot perfect or anywhere near perfect our Military and Naval Establishments within a period of years. So that what some of us regard as an unprecedented peril to this country at the instant time is the utter impossibility of creating machinery, that is the physical thing constituting our defense, and also the utter impossibility of enlisting the necessary personnel to man such machinery in a short period of time.

That means to the people of this country, as evidenced by what I am going to point out, that we ought to begin now; that we should not postpone; that we should not delay; and without depriving anybody of the opportunity to express his views, and taking everybody's views as bona fide, and giving full weight and consideration to them, we should progress as rapidly as the circumstances will permit to a solution of the questions relating to national defense.

In order to show to what extent public opinion is in advance of the Congress with respect to the element of time, and as applied specifically to the personnel of the Army, I desire to read a card, copies of which have come to me by the thousands from the State of Vermont, from every part of the State of Vermont, and from persons engaged in all kinds of activities. It is as follows:

Because I believe that America faces the greatest danger in its history, and because this danger forces us to put the fully trained manpower of the Nation behind the defensive equipment just voted by Congress, I urge the immediate adoption of a selective military-service law for all ages as the only efficient and democratic way of manning our national defenses and protecting our men against the needless slaughter of an ill-equipped and unprepared defense.

Sincerely yours.

This card happens to come from Barton, Vt., but the cards come in such numbers to my office that we could not store them, and they have had to go unresponded to, save as I am now by this means responding to them and acknowledging the receipt of them, and the fact that I give due regard to them, together with all the other evidence which is being taken in the Military Affairs Committee, and all the other evidence that I can gain here on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere.

Mr. President, those cards are being received, and they cannot be answered otherwise than in this way. Their presence here is evidence of a widespread, a deeply rooted persuasion by the people of my State that we should proceed as rapidly as feasible and proper in the passage of a selective military service law. You will observe that the signers of the cards have not been specific. They have declared for a principle; and that is characteristic of Vermonters. I shall, of course, adhere to that in my service for them in the committee and in the Senate.

Mr. President, I desire also to have noted in the RECORD the fact that I have received numerous petitions reading as follows:

To the President and Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned American citizens, meeting at Middlebury, Vt., July 5, 1940, believe that our security and our way of life are

seriously menaced at this moment. We therefore urge the following program:

- (1) Continued and effective aid to Great Britain to insure her survival in this war of democracy against the totalitarian powers.
- (2) Modification of any American laws which may hinder such effective aid.
- (3) Quick passage of the Burke-Wadsworth bill for universal military training, with any necessary revisions.
- (4) Passage of such legislation as may be necessary to permit our citizens to volunteer for military service with Britain.
- (5) Speedy confirmation of the appointments of Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox as outward evidence of the unity of all Americans in the cause of American defense.
- (6) Whatever legislation may be needed to facilitate the removal to the New World of refugee children for the duration of the war.

I also have a similar petition from the town of Wolcott, Vt., which I should like to have noted in the RECORD, although I do not care to have the names printed.

Mr. President, I conclude with the request that these petitions be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. At the hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs this morning on the bill to which the Senator is addressing his remarks, the distinguished Senator from Vermont made a statement which impressed me as being entirely correct. He said, in answer to some questions, that in his judgment the people of the country were far ahead of Congress in realizing the importance of prompt action upon a measure for selective compulsory military training.

In that connection, I should like to call attention to the fact that a careful compilation shows that the press of the country, as expressed in its editorial policy, endorses the general principle of this bill and substantiates the position taken by the Senator from Vermont to the extent of about 90 percent.

As an example of that, let me read just one short excerpt from the Beatrice (Nebr.) Daily Sun:

Universal military training for all young men would be justified as an established policy by the benefits it gives the individual, even if unrelated to the national defense. * * * So long as we recognize the possibility, however remote, that armed defense may be resorted to, justice to those who may be called upon to provide the defense demands that they have preliminary training for their duties.

That is the thought which seems to have found lodgment in the hearts and consciences of the people over the country, that in fairness to those who may some time—we hope never, but may—be called upon to engage in the defense of this country, we owe them the duty of providing the training now while there is time.

If the Senator will permit me to do so, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point brief excerpts from editorials appearing in some of the leading newspapers of the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

INLAND EDITORS JOIN COAST EDITORS IN URGING NEED FOR IMMEDIATE LAW FOR SELECTIVE COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

A digest of editorial comment in daily newspapers throughout the United States on selective compulsory military training and service, as provided for in the Burke-Wadsworth bill, reveals that inland editors, as well as coast publishers, are 87 percent united in urging immediate action by Congress.

Heretofore it has been supposed that public realization of the danger of war and sentiment for naval and military expansion were keener in the Coast States than in the inland section. It is now indicated by a survey of editorials by the Military Training Camps Association, which is sponsoring the Burke-Wadsworth bill, that the inland States are just as alive to the perils of a Hitler "blitzkrieg" as are the more exposed States.

Of hundreds of editorials studied and collated, about 13 percent are either mildly or strongly opposed to the immediate enactment of a law for selective compulsory training, but admit that compulsory service will be necessary after war is declared. Most of the favorable comment, however, points out that it will be too late to train an adequate army and expand the existing land and naval forces after this country becomes actually involved in war.

Brief excerpts from editorials in some of the newspapers, both in support of and in opposition to compulsory training, are given below:

Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal: "Three months ago it was unthinkable that compulsory military service would ever be invoked except in case of war. * * * Today it has the approval of President Roosevelt and many of the very same people who considered it cross militarism a short time ago."

Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle: "It is folly to think that in an era when two or three million men are thrown into a single battle that the necessity of our country should rest upon the shoulders of an army of less than half a million men. * * * We must have millions trained and ready. * * * How is this manpower to be trained? There is only one known method, and that is some form of compulsory military training."

Albany (Ga.) Herald: "The idea that every citizen should be made to give a year or more out of his lifetime to serving in the armed forces of the Nation is not one which can be sufficiently sugarcoated to be made pleasant to the people of this Nation. * * * We hope that compulsory military training will not become necessary, but we believe that if it does this Nation will adopt it in the spirit of sacrifice without grumbling."

Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal: "There undoubtedly is a rising tide in the United States today in favor of compulsory military training, but it is doubtful if public opinion will support legislation at the present time. Volunteer enlistments can fill the requirements in enlargement of the armed forces to the size now contemplated. Until this fails, or the war menace becomes more dangerous, the United States can well pass up compulsory military training."

Alexandria (Ind.) Times-Tribune: "Compulsory training in the essentials of military operations, and especially as they relate to the handling of mechanized equipment and supplies for the fighting forces, appears as one of the certainties of the not far-distant future in the United States."

Amsterdam (N. Y.) Recorder: "We are in thorough sympathy with organization of the whole manpower of the Nation. * * * It is apparent that a great deal of thought has been devoted to the (compulsory training) program, for while every eligible man and woman in the country would be assigned to specific duties and trained for them, care has been taken to assure a minimum of industrial dislocation."

Annapolis (Md.) Capital: "If the United States is to drift still closer to war, and it has been drifting rapidly in that direction in recent months, universal military conscription will probably again be applied. * * * But any indication that this country will be compelled to resist invasion of this hemisphere will lead to clamor for universal governmental command of all resources, human and material."

Anniston (Ala.) Star: "As much as anyone else, we hate the idea of compulsory military training; but in the light of conditions that obtain in the world, it appears necessary. The only power a great army respects is an army just as great."

Antigo (Wis.) Journal: "Universal military training has gained more ground in the last few days than it has in the past 10 years. * * * The situation in Europe should therefore be a lesson to us; and from the activity that has already been started, we are apparently going to profit from it."

Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent: "We support it, irrespective of potential enemies, for the wonderful good it would do to the health, morals, and the manhood of our youth. * * * Military training is cleanliness and efficiency. It is independence and self-reliance. It hasn't a single draw-back, not a black mark. And some day it may be used to the salvation of the Nation."

Asheville (N. C.) Citizen: "If the United States is to be able to oppose their aggressions effectively, we will have to discard some of our traditions. We must be prepared at a moment's notice to throw all that we have in wealth and manpower against them if they seek to seize our possessions."

Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution: "We know of nothing to be said against compulsory military training for the United States except its cost. Experience might well prove more expensive to save money than to spend it. * * * Military training in a democracy teaches discipline and responsibility. It makes better citizens, physically and morally. Only in peace does a nation have time to prepare for war. If war comes, we shall have to fight, whether we wish it or not. The question is whether our men go trained and prepared or as mere raw material for enemy guns."

Attleboro (Mass.) Sun: "There is a widespread demand in a world where the makers of war seem to almost rule the planet for compulsory military training."

Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun: "If we are to expand our defense forces as planned, it is obvious that we cannot rely on volunteers. * * * There are not enough volunteers to do the job. * * * If these are times that try men's souls and strain their emotions, they are also times which test democracy's capacity for unity, sacrifice, and competent effort."

Baltimore (Md.) Morning Sun: "The Constitution gives the Federal Government plenary powers to provide for the national defense. * * * We have a defense problem of the greatest magnitude. * * * We must have trained reserves ready. * * * Such a necessary program cannot be manned by any system of voluntary enlistments. * * * National service, like taxes, must be asked of all of us. Indeed, such national service is a form of taxation, in that the Government must have it if it is to endure."

Baton Rouge (La.) Advocate: "Registration for compulsory service, military or civil, appears to be a primary and vital step toward the national self-discipline which we must acquire and without delay, if we are to meet successfully the regimented nations of the world."

Bay City (Mich.) Times: "Those who are looking upon the proposal for compulsory military training * * * in the United States as something foreign to our traditions are quite correct as far as peacetime service is concerned. But its advocates hold that what is lawful in war is also legal in preparing for war. If that is accepted as true, the compulsory idea is well supported by our history."

Beatrice (Nebr.) Daily Sun: " * * * Universal military training for all young men would be justified as an established policy by the benefits it gives the individual, even if unrelated to the national defense. * * * So long as we recognize the possibility, however remote, that armed defense may be resorted to, justice to those who may be called upon to provide the defense demands that they have preliminary training for their duties."

Berlin (Wis.) Journal: "Compulsory military training, or universal training, embracing certain age groups generally, is a thing this country must now consider. * * * Such training, because it would fall equally on all individuals within the age groups, would be fair."

Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune: "A month ago the Bismarck Tribune felt it might be extreme in suggesting compulsory military service for American youth. On the contrary, it found the people here supported the idea. * * * The Bismarck Tribune is an independent paper. * * * The point is that sound Americanism and a proper national-defense policy know no partisanship."

Bordentown (N. J.) Register: "There is a definite trend to universal military training for our American youth. Every sane parent in the United States realizes that a young man who has spent from 3 to 6 months in a military camp has better physical stamina to meet either the normal civilian requirements of later life, or the more severe test of military service in an emergency."

Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor: "If the United States had a background of universal military training there would be available several million trained reserves. The necessity now is to prepare such a body of citizen reserves as rapidly as possible. The United States, through Congress, ought to adopt now a compulsory universal service act along the general lines proposed by the Military Training Camps Association in conjunction with the War Department."

Boston (Mass.) Herald: "Compulsory military service, has been an odious expression. But various conceptions have been vanishing not because we have modified our ideals but because the world which is closing in on us is not the world of even 150 days ago. A proposal which we would have dismissed instinctively and angrily even a month ago must now be debated in cold blood."

Boston (Mass.) Herald: "The bill for selective compulsory military training and service which Senator BURKE has introduced should have the closest, most conscientious, most sympathetic attention of every American, whether a pacifist or a fire-eater, an interventionist or an isolationist. There is a preponderant sentiment in the country for something of this kind. The character of the sponsors makes ridiculous any assertion that this is an attempt to pervert democracy, to regiment us, and get us into war. The measure is protective and preventive, and the motives are patriotic."

Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express: "We believe that trained forces, freed for civilian occupations in peacetime but prepared at all times for the serious business of the soldier, are much to be preferred to the creation of an immense standing Army. Compulsory military training, however, is not something of the immediate in this country."

Carlisle (Pa.) Sentinel: "A bill to establish such a system of training and service is built on the right lines; thoroughly democratic in the sense that it calls on all alike; thoroughly fair in the sense that it does not seek to put the burden wholly on the young."

Centerville (Iowa) Iowegian: "America can continue to rely in the present emergency as it has in the past, to a considerable extent on its voluntary preparation for military service. We have had this through enlistment in the National Guard, through attendance at universities and colleges giving military training, by attending citizens' military training camps, by joining such organizations as the National Rifle Association, and in other ways."

Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer: "It takes a long time to create a large army by conscription. And there is much to be said for taking the preliminary steps promptly. Apart from its value as national defense, universal military service has certain definite uses. Compulsory military service is a democratic means of providing for the better defense of our homeland."

Champaign (Ill.) News Gazette: "Universal military training would not only greatly benefit young men physically but would mean training in arms invaluable in case of an emergency in which this Nation was called upon to defend itself. The advantages of universal training far outweigh any disadvantages."

Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier: "Let us have the compulsory military training. The News and Courier has always been for it. The News and Courier would advocate some form and period—not too much—of compulsory military service for all youth, whether a threat of war was present or not."

Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail: "We must face our defense problems realistically, and that obviously calls for universal compulsory training, if we are to have any program outside of the existing military establishment."

Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times: " * * * The experience of this Nation, since the first day it required the services of soldiers, has been that an adequate defensive force cannot be obtained by voluntary enlistment. And even if that method sufficed to raise an army of

a million men, the result would not be representative of the country as a whole. Such an army would not be a democratic army. * * * Without trained men we shall have spent billions of dollars for nothing. And the only way to train men in sufficient numbers and in the spirit of democracy is to call them up in the name of the people from every station in American life."

Chicago (Ill.) Daily News: "There is no worth-while opposition to proper military training for young Americans, and never was. Politicians have mistaken for public opinion the vocal outbursts of the few pacifists and reds who have harried the R. O. T. C. ever since the last war."

Chicago (Ill.) Tribune: "This country has need for a bigger army than it has today, but before it needs conscripts it needs the modern weapons with which they must fight and knowledge on the part of Army officers of how these weapons are employed. France fell not for lack of men but for lack of modern weapons. Until our Regular Army gets the weapons * * * and learns to fight in 1940 fashion, with 1940 cooperation between the various arms, and 1940 speed of movement, there will be no teachers for * * * conscripts. When the Army has caught up with the military times we can begin to think seriously of a program of universal military training."

Chilton (Wis.) Times-Journal: "It must be admitted that universal military training is inconsistent with the ideals of American democracy. * * * Better a system of voluntary training provided under Government auspices."

Clarksville (Tenn.) Chronicle: "Compulsory service for our young men is a sensible program. The simple fact that this country is fast realizing that we must build up a powerful military machine if we are to live in a dictatorial world."

Clinton (S. C.) Samson Independent: "We are inclined to favor compulsory military training, not only because of the present world conditions, but because we believe it worth while, even if we never went to war."

Columbus (Ind.) Republican: "The whole idea is contrary to American tradition and repugnant to most Americans, or at any rate, has been until now. But there is no question that young people of today need more discipline and more purposefulness."

Columbus (Ga.) Ledger: "America cannot take too many precautions to safeguard the Nation and maintain democracy. * * * Compulsory military training as we view it does not mean sending our youth off to battle, but merely a step in preparedness that would insure us an effective and trained arm of defense if the time ever came when we would need it."

Coshocton (Ohio) Tribune: "Universal compulsory military training does not fit into our needs, certainly at this time. On the contrary it would be a positive distraction from our main requirements in national defense—airplanes, pilots, an expanded navy and naval personnel, modernization of naval bases, increase in mechanical equipment for the Army. But universal compulsory military training would be more than a distraction. It would take funds which had far better be used in the improvements just enumerated."

Cumberland (Md.) News: "Americans are so nimble minded that they can jump in a few weeks from an isolationist policy to contemplation of some form of compulsory military service for young men. * * * If the worst fears for Europe are realized, not only a compulsory training period but also universal service under a draft law may become necessary."

Dallas (Oreg.) Chronicle: "Military training never hurt anyone. It will provide healthful, body-building activities for American young men."

Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald: "Its monetary cost would be enormous. So far, the readiness with which our young men have come forward to enlist in the various branches of the service has not indicated a need for compulsion. * * * Technically trained men are needed in the Army but it is possible without compulsory training. The man power that serves men behind the lines cannot be neglected."

Dallas (Tex.) News: "The safest procedure for this country now would be universal and compulsory training * * * with reserve duty made mandatory for a prescribed period after active service. The News reached this conclusion under the compulsion of events abroad, realizing that military training upsets a tradition of more than 150 years to which this newspaper has fully subscribed."

Dansville (N. Y.) Breeze: "Nothing should stand in the way of protecting the Nation, and youths certainly should not and will not be expected to go to war without training. * * * There is no reason in common sense why the youth who willingly go to the Government for assistance in earning a living should not learn the rudiments of military science."

Dayton (Ohio) Herald: "With war racing with the speed of planes and tanks, even democratic people must think faster than they ever have before. It is apparent that America must arm itself to the teeth to defend its freedom, and that requires men, millions of well-trained, resourceful men. And as we think (of becoming a totalitarian nation) let us remember that democracy, if it is to survive, must fortify itself to face a rough, tough world."

Daytona Beach (Fla.) Sun: "Shall the arms burden, in short, designed to protect all, be carried by all in proportion and in manner called for by ability? That would seem, in principle, to be the democratic way. In the World War compulsory service was immediately adopted as the only equitable and effective way to face the situation. It is not too soon to begin considering whether or not today's world demands that we come at last to the European system of universal militarization."

Denison (Tex.) Herald: The American people have never taken very well to compulsory military training. The British have taken the same attitude. Consequently the United States and Great Britain have entered every war in which they have been engaged unprepared. It is utter folly for a great nation to wait until war has been declared before starting to build its army."

Dennison (Ohio) Paragraph: "The idea of compulsory military training for the youth of America gains strength proportionate to Hitler's drive through France. The establishment of such a system will be the country's best answer to the charge of Mussolini that the world's democracies are 'decrepit.' Congress and the country should face the issue now. One fact that helps to make democracies 'decrepit'—if they are—lies in their slowness to reach major decisions."

Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal: "If the worst fears for Europe are realized, not only a compulsory training period but also universal service under a draft law may become necessary."

Duquoin (Ill.) Evening Call: "To call in peacetime for compulsory military service, no matter in what form it is disguised, is one more step—and a long step—in taking this country down the long, hard, terrible road the nations of Europe, victor and vanquished alike, are following."

Elwood (Ind.) Call Leader: The most elementary lesson to be learned from the war in Europe and from the strategy and tactics of the "blitzkrieg" is that there may be no time for military training, especially if the initial force is inadequate after a war has begun. Congress will be blind to the most glaring lesson of the present war, and negligent in its duty, unless it provides now at least for setting up the machinery for military training. Compulsory training is a form of insurance which has become essential in the present emergency."

Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guardian: "The nature of modern war makes universal military training almost imperative. * * * Those who argue that 'when we are invaded it is time enough to prepare' speak out of sheer ignorance of modern war."

Fayetteville (N. C.) Observer: "The burden should be spread among many shoulders by a universal military service law which would require at least 1,000,000 young Americans to undergo military service for a period of at least 6 months each year."

Florence (S. C.) News: The Morning News, while strongly opposed to compulsory service as a permanent policy as being utterly inconsistent with American ideals and the American way of life, is at the same time in full sympathy with such a legislative move for the purpose of coping with the present emergency."

Gary (Ind.) Tribune: "In the past, compulsory military training has been a moot question. * * * The answer usually was that we had no need of a large force of trained men. * * * The same answers can't be given now. It is not a question of being warlike but of being ready to meet an aggressive nation—or a combination of aggressors. We should consider seriously the advisability of instituting compulsory training."

Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder: "For the time being, however, it is generally believed that volunteer enlistments will strengthen the Army, Navy, and air services sufficiently to meet the emergency."

Greenville (S. C.) News: "If this country recognizes the need for training a great civilian army reserve for the long-term future, universal military training is the only answer."

Hamilton (Ohio) Journal: "Compulsory training for youth sounds distasteful. But is there a better way in these trying times to guard against attack and at the same time instill in the minds of people that this is a time when our responsibilities to our country are important, and that without a democratic government our homes, our businesses, our mode of living all will vanish?"

Houston (Tex.) Post: "It is doubtful if the United States can avoid compulsory military service under present conditions. We can reject the idea entirely only when some of the world's most powerful nations are willing to lay down their arms and return to a more peaceful method of settling international difficulties, and at this moment that day seems very far distant."

Iola (Kans.) Register: "We see no particular reason to shrink from the thought of universal military service for American youth. * * * If we must have universal compulsory military service in this country in order to live in this military world of today, let's have exactly that. Let's train men how to fight."

Indianapolis (Ind.) Star: "This country is 100 percent for preparedness, but for preparedness in the American way. * * * If there is need for personnel, why not appeal to the people, not order them?"

Jackson (Miss.) News: "Officers of the Mississippi National Guard adopted resolutions declaring that Congress should immediately provide for compulsory military training. * * * It might as well start now as later. * * * Every able-bodied man ought to be trained to bear arms in defense of his Nation."

Kalispell (Mont.) Monitor: "In the face of what has happened and is now going on in Europe, we feel that compulsory military training is one of the first phases of preparedness that should be adopted."

Kansas City (Kans.) Kansan: "The country's defense needs are going to call for some form of compulsory military training. But wars are no longer fought by military units alone. This is the age of total war, and if it should ever come to us, all resources and activities will have to be devoted to it. It sets no bounds to the power of Congress to use men in an army. It can take men and risk their lives; it can take them for the much milder purpose of training."

Kansas City (Mo.) Times: "The first step is authorizing the use of the largest possible amounts of relief funds for preparedness.

Then, as events require, a further just and equal principle may be applied through universal training."

Kinston (N. C.) Free Press: "Let's postpone compulsory military service until there is evidence that the traditional patriotism, exhibited and demonstrated in voluntary service when needs arise, is no longer motivating the hearts and souls of the men of this country."

Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal: "If in our democracy we have something worth fighting to preserve, then it is worth while that the fight be made intelligently and effectively when it comes. That can mean only one thing—proper training of American citizens; all of them. Universal service is the only way to insure this result."

Little Rock (Ark.) Gazette: "While the need is keenly realized for equipping and modernizing the Army and Navy on the material side, it must equally be recognized that the United States could not put a million young civilians into uniform and have an army of a million soldiers in a few weeks, or even a few months. Universal conscription would provide * * * the hard and fast military training that United States Army recruits now receive."

Los Angeles (Calif.) Times: "A year ago, had anyone dared make them, proposals for such staggering arms expenditures and defense taxation as we are now not only accepting without protest but actually urging would have been howled down in a chorus of indignation. And yet most of us will now admit that it would have been better for us if we had not lost that time for preparation."

Lowell (Mass.) Citizen: "There is no evidence of a general readiness on the part of young America to volunteer for military service; on the contrary, there is rather more than is comfortable of the idea that national defense is not an inescapable adjunct of American citizenship. * * * That's what these pacifists and youth coddlers have got us into."

Manhattan (Kans.) Chronicle: "Perhaps before many months have passed, the American public will speak out in favor of (compulsory) training, and the Congress will adopt such a program. If it becomes the will of the people, then let it be done, but it should not be sold 'wrapped up' to the American people. We wonder how many of those favoring it realize just what training is?"

Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal: "It (compulsory service) will be adopted eventually because realism is beginning to dominate in this Nation. * * * Selective compulsory military service will require sacrifice, but not out of proportion to the national need. * * * Military training is a great leveling process in which the gold is separated from the dross."

Meriden (Conn.) Journal: "Military power seems now to count more than justice or promises made in treaties. When a strong little nation like Holland can be beaten down in 5 days, it is time for even a great nation to polish up its weapons and learn to shoot."

Millville (N. J.) Republican: "Military training cannot be dismissed as jingoistic or war-mongering. Those who enjoy the blessings of democracy must be prepared to protect and preserve them."

Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal: "War asks better preparation than padding canoes and kindling fires without matches. Why deny our young men this insurance in a world in which we are surrounded on every side by the apostles of force?"

Moline (Ill.) Dispatch: "There can be no objection to a demand that every American regardless * * * do whatever he can to guarantee our security. Recently this newspaper recommended compulsory military training for all able-bodied young men. * * * It is a good thing to have every potential soldier trained in advance, by compulsion if necessary."

Monett (Mo.) Times: "What about compulsory military service? We should have an army and it should not be less than a million men. Such an army cannot be raised by voluntary recruitment. * * * First, there should be a general registration of all of America's manpower. Then * * * the Government could decide how many men it would need and what age bracket they should be."

Monroe (Wash.) Monitor: "With all the branches of the military service short on enlistment, we go on record as being wholeheartedly for a compulsory form of military training."

Montgomery (Md.) Independent: "By compulsory military training, if merely for the sake of physically developing our men, not to mention the rich lesson in discipline of which there is so little today, we can retain our position of physical supremacy throughout the entire world."

Moultrie (Ga.) Observer: "A year ago anyone who suggested compulsory military training in the United States would have been regarded as one of our wildest radicals. * * * We never dreamed that we would soon be imitating (governments that had conscription). Maybe it will blow over and the skies will clear up. We sincerely hope this will happen before we inaugurate compulsory military service."

Murfreesboro (Tenn.) Journal: "President Roosevelt said that he approved * * * a proconscription editorial. Every citizen is bound to serve and defend the state as far as he is capable. Society could not otherwise preserve itself' was the way the idea was expressed by an outstanding (French) jurist of the (1793) period."

Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean: "Volunteers are enrolling for military service. * * * but that is a slow and uncertain method of getting soldiers. * * * Before the days of the 'blitzkrieg' * * * there might have been some excuse for a leisurely approach to the problem of national defense. * * * Universal military service is well within the democratic tradition. * * * It discriminates against no class or station. If we are to become strong without delay, we must follow the only methods which give results."

Nashville (Tenn.) Banner: "Preparedness is, for a nontotalitarian state, the finest peace insurance. * * * Adequate preparedness

requires not only machines but men. It requires an army and such millions of trained men as could immediately augment that army should need arise."

New Orleans (La.) Item: "There can be no question that the individual who has had military training stands a better chance for health, life, and safety than the untrained man or boy, in peace as well as war. * * * Time is the essence of this situation. * * * The whole world knows what compulsory military service means. The enactment of an equitable law along these lines is worth a million speeches."

New Orleans Times-Picayune: "This newspaper shares the belief now finding Nation-wide expression that this Republic, for its own safety, must now adopt a system of compulsory military training."

Newport (R. I.) News: "For those who find the idea of compulsory military training in peacetime hard to accept, it might be proper at this time to quote from an opinion in World War days of the United States Supreme Court. 'Compelled military service,' the Court held, 'is neither repugnant to a free government nor in conflict with the constitutional guaranties of individual liberty. Indeed, it may not be doubted that the very conception of a just government and its duty to the citizen includes the duty of the citizen to render military service in case of need and the right of the government to compel it.'"

Newton (N. J.) Herald: "During the World War, thousands of young Americans lost their lives because of lack of training. It is not possible to give men a few weeks' training and pit them against well-trained, fully equipped troops, and hope to prevent unnecessary sacrifice of lives."

New York Herald Tribune: "Three months ago the mere introduction of a bill to establish universal service in the United States would have been politically unthinkable. The fact that Senator BURKE could lay before the Senate the bill sponsored by the Military Training Camps Association, calling for the registration of 40,000,000 American men and rendering all of them between 21 and 45 legally liable, as needed, for 8 months' service, represents an enormous advance. With the purposes of the bill this paper is wholly in sympathy. We are convinced not only that the Nation should have the power to call on every citizen in its own defense, but that this common obligation should be made plain to all, and made plain now, by some such measure as this one."

New York News: "We think the logic is all on the side of Senator EDWARD R. BURKE (Democrat), of Nebraska, who introduced the compulsory military training bill in the Senate the other day. Senator BURKE remarked in a radio debate the other night that there is no substitute for the strength to throw an aggressor out of the country, or to keep him from ever getting into that country. We see nothing for it but to adopt universal military training of American men for 1 year or 2 years—meaning every American man physically capable of taking such training, the job to begin when he is 19. It will be a fundamental change for this country to undergo. But we are convinced that it will be a change for the better."

Oneonta (N. Y.) Star: "While the days and weeks go marching on the people of the United States are agreed that we must build an Army and Navy. * * * but we are not doing very much about it. We need to start a program of immediate military training for the first men who would be called to support our standing Army, which is woefully small for a world like today's. The United States must prepare."

Ontario (Oreg.) Argus: "This newspaper never before entertained the thought that the time would come when it would voice approval of a program of compulsory military training for American boys. But times have changed. So, too, have the ideas of this publication. So long as there is a threat in the world to the continuation of American liberties, so long it will be necessary for Americans to defend them. So long as defense is needed, so long will training be required. That training should be compulsory and all-inclusive."

Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger: "Americans are called upon to weigh and act upon the most momentous issue that ever faced them. At any moment this country may become the sole torch bearer of western civilization. But America, too, is vulnerable. * * * Our greatest need is trained manpower. Compulsory military training should be instituted at once."

Palestine (Ohio) Leader: "Whatever may have been true in the past, compulsory military training is ineffective unless it has been started in time of peace. Congress will be blind to the most glaring lesson of the present war and negligent in its duty unless it provides now for military training."

Peoria (Ill.) Journal: "There are in the United States several hundred thousand young men who ought to be in the United States Army. They are men who could easily be taught the business of soldiering so that this country would have a backlog of personnel to handle the material which our national-defense program is to create."

Perth Amboy (N. J.) News: "You cannot get prepared overnight. Compulsory military training has always been a subject of controversy in this country. There will be opposition on the part of parents who didn't raise their boys to be soldiers. But, in the event of war, these young men would have a much better chance of surviving it, if they knew something about the business and had been trained for it."

Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin: "The idea that every man has a duty and a privilege in protection of his home and country will eventually be translated into a practical law."

Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Ledger: "What is the use of all these ships, all these intricate machines for the Army, all of the 50,000 airplanes to be built every year, if we are not prepared to man and operate them? * * * Every piece of mechanical equipment

must be understood by the men who must make them function. This applies to the simplest gun, the largest tank, the heaviest cannon. Every plane needs not one pilot, one combat crew, but many. All must know something of the job of all the others. * * * We have the men. We are spending billions to produce ships, equipment, and planes. Now it is up to Congress to make some provision for training the millions of men needed to make our defense plan work. It will not work without them. And training cannot be delayed until after hostilities begin."

Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic: "We have, of course, abandoned the idea of an efficient army flying to arms overnight. Fighting men are no longer besieging the recruiting offices. Compulsory military service became less objectionable as the perils of the European democracies seemed to increase. * * * Later an editorial in the New York Times urging compulsory training was given the approval of the President and, after that, of the press generally."

Pompton Lakes (N. J.) Ledger: "No one here believes in sending our men to Europe; but we do want them to find trained men when, after resting up a year or so, they tackle us through Mexico."

Port Jervis (N. Y.) Union: "Is it too much to ask our young people to give a year of their time to their country to be ready to protect it if it is necessary? The conditions that were found at the drafting in the last war ought to be a lesson to America to be prepared with able-bodied young men ready to start out at short notice."

Portland (Maine) Express: "Sentiment in favor of immediate adoption by the United States of the principle of compulsory military training appears to be gaining headway daily. It should! * * * America has the force potential. And for her own security she must convert it into an actual force of trained men—men not only willing but trained and able to serve, if and when the call should come."

Poughkeepsie (N. Y.) Eagle: "Everybody agreed on an arms program? Yes. Action. Let's go. To propose any (compulsory) training plan for peacetime operation would at any time in American history have produced a storm of opposition. Today even those who oppose it give it the gravest consideration."

Poughkeepsie (N. Y.) Star: "A little good old-fashioned discipline, be it imposed within the confines of a rigorous home life or by means of universal military training, can do no harm to an individual, irrespective of his background. The major problem appears to be unification and training, not of a few isolated hundreds of thousands, but of the citizens of America."

Plymouth (Wis.) Review: "In no other program are we demonstrating the characteristic weakness of democracies more than our efforts to secure national defense. * * * The Senators are still afraid they might lose a few pacifist votes."

Raleigh (N. C.) Times: "It is doubtful that anyone taking the C. M. T. C. courses regrets it. And, should war come, the beneficiaries of this instruction will be in a position to adapt themselves quickly to military life. * * * The draftee will be put through suddenly rigorous training, and in this predicament he might well wish that he had undergone previous military training toughening him for his new duties."

Ridgeway (Pa.) Record: "If we are going to fight a war, let's be prepared for it. Compulsory military training savors of dictatorship, but if America is to live as a democracy we must be prepared to fight for it."

Greenville (S. C.) News: "An important first need is that of military training of sufficient young men of military age to enable the Nation to call into service, if need be, a well-trained army of much greater size than the existing force."

Rockford (Ill.) Republic: "We in America should face the facts. We are vulnerable. Speed, in this age of the blitzkrieg, is the essence of liberty. It is imperative that practical steps be taken. We need trained manpower. Compulsory military service would be a terrific wrench on the American population, but it should be instituted."

St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch: "The Burke bill is sponsored by the Military Training Camps Association, and so would seem, on the surface at least, to represent informed opinion in the field of national defense."

St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times: "The all-important issue before the United States is self-preservation. Against that consideration and no other the Burke-Wadsworth bill must be appraised. If the answer is affirmative, then the lawmakers should not flinch from enactment of this bill. Nor should they be stayed by the sonorous charges that it is antidemocratic. It is in the best democratic tradition to demand that all men share according to their abilities in the protection of free institutions, providing that civilian standards are restored as soon as the danger is passed."

Salem (Ohio) News: "But it is blind not to see that the only way to preserve what is worth cherishing is to do promptly and decisively what seriously needs to be done."

Salem (Oreg.) Journal: "It must become apparent to any thinking person that if we are to have the manpower necessary for adequate defense, we must enforce compulsion of military training."

Salem (Oreg.) Statesman: "Most any veteran of the World War will testify that military training and experience did not make him a militarist * * * there is actually no valid argument against it. Military training hurts no one; it promotes democracy through fraternity, rather than building a caste system; it helps to build citizenship; it helps to build bodies, and to some boys it is fun, but they know that real war isn't."

Sandusky (Ohio) News: "Military sentiment in this country is growing at a surprising rate. Recent opinion polls indicate that 85 percent of the people think we are not safe from war."

Sanford (N. C.) Herald: "Military training, almost anyone will admit, is almost universally beneficial from the standpoint of physical fitness. It would be an untold improvement to our national health if every able-bodied man in the United States today had a certain amount of such training. If we ever go to war, our present trained armed forces are pitifully small beside the tremendous manpower that will be demanded. Therefore this manpower should have at least minimum military training and knowledge."

San Angelo (Tex.) Standard: "Should the United States immediately invoke compulsory military training? That question, asked of San Angeloans a year ago, would have drawn a chorus of 'noes.' Yesterday the chorus said, 'Yes,' and in no unmistakable tone. * * * Compulsory military training is the most vital factor in the preparations for war. Britain's fate is the best argument for action now, regardless of how foreign to the old American way it may be."

San Bernardino (Calif.) Telegraph: "Even the professional pacifists whose livelihood depends upon getting together a group so stupid as to be willing to pay for assurances of a false security will encounter tough sledding. * * * Compulsory military service means only that our young men would be able to defend themselves and their country if needs be. It does not mean it would necessarily make militarists of them."

Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat: "A growing movement is under way for compulsory military training in the United States. * * * The day of peace idealists, no matter how worthy their object, seems shattered. If we are going to survive in a world of force and violence, we, too, must have force of arms to protect ourselves. Any parent, no matter how he or she might grieve over sending a son away to war, would rather have that son adequately trained to defend himself than to send him untrained against legions of expert warriors."

Schenectady (N. Y.) Union Standard: "There are two steps, which, in our opinion, should be taken immediately. Step No. 1 is compulsory military service. Step No. 2 is the mobilization of the country's industrial resources."

Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer: "Everyone hopes that war can be avoided. But the fact must be faced that the liberties we enjoy were won by battle and may have to be defended the same way. We will have a better chance of avoiding war if we are prepared for that eventuality. And with universal training we will have an infinitely better chance of avoiding defeat in war, with its horrific implications."

Sheridan (Wyo.) Press: "In our opinion, military training is a very definite advantage for any boy, physically and mentally, and any boy who has a chance to get it is fortunate."

Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus: "The compulsory system should be avoided if it can. It smacks too much of the intense regimentation of the nations that are strictly militaristic and whose sole purpose in life seems to be to prepare for aggression."

Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review: "The necessity for instituting a system of universal military training * * * has been so clear from the start of our vast preparedness undertaking that it seemed strange the plan was not suggested at the same time that Congress was asked to authorize unprecedented expansion of armaments."

Springfield (Ohio) News: "The young man who volunteers to fight may happily need only to volunteer to train. Even this training may have to be made, like service in war, a universal rule. In the paying too, the day of conscription is at hand."

Staunton (Va.) Leader: "Compulsory military training is undemocratic, illiberal," say some. Are Switzerland, Finland, Holland, Belgium, France, and now England undemocratic, illiberal? It is necessary for America to become militarized to the extent of maintaining a huge army and navy, and the only fair, democratic, effective way to do it is by conscription."

Steubenville (Ohio) Star: "As the war crisis of 1917 proved, preparation of an army cannot be performed in a few months. Soldiering, even then, was beginning to call for specialists. Today, a soldier who has not learned his trade is hopelessly handicapped. Conscription, in the United States and everywhere else, is one of the unpleasant facts of a world at the mercy of unpleasant individuals."

Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald: "The trouble is that today the voluntary system simply isn't working. Unless it begins to work on a large scale in the very near future, some form of universal military service is inevitable. If the voluntary system fails, as is now indicated, we favor the step."

Swensboro (Ky.) Inquirer: "It is imperative that this country take immediate practical steps. Our greatest need is trained manpower. Compulsory military training should be instituted at once. Now is the time to start. We can prepare for war in peacetime."

Teaneck (N. J.) Times: "Our humble opinion is that people are proving themselves alert to the conditions that confront us and intelligently aware of the dangers we face. Preparations must include compulsory military training for all our physically fit men within the proper age limits in the quickest possible time, or everything else we do and every dollar we spend will merely represent wasted effort and money."

Texarkana (Tex.) Gazette: "Indications are that the United States will be compelled to adopt a system of compulsory military training as a measure of national defense, dictated by new conditions in which the whole world is an armed camp."

Topeka (Kans.) Capital: "Some readers may ask, 'Are you opposed to military preparation?' To that we emphatically answer, 'No.' We

are not even absolutely opposed to universal compulsory military service; it may become necessary."

Troy (N. Y.) Record: "Any constitution must set up a government able to defend itself. It must have power to use every resource, including property and human lives. Our Constitution does this."

Tucson (Ariz.) Star: "More than 6 months ago the Star said that in case of a German victory we would have to impose universal military training."

Tulsa (Okla.) World: "It is only sensible for a peaceful nation to take logical steps to prepare itself to turn back the threat of aggression. It is only fair for the Nation to expect universal contributions to that effect."

Tupelo (Miss.) Journal: "No nation in the world can defeat us. (But) even a brutal, inferior group, such as the Nazis, can defeat us unless we are trained and unless we have modern defense equipment. We hope that America will move with unprecedented speed in the training of every one of her citizens and in the production of defense instruments."

Union City (Tenn.) Messenger: "Now be it said to the credit of the Nation, since danger faces, a suggestion of compulsory military training is received with almost universal approval. And why not? Better to adopt a military policy than to be caught unprepared to defend and protect our Nation and its institutions."

Urichville (Ohio) Chevron: "We shall have a military draft law in this country, with large numbers of men enrolled in training. Our people, greatly shaken by recent world events, are determined to make our country, at least, and our hemisphere, if possible, secure from invasion."

Waltham (Mass.) Tribune: "Senator BARKLEY prophesied that no bill for compulsory military training would be passed at this session of Congress. That is a safe prophecy; on the eve of a political campaign no party will advocate the abandonment of a policy which, with one major and one minor exception, has been maintained since the foundation of the Government. Unless the United States becomes directly involved in war, there are little probabilities of any conscription plan. The plan which was so signally successful in the World War will probably be adopted."

Washington (D. C.) Star: "Favorable reaction in Congress to the selective compulsory military training bill sponsored by the Military Training Camps Association of the United States is a most encouraging indication that the legislators finally have made up their minds to deal with this urgent problem before adjournment. The British put into effect a system of compulsory military training, but by that time the war was so close at hand that there was no time in which to raise, train, and equip an effective army. The grievous consequences of that blunder are all too clear today, and it is simply inconceivable that this country should make the same mistake."

Washington (D. C.) Post: "Should the United States have to defend itself with arms in the future, it could expect no undisturbed period in which to prepare. It would need an army of trained men immediately. Such an army can be prepared in only one way—through routine compulsory military training."

Washington (D. C.) Evening Star: "Plainly, the almost incredible success of the Nazi campaign is based primarily on two factors—first, superior equipment, and, second, troops who were better trained in the use of that equipment. The French soldiers were trained—well trained—but not in the type of war they were forced to fight. * * * In the United States we are beginning the task of assembling the instruments of modern war. But in the equally important matter of preparing an adequate reserve of trained manpower we are doing next to nothing. As one reads of the collapse of France, of Marshal Petain's sorrowful admission that the Republic fell for three reasons—lack of equipment, lack of manpower, lack of determination—it is difficult to believe that we, as a nation, can be so indifferent to our own weakness. But the fact remains that no vigorous effort is being made by the administration or by congressional leaders to set up a system of compulsory military training based on the selective draft, the only fair and effective way in which the necessary number of trained men can be secured."

Washington (N. C.) Progress: "Repugnant as is the idea of compulsory military training for American youth, the state of world affairs suggests the wisdom of such a departure for this country. * * * And the sooner we get started on this policy the better."

West Palm Beach (Fla.) Post: "Whether rightly or wrongly, a majority of Americans have reached the conclusion that a victory for Hitler does constitute a threat to this country. * * * It explains why Congress can vote billions for national defense, with scarcely a murmur of disapproval. It reveals why even a proposal for universal military training was received by the country as a matter of course."

Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal: "A training system which would teach boys how to perform some manual or technical job, efficiently develop their self-reliance and sense of discipline, and keep them out of mischief would go far, not only toward solving our military defense problem but also our crime and vice problems."

Wichita (Kans.) Beacon: "There is coming an increased realization of the necessity of compulsory military training. Behind all the guns and cannon and warships and airplanes there must be trained men if the defense of this Nation is to be effective. * * * The sooner this Nation adopts some form of national military training the more effective will be the national-defense program."

Yonkers (N. Y.) Statesman: "If military training for youth is chosen by America, that, too, will be universal, allowing in either

case exceptions which the constituted authorities may find reasonable. Any other method of handling this matter would be following the totalitarian way, not the American way."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me before he takes his seat?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. One of the factors bearing upon the imminence or necessity of universal service, of course, is the degree of success or failure which the Army and the Navy are experiencing in respect to voluntary enlistments.

As I understood the distinguished Senator from Vermont yesterday when he interrupted the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], he indicated that there is some dispute as to whether or not enlistments are now proceeding at an adequate and satisfactory rate. I understood the Senator to say that he anticipated receiving authentic information upon that subject. I ask him if he now has it, because I think it is very important.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have been looking for that information, but it has not arrived. If the Senator will permit a further answer which is really not responsive, I should like to make this statement:

In the first place, we must have comparables in order to make a comparison. The figures which the Military Affairs Committee has, and which I quoted at the World's Fair, related to the first 5 months of the year, showing a net gain of between 14,000 and 15,000 men. The gross accretion was stated to be approximately 37,000; but taking into account the mortalities that occur through expiration of enlistment and other causes, the net accretion was said to be between 14,000 and 15,000 for the first 5 months. The figures given to me by General Adams, The Adjutant General, were for the first 6 months. I do not suppose the slack is all taken up in the sixth month, but it may be. So we cannot yet draw a conclusion from the divergence in these figures; but there should be this further consideration of the figures, namely, that these are the first enlistments. They are the response of those who are enthusiastic and patriotic, and are apt to step out quickly. If we are dealing with a quota for a much larger army, and have to take our voluntary enlistments from the last 6 months, the 18 months, and so on, I think it is a fair assumption to make that the stimulus for voluntary enlistment will thin out as we proceed with the larger demand.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] presented figures from The Adjutant General a few weeks ago upon which I based the same conclusion the Senator from Vermont evidently reached as a conclusion, namely, that voluntary enlistments are behind the quota. As I recall, those figures showed an enlistment of 8,000 men in the Army in 30 days, whereas the quota for July and August would be in the neighborhood of 18,000. So I assumed we were correct in saying that voluntary enlistments are not even now keeping up with the quota. But my understanding of the Senator's statement yesterday was that the War Department denies that assumption.

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes; definitely.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And says that the voluntary enlistments are up to the quota.

Mr. AUSTIN. Definitely. The Adjutant General stated to me that the enlistments were satisfactory, and that he did not like to have my statement get out, because its effect might be derogatory, might slow down the spirit of volunteers who are yet to be summoned; and if I have made a mistake, I am trying to correct it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The thing which bothers me is that I do not see how the statement of The Adjutant General can be paralleled with The Adjutant General's statement to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, I call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to a statement in this morning's press by no less an authority than Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum, in which he said that the haphazard methods

we have been following are incapable of creating an adequate force for defense.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does he deal with the specific question? It seems as though we should have an authentic answer as to whether voluntary enlistments today are furnishing an adequate quota.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think we should have the answer, and I am trying to get it.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator know whether the Army favors the conscription bill at the present time?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is another question. I asked specifically of General Adams whether he favored this principle, and he said that he did, that he did not want me to understand that his criticism of my statement was an indication of opposition to the principle of the Burke-Wadsworth bill. I believe the Army does not accept it in the very terms it now contains; that it is their purpose to present amendments, and I believe that the differences will be composed, and that a bill will come out which will be an improvement.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me suggest to the Senator from Vermont, in order to make the record clear, that my understanding is that the Army favors this proposition as a principle to be utilized as a method in case of emergency, but I likewise understand that the present task of the Army is to take the scattered forces of the Army over this country and make them into nine fighting divisions, equipped, insofar as is possible, in a modern way, and to have those divisions ready for call on 24-hour notice; and that in addition to that policy there will be some skeleton companies, composed, for example, of a captain and a lieutenant or two, a couple of sergeants and a couple of corporals, and that the new recruits will be put into those skeleton companies for training; that if all of the remainder of the Army personnel were put into the fighting divisions, so-called, there would not be any officers and non-coms available at this time to train a conscripted army, even if we were to start conscription tomorrow morning. They have just so much capacity for training, and during the time they are organizing these 9 or 10 or 12 fighting divisions, ready to go forward at a moment's notice, they could not take the personnel from those divisions to develop personnel from other sources in order to train and equip a conscript army, even if we had conscription.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, if that is offered as a reason for postponement, I wish to make the comment that first there must be registration, which will take time of itself. Second, there must be an administrative set-up created, and that will take time. Third, the poverty of officers for teaching is not so great as is claimed, I think, and under the selective feature of the proposed law, the law could be put into operation gradually and developed from day to day.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I was attempting to show, in the observation I was making, was that those who are prone to feel that the Army should have conscription now, and wonder why, when the men are not coming, they do not ask for conscription, overlook the fact that at this moment it would create a problem which would accentuate the present difficulty rather than aid in a solution. I was not saying that the Army did not favor setting up the machinery and eventually doing what the Senator suggests, but they do not want to do it now because of the reasons I have outlined.

Mr. AUSTIN. We expect to give the Army an opportunity fully to develop its views about this matter.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, following the remarks of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], a statement entitled "A Declaration Against Conscription."

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

A DECLARATION AGAINST CONSCRIPTION

The American people are today being deluged by propaganda for military conscription in peacetime. Sincere and distinguished as many of the proponents of conscription may be, and plausible as

many of their contentions may seem, we, the undersigned, urge the American people and their representatives in Congress to deliberate with sober caution before permitting such an unprecedented innovation to become a part of our national life.

In our judgment military conscription in peacetime smacks of totalitarianism, and we are convinced that its adoption would be highly dangerous to the spirit and traditions of American democracy. The reasons upon which we support this conviction are as follows:

First, the essential idea underlying military conscription is the major premise of every dictatorship and all totalitarianism. It is the assumption that the individual citizen is but a pawn in the hands of unlimited state power. Conscription has always been abhorrent to free men because it is, in effect, a seizure of a man's body, time, and service by force and under threat of heavy penalty. For generations millions of Europeans have fled their native countries and become loyal and devoted American citizens in order to enjoy, among other things, our freedom from conscription. Universal military service has been and is today the chief weapon by which dictators suppress free conscience among their people, inculcate them with the false ideals of chauvinistic nationalism, and indoctrinate them with belief in the superiority of brute force over morals and ideas. The adoption of conscription among Americans will be the opening wedge for the totalitarian dogma that individual citizens are pawns of the state from birth until death, without any rights which those in positions of power are bound to respect. Americans must not delude themselves with the belief that their democracy will remain unscathed if we adopt the essentially anti-democratic processes which have worked such havoc abroad.

Second, we consider that peacetime conscription is in itself a flagrant negation of democracy. We reject as transparent sophistry the contention that conscription under the name of "selective service" is democratic and that voluntary military service is undemocratic. The "equality" that conscription makes for is akin to the "equality" which prevails among regimented galleys slaves. It is no more democratic than any other form of involuntary servitude. Our American conception of democracy signifies vastly more than mere equality, for it also includes the great concepts of liberty and freedom for the individual. Furthermore, we deny that conscription can be justified by the assertion that it prevails in such democracies as England, Sweden, and Switzerland. The conditions we face in United States are in many respects widely different from and not comparable to those prevailing in European nations. For this reason valid conceptions of American democracy and military service must be derived from American history and tradition, not from contemporary European practices. In our view, peacetime conscription and American democracy are quite incompatible.

Third, the adoption of military conscription in peacetime would be a radical departure from historic American tradition. Never before in American history has it been thought necessary to resort to peacetime conscription for purposes of defense. This fact has been one of the truly glorious traditions of our American democracy; in common with most Americans we take profound pride in it, and we deny that the time has now come to abandon this feature of our national life because of the events in Europe, the gravity of which we well recognize. We are confident that the defense purposes enumerated in the Constitution—"to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasion"—can still be met and effectively discharged without resort to peacetime conscription. As ardently concerned for the safety of our beloved Republic as any advocate of universal service can possibly be, we reject the suggestion that to preserve American democracy we must embrace the worst feature of the totalitarian regimes. We deny that free Americans must now, in the name of freedom, submit to peacetime conscription and thereby become regimented vassals of the national state.

Finally, we oppose conscription because of the disruption it will cause in our American way of life, and also because we question its necessity and wisdom as a defense measure. The military regimentation of the entire manpower of our nation will inevitably result in widespread dislocation in business, industry, agriculture, and higher education; and it may prove unnecessary and ineffectual from a military standpoint. Conscription would have been unnecessary in 1917 if we had been raising a force for the defense of our territory rather than an army of 5,000,000 men for service in Europe. Today the asserted need is for substantial expansion in our Army, Navy, and Air Corps. If the personnel need is for highly trained permanent forces sufficient in number to man expertly the new weapons as they are produced, we contend this need can best be met by voluntary enlistments under pay schedules sufficiently attractive to induce the required numbers to enroll. By such a procedure it may well be that the required enlistments could be obtained before the new weapons themselves are ready. This solution for the asserted need would seem to us to be vastly preferable to the alternative of organizing huge forces of partially trained civilians. It would be free of totalitarian semblance, as it would be in keeping with our democratic traditions and conceptions. Moreover, it would be based on a recognition of the military lesson being taught on European battlefields—that comparatively small forces of highly trained soldier mechanics, properly equipped, can defeat many times their number of partially trained civilian conscripts regardless of how courageous the latter may be.

For these reasons, and for others, we appeal to all our fellow Americans who have a zealous regard for the preservation of their

democratic institutions to identify themselves with the cause represented in this declaration.

Rev. Ralph C. Abele, St. Louis, Mo.; Prof. Freeman H. Allen, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.; Rev. Paul J. Allured, Kinde, Mich.; Rev. R. M. Atkins, Flint, Mich.; Prof. Zonia Baber, Chicago, Ill.; Prof. Charles S. Bacon, Chicago, Ill.; Cyrus LeRoy Baldrige, New York City; Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, Cooperstown, N. Y.; Prof. Albert Barnett, Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev. Norman B. Barr, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Helen Marston Beardsley, Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. John Barrow, Berea College, Berea, Ky.; Prof. Howard K. Beale, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.; Rev. Canon Bernard Iddings Bell, Providence, R. I.; Rev. Shelton Hale Bishop, New York City; Alice Stone Blackwell, Cambridge, Mass.; Frederick H. Blair, Los Angeles, Calif.; Rev. Ralph E. Blount, Oak Park, Ill.; Rev. Edward H. Bonsall, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.; Prof. Edwin Borchard, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Rev. Dr. Charles F. Boss, Jr., Chicago, Ill.; Prof. W. Russell Bowie, Union Theological Seminary, New York City; Harold Leonard Bowman, Chicago, Ill.; Prof. Edward S. Boyer, James Millikin University, Decatur, Ill.; Fred G. L. Boyer, Hamilton, Ohio; Dorothy Dunbar Bromley, New York City; Rev. Dr. Edwin A. Brown, Cincinnati, Ohio; Hugh Elmer Brown, Evanston, Ill.; Zaidée Brown, Upper Montclair, N. J.; F. W. Burnham, Richmond, Va.; Harold S. Buttenheim, Madison, N. J.; Benjamin Cadbury, Moorestown, N. J.; Mrs. A. Morris Carey, Baltimore, Md.; Mr. and Mrs. Charles L. Carhart, Chevy Chase, Md.; Rev. J. Henry Carpenter, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. Harold F. Carr, Flint, Mich.; Richard B. Carter, West Newton, Mass.; Prof. Adelaide Case, Columbia University, New York City; Prof. J. McKeen Cattell, Garrison, N. Y.; Dean W. G. Chambers, State College, Pa.; Rev. A. Burns Chalmers, Northampton, Mass.; Harold A. Chance, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Don M. Chase, San Francisco, Calif.; Sarah Cleghorn, Manchester, Vt.; Prof. Frank W. Clelland, Atlanta, Ga.; David L. Clendenin, New York City; Prof. J. Herschel Coffin, Whittier College, Whittier, Calif.; Mrs. E. A. Codman, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Dr. Albert Buckner Coe, Oak Park, Ill.; Prof. Morris E. Cohen, New York City; Prof. Norman F. Coleman, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.; Rev. George L. Collins, Madison, Wis.; Dean E. N. Comfort, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.; Rev. Elbert M. Conover, New York City; Paul M. Cope, Atlantic City, N. J.; Mrs. J. Sergeant Cram, New York City; Rev. Dr. Henry H. Crane, Detroit, Mich.; Prof. Earl Cranston, University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.; Dr. Abraham Cronbach, Cincinnati, Ohio; Prof. Edward E. Curtis, Wellesley, Mass.; Frances G. Curtis, Manchester, Mass.; Rev. Wolcott Cutler, Charlestown, Mass.; Prof. Jerome Davis, West Haven, Conn.; Dorothy Day, editor, The Catholic Worker, New York City; Rev. Dr. Albert Edward Day, Pasadena, Calif.; Prof. John W. Darr, Scripps College, Claremont, Calif.; Rev. E. LeRoy Dakin, Milwaukee, Wis.; Dorothy Detzer, Washington, D. C.; Babette Deutsch, New York City; Prof. John Dewey, New York City; Prof. Dorr Diefendorf, Madison, N. J.; Harriet A. Dillingham, Santa Barbara, Calif.; Alice L. Dodge, New York City; Frances Doherty, Madison, N. J.; John M. Duncan, Petersburg, Va.; Prof. Huntley Dupre, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; Prof. Horace A. Eaton, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.; Mrs. Emily L. Eaton, Syracuse, N. Y.; Mrs. Rose K. Edelman, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Christopher R. Eliot, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. Ellen Coit Elliott, Stanford University, Calif.; Rev. Dr. Phillips P. Elliott, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Prof. Charles A. Ellwood, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Jane Evans, Cincinnati, Ohio; Allan Farquhar, Sandy Spring, Md.; Mary Farquharson, Seattle, Wash.; Rev. Victor G. Flinn, Brooklyn, N. Y.; William Floyd, New York City; Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes, Milton, Mass.; Rev. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, New York City; Margaret Gage, New York City; Mrs. Ruth Gage-Colby, St. Paul, Minn.; President Buell G. Gallagher, Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.; Mrs. Mary T. L. Gannett, Rochester, N. Y.; Dr. Merritt F. Garland, Haverhill, Mass.; Rev. Harding W. Gaylord, Farmington, Maine; Rev. Dr. A. C. Goddard, Rome, N. Y.; Mrs. A. M. Goldstein, Waco, Texas; Rev. Robert Cowan Grady, Cleveland, Ohio; C. Hartley Grattan, New York City; Rev. Dr. W. E. J. Gratz, Chicago, Ill.; Prof. G. H. Graves, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind.; Harold S. Gray, Saline, Mich.; Rev. Dr. Theodore Ainsworth Greene, Dublin, N. H.; Richard B. Gregg, South Natick, Mass.; Prof. C. H. Hamlin, Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, N. C.; J. J. Handsaker, Portland, Oreg.; Prof. George W. Hartmann, Columbia University, New York City; Prof. Georgia Harkness, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.; Stanley G. Harris, Jr., Seattle, Wash.; Prof. E. L. Harshbarger, Bethel College, North Newton, Kans.; Rev. Charles Hart, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Prof. Hugh Hartshorne, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; J. S. C. Harvey, Radnor, Pa.; William B. Harvey, Westtown, Pa.; Harold A. Hatch, Sharon, Conn.; I. A. Hirschmann, New York City; Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, New York City; Quincy Howe,

New York City; Clarence V. Howell, New York City; Paul H. Hudson, Upper Montclair, N. J.; B. W. Huebsch, New York City; Dr. Jessie Wallace Hughan, New York City; Rev. Harold Stone Hull, Pasadena, Calif.; Rev. Dr. Allan A. Hunter, Hollywood, Calif.; Rev. Dr. Stanley Armstrong Hunter, Berkeley, Calif.; Paul Hutchinson, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Dr. Finis S. Idleman, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. Philip E. Jacob, Princeton, N. J.; William C. James, Berkeley, Calif.; Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius Jansen, Pasadena, Calif.; Rev. Dr. Ray Freeman Jenney, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. Harold V. Jensen, Seattle, Wash.; Bede A. Johnson, Los Angeles, Calif.; Edwin C. Johnson, New York City; Rev. G. R. Johnson, Durham, N. H.; Bishop Paul Jones, Yellow Springs, Ohio; Prof. Rufus M. Jones, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.; Rev. Allen Keen, Shenandoah, Iowa; Rev. Harold R. Keen, Hebron, Conn.; Dean Frederick D. Kershner, Butler College, Indianapolis, Ind.; Edward S. King, Raleigh, N. C.; Dr. William P. King, Nashville, Tenn.; President Willis J. King, Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.; Harry L. Kingman, Berkeley, Calif.; Rev. Dow Kirkpatrick, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. Dr. Albert J. Kissling, Jacksonville, Fla.; Rev. H. P. Krehbiel, Newton, Kansas; Dr. Mary R. Lakeman, Swampscott, Mass.; Rev. Dr. William E. Lampe, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Leon Rosser Land, New York City; Carl J. Landes, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Dr. John Howland Lathrop, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Bishop W. Appleton Lawrence, Springfield, Mass.; Henry W. Leeds, Atlantic City, N. J.; Caesar S. Ledbetter, Charleston, S. C.; Frederick J. Libby, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Lola Maverick Lloyd, Winnetka, Ill.; Rev. John Leslie Lobingier, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Dr. Sidney Lovett, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Prof. Halford E. Luccock, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Prof. Eugene W. Lyman, Union Theological Seminary, New York City; Prof. Helen Merrell Lynd, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N. Y.; Prof. Robert S. Lynd, Columbia University, New York City; Robert W. MacGregor, Reed College, Portland, Ore.; Rev. Oscar Maddaus, Manhasset, N. Y.; Rev. Dr. Charles A. Maddry, Richmond, Va.; Horace Mann, Richmond, Mass.; Benjamin C. Marsh, Washington, D. C.; Prof. Kirtley F. Mather, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Milton S. Mayer, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Mary S. McDowell, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. William McFadden, West Lafayette, Ind.; Rev. Dr. D. P. McGeachy, Decatur, Ga.; Rev. Dr. Elmore M. McKee, New York City; Prof. Charles McKinley, Reed College, Portland, Ore.; William Ayer McKinney, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Dr. N. C. McPherson, Jr., Atlanta, Ga.; President O. Myking Mehus, Winona State Teachers College, Winona, Minn.; President W. O. Mendenhall, Whittier College, Whittier, Calif.; Rev. Dr. William S. Meyer, Ponca City, Okla.; Orle O. Miller, Akron, Pa.; Bert G. Mitchell, Seattle, Wash.; Bishop Walter Mitchell, Phoenix, Ariz.; Rev. Dr. A. J. Muste, New York City; Rev. Arthur Newell Moore, Houlton, Maine; Mrs. Ethel P. Moors, Brookline, Mass.; Rachel Conrad Nason, West Hartford, Conn.; Rev. Dr. J. Pierce Newell, Superior, Wis.; John R. Nichols, Pocatello, Idaho; Rev. Charles C. Noble, Glens Falls, N. Y.; Dean S. A. Nock, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.; Waldemar Noll, Berea, Ky.; Mrs. Victor P. Noyes, Gittings, Md.; Helena M. Nye, Stanford University, Calif.; Frank Olmstead, Leonia, N. J.; Mrs. Mildred Scott Olmsted, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Howard B. Osborne, Bridgeport, Nebr.; Prof. Harry A. Overstreet, New York City; Rev. George L. Paine, Boston, Mass.; President Albert W. Palmer, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.; Carl Patterson, Chester Hill, Ohio; Mrs. Marie Pautz, Los Angeles, Calif.; Frank C. Pettit, Woodstown, N. J.; Rabbi David Philipson, Cincinnati, Ohio; Mrs. Henry Hill Pierce, New York City; Dean Charles W. Pipkin, Louisiana State University, University, La.; Kenneth W. Porter, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Rev. Dr. Edwin McNeill Poteat, Cleveland, Ohio; Richard W. Pousette-Dart, Valhalla, N. Y.; President Roscoe Pulliam, Southern Illinois State Normal University, Carbondale, Ill.; Rev. W. P. Reager, Oakland, Calif.; Prof. Harris F. Rall, Evanston, Ill.; A. R. Rathert, Brainerd, Minn.; Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch, Columbia University, New York City; J. W. Reed, Portland, Ore.; Rev. Royal H. Reisner, Long Beach, Calif.; Bishop William P. Remington, Pendleton, Ore.; Rev. E. K. Resler, Strong, Kans.; Ray C. Roberts, Seattle, Wash.; Prof. George L. Robinson, Chicago, Ill.; Prof. Fred Rodell, Yale Law School, New Haven, Conn.; Prof. Herbert W. Rogers, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.; George Knox Roth, Los Angeles, Calif.; Constance Rumbough, Nashville, Tenn.; Dean Elbert Russell, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Arthur H. Sargent, Ellsworth, Maine; Porter Sargent, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. J. Paul Satterthwaite, Westfield, N. J.; Rev. John Nevin Sayre, Orangeburg, N. Y.; J. Henry Scattergood, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Dr. Paul E. Scherer, New York City; Rev. Alfred Schmalz, Darien, Conn.; Prof. Waldo Schumacher, Eugene, Ore.; Rev. Dr. Frank J. Scribner, New York City; Gale Seaman, Los Angeles, Calif.; Elizabeth Sessions, Hampden, Mass.; Rev. Dr. Charles M. Sheldon, Topeka, Kans.; Mrs. Robert E. Simon, New York City; E. W. Smiley, Warren, Pa.;

Mrs. Ida B. Wise Smith, Evanston, Ill.; J. J. Smith, New Concord, Ohio; Don E. Smucker, Chicago, Ill.; Prof. Theodore G. Soares, Altadena, Calif.; Guy W. Solt, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Dr. Frederick K. Stamm, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Dr. Joseph Stokes, Moorestown, N. J.; Rev. Thomas W. Summers, Houston, Tex.; Rev. Dr. Alfred W. Swan, Madison, Wis.; Prof. Arthur L. Swift, Jr., Union Theological Seminary, New York City; Rev. John M. Swomley, Jr., Harrisburg, Pa.; Alva W. Taylor, Nashville, Tenn.; Katharine Terrill, New York City; Norman Thomas, New York City; Leon Thomson, Lincoln, Nebr.; Rev. Dr. Ernest Fremont Tittle, Evanston, Ill.; Prof. Arthur J. Todd, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. Frank M. Toothaker, Compton, Calif.; Prof. Edward L. Tullis, Rapid City, S. Dak.; Prof. Harold S. Tuttle, College of the City of New York, New York City; Rev. Dr. Robert Leonard Tucker, Columbus, Ohio; William A. Tyler, Ogden, Utah; Oswald Garrison Villard, New York City; Marian DeC. Ward, Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. Carleton, Washburne, Winnetka, Ill.; Mrs. Margaret P. Welch, Boston, Mass.; Oliver C. West, Bronxville, N. Y.; Ruth West, Spokane, Wash.; Rev. Eliot White, Roselle, N. J.; Prof. Henry N. Wieman, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. George L. Willets, Caldwell, N. J.; Howard D. Willits, Portland, Ore.; Theresa L. Wilson, St. Johns School, Mountain Lakes, N. J.; Rev. and Mrs. Elwin L. Wilson, Biddeford, Maine; Richard Wood, Philadelphia, Pa.; Prof. Thomas Woody, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Harold Worden Wylie, Clinton, N. Y.; Dr. Howard E. Yarnall, State College, Pa.; President William L. Young, Park College, Parkville, Mo.

NOMINATION OF MRS. EVELYN ADAMS WHYTE—RECOMMITTAL

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, on yesterday, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, I reported favorably the nomination of Mrs. Evelyn Adams Whyte, of California, to be recorder of the General Land Office—reappointment. There seems to have been some misunderstanding in reference to the nomination and as to the office itself. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FRANK KNOX

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Knox, of Illinois, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the debate which has been proceeding in the Senate during the last 2 days in relation to the nomination of Colonel Knox and Colonel Stimson, and on other occasions, we have heard much said about the isolationist viewpoint. Columnists have bastardized its meaning by their peculiar bent of mind. Before discussing the matter of Colonel Knox's nomination, I wish briefly to say a few words on a subject which is often misquoted, misstated, and misunderstood, to wit, isolation.

The current of history is gaining daily added momentum. We have just heard a discussion in relation to the subject of preparedness, the question of drawing our youth into the Army by force. Six months ago the discussion of such a subject would have been out of order. But, as I have said, the current of history is moving swiftly.

Not only do words and phrases have their meanings changed, but overnight nations are obliterated and changed. New methods come into use in every field of human activity. Life is indeed literally "on the fly."

Consequently there is no place in a national-preparedness program for "ostrich minds." Such folks should be taken from the controls of government. We need men at the controls who can and will build America strong.

The dictionary defines "isolationist" as one who would have his country remain politically aloof from other countries. I repeat, "politically aloof." In other words, he is one who agrees with the original idea of Washington. He would have his country beware of entangling alliances. Washington, it will be remembered, spoke very clearly on this subject, but I want it understood that Washington suggested that we engage in free intercourse with nations, free commerce with all nations.

In his day Washington recognized that Europe had different ideas of life and living, different political ideas, that Europe consisted of a group of nations entangled by treaties,

by hatreds, by prejudices. So he suggested that we have no entangling alliances. Let me make it clear that if we had not followed this injunction, we today would be involved in the European conflict. In other words, if we had entered into treaties in relation to our defense, in relation to the war that is now spreading fast over the world, we would be called upon to defend not ourselves but others. We would be called upon to engage in war in case our ally were attacked. Then what would the situation be? What would we fight with? The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYNDINGS] yesterday again brought a message to our country which I hope every hamlet will be made aware of. He showed that we could not fight. So clearly did he demonstrate it that there should be no question at all about our intervening or mixing up in any quarrel, at least until we are ready.

Let us make it doubly clear that there is nothing in the isolationist doctrine which prohibits the flow of commerce between the nationals of this country and other countries at war. American nationals today are selling airplanes and munitions and supplies to Britain, and note this, to any other nation that can come to our ports and pay for such articles.

Not only the isolationist but everyone else who does not want to get America into war stands for the doctrine that this country as a political entity must not sell munitions or contraband goods to any combatant.

I said that this country must not sell such goods. That does not prohibit the nationals of this country, corporations, or institutions from selling, but this country must not sell. Why? Because if this country sold them it would not only violate the statute law of this Nation but it would violate international law, and it would be equivalent to intervention. It would mean war.

So we revert to the original idea, that an isolationist is one who does not want this country to mix up with other nations in other hemispheres in their political affairs and wars. He is one who wants no entangling alliances with nations in other hemispheres. Why? Because we know that is the road to war, and war would mean what we heard described very clearly and graphically yesterday on the Senate floor. It would mean the ruin of every democratic principle we have, at least temporarily. It would probably mean the submergence on this continent of all democratic concepts, as they are submerged in France. Besides, it would mean loss of life, destruction of property, and probable loss of the great American values.

An isolationist is one who does not want America to become involved in the quarrels of other nations. Now let us make it clear again so there will be no opportunity for anyone to misunderstand. The United States of America as a nation, under the isolationist theory, should not enter into political arrangements, or treaties, with nations in other hemispheres lest such agreements, arrangements, or treaties involve us in Europe's or Asia's quarrels. But, I reiterate, this does not prohibit any of our people from themselves selling for cash anything they possess to any of the combatant nations, nor does it prohibit any war-minded citizen in this country from joining as an individual the forces now fighting in other lands. He can do more than that. If any citizen himself desires to get into war he can give of his own property. He can give his own life. But the isolationist would prohibit this Government from tying up with foreign nations 130,000,000 people who compose this Government, when such action might result in war.

Again let us make it clear that an isolationist is not a pacifist. He is ready to fight if any of America's rights are invaded. The isolationist stands four-square for preparedness and defense. He says to the world, "America for Americans—the American hemisphere for Americans," and he stands four-square for the Monroe Doctrine.

All America is isolationist-minded according to recent polls. All America would send aid "within the law" to the Allies, but all America would not send her ships or her men, to fight on European soil, in Europe's war, unless such a war should become America's war.

In this stand all America shows her common sense, her horse sense. In the first place, we are unprepared. We can not fight battles nowadays with pea shooters because the other fellow will not fight with such weapons.

As this seems to be the sentiment of all America, it would clarify the situation if the President of the United States were to declare our foreign policy to be as stated above, and declare it unequivocally to conform to 99 percent of the sentiment of this country. It would not be a milksop way of putting it, it would be a strong American way of putting it.

America does not want war, but America will prepare herself so that if she is attacked, or her rights and her sphere of action invaded, she will then be able to defend herself. We must be ready then to put into action the saying that the "best defense is an offense."

Mr. President, as I have said, there has been much misunderstanding about the word "isolationist." It has been due in no small part to some of our columnist friends. There is as much misunderstanding about the word "isolationist" as there has been about the word "liberal."

Folks who have been liberal with other people's money, folks who have been careless with American values, folks who have dug up antiquated ideas and outmoded schemes have been called liberals.

Folks who have softened America even as France was made soft, who have taught that loafing, chiseling, and grafting should be indulged have been called liberals.

Yes, all the folks who advocate dressed-up outmoded methods, antiquated tactics, red-tape processes, caste controls have been called liberals.

But, Mr. President, are they? They have not brought about greater freedom, in political matters. A good many of them thought they were doing so, even as France thought so.

Mr. President, the folks who believe in political isolation, as Washington believed in it, have felt that in our own land there should be greater opportunity for the individual to develop, and less regimentation. They have not believed in the caste system which has prevailed under so-called liberal regimes. France had antiquated minds looking after her interests, that is why she is a vassal state today. We do not want such minds looking after America's interests. We want to be strong within. We want the inventive minds to have a chance. We want the great genius that has been dormant in America to express itself again.

Up through the years America waxed strong, due to the fact that the individual knew that he himself had to do the work of building, because there was not available the Government pap which may be had under so-called liberal leadership.

America must awaken to her dependence on self and build herself anew. She must go forth to meet the responsibilities of the present. She must get rid of the rut-ist mind, the mind that becomes set, and remains set. We have had too much of that in our armed forces. We have not had enough men like Billy Mitchell who had vision—to do what? To protect America. No, the rut-ist mind, the ostrich mind, has no place in American defense. We must adventure again, explore again, and get rid of antiquated, outmoded thoughts, actions, and methods. Let the crusading spirit be awakened again in America and we will build its defense.

As I said the other day when speaking in the Senate Chamber in relation to Billy Mitchell, "I pray God that his spirit may enliven and give vision to the men who control the safety of our America."

There have been at the controls of our Government too many men with ostrich minds, men calling themselves liberals. There have been too few isolationists—men who would build America strong.

Mr. President, I have listened to the arguments in relation to the nomination of Colonel Knox, and it seems to me that the issue is flatly presented in this way: What effect upon the country would the appointment of Colonel Knox have? Would the appointment mean war, peace, more preparedness, more defense, more safety?

We all recognize that, unless there is some vital objection, nominations submitted by the Executive of the Nation ordinarily are confirmed by the Senate as a matter of course. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] yesterday presented clearly the obligations of the Senate and the President in this matter. Each has a constitutional field.

The objections we have heard so far are not that Colonel Knox is a Republican but that he thinks as the President does in relation to intervention, or aid to the Allies. To me the fact that he is a Republican should enhance his value.

Lincoln realized that a difference of opinion in his Cabinet made for strength. He wanted independent minds. After listening to the editorials by Colonel Knox which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] put into the RECORD a few days ago, I am sure Colonel Knox has an independent mind, such a mind as is needed in the Cabinet of the President.

These editorials of Colonel Knox indicate clearly a grasp upon New Deal policies and their effect upon the Nation. They also show a keen character analysis of our political leaders.

After years of business baiting, this administration has now turned to industry to grind out its defense program; and it seems logical that now, after a woeful lack of defense preparation, the administration should seek the type of leadership represented by men like Colonel Knox.

This brings us to the real objection which has been raised relative to this appointment, the objection that Colonel Knox thinks as the President does in relation to the war situation, or, as it was phrased yesterday, that his appointment would create a war Cabinet. Much has been said on the floor of the Senate which would indicate that possibly Mr. Stimson's views too closely parallel certain administration views which might cause America to intervene. I can find no such degree of parallelism between the views of the President and those of Colonel Knox. An analysis of all the testimony thus far presented does not appear to bear out the conclusion that Colonel Knox is an interventionist. I should say that Colonel Knox is a "preparedist," a man who would prepare. I trust that before I have concluded I shall show why I think he should become a part of the "picture."

The testimony bears out the conclusion that Colonel Knox is sympathetic toward the Allies—now England, and what England represents. I heard him say in the committee room words to this effect: "I would see that England receives munitions and all the things she needs; not that I love England so much, but that there is need for a wall to stand between this Nation and the forces of destruction while we are preparing." In substance, those were his words. In that respect he shares the views of almost 99 percent of the people of this country, who feel that England's Navy has been and will continue to be a line of defense for America against the Nazi, Fascist, and Communist revolution.

Colonel Knox has stated that he is not in favor of violating the law of this country or international law, or doing things which might be construed as intervention or an act of war. He is in favor of seeing that England obtains all the legitimate and humanitarian aid it is possible for us to give her within the law. As has already been indicated, the phrase "within the law" is very important. In other words, he would have England able to buy in this country airplanes, contraband material, and everything she needs from the nationals—not the Government—of this country, provided she pays for them. As a matter of fact, any other combatant nation has the same rights, as I have stated.

We now revert to the principal issue. What effect upon the country would the appointment of Colonel Knox have? It seems likely that the appointment of Colonel Knox would have a healthy effect. This powerful and energetic Chicagoan retains his valuable capacity for getting things done. He retains his capacity for leading the "strenuous life" which he learned from his one-time chief, Col. Teddy Roosevelt. Make no mistake about it; he will need all his tremendous reserve of vitality and all his capacity for strenuous living to perform the tremendous job which will be presented to him.

When we think of this man's appointment, let us remember that he is the man who joined with Teddy Roosevelt to ride up San Juan Hill. These are days when we need men who can speak softly, but who carry a "big stick." I pray that he may be a great instrumentality in providing this Government with such a "big stick."

I do not necessarily agree with Colonel Knox's demand that we should have a two-ocean Navy, although I do believe that our Navy could be infinitely better along some of the lines he has advocated. I believe that in the interest of national solidarity Colonel Knox will at least be able effectively to press for the creation of an invulnerable armada, an armada whose activities would be more closely integrated with our air arm. I do not necessarily concur in every phase of Colonel Knox's foreign policy, but I am impressed by his dynamic plan for the formation of an aviation unit to recruit 10,000 volunteer pilots. This plan was launched weeks ago, and was put over almost immediately.

I am impressed by the fact that Colonel Knox combines the practical experience of a hard-hitting business executive—which we have been lacking for the past 7 years—with the practical experience of a one-time soldier. Colonel Knox is no theorist. The Government has been shot through with theorists. When the United States entered the World War, Colonel Knox enlisted in the Army. He became a major on the western front. When he was mustered out, in 1919, he retained a colonel's commission in the Three Hundred and Sixty-fifth Field Artillery Reserve for the next decade and a half.

Such a man can be a constructive force in aiding the Government to keep out of war and to secure preparedness. He is a man of ability and experience, and apparently his selection results from that very fact. I say "apparently" because some persons claim that these selections were made because of political reasons. I, for one, am reluctant to believe that anyone would play politics in such responsible appointments in trying times such as these. I know that if Colonel Knox should fail to do his part in securing preparedness for the country, he personally would be condemned, and the President would be condemned. If he should secure preparedness for this country, everyone can afford to bestow praise where praise is due.

My concern is not with the political implications of this appointment. I realize that Colonel Knox is faced with a tremendous task. The extent of the task is undoubtedly greater because Colonel Knox will have to start almost from scratch. I realize also that it has been charged that no man will be able completely to accomplish what is now demanded. As a consequence, it may be that Colonel Knox will be placed in the position of pulling someone else's chestnuts out of the fire, so that if he should fail the blame would be laid at his doorstep rather than that of the administration. I hesitate to make such an indictment. I prefer to believe that the Chief Executive is making a conscientious effort to reach out and obtain men of a different political persuasion to do a job which they may be better equipped to do than men of his own political faith. My sole interest in this appointment is to see that Colonel Knox will give leadership, so that our country may be properly looked after and safeguarded.

I met Colonel Knox for the first time in the campaign of 1936. I am satisfied that when he becomes Secretary of the Navy he will use his head. That is more than can be said for some Government officials, who should have been using their heads in recent years. He will not be merely a figure head. He will probably reach out and obtain the ideas of men who do not belong to the Navy clique. He will obtain men with inventive ideas, men with vision. I should not be surprised to see him anticipate much of what is now being considered in Europe, and make our ships more nearly immune to attack by torpedoes and bombs. He will consider new methods, new ways—and probably less expensive ways—to defend this country. He will not be asleep on the job.

In my opinion, the country needs men with such qualities. I believe that Colonel Knox is a man of common sense. I am sure he would not want to get this country into war. He

knows that we are unprepared. He knows war, because he was in two wars. He also knows what war would do to this country. I also believe he recognizes the significant fact that the greatest aid which could be given to England would be for America to stay out of the war, so that England, now fighting the battle alone, may buy in this country her arms, munitions, and other goods.

At any rate, I am glad to observe that the Chief Executive has finally arrived at the conclusion that if he is to get anything done he must obtain Republicans to do it. His recognition of this fact confirms what great sections of the country recognized in 1938, and what all the country will recognize and affirm in November 1940.

Mr. President, if I believed for one moment that this appointment was an attempt to foist an impossible job—made impossible by our present woeful lack of preparedness—upon a Republican so that he might then be blamed for a failure to complete our defense program, I could not sanction the appointment. If the appointment were made with the idea that through it there might result an unholy coalition predetermined and bent on war, I could not support it. However, I cannot believe such things; and I, for one, prefer to credit the Chief Executive with good faith. It is inconceivable to me that in these trying times anyone could act on such matters in anything but good faith. The President wants Colonel Knox and Mr. Stimson as members of a preparedness Cabinet. He needs such men to do a man-sized job.

Mr. President, in general it seems to me that the appointment of Col. Frank Knox is a sound move in bolstering confidence in the administration of our vast national-defense program. How important that is! The American people need a restoration of confidence, coupled with the desire to go to work, as suggested yesterday by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], not simply for 40 hours a week, but to go to work unitedly, as a nation, with one great object in mind—to be so prepared that anyone thinking about tackling us would fear the "big stick."

Colonel Knox should bring to the Navy Department both his practical insight into service needs and his executive experience as an outstanding businessman. He is a first-class fighting man, and he is able, trained, and energetic.

Mr. President, I believe that national defense must be neither Republican nor Democratic. If there is any competition between our major political parties with reference to defense, it should be the honest competition of each party attempting to render the fullest measure of leadership and patriotic service.

Our approval or disapproval of the selection of these two Cabinet officials must be based solely on America's best interests. I believe that Colonel Knox's selection will serve those interests.

Mr. President, these are dark days. Out of the shadows must emerge great leadership—leadership which transcends political expediency, leadership which calls lustily for non-partisan American action on important issues. I believe Colonel Knox can supply such leadership.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bulow	Connally	Green
Andrews	Burke	Danaher	Guffey
Ashurst	Byrd	Davis	Gurney
Austin	Byrnes	Downey	Hale
Bailey	Capper	Ellender	Harrison
Barbour	Caraway	Frazier	Hatch
Barkley	Chandler	George	Hayden
Bilbo	Chavez	Gerry	Herring
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Gibson	Hill
Bridges	Clark, Mo.	Gillette	Holman

Holt	Mead	Reynolds	Thomas, Utah
Hughes	Miller	Russell	Tobey
Johnson, Calif.	Minton	Schwartz	Townsend
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Schwellenbach	Tydings
King	Neely	Sheppard	Vandenberg
La Follette	Norris	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Lodge	Nye	Slattery	Walsh
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Smathers	Wheeler
Lundeen	Overton	Smith	White
McCarran	Pepper	Stewart	Wiley
McKellar	Pittman	Taft	
McNary	Radcliffe	Thomas, Idaho	
Maloney	Reed	Thomas, Okla.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SELECTION OF PERSONNEL FOR ENLARGED ARMY

As in legislative session,

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill which has as its stated purpose to procure a highly selected personnel for a Regular Army of 750,000 men. The bill provides for a compulsory registration of all males between the ages of 21 and 25, from which number would be selected enough men to bring the Regular Army up to a strength of 750,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator's bill compulsory?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under it all men from 21 to 25 would be registered, and from them there would be selected a sufficient number to recruit the Army up to the strength suggested by the Senator?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why stop at 25 years of age? I know of many very patriotic people who are older than that and who, seemingly, are interested in military affairs.

Mr. LODGE. The reason I have placed a limitation of from 21 to 25 is in order to avoid the delay which is incident to any wholesale registration. If there were a requirement to register all those between the ages of 18 and 65, it would take a much longer time than if those from 20 to 45 were registered, and, of course, the registration of those from 21 to 25 would take less time. I want to get men to meet the present situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas has no desire to quarrel with the Senator from Massachusetts. I want to say for myself, however, that while I hope we will never have war, in the next war, if it should come, I shall not consent to the sending of all the boys to war to be shot to pieces, and leaving at home a lot of the old boys who ought to be right by their side if we should have a war. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend for a moment. Under the rules of the Senate all demonstrations, applause, and conversation on the part of the occupants of the galleries are prohibited. Visitors in the galleries are here as guests of the Senate, and, as guests of the Senate, they will observe the rules of the Senate. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I continue to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Chair for his admonition to the galleries, but it looks as if every time I get any approval somebody has got to disapprove the approval. [Laughter.]

I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the boys have not had their chance in life. If when they get out of high school they are thrown into the Army and then sent to the battlefield, they will never have their chance. I am in favor of raising the age limits, when it becomes necessary to raise them, so as to take in some of the old fellows in some of the higher brackets who are sort of loose with their mouths and strong for patriotism, provided somebody else will do the fighting.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator 100 percent, not only as to those in the higher brackets but I should like, if the Burke bill ever comes up, to strike out the provision for the exemption of Members of Congress. I would take in

everybody. But this bill is merely a limited, specific, short-view proposition to bring the Army up to a respectable strength now. It is not a general proposal to establish a military policy over a long period of years. Of course, the Senator from Texas is entirely correct. We ought to distribute the burden so as to cover everybody, rich and poor alike, old and young, and make it as sweeping as we possibly can; but to meet the immediate situation in which the Army is not able to get soldiers, we want to avoid delay, and, Mr. President, we all know that the men who are best fitted to go out and operate military weapons are the men in their early twenties. There can be no argument about that.

I continue my description of the bill.

As I have said, it provides for a compulsory registration of all males between the ages of 21 and 25, from which would be selected enough men to bring the Regular Army up to a strength of 750,000. If the Army attains its expected total of 375,000 under existing law, this would leave a total to be procured by my bill of 375,000 more.

The bill contains provisions for the creation of a reserve from those who have served under its terms. It provides for service for 1 year in time of peace, and for a continuation of service during war.

Men would become liable for military service by lot with selection on the basis of fitness for service.

There is no exemption for public officials contained in the bill.

I think, Mr. President, there is a unanimity of professional opinion that the United States needs an efficient army which is immediately available for field service, such an army, of course, to be used entirely for our own defense. The times call for placing the emphasis on mechanized armies fully equipped and highly trained.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says an army that is only to be used "for our own defense." Is that what the bill provides?

Mr. LODGE. No; that is my own view. In my opinion, the United States Army and Navy should only be used for the defense of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. In no event outside the United States? Would the Senator stop at the seashore?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; certainly not. I use the word "defense" in the general comprehensive sense of defending America and its essential outposts; and, of course, if we see somebody coming at us, naturally we go out and stop them.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator would defend the Western Hemisphere, would he not?

Mr. LODGE. I would defend what I described here the other day as the base area, which is North America, Central America, and the coasts of the Caribbean.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator would not go down to South America?

Mr. LODGE. I doubt whether I would see much point in fighting for the Falkland Islands, off the tip end of South America.

Mr. CONNALLY. How about Colombia, which adjoins the Panama Canal?

Mr. LODGE. That is different.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is getting over into South America now.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that is correct. That is what I said; I said the coasts of the Caribbean.

Mr. CONNALLY. What about Greenland? Would the Senator regard that as in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. LODGE. Not only would I regard Greenland as in the Western Hemisphere but also Iceland.

Mr. CONNALLY. Iceland, or Ireland? [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Again the Chair must caution the occupants of the galleries that no laughter, no signs of either approval or disapproval are permitted under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator said that he would use the Army and Navy only for the defense of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought we had already announced here, by solemn legislative act, that we would not permit the transfer of any territory in the Western Hemisphere from one non-American power to another. It might be necessary for us to maintain that doctrine, and I am for maintaining it, with all the armed and naval forces we have and with all of our resources. If we are to maintain that doctrine, it might become necessary for us to use the Army for something other than purely North American self-defense, but for offensive operations as against those who might attack territories in the Western Hemisphere. I did not want the Senator to maneuver himself into a position in which we would have an army which, when it got down the road a certain distance, would have to stop because there was a traffic sign there and it could not go any farther.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no. I am much obliged to the Senator. Not only am I immensely flattered that he should take so much interest in my proposition, but I really appreciate his solicitude that I shall not be lured into an improper position.

There is no real conflict that I can see between us. I used the word "defense" in a general sense. Call it "the preservation of the United States" or any word you want to use; but I do not want to draw the sword except for an American cause. Let me put it that way.

As I was saying, Mr. President, I think the times call for placing the emphasis on mechanized armies that are fully equipped and highly trained, rather than on the development of huge mass armies with relatively little mechanization. If we have learned any lesson from the terrible war in Europe, I think it is that a modern army simply cannot be created after war is begun, and that if we do not actually possess military strength at the outbreak of the war we shall not be given time to develop it.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MINTON. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts will be interested to know that Col. Frederick Palmer, who testified before the Military Affairs Committee the other day, said that only a small percentage of the great German Army was mechanized.

Mr. LODGE. In this particular case I used the word "mechanized" in its broadest sense, to include motorized equipment and all the mechanical appliances. Of course, if tanks alone are to be counted as mechanization, the statement of the Senator from Indiana is correct. If trucks and motor transport are counted as mechanization, I should imagine that almost all of the German soldiers, certainly a great many of them, were transported in motors.

Mr. MINTON. I was surprised to hear from this authority, who was an eye-witness to the operations on the front quite recently, that this small percentage of the great German Army was mechanized.

Mr. LODGE. I think that statement is very interesting.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. Referring to the statement made by the Senator from Indiana, I wonder if he meant that the German Army, when it invaded France and Belgium, had a limited number of tanks. I recall reading that several thousand—perhaps 10,000—tanks were taken into France and into Belgium in the advance of the German Army. It seems to me that if we regard tanks as a part of the mechanized system, the German Army was pretty well mechanized.

Mr. LODGE. It is a question of percentage. A mechanized division contains about 10,000 men; and if you have, let us say, 10 divisions, that is 100,000 men. Out of an army of several million, of course, that is not a very large percentage measured from the standpoint of men; but judging it by its effect on the battlefield and its relative importance from a tactical standpoint, of course, it is very much greater.

The general statement still holds true, however, that in a war in which machinery plays a large part—whether it is tanks, or whether it is trucks, or whether it is electrical devices for recording the range of artillery, or whether it is photography, or whether it is electric welding, or whether it is any one of a hundred different occupations that are essential to the daily routine of a modern army—those things cannot be improvised on short notice; and when I use the term "mechanized" here, I use it in its broadest possible sense to describe our whole civilization. We have a mechanized civilization in time of peace, and that gives us a mechanized army in time of war; and that, I submit, is something that we cannot improvise on short notice.

Mr. President, prolonged studies by the War Department have long fixed 750,000 as the number of men who in all probability would be sufficient, in conjunction with the Navy, to defend America and its essential outposts. This is only a little larger, let me say, than the late Belgian Army. Congress has approved this study, and has appropriated funds to procure the weapons and equipment for an army of this size; and this equipment, as we all know, is supposed to be ready by December 1941 or early in 1942.

It is obvious that this equipment is worthless without men who know how to operate and fight it. There has been, however, a reluctance to procure the men. The plain fact is that we cannot have an army without men. To date, Congress has appropriated funds for an army of 375,000, such an army to be recruited by voluntary enlistment. It is a matter of common knowledge that for numerous reasons men are not enlisting in large numbers. The Army, at the last report I received, was experiencing difficulty in obtaining the men for an army of 280,000. What the result will be in its efforts to grow to 375,000 by voluntary means can only be conjectured; but I call the attention of the Senate to the statement in the press today by Lt. Gen. Hugh Drum, who surely is an authority of the highest standing, that the present—and I quote—"haphazard method" will never produce men adequate for the Army.

It seems to me clear that the voluntary system is not working. Faced with this fact, some persons suggest that men now on the rolls of the Civilian Conservation Corps and other Government relief agencies be placed in the military service. To my mind, to single out boys for combat service simply because they are of moderate financial means is undemocratic and unjust. The only fair way is to raise the necessary troops from all elements of the population, rich and poor alike.

My bill calls for only 375,000 men in addition to what the Army now has. That is a figure which is so small in comparison with the population of the country that it would create no dislocation whatever and would make it possible for the selections to be made almost entirely from men who are without dependents. As I said to the Senator from Texas, it would avoid the tremendous delay which is inevitable if we try to have a registration that embraces the entire male population.

It is my hope that by developing a standing army of 750,000 we may avoid the necessity for a mass draft and conscription of the total manpower of the country later on.

Ideally speaking, a relatively small army consisting of men who are temperamentally, physically, and mentally qualified for the military life is superior to a much larger body recruited in a wholesale higgledy-piggledy fashion, and including many individuals who are not adapted to the military life. We must not, in our bill, take in so much that we put weapons into the hands of the "fifth columnists" in this country. When we give a man military training and make him the power that he becomes by virtue of that training, I think we ought to know something about him; and we ought not to do it on a wholesale, rough-and-ready basis.

I point out that the army which Germany was allowed to have after the Versailles Treaty was limited to 100,000 men. The Allies prohibited Germany from having general conscription. What was the result? The result was that every rear-rank private in the German Army was a man of offi-

cer material; and all of those men, I am advised, are officers today.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish the Senator would be kind enough to develop the last point just a bit further, if he will. It is a most interesting point, and I think highly significant to the purposes he explains to us.

Mr. LODGE. Has the Senator in mind the difference between a professional standing army and a wholesale conscription?

Mr. DANAHER. I had in mind particularly how the officer material was created by the replacement of 100,000 men periodically, and their extraordinary selectivity in the first place.

Mr. LODGE. What they did is what I have covered in the title of the bill, provide a highly selected personnel. They were limited to an army that was very small, by all previous standards, but they exercised the greatest care in enlisting men in that army, so that every man they took into the army and trained was a man of the utmost merit. They continued along that line, never having anything but the highest quality, which gave them a nucleus, the results of which are apparent to the world today.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. I have not heard all of the Senator's explanation of his bill. Are there provisions in the bill as to the method of selection, and providing a proper method for determining, under the selective plan, who would be suitable and who would not be suitable for military service? It seems to me that it would be a very difficult task if there were devolved upon a board the duty of determining the selection, those who are to be brought into the Army and those who are to be excluded.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator that that is a very important question. The way I approach it is by providing for registration of young men, and then for selection by lot from such registration. Then those who have been selected by lot will receive tests to determine their fitness for service.

Of course, the findings of local boards would be of great importance in a matter of that kind, because while a man's physical qualifications can be described, and he can be given intelligence tests, there is a certain knowledge of a man in his community which a local board could impart. In brief, that is the provision I have made for that particular feature.

Let me say, in conclusion, that the bill is not introduced with any idea of taking a long view. It is introduced with the specific purpose of meeting the present situation. We have provided for the weapons, and we all know we should have men for the weapons, and we are not getting men. This is an attempt to meet that practical situation right now, in July 1940. I do not try in this bill to set up a system of military training for all boys when they reach a certain age. However desirable that may be—and there is much to be said for it—the first duty confronting us is to build up our defenses in this particular year 1940.

I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to introduce the bill, as in legislative session, for reference to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received, as in legislative session, and referred as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bill (S. 4202) to procure a highly selected personnel for a Regular Army of 750,000, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 874)

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in legislative session, the Chair will ask the Senator from Illinois to permit the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	Lodge	Schwollenbach
Andrews	Ellender	Lucas	Sheppard
Ashurst	Frazier	Lundeen	Shipstead
Austin	George	McCarran	Slattery
Bailey	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Barbour	Gibson	McNary	Smith
Barkley	Gillette	Maloney	Stewart
Bilbo	Green	Mead	Taft
Bone	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Thomas, Utah.
Burke	Harrison	Neely	Tobey
Byrd	Hatch	Norris	Townsend
Byrnes	Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Capper	Herring	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hill	Overton	Van Nuys
Chandler	Holman	Pepper	Walsh
Chavez	Holt	Pittman	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Radcliffe	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has been recognized, but the Chair, as in legislative session, was about to lay before the Senate a message from the President of the United States. The clerk will read the message.

The message was read, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

As President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of its armed forces, I come again to the representatives of the people in Congress assembled, to lay before them an extraordinary estimate of funds and authorizations required for the national defense.

In my opinion, it is necessary now that the people of this Nation and their representatives in Congress look at the problem of the national defense with utterly dispassionate realism. Never have we as a nation attempted to define the word "defense" in terms of a specific attack at a certain place at a certain time or with specified land and sea forces. In the long sweep of the century and a half since our defenses have been concentrated and unified under the Constitution, it has been a prime obligation of the President and Commander in Chief promptly to advise the Congress with respect to any world circumstances calling for either increased or diminished defense needs.

From time to time during the last 7 years, I have not failed to advise the people and their representatives of grave dangers threatening the United States and its people, and the institutions of democracy everywhere. From time to time I have availed myself of opportunities to reassert and to implement the right of all the nations of the American hemisphere to freedom from attack or control by any non-American power.

A year and a half ago, on January 4, 1939, in my address to the Congress, I referred to the fact that I had felt it necessary on previous occasions to warn of disturbances abroad, and the need of putting our own house in order in the face of storm signals from across the seas. On that day I said that a war which threatened to envelop the world in flames had been averted, but that it had become increasingly clear that peace was not assured. I said then that all about us raged undeclared wars, military and economic. I said then that all about us were threats of new aggression, military and economic. I said then that the storms from abroad directly challenged three institutions indispensable to Americans—religion, democracy, and international good faith.

Unhappily, many Americans believed that those who thought they foresaw the danger of a great war, were mistaken. Unhappily, those of us who did foresee that danger were right.

A week later, on January 12, 1939, I submitted a program considered by me as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and by my advisers to be a minimum program for the necessities of defense, saying that every American was aware

of the peaceful intentions of this Government and of this people, and that every American knew that we have no thought of aggression and no desire for further territory. The Congress granted that request for the minimum program then deemed necessary.

At the beginning of September the storm broke, and on the 21st of that month, in a message to the extraordinary session of the Congress, I said that this Government must lose no time or effort to keep this Nation from being drawn into the war, and I asserted my belief that we would succeed in these efforts. We have succeeded. I believe we shall continue to succeed.

In September last I increased the strength of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation within statutory authorizations made by the Congress. In January 1940 I submitted a Budget to the Congress which included provision for that expansion of personnel, as well as estimates for the national defense, amounting to approximately \$2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1941.

On May 16, in a message to the Congress, I pointed out that the swift and shocking developments of that time forced every neutral nation to look to its defenses in the light of new factors loosed by the brutal force of modern offensive war. I called attention to the treacherous use of the "fifth column," by which persons supposed to be peaceful visitors were actually a part of an enemy unit of occupation, and called especial attention to the necessity for the protection of the whole American Hemisphere from control, invasion, or domination. I asked at that time for a sum totaling \$1,182,000,000 for the national defense.

On May 31, 1940, I again sent a message to the Congress to say that the almost incredible events of the then past 2 weeks in the European conflict had necessitated another enlargement of our military program, and at that time I asked for \$1,277,741,170 for the acceleration and development of our military and naval needs as measured in both machines and men.

Again today, in less than 2 months' time, the changes in the world situation are so great and so profound that I must come once again to the Congress to advise concerning new threats, new needs, and the imperative necessity of meeting them. Free men and free women in the United States look to us to defend their freedom against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Those enemies of freedom who hate free institutions now deride democratic governments as weak and inefficient.

We, the free men and women of the United States, with memories of our fathers to inspire us and the hopes of our children to sustain us, are determined to be strong as well as free. The apologists for despotism and those who aid them by whispering defeatism or appeasement assert that because we have not devoted our full energies to arms and to preparation for war that we are now incapable of defense.

I refute that imputation.

We fully understand the threat of the new enslavement in which men may not speak, may not listen, may not think. As these threats become more numerous and their dire meaning more clear, it deepens the determination of the American people to meet them with wholly adequate defense.

We have seen nation after nation, some of them weakened by treachery from within, succumb to the force of the aggressor. We see great nations still gallantly fighting against aggression, encouraged by high hope of ultimate victory.

That we are opposed to war is known not only to every American but to every government in the world. We will not use our arms in a war of aggression; we will not send our men to take part in European wars.

But we will repel aggression against the United States or the Western Hemisphere. The people and their representatives in the Congress know that the threats to our liberties, the threats to our security, the threats against our way of life, the threats to our institutions of religion, of democracy, and of international good faith have increased in number and gravity from month to month, from week to week, and almost from day to day.

It is because of these rapid changes, it is because of the grave danger to democratic institutions, and, above all, it is because of the united will of the entire American people that I come to ask you for a further authorization of \$4,848,171,957 for the national defense.

Let no man in this country or anywhere else believe that because we in America still cherish freedom of religion, of speech, of assembly, of the press—that because we maintain our free democratic political institutions by which the Nation after full discussion and debate chooses its representatives and leaders for itself—let no man here or elsewhere believe that we are weak.

The United States is the greatest industrial nation in the world. Its people, as workers and as businessmen, have proved that they can unite in the national interest and that they can bring together the greatest assembly of human skills, of mechanical production, and of national resources ever known in any nation.

The principal lesson of the war up to the present time is that partial defense is inadequate defense.

If the United States is to have any defense, it must have total defense.

We cannot defend ourselves a little here and a little there. We must be able to defend ourselves wholly and at any time.

Our plans for national security, therefore, should cover total defense. I believe that the people of this country are willing to make any sacrifice to attain that end.

After consultation with the War and Navy Departments and the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense, I recommend a further program for the national defense. This contemplates the provision of funds and authorizations for the material requirements without which the manpower of the Nation, if called into service, cannot effectively operate, either in the production of arms and goods or their utilization in repelling attack.

In broad outline, our immediate objectives are as follows:

First. To carry forward the naval expansion program designed to build up the Navy to meet any possible combination of hostile naval forces.

Second. To complete the total equipment for a land force of approximately 1,200,000 men, though of course this total of men would not be in the Army in time of peace.

Third. To procure reserve stocks of tanks, guns, artillery, ammunition, and so forth, for another 800,000 men or a total of 2,000,000 men if a mobilization of such a force should become necessary.

Fourth. To provide for manufacturing facilities, public and private, necessary to produce critical items of equipment required for a land force of 2,000,000 men, and to produce the ordnance items required for the aircraft program of the Army and Navy—guns, bombs, armor, bomb sights, and ammunition.

Fifth. Procurement of 15,000 additional planes for the Army and 4,000 for the Navy, complete with necessary spare engines, armaments, and the most modern equipment.

The foregoing program deals exclusively with matériel requirements. The Congress is now considering the enactment of a system of selective training for developing the necessary manpower to operate this matériel and manpower to fill Army noncombat needs. In this way we can make certain that when this modern matériel becomes available, it will be placed in the hands of troops trained, seasoned, and ready, and that replacement matériel can be guaranteed.

I take this occasion to report the excellent progress being made for the procurement of the equipment already ordered under authorization by the Congress. Every week more and more is being delivered. The several branches of the Government are working in close cooperation with each other and with private manufacturers.

We are keeping abreast of developments in strategy, tactics, and technique of warfare, and build our defenses accordingly.

The total amount which I ask of the Congress in order that this program may be carried out with all reasonable speed is \$2,161,441,957, which it is estimated would be spent out of

the Treasury between now and July 1, 1941, and an additional \$2,686,730,000 for contract authorizations.

So great a sum means sacrifice. So large a program means hard work—the participation of the whole country in the total defense of the country. This Nation through sacrifice and work and unity proposes to remain free.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 10, 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair). Without objection, the message of the President will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2751) 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.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) authorizing the printing of the proceedings at the unveiling of the painting depicting the signing of the Constitution of the United States as a document, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FRANK KNOX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Frank Knox, of Illinois, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I presume that what I shall say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon will make little or no difference in connection with the final vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Col. Frank Knox, who has been nominated by the President to be Secretary of the Navy. However, it seems to me that in view of the charges which have been made on the floor of the Senate that this man is an interventionist and a warmonger, and desires to precipitate the Nation into war, at least I should do him justice by correcting the record in the United States Senate, even though it may not influence a single vote.

There is perhaps another reason why I should not delay the vote upon the confirmation of Colonel Knox's nomination. Yesterday on the floor of the Senate we heard condemnation because of delay, red tape, and indecision on the part of certain governmental agencies in dealing with our tremendous defense program. Yet the nomination of Colonel Knox was sent to the Senate on June 20, just 3 weeks ago, and we are just now getting around to the point of voting either to confirm or reject the nomination. We have required 1 week longer to reach a decision upon this very important appointment, in an hour of emergency, than Germany required to overrun the entire nation of Poland.

Mr. President, I have been a Member of the United States Senate for only a very short time. During my incumbency in office representing the State of Illinois I have never heard a measure dealing with our national-defense program or our foreign policy discussed without hearing from some source the statement that what we were doing in the way of changing the Nation's foreign policy or aiding our national defense was placing America on the road to war. I have heard that expression in the United States Senate, and over the radio. I have seen it in the press, and I have heard it on street corners, until I sometimes wonder how I have been able to keep my feet on the ground and not join the chorus of those who cry, "On the road to war," or "Down the road to war," or "This means war." That cry has been going on in this country for the past two years or more; and yet today America is still at peace, notwithstanding the utterances of many who were no doubt sincere in their belief that what the administration was doing at certain times was a step toward war.

During the neutrality debates a year ago I distinctly recall that more than one Senator and more than one newspaper editor, through the news items and editorial columns, stated

that if we should repeal the arms embargo it would be the first step toward entering the present European war. All through those debates that school of thought was presented to the American people with such force that letter after letter came to my office from mothers of sons who believed that if we should repeal the arms embargo immediately the sons of America would be marching in the streets, going off to war.

Mr. President, we recall that when we walked through the corridor of this building to hear the President's message delivered at the extraordinary session last year, a group of patriotic ladies surrounded Senators as they passed through the corridor and displayed all types of slogans urging us not to repeal the arms embargo because it would mean immediate war. Yet, notwithstanding the propaganda which went out over the country at that time, we did repeal the arms embargo, and in addition we formulated and placed upon the statute books the cash-and-carry plan.

Throughout these debates we have not heard a single word about the argument which was made a year ago with respect to the repeal of the Embargo Act. Every Senator who has discussed our possible entry into the war has used the Neutrality Act which we passed a year ago as a basis for his argument. He has advised the Senate and the public that it is probably the real reason why we are not in the war at this particular time.

I recall that many Senators voted against the Neutrality Act because they placed the importance of repeal of the arms embargo above that of the cash-and-carry plan; but to my knowledge not one word has been said in the debates on the confirmation of these two men as to what would have happened to the country if we had not repealed the Arms Embargo Act. At this particular moment the entire case of a Senator who voted against the repeal of the embargo and against the cash-and-carry plan rests upon the latter, and not the former.

In the present discussion we hear the words "warmongers" and "interventionists." We hear Senators saying that if Colonel Knox becomes a member of the Cabinet he will attempt to take the country into war.

Mr. President, yesterday the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], referring to the President of the United States and the various speeches he has made from time to time upon this very question, quoted from three or four speeches, or at least quoted the titles of them, leaving the impression with the country—as the Republicans have constantly done—that the President of the United States wants war. I challenge that statement. Anyone who cares to take the time to read carefully the speech which the President of the United States made in October 1937, in the city of Chicago, when he was dedicating a new bridge, will surely understand and appreciate the presence and statesmanship of President Roosevelt when he made that great speech.

Mr. President, I do not believe I am right all the time. If anyone can show me wherein I am in error, I am always willing to admit my mistake, and to go along with a policy or program which I believe to be right. I have always tried to be big enough to do so. When the President of the United States made that speech in the city of Chicago I said he was wrong. I thought it was a bold and daring thing to do. I did not think he was right, and I did not have any hesitancy in so expressing my views. But, Mr. President, President Roosevelt was so uncannily correct in his analysis of the world situation at that particular time that I take off my hat to him. In view of the remarks made yesterday by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], let me read exactly what the President said on that occasion.

Among other things, he said:

It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading. When an epidemic of political disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease.

It is my determination to pursue a policy of peace.

That last statement is always omitted. Those who are constantly condemning the President of the United States for

being an aggressor and wanting to get the Nation into war never use anything except the paragraph which I have just read; but I ask the Senate and the country to listen to what President Roosevelt said in 1937, after he made that statement:

It is my determination to pursue a policy of peace and to adopt every practicable measure to avoid involvement in war. It ought to be inconceivable that in this modern era, and in the face of experience, any nation could be so foolish and ruthless as to run the risk of plunging the whole world into war by invading and violating, in contravention of solemn treaties, the territory of other nations that have done them no real harm and which are too weak to protect themselves adequately. Yet the peace of the world and the welfare and security of every nation is today being threatened by that very thing.

That was said in October 1937. All over this country there rang from the lips of those who were Roosevelt haters, from those who disapproved of his foreign policy, charges that he was using this message at that time for the purpose of getting America into war.

He further said:

No nation which refuses to exercise forbearance and to respect the freedom and rights of others can long remain strong and retain the confidence and respect of other nations. No nation ever loses its dignity or good standing by conciliating its differences, and by exercising great patience with, and consideration for, the rights of other nations.

War is a contagion whether it be declared or undeclared. * * * If civilization is to survive, the principles of the Prince of Peace must be restored. Shattered trust between nations must be revived.

This is the President still speaking:

Most important of all, the will for peace on the part of peace-loving nations must express itself to the end that nations that may be tempted to violate their agreements and the rights of others will desist from such a cause. There must be positive endeavors to preserve peace.

He closes by saying:

America hates war. America hopes for peace. Therefore, America actively engages in the search for peace.

Mr. President, I unhesitatingly say that, in my humble opinion, from that day on the President of the United States has acted in the spirit of that last declaration and has actively engaged in the search for peace. His utterances, even in the message which is before the Senate at this very moment, prove that to be so.

I make the prophecy that history will record the unerring judgment of this man, who, as no other individual in this country, saw the approach almost 3 years ago of the present world calamity. He was attempting by that speech to fire the imagination of the American people to such a point that he might recommend even at that time the type and kind of preparation for defense on which we are working feverishly and furiously at this very moment. But the American people were in no mood for that. Mr. President, 6 months ago had the Congress of the United States attempted to put through a \$5,000,000,000 program for national defense, the senior Senator from Illinois would not have voted for it, and there could not have been found a dozen Senators, I dare say, on this floor who would have supported such a defense policy even 6 months ago when so many of us thought that the war between Germany and France was nothing more nor less than a "phony" war.

In the discussion of the question of neutrality, which was argued last year, and since that time the statement that we were on the road to war, made constantly over and over again, has created in this country, in my judgment, more war hysteria than any one thing that has been done.

Mr. President, what did the President of the United States say in his message to the Congress when we met in extraordinary session for the purpose of passing the neutrality bill, when men were crying out at that particular time, "The President is trying to get us into war; whatever he does means war; this fellow Roosevelt, in the White House, is not a peaceful man, he is a warrior." Very well, let us see what he said upon that occasion. He said:

Let no man or group in any walk of life assume exclusive protectorate over the future well being of America, because I conceive

that regardless of party or section, the mantle of peace and of patriotism is wide enough to cover us all. Let no group assume the exclusive label of the peace bloc. We all belong to it.

Yes, Mr. President, we all belong to the peace bloc, as the President of the United States said in the noble and inspiring message which he sent to the Congress of the United States at that time.

What does he say in the message which was just read by the clerk of the Senate with respect to this very matter? May I read one paragraph which I noted in scanning this message hastily a few moments ago? On the road to war. Some have said that the Democratic Party is a war party and that the Republican Party is the party of peace. We all belong, in my humble opinion, to the peace bloc. Mr. President, listen to what the President has just said—this is hot off the griddle:

That we are opposed to war is known not only to every American, but to every government in the world. We will not use our arms in a war of aggression, we will not send our men to take part in European wars.

That ought to be fairly satisfactory, Mr. President, to every Member of the Senate insofar as the President is concerned because he is directly connected with what we are doing at this particular moment in the confirmation of Col. Frank Knox to be Secretary of the Navy. If Colonel Knox is an interventionist and a warmonger, then, Roosevelt is an interventionist and a warmonger, notwithstanding the constant utterances for peace that he has made in more than one message to the United States Congress and from the platform upon many occasions.

Mr. President, I want it understood that I in nowise reflect upon the integrity or the sincerity of purpose of any Member of this legislation body. I grant every man the right to solve these problems according to the dictates of his own conscience; that is all I expect for myself. It is certainly that we all belong to the peace bloc, and the only difference is, perhaps, the method of approach.

I think that in the Senate we all are alert to the danger which exists to civilization in the Old World. We see at this moment the light burning rather low in practically all of Europe and in certain parts of Asia as well as Africa. I do not believe that any United States Senator will say that what is going on in Europe is not a menace to the democratic civilization of the New World and especially of these United States of America; that is proved beyond a shadow of doubt, because, Mr. President, we have seen in the last 60 days unity of thought, unity of purpose, and unity of action in the United States Senate which cannot be compared with anything in the past since the last great World War. I ask with the utmost sincerity why is it that Senators, regardless of their views as to England or Germany or France or any other nation across the sea, are now advocating almost fervently and passionately the program of defense which means billions of dollars of cost to the taxpayers of America? Why is it that practically every Senator in the last 3 or 4 weeks has voted for every defense measure that has come before the Senate?

Mr. President, have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, suddenly become imperiled? Is the security of the citizen threatened? Is the American way of living in danger? Are these fundamental possessions handed down to us by our forefathers amidst blood and tears imperiled in some way? If so, is it not our duty to ascertain from what ominous source the danger appears?

Why are we doing all of this? Why is the country aroused at this particular moment as it has not been, perhaps, since the Civil War?

Is it Poland, which was overrun by the ruthless German machine in 14 days, that we fear?

Is it Czechoslovakia and Austria, which were taken over by the German Reich in a bloodless war?

Is it little Denmark, which only wanted to live out its destiny in peace and quietude, that we fear?

Is it Norway, whose neutrality had not been violated for over a hundred years until Hitler went in?

Is it Holland that we fear—a peace-loving nation which for 147 years never drew the sword?

Certainly it is not Belgium.

Is it France, now prone on her knees, and powerless under the iron heel of the most ruthless dictator in the history of civilization?

Whom do we fear? Is it England? Are we making these preparations for fear of England, with her back to the wall, fighting the last great fight for democracy upon the other side of the ocean? Do we fear England? Do we believe that England somehow will turn, and train her guns and men and her ships toward America's shores and invade us? We have lived with Canada in peace for over a hundred years. We have lived with Great Britain and all her possessions in peace for over a hundred years. Is it Britain that we fear at this hour? If it is, why did we not become excited a year ago, and then appropriate billions upon billions when England was at her peak with her army and her navy, the best—at least the Navy—that the world knows anything about?

No, we do not fear any of those countries. If England now held the position on the international stage she had 1 year ago, with her fleet intact, with peace and security on the isle as it was then, we would not be here considering the confirmation of Colonel Knox and Colonel Stimson. We would be just continuing along the same path that we traveled in the past. No, Mr. President; the one fear that we have—and anyone who is honest must admit it—is the spread of the totalitarian germ from Europe to the Western Hemisphere. Of course, we do not care what type of government they have over across the way, but we do care what kind of a government comes in here through "fifth column" tactics, through subterfuge, and subversive movements, to destroy our God-given rights transmitted to us by the founding fathers.

Mr. President, let it be understood that I hold no brief for England. I have no special affection for the English people. I know they drove a hard bargain at Versailles. I know that there were punitive and disciplinary measures in that treaty which never should have been there; but we can not, at this particular moment, assess the blame of the past. We must look the world, as it is, coldly in the face, and look it in the face with a view of determining what is best for our own national defense and the future welfare of 130,000,000 people.

Yes, the only way, Mr. President, by which the totalitarian germ can be kept from spreading is to continue to have in this country the unity of thought and purpose and action that we have seen here on the floor of the United States Senate in connection with all of the defense movements that we have put through in the Senate. I undertake to say that that is what was in the President's mind when he asked Colonel Knox to become Secretary of the Navy.

On July 4, the President of the United States wrote a letter to the Council Against Intolerance in America, and in that message he said, among other things:

Nothing could be more fitting in this troubled year of 1940 than that we, as Americans, should supplement the Declaration of Independence with a declaration of national unity. The adhesion of every man and woman to such a declaration would insure, as naught else would, the perpetuation of those free institutions which have been the source of all of our greatness as a Nation and our happiness as individuals.

Mr. President, the stream of thought running through that message to the Council Against Intolerance in America was the same stream of thought that coursed through the brain of President Roosevelt when he asked for the appointment of Col. Frank Knox to become Secretary of the Navy. When the call for duty came, what did Knox do? What did he say? Here is the statement that he issued, as is shown in the records of the proceedings before the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Colonel Knox made the following statement. Listen to this. I wish every Senator could hear this statement, especially those who have judged this man in advance. I challenge any individual who wants to be entirely fair and impartial to read the record made before the Committee on Naval

Affairs, and I do not see how a single man who does so can vote against his confirmation.

He said this:

National defense is not a partisan question. It should have the united support of the people regardless of party. Congress in the past few weeks has acted with substantial unanimity on every national-defense proposal.

The administration of the Navy Department is in no sense political.

"The administration of the Navy Department is in no sense political."

The Navy knows no party. At a time of tremendous naval expansion it is vital that its management shall be wholly nonpolitical. The President has asked me to serve as Secretary of the Navy on that basis and on that basis—

On that basis—

I have accepted.

I firmly believe that in a time of danger to our country each of us must do whatever he can to meet that danger. As good citizens we must serve in whatever capacity is prescribed for us.

We are in danger now because we are inadequately prepared. The President has said I can help him. If I can help him prepare us for any emergency I must do so. What happens to me is unimportant. If I should be cast into the discard a few months later, the only questions I must answer to myself are these: "Did I do my duty? Did I do it well?"

It was not months later that he was cast into the discard. It was only a day or two afterward when he was read out of the Republican Party by John Hamilton and his coterie of sycophants up at the Philadelphia convention.

Mr. President, that statement was made by a man who for 45 years promoted the principles of the Republican Party in this Republic. That statement of patriotism was made by a man who was the candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket 4 years ago. That statement was made by a man who was a delegate at large from the State of Illinois to the Republican convention recently held in the city of Philadelphia. Notwithstanding that background of Republicanism, notwithstanding the fact that he is recognized as one of the 15 leaders of the Republican Party in this country, or at least he was until the recent Republican convention, this man, in my judgment—and I say it from a heart chisled with sincerity—placed his patriotism and service to his country above partisanship when he made that acceptance.

What had he to gain, other than the approbation of his own conscience, when he made that great decision, Mr. President? Today he stands in the eyes of many as an individual without a party, but a man who, in my opinion, will live in this country, as a result of his high patriotic ideals, when party labels are long forgotten.

Politics? It was not a matter of politics with Frank Knox. Of course I know that Frank Knox has been against the Democratic Party. Do I know it? I ought to; I live in Illinois. I know that he does not believe in a number of things that this administration has done. I know all about the editorial policy which he followed in 1936 against this administration. But domestic issues sink into insignificance at this particular moment, when the world is on fire and when patriots are needed, Mr. President.

At the recent Springfield, Ill., convention of the Republican Party Frank Knox was present. That convention put a plank in its platform which said, "The Democratic Party stands for war and internationalism, and the Republican Party stands for peace and Americanism." They placed the mantle of peace and Americanism upon their political shoulders, and laid the blood of the sword upon the brow of the Democratic Party. Frank Knox would have no part of that pusillanimous piece of political diatribe, and he went back to Chicago the next day and wrote an editorial condemning that very thing. We all belong to the peace bloc, Mr. President; and the party which attempts to inject into politics this question of defense, before it gets through, will be doomed to defeat.

Mr. President, if I wanted to play politics at this particular moment with this appointment, no one in the Senate would have a better opportunity of doing it, and a more justifiable one, if I may put it in that way. If I wanted to play mean, puny politics in connection with this appointment, I could do

it, because 2 days after I was nominated as United States Senator in the primary in Illinois in 1938, a flaming editorial appeared in Frank Knox's paper, the Chicago Daily News, behind whose editorial policy he stands, opposing my election in the fall and he told the State what a great fellow my opponent was.

Politics! If I could not rise in a great emergency of this kind above political consideration, I would expect to lose whatever respect and confidence the people of my State have bestowed upon me in sending me to the United States Senate. As one who is required under the Constitution of the United States to vote either for confirmation or against, I am a party to this action, and I wish to rise to the high plane of patriotism on which the President of the United States and Frank Knox stand at this particular moment. In doing that I do not want others to believe that I am reflecting on their judgment, upon what they may do; that is their own business. But I have a very strong feeling about this whole matter, in view of the record of the past. Roosevelt will long be remembered as rising above what Knox tried to do to him in 1936, issuing to him a challenge of patriotism; and Frank Knox was big enough to forget the past and accept that challenge of patriotism. The Senator from Illinois wants to be in the same category, so far as this great question of national defense is concerned.

It is said Frank Knox is a war monger, that he is an interventionist. What is an interventionist? Frank Knox gave as clear a definition of what an interventionist is before the Committee on Naval Affairs as Mr. Webster, or Mr. Hyde, the writer on international law, has given. Hyde, in his work on international law, says:

Intervention is sometimes by a written notice to the country intended to be coerced or by an international congress or conference, but coercion actual or intended is essential to constitute an act of intervention, and the term is usually understood as importing an armed interference.

What did Knox say about that? In the Senate committee hearing, on July 3, the Senator from Illinois read into the hearing a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Montana on June 20, and requested Colonel Knox to define the term "interventionist" as he understood it. He said:

I conceive in broad terms "interventionist" means intervening by force, and I am against that.

I said further:

If I understand it correctly, you say now to the committee and the country that an interventionist, in your opinion, is one who advocates the intermingling in a foreign debacle such as is going on now through the force of arms?

Colonel Knox replied, "That is right."

I further said, "And you are unalterably opposed to it, as you have testified, time and time again before the committee?"

Colonel Knox's reply was "Yes."

On June 20 the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] made a statement on the floor of the Senate which I wish to read into the RECORD at this particular time. He made this statement about Stimson and Knox:

Both of them have justly earned the high regard of the American people. Both of them are men of ability. Both of them are men of high character. I do not doubt the patriotism of either one of them, although I very violently disagree with some of their views. Each one of them has a right to his own opinion. But, Mr. President, I shall vote against their confirmation because they are both interventionists, not secretly, not clandestinely, but openly. The writings and speeches of both of them conclusively show that they favor a policy of American intervention. They are for war or for acts which amount to war and are certain to precipitate war.

Mr. President, I want first to commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri when he said what he did, that he wished it distinctly understood that his vote would not be cast because he believed for a moment that either of these men has been in treasonable or semitreasonable correspondence with any foreign power, or subjected to the improper influence of any foreign power, or because he was objecting

to their political views, or to the fact that both are ultra-reactionaries in their politics.

Mr. President, that is a frank statement, it is a statement which is not based upon speculation and conjecture, it is a statement which does not convict anyone upon innuendo. It is a frank statement as to why the Senator is against these men.

I propose to take the allegations of the Senator from Missouri briefly and prove conclusively to any fair-minded person and prudent man who wants to decide the issue on the record that Frank Knox is not an interventionist; furthermore, that he has said nothing which amounts to an act of war, or which amounts to an act which could precipitate us into the war.

Mr. President, I dislike very much to burden the Senate, but I honestly believe that a grave injustice has been done to Colonel Knox throughout the country by statements which have been made to the effect that he is a warmonger and an interventionist, and is likely to precipitate us into war, that he had a feeling we should intervene and send our boys to Europe to fight as combatants on land or on the sea or in the air in the European war. Before our committee he used a speech which he made at Cleveland last year as a basis of the entire philosophy of his foreign policy, not only then, but in the days to follow, so far as his editorial policy was concerned. He started out by saying:

I am one of those who refuse to believe we will actively participate in this new war—certainly not to the extent of sending an army overseas. And if we do not do that, all these trumped up fears of a wartime dictatorship and the destruction of both our democratic institutions and our free-enterprise economy are fantastically unreal.

With the wisdom that comes from experience, we know that the phrases, "a war to preserve democracy," or "a war to end all wars" were afterthoughts—rhetorical incitements to our war spirit. We will not fall for this form of incitement so readily again. We are far more in the mood to heed the wise words of Washington who, in his Farewell Address, adjured us in disputes with other nations to think of our own country first. So much for the contrast of our state of mind in 1917 and in 1939.

Again an editorial dated September 7, 1939, was inserted in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Keeping Us Out of War." In that he said, among other things:

We must keep out of this war. It comes first as a whisper of a half-believed hope in the hearts of millions.

We must keep out! It finds expression in the columns of the newspapers, on the air, and from the rostrum. This cry knows no partisanship.

We must keep out! It wells up from the whole people—North, South, East, and West. It comes from the factory and the farm. From the young and the old. From the poor and the rich.

And it thunders at the door of the White House, where sits the man in whose hands rests very largely the decision.

Last Sunday night that man, in reassuring, stirring terms, reiterated this universal hope when he said:

"I hope the United States will keep out of this war. I believe that it will. And I give you assurances that every effort of your Government will be directed toward that end."

You know, Mr. President, that this hope can only be realized if you have at your back the united people of the country.

Mr. President, that is the basis of my plea on the floor of the Senate in connection with this appointment.

We know that you know this for two reasons. First, because in the same speech from which we have just quoted you urged that partisanship and selfishness be adjourned; and second, because it was precisely in this way that you met the crisis of 1933.

Again, in an editorial of November 3, 1939, entitled "The Time to Think Is Now," he said, among other things:

What can be demonstrated, in fact has been repeatedly, is that those who advocated repeal are as vigorously opposed to the United States entering the war as are the champions of an embargo. There is no war party in the United States.

That follows out the message the President read to the Congress last year when we met here in extraordinary session.

Again, in an editorial that was introduced into the RECORD, dated April 11, entitled "The Scroll Unfolds," Frank Knox said:

Why do our public men, disregarding the multiplied evidences that American sympathy is overwhelmingly with those who fight

against such dictatorships as those of Hitler and Stalin, seek after the applause of the timid few who tremble before the ruthlessness of a bloody-handed tyrant, and would shush every utterance that told in simple words of American abhorrence of the Stalin-Hitler alliance, and its brutal inhumanity, injustice, and rapine, practiced at the expense of those who cannot defend themselves?

We are not called upon to fight. We do not expect to have to fight. God grant that it is not because we are afraid to fight—that way lies war. But national self-respect calls upon us to speak, as we have always spoken, without fear, when our national sensibilities have been deeply touched. Has that fearlessness for the right gone out of us?

I could read other editorials by Frank Knox written up to the very day he appeared before the committee and testified, which carried along the same philosophy so far as he was concerned, with respect to the present European war.

This is what he said about the Monroe Doctrine:

Shall we permit the practical transfer of political and military control over islands in the Caribbean Sea to pass from French into German hands?

The Monroe Doctrine, about the only clearly defined foreign policy we have, negatives such a change.

The safety of the Panama Canal, the uninterrupted operation of which is vital to our national defense, forbids it.

Congressional action, not 10 days ago, specifically declares against such a change in sovereignty.

It is clear that we must act—and act promptly.

Furthermore, in the new world created by new and undreamed of dangers, we, here in the Americas, must begin to think hemispherically.

Our danger is a common danger and our defense must be a mutual defense. In what better way could be begun this new mode of thought than meeting the first tangible danger by common action?

Again speaking of unity of purpose and unity of thought.

In the hearings on the question of sending boys across the sea to pull out of the fire the chestnuts of some foreign nation, what Colonel Knox said was definite and certain. Of course, it seems to me that all this talk about sending boys to Europe is more or less childish, because I do not know where we could send them at the present time. We would have to lease a field from Hitler on which to have them land, or on which they could fight somewhere, because England has more men than she can take care of at the present time. What England needs is materials and supplies, not men.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], on page 20 of the proceedings in questioning Colonel Knox, said:

Senator HOLT. You would not favor sending any of our boys to Europe under any circumstances in the present crisis?

Colonel KNOX. That is right.

Senator HOLT. Even if the vital interests of the United States can best be served by sending our boys over there?

Colonel KNOX. Let me say this again, so there will be no doubt about it. My position has consistently been from the first that we ought to aid them in a moral and economic way, never in manpower.

Senator HOLT. If the moral and economic way would not be sufficient for them to win, would you feel that we should go the rest of the way?

Colonel KNOX. No.

Senator HOLT. You do not?

Colonel KNOX. No.

Then, again, on page 24 of the proceedings, when the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was questioning Colonel Knox, the following colloquy took place:

Senator JOHNSON. The term "short of war," as you understand it—I am not speaking as to how others understand it, but as you understand it—"short of war" will mean doing anything you can do to aid the Allies, as you express it, and stopping when you reach the point where it may be necessary for our own military assistance?

Colonel KNOX. Yes; that is correct.

Senator JOHNSON. Now, you would not go to war under any circumstances in this particular misadventure that is occurring in Europe, would you?

Colonel KNOX. That is right.

Senator JOHNSON. You never, on any occasion, would attempt to send our boys, as we term it, abroad in a European controversy?

Colonel KNOX. That is right.

Mr. President, on the same day I had occasion to examine Colonel Knox as to what he thought a warmonger was, because he had been charged on the floor of the Senate and throughout the press of the country with being one. I read

to him the statement of the Senator from West Virginia upon the floor of the Senate, when he said:

These two appointments ought to be particularly pleasing to the warmongers, to those who think we ought to go to war; to those who think that isolation means putting our heads in the sand.

I asked Colonel Knox to elaborate and expand upon that statement if he cared so to do, and he said this:

Colonel KNOX. As I understand the term, it implies a man who seeks to involve his country into war, who thinks war is, under the circumstances, desirable. That is not my position.

Senator LUCAS. A warmonger and an interventionist, then, practically mean one and the same thing?

Colonel KNOX. Practically.

So, Mr. President, Senators who will take the speeches, or the editorials, or the statements made by Colonel Knox before the Senate committee and analyze them fairly and impartially will be compelled to give him the benefit of the doubt upon the question of intervention and warmongering. They will be compelled to vote for confirmation upon this occasion. Of course, if Senators are prejudiced against him, it would make no difference what type or kind of evidence he might give; but if they are open to conviction, as American jurors should be in a great case of this kind, when unanimity of thought and action is so necessary for the preservation of the Nation, it seems to me that they should be big enough to give this man the benefit of the doubt upon the question of the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. President, it was charged, at least by insinuation and innuendo, that Colonel Knox had holdings in South America and had made commitments to foreign governments before he was nominated by the President. That is emphatically denied in the record. Not only that, but he took the necessary precaution to dispose of every share of stock he had—and the amount was negligible—in any corporation in this country that was involved in the making of implements and munitions of war. In other words, he comes before the United States Senate upon this record with absolutely clean hands, as a patriot, wanting to serve his country in time of need.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that I shall vote for the confirmation of Frank Knox. He has the experience, the drive, and the capacity to speed full steam ahead in one of our crucial periods. He will get things done in this emergency regardless of red tape and delay. If the Senate refused to confirm this man, I say with the utmost sincerity that Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini would be the two real victors in this battle. It would give them comfort and encouragement. Yes; it would inspire and hearten the Nazi and Fascist agents in this country to continue their dastardly and diabolical "fifth column" tactics that we know exist within this Nation.

Yes, Mr. President, he has been in two wars. He was in the war of 1898 with Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders. Colonel Knox was in the last war, doing duty overseas.

Mr. President, that record has been made; it is one of honor and respect; yet, regardless of the heroic deeds he may have performed in line of duty in those two great emergencies, I honestly feel that what Frank Knox is doing at this particular time is just as high and noble and patriotic as any service he has ever performed in his long public life as a citizen and a soldier of this great Republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have listened with special interest to the vigorous, eloquent, and convincing address of the able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in support of the confirmation of the nomination of Col. Frank Knox. Yesterday I would have voted against confirmation because I honestly believed that he was selected to form a war Cabinet. Today I shall vote to confirm his nomination.

In addition to the able Senator's unanswerable argument, I have been tremendously heartened and reassured by one small sentence in the President's message just read to the Senate in which he said:

We will not use our arms in a war of aggression; we will not send our men to take part in European wars.

As I interpret this important sentence, the despised, so-called isolationists have won a notable victory. On this his-

toric day the noninterventionists welcome the President into their ranks.

Harry Woodring, a courageous statesman, the beloved former Governor of my native State of Kansas, and one of the greatest Secretaries of War who ever sat in a President's Cabinet, has not preached preparedness and nonintervention in vain.

Last night Governor Woodring spoke these significant words in a great gathering to welcome him home. I read from the Times Herald, quoting Secretary Woodring:

If reaction from my leaving the War Department as a known noninterventionist has caused modification of some policies and sobered some of those provocative and meddling advisers of the administration who would strip our own defenses, then I regret that I had only one set of guts to sacrifice on the altar of public service.

Many of us in the Senate say "Amen" to that notable statement by Secretary Woodring.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate very much what the Senator from Colorado has said in regard to my remarks. I do not quite follow him about having everyone coming into the isolationist camp.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I did not say that, Mr. President. I said the noninterventionist ranks. I did not say anything about isolationist camp.

Mr. LUCAS. I have never been able to find anyone on the floor of the United States Senate in making a public utterance, neither have I ever found anyone in the corridors of the Capitol, nor have I ever found any Senator in the lobby, with whom I have discussed the European war, who wanted to intervene. I challenge the Senator from Colorado to make a careful analysis and an exhaustive study of the speeches that have been made by the President of the United States, a number of excerpts from which I have just read. I contend that the President has been the champion of the peace bloc.

He foresaw with an unerring eye the calamity which has descended on the world at the present time, and he was one of the few who did. He was unable to convince me that he was right. He was unable to convince the Senator from Colorado that he was a right at the time in predicting what is now going on throughout the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In answer to the Senator from Illinois, I will say that I have read every word the President has spoken on this great subject; but actions have spoken louder and more eloquently than words. Actions prior to the present time have convinced me of the view I have held, that intervention is a very dangerous policy of the present administration.

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly do not disagree with the distinguished Senator upon the question of intervention. I have never given anyone the slightest intimation that I was for it in any manner, shape, or form; and all my utterances during the past 3 or 4 years will bear out that statement. I want the Senator to know that I am grateful for his change of viewpoint in connection with this matter, because I am tremendously interested in it. I honestly feel, from the bottom of my heart, that Frank Knox has really accepted this appointment as a call to duty in a time of great emergency and stress. Certainly nothing in the record could convince any fair and reasonable man that Colonel Knox is an interventionist.

I thank the Senate.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I rise for the same reason the Senator from Illinois rose, but to take an entirely opposite view. I know that no votes will be changed. I have no such result in mind; but I do feel that the RECORD should be made very clear and complete as to these appointments.

I hold no personal ill will in any degree against Colonel Knox; but I feel that his appointment as Secretary of the Navy would be dangerous. I feel that I have a constitutional duty to oppose the confirmation of nominations of those who I believe would be dangerous to the peace and welfare of my country.

A man may be appointed to the Cabinet for a number of reasons. First, did he give money to the campaign? Many members of the Cabinet in the past have been appointed for that reason and that reason alone. I am sure that Colonel Knox is not in that class. He may be called upon to buy a campaign book in 1940, when he is in the Cabinet, but so far he has not contributed to the campaign fund and is being rewarded therefor. He has not been appointed for faithful party service.

The second reason a man may be named to the Cabinet is that he may have specific qualifications in a particular department which would make him an extraordinary Cabinet official. Colonel Knox said—and correctly—that he has had no experience whatever in the Navy, in building naval vessels, or in naval affairs.

COLONEL KNOX ON DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

We must bear in mind that this is an important appointment in a particular emergency. Therefore we must look for some other reason why he might be named to the Cabinet. I do not say the reasons mentioned are my reasons for such an appointment. Let us consider his viewpoint on domestic issues. How has Colonel Knox stood on domestic issues? Was he appointed for that reason? I shall let the Senate be the judge. I myself will not make the decision. I wish to read what Colonel Knox has said—not what the Senator from West Virginia, RUSH HOLT, is saying, but what Colonel Knox has said:

Mr. Roosevelt is a strange figure in the American scene. He has squandered the savings and future earnings of not merely a part of our people but all our people. He has broken practically every pledge he has ever made to the people.

That is the statement of the new Cabinet member. Let me repeat what I have previously said on the floor of the Senate. Surely the President would not appoint a man who would not speak the truth. He must want a man who has good judgment, because we need men of good judgment in the Cabinet. This is what Colonel Knox said:

Mr. Roosevelt is a strange figure in the American scene. He has squandered the savings and the future earnings of not merely a part of our people—but all our people. He has broken practically every pledge he has ever made to the people. He has driven the people into another depression at a cost of 10,000,000 jobs and at a loss of some \$30,000,000,000 in the market value of securities owned by approximately 12,500,000 stockholders. He has weakened the banking structure of the Nation where some 48,000,000 of our people have deposited their savings. He has weakened the insurance companies with their 66,000,000 policyholders. He is using the social-security funds for the daily running expenses of his administration and as security for the appropriated savings is dropping I O U's into special funds in the United States Treasury.

This is the new Cabinet official, who I am sure is a truthful man. Speaking about the President, he said:

He has openly taunted the people about their constitutional rights, and he has ridiculed the Supreme Court of the United States by adding to its membership a common scold, and a Ku Kluxer to boot.

The reason why I am reading this is that we want to know why Colonel Knox is appointed at this particular time, and we want to see if his viewpoint on domestic affairs dovetails with that of the President so that the President desired to name him. Colonel Knox continues:

The President, though posing as both, is neither a true Democrat nor a true liberal—

I want some Democrats who are for the colonel to defend the President against such an attack. This is what Colonel Knox said:

The President, though posing as both, is neither a true Democrat nor a true liberal, but an aristocratic dilettante—

That is a word which I had to look up in the dictionary. I did not know what the word "dilettante" meant. Perhaps some Senators do not know what it means. I looked it up in the dictionary. According to Webster's dictionary, a dilettante is:

A dabbler in art matters; a superficial amateur.

I am not saying this. This is the statement of a man who the President feels has enough judgment to be in his

Cabinet. He would not be in mine, but the President wants him in his Cabinet. He says that the President is—

An aristocratic dilettante with radical leanings and an inordinate appetite for personal power. He has sought and received at the hands of a craven Congress—

He loves us. [Laughter.]

He has sought and received, at the hands of a craven Congress, personal powers over the economic life of the American people which he admits are inherently dangerous to our liberties and which are comparable only to the personal powers of Europe's dictators.

By his misguided efforts at price fixing, wage fixing, and other monopolistic practices, and by his philosophy of scarcity he delayed for 2 long years our natural recovery, which, indeed, began only after the Supreme Court had declared these efforts unconstitutional.

He has upset our monetary stability, clipped our currency, and diluted our gold reserve with silver.

By arbitrary grants of Federal funds he has corrupted the sovereignty of the States and undermined the home rule of local governments.

For the benefit of Senators who may have entered the Chamber since I started to speak, let me say that I am reading what Colonel Knox said about the President.

He has erected a multitude of alphabetical agencies and sent among us swarms of bureaucrats to harass us and devour our earnings.

Without solving either the problem of unemployment or the problem of relief he is wasting the people's substance in extravagant and unnecessary experiments, thus placing an excessive strain of taxes and an excessive burden of debt not only upon us but our children.

In his efforts to secure reelection he has set up a Nation-wide Tammany machine, lending aid and comfort to the most vicious elements in the local politics of our great cities.

While preaching benevolence and extolling freedom, he has heartlessly authorized or permitted his henchmen to try to frighten or coerce the poor and the unprotected into giving him their votes.

In urging the enactment of laws which he knew to be of doubtful constitutionality, he has ignored the true spirit of his oath of office that he would, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Let me make this emphatically clear. I am sure that the President would appoint a man who would tell the truth. Colonel Knox has said that the President would not pay any attention to his oath. This is what Colonel Knox says:

He has callously repudiated not only his own prelection promises but the solemn pledges of his party and the covenant of the Federal Government with the holders of its bonds.

In his reckless disregard of our basic liberties and his ill-considered impatience with our form of government, nothing will check him save a crushing defeat at the polls.

In a few moments I intend again to introduce Colonel Knox to the various members of the Cabinet. I have found some new quotations about them.

COLONEL KNOX CALLS PRESIDENT A "TORY"

This is a clipping from a speech in Boston, the home of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts:

PRESIDENT A "TORY," COLONEL KNOX ASSERTS—PUBLISHER, IN FIRST SPEECH AS AN AVOWED CANDIDATE, CALLS NEW DEAL "SMOKE SCREEN"—CHARGES ABUSE OF POWER—"NEVER HAD PATIENCE WITH IDEA THAT ROOSEVELT MEANS WELL," HE SAYS AT BOSTON

BOSTON, February 12.—Col. Frank Knox, in his first address as an avowed candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, charged the New Deal tonight with abusing power and the public trust.

He hurled back at administration leaders the charge of "Toryism" and asserted that President Roosevelt sought "to undermine the confidence of the people in business leadership to the end that they may place their trust in political leadership."

Colonel Knox, Chicago and Manchester, N. H., publisher, spoke at the Lincoln Day meeting of the Middlesex Club.

Just before the meeting, reporters asked him if he were a candidate.

"Yes. I filed this morning in Springfield," he replied, referring to the Illinois State primary.

For his platform, Colonel Knox referred reporters to his speeches of the past month in which he has denounced the New Deal as "autocratic" and as destroying fundamental principles of the Constitution.

"I never did have any patience with this idea that the New Deal is all 'phony' but that Roosevelt means well," Colonel Knox said. Colonel Knox, in his speech tonight, asserted that the President, by taking over legislative powers, had broken a balance of power which the Constitution established to protect individual freedom.

"History," he added, "makes it clear that complete power in the hands of one man or one group of men is the prelude to an era of arbitrary and capricious government; therefore I am against the government of men which has been set up by Mr. Roosevelt. I am in favor of a return to a government of laws.

"I am convinced the men and women who now seek to perpetuate the liberties guaranteed to them by the Constitution are the true liberals of the time. To me, the New Deal is essentially a Tory movement, and Mr. Roosevelt, seeking encroachment upon the liberties of the people behind a smoke screen of false liberalism, is the arch-Tory of them all."

As I say, I want to see why Colonel Knox was nominated. I want to see if he was nominated because of his viewpoint on domestic affairs.

This is from a speech which Colonel Knox made in Los Angeles. He was so sure of his position that he did not want to be misunderstood. Here is what he said, and I quote him again:

With a full sense of the meaning of my words, I ask, Are such acts in accord with the sacred oath taken not only to defend and to protect but to preserve the Constitution?

Then he becomes literary for a moment and asks:

Upon what food does this, our Caesar, feed?

Speaking of the President—

What madness has seized upon him? Does he not see how dangerously close this comes to conspiracy to break down our institutions of government?

Mr. President, I want to be sure that no Democrat will think I am saying these things. I do not believe them; but Colonel Knox, a very truthful man and now named by the President as a member of his Cabinet, has called the President a conspirator to break down our institutions of government. Of course, I am sure that when the Senate confirms Colonel Knox it will stamp its imprimatur on that statement and say it is correct.

Now, what does Colonel Knox think about it? Let me read further. I read this once before, but I think it is worth repeating.

Collectivists of every sort are supporting Mr. Roosevelt. That is natural. For at the root of his philosophy lies the view, shared alike by Communists and Fascists, that conditions have suddenly changed fundamentally, and that, in consequence, individual liberty under democracy, as hitherto practiced in this country, is no longer either desirable or feasible.

Colonel Knox said further:

Many people are confused about Mr. Roosevelt—

I admit some of us are confused; I will go that far—

Many people are confused about Mr. Roosevelt because his tactics are confusing, and are meant to be confusing. He knows very well where he is going. It is toward a kind of coercive collectivism—call it socialism or national socialism, or what you will. But, as a matter of tactics—

I want to make it clear that this is Colonel Knox speaking; it is not RUSH HOLT.

But, as a matter of tactics—

Speaking of the President—

he will not avow this aim. And to reach it he is ready to nod, smile, agree, assert, evade, deny, distort, distract—

I am not half way through yet [laughter]—

dally, retreat, startle, dazzle, juggle, sidestep, and circumvent.

He says the President in order to reach his aim "is ready to nod, smile, agree, assert, evade, deny, distort, distract, dally, retreat, startle, dazzle, juggle, sidestep, and circumvent."

I continue the quotation:

Our leader, incidentally, is a showman. He likes to astonish. He likes to keep people guessing.

He kept Frank Knox guessing for 6 months before he gave him this appointment—

He has a taste for the novel, the dramatic, the grandiose. He is strongly attracted by such vast notions as harnessing the tides at Passamaquoddy, planting a thousand-mile belt of trees in the wind-swept western prairies, digging a gigantic ship canal across Florida.

That was before the Congress stepped in the way. Colonel Knox knows whom the President gathers around him. I again quote from Colonel Knox:

In the past it has been customary for a President to gather around him, as his advisers after election, outstanding members of his party—men who helped nominate him and who fought for him in his campaign. But "our leader" has turned his party into a one-man affair. He has brushed aside the outstanding Democrats.

Now, there seem to be no outstanding Democrats fit to be Secretary of the Navy—

His general staff consists of Prof. Rexford Guy Tugwell, a sly social revolutionary; Henry Wallace, a farm-journal editor with a messianic complex; Harold Ickes, a reformer who imagines he is the only honest man in the world [laughter]; Jim Farley, an unscrupulous Tammany boss; John Lewis, a ruthless and ambitious labor leader—

I must not forget Miss Perkins—

Miss Perkins and Harry Hopkins, social workers with a bias against businessmen.

I desire a little later on to indicate what Colonel Knox thinks of the men he is going to sit with in the Cabinet. I want to introduce them to each other so that they will know each other better. I shall refer to that in a moment; but let me go ahead with Colonel Knox' words about the President:

Yes; "our leader" knows where he is going. He is devoted to the cause. He is disposing the forces. He is timing the attacks. Anything that increases his personal power, or that tends to break down the independence of individuals or groups that might oppose him, he favors. The C. C. C., a larger Army and Navy, a swollen Federal bureaucracy, Federal social-security laws, Federal relief, Federal public works, a managed currency—managed by him—and huge personal funds to spend as he likes—power over money, power over people—these fit his aim.

Meanwhile, anyone—

I do not think very many Members of the Senate would say this—

Meanwhile, anyone who brings him an attractive scheme to flatter the momentary hates or fears of the crowd, or to intensify class feeling, or to take money from those who are earning it and give it to those who are not, or to attract attention dramatically to "our leader," or to spend large sums under his personal direction, is assured of a sympathetic audience.

I shall refer to a couple of more quotations about the President. I have many others, but I do not desire to take the time of the Senate to read them all, and I am sure the President and Colonel Knox will become better acquainted as they meet in the Cabinet gatherings. Here is something else Colonel Knox has said:

When will the President find out that he cannot indefinitely be all things to all men? He cannot effectively boast of his democracy, while at the same time reaching out for unprecedented personal powers—powers which in other hands, as he has himself ingeniously admitted, would endanger the people's liberties. He cannot, while practicing collectivism, pose as the savior of capitalism. He cannot appear one day as a radical, the next as a conservative—and expect anyone to take him seriously.

The colonel must have taken him seriously when the President called him in and asked him to become a member of the Cabinet. But I will continue reading what Colonel Knox thinks of the President. This is the last quotation at this time:

A characteristic of the autocrat, as Kipling pointed out, is that he promises right, but brings wrong. So was it, only too lately, abroad. So has it been, all too lately, here.

For President Roosevelt is without doubt—

I want the Senate to note this statement. This is the new beloved member of the Cabinet speaking:

For President Roosevelt is without doubt the greatest autocrat in the history of this country.

After all this, the President must have had a pretty large throat for swallowing. But let me continue. This is not RUSH HOLT speaking; it is Frank Knox:

Behind the pleasant voice and the gay smile is the grasping hand.

Mr. President, you can determine for yourself what he means by that. I shall not do so at this time, because certainly I do not want to delay any more than I have to the proceedings of the Senate. I think, however, it would be unwise

not to introduce the different members of the Cabinet to Colonel Knox in the language of Colonel Knox himself. He is going to sit in the Cabinet room with Secretaries Hull, Morgenthau, Wallace, Ickes, Farley, Perkins, Hopkins, and Jackson. He is going to sit also with Secretary Stimson. He has not said much about Secretary Stimson, but I will quote some of the things he has said about the other members of the President's Cabinet. They should make it interesting when they all sit down at the same table.

KNOX APPRAISES CABINET

I now give a thumbnail sketch of the Cabinet as seen by the newest Cabinet officer, Col. Frank Knox. First, here is what he said about Secretary Hull—I am not responsible for these statements:

Mr. Hull is honest and well-meaning but weak. He will never rank among our great Secretaries of State.

Will Colonel Knox, when he attends his first Cabinet meeting, say, "How are you, Mr. Secretary? I am glad to meet you, but you will never be one of our great Secretaries of State"? I want to provide a little background so that they may introduce each other as Colonel Knox goes into his first Cabinet meeting.

Next, he will meet Secretary Morgenthau. Here is what he said about Secretary Morgenthau:

Henry Morgenthau is out of his depth.

When Colonel Knox goes to his first Cabinet meeting, will he say, "How are you, Mr. Secretary Morgenthau? I am glad to meet you, but you are just out of your depth"?

Referring to members of the Cabinet having a meeting, Colonel Knox said:

Somebody, probably not Mr. Morgenthau, had a bright idea.

In other words, Henry Morgenthau was not very smart; Mr. Knox did not give him credit for having any bright ideas at that time.

Then Colonel Knox will meet Secretary Wallace, and I will only repeat what I said a moment ago. He said that Mr. Wallace was "a farm-journal editor with a Messianic complex."

This will be a good one when he goes up to meet "old Ick" down there at the Cabinet meeting—Secretary Ickes. That will really be a good one, because this is what he said about him:

Harold Ickes, a reformer who imagines he is the only honest man in the world.

I am sure that when he goes up to meet Secretary Ickes in the Cabinet he will say, "How are you, Honest Harold?" And then he calls him a "stalwart of invective."

I do not think Jim Farley will be in the Cabinet very long, from all indications. I do not say this, but this is what the new Secretary of the Navy thinks of Jim Farley, as I mentioned a moment ago. He said he was "an unscrupulous Tammany boss." I disagree. He said of Miss Perkins—now, this will be lovely when he meets Miss Perkins—he said Miss Perkins is "a social worker with a bias against businessmen." He also used the same expression about Harry Hopkins, but he said Harry Hopkins is "a social spiritualist." [Laughter.] Well, I think he is just about right on that, only I do not think the statement is quite direct enough. You should hear what I call him.

This is what he said about the Attorney General. When he calls him up on the telephone to get an opinion I am sure it will be very lovely, because he said this about Bob Jackson:

Secretary Jackson is "a get-while-the-getting-is-good boy." [Laughter.]

That is all. There are only two other members left—Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox; but I am sure the members of the Cabinet will get along better after I have introduced them to each other.

Let us see who else there is. Of course, as Secretary of the Navy, Colonel Knox will have to deal with Tom Corcoran. The Members of the Senate know that; do they not? Sometimes you have to deal with Mr. Corcoran. This is what Colonel Knox said about Tom Corcoran. He said he is "head man among the whispering brigade"; and a moment ago I

mentioned the fact that I am sure at one of these receptions, when he sits down with the Supreme Court, he will meet Mr. Justice Black, and this is what he said about Justice Black. I mentioned it a moment ago. He said he is—

A common scold and a Ku Kluxer, to boot.

[Laughter.]

So it will be very lovely when these men sit down together at the Cabinet meetings. I will leave it to the Senate, after reading those things, to decide whether or not Colonel Knox was appointed because of his viewpoint on domestic affairs. He must have been appointed because of his viewpoint on foreign affairs. He does not like our State Department adviser. This is what he says about him:

Mr. Bullitt—

Of course, he is the one who does most of the advising. He says:

Mr. Bullitt himself would be the last to challenge the validity of that judgment in the light of his experience in Moscow. He must now have accepted the appointment to the vacant Embassy at Paris with a sense of deep relief. For in 3 years he has not been able to effect a settlement of vital Russo-American questions in such a manner as to earn the plaudits of his country. * * *

The reason for the failure is obvious. The Russians expected more of Mr. Bullitt, by virtue of his alleged sympathy with their cause, than they would have expected from a disinterested or avowedly unsympathetic ambassador.

Of the conduct of the State Department, he said:

In his negotiations with foreign powers, Mr. Roosevelt has not been fortunate. He muffed his chance with France and Britain in the spring of 1933. Two months later he laughingly broke up the London Economic Conference, and with it the world's hopes of speedy recovery from the depression. He has done nothing about the war debts. His off-and-on efforts at dollar-pound stabilization have got nowhere. Under him, our foreign trade, and indeed our foreign relations in general, have fallen to a new low. His Russian policy is a fizzle. His far-eastern policy is a naught.

The State Department under Roosevelt is not exactly a tower of strength. Mr. Hull is honest and well-meaning, but weak.

He will never rank among our great Secretaries of State. The President's diplomatic appointments have been equally feeble. Mr. Bingham in London and Mr. Strauss in Paris have been notable chiefly for their ill health, which has incapacitated them for months on end. Mr. Bullitt, first in Moscow, now in Paris, is a jolly amateur, a playboy. Mr. Bowers, in Madrid, spent most of his time writing books. Since the civil war broke out in Spain, with its many complications for the United States, he has been cruising safely on an American warship in the Bay of Biscay.

Mr. Roosevelt was a member of the memorable Wilson administration, which, in trying to keep us out of war, got us into it. He is by nature an experimenter. He likes to try new things. He is no more bound by precedent than by his own statements. Caution, with him, is something to be thrown to the winds. His hand on the tiller of a little sailboat may be skillful enough. But, judging by the zigzag course he has steered in the last 3½ years, his hand on the tiller of the ship of state is amazingly erratic. It is bad enough to have for President in time of peace a man who is overconfident, incautious, self-willed, uncertain, and unreliable. In time of war it would be disastrous.

But, now, let us see. Let us get down to the real reason for the appointment of Colonel Knox.

Colonel Knox was appointed because of his views on foreign affairs. This book called *The American White Paper* is supposed to have administration sponsorship. It is supposed to be the real viewpoint of the administration on foreign affairs. Colonel Knox once before was called to the White House; and it says:

Colonel Knox was called by the President to the White House to act as "mere window dressing."

Is he today being called to the Cabinet to act as "mere window dressing"? Of course, others can answer that question as well as I can.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

But, going into his viewpoint on the subject of foreign affairs, let me say frankly that after Colonel Knox got through testifying he almost agreed with us isolationists; and I am still an isolationist. I am not ashamed of it—not at all. Let me quote the words of Colonel Knox himself; not his interpretation, but his words on foreign affairs. This is what he said:

The primary duty of those charged with the conduct of our relations with the rest of the world is the protection, at whatever cost, of the vital interests of the United States.

If these vital interests can best be served by aloofness from any participation in the crucial struggle now in progress in Europe, then we should remain aloof and inactive.

If, however, our vital interests are involved and we will be critically and perhaps disastrously affected by a defeat of the Allies, and a victory for Germany, then indifference to the outcome and pursuit of a policy of rigid isolation not only is cowardly and despicable, but is as well a betrayal of our vital interests.

I questioned Colonel Knox about that. I said, "Would not the defeat of England affect our vital interests?" He said, "Most assuredly." I asked him if the defeat of the Allies would not affect our vital interests, and he said it would. In his own statement he said that if the vital interests of the United States were so affected, we should not remain aloof and he said the vital interests of the United States should be protected at any cost. I asked him, "Including war?" He said, "Including war, most certainly, to protect the vital interests"; and he said that our vital interests were at stake in the war in Europe, and then later hedged on his statement.

In his testimony he said we had given all the aid we could to the Allies; but he made this statement in his newspaper, and I think it is important. He tried to explain what it meant, but to me it states in plain English what it means. This is what he said:

Here is no qualified declaration; here is no limited pledge of assistance to those who are fighting the battle of freedom. All that we have, that they need to win that fight, will be given.

Let me repeat the last sentence:

All that we have, that they need to win that fight, will be given.

"All that we have" means boys. That is what it means. It means first to send them all the materials necessary; and then, if they are not enough, it means and it can unquestionably mean only one thing. "All that we have" means all, and "all that we have" means our troops, regardless of whether he says that he would not send troops across the ocean; and we can find that viewpoint expressed elsewhere. There is an outstanding point in that statement; but Senators talk about a speech he made in Cleveland and the Senator from Illinois has referred to it. Let me quote another speech that he made in Cleveland; not the one he gave to the committee, but the one I looked up and got in his own book. This is what he said, speaking at Cleveland:

May I say in passing the thing that perhaps will shock you. We hope, and some of us earnestly believe, that if another European war comes we can hold ourselves aloof and not be dragged into its turmoil, its suffering, and its cost of treasure and life. I share that hope, but it is without great conviction because what is happening in Europe, obvious to anyone who chooses to see, is a death grapple between two principles of government, the principle of democracy and principle of dictatorship. This is what I have in mind to say: It may come to some of you with a shock, that if that conflict is joined, if that battle begins and there is peril that the democracies of Europe are going under—

KNOX SAID "WE WILL BE IN"

Let me interpolate here that there is not a man in the Senate, who does not think there is peril of the democracies going under. We know there is peril of the democracies going under; but this is what Colonel Knox said:

It may come to some of you with a shock, that if that conflict is joined, if that battle begins and there is peril that the democracies of Europe are going under, we will be in that war on the side of democracy, whether we choose to be or not.

That is Colonel Knox.

Let me continue, and then I will comment on this statement. These are the words of Colonel Knox:

We cannot see the democratic principles go down without a certain knowledge that having defeated those principles in the Old World the victors there will cross the ocean to challenge them here.

We will be in the war, he says, if the challenge is against the democracies, and they are in peril; and I do not believe there is a man on the floor of the Senate today who will not say that the democracies are in peril.

Those are the words of the colonel on foreign affairs in Cleveland, just as much as the words that were read before. And what else did he advocate? Not only did he declare that this war was a war of liberty, and that the vital interests

of America were tied up in it, but he advocated in his newspaper the extension of credit to the allied nations. Let me quote his exact words:

If, as is entirely possible, we lend other and more positive assistance to the Allies, through modifications of credit requirements, the supply of munitions and foodstuffs, when Allied credit is exhausted—

Get this—

and then financial assistance, it will not be because we love England as our mother country, nor out of gratitude to France because of something that happened 150 years ago, but wholly because it is against our vital interests to have Germany emerge from this war with complete domination of both land and sea in the Eastern Hemisphere.

ADVOCATES REPEAL OF JOHNSON ACT

The last part is not important; but he does say that we would lend financial assistance to the Allies, and he specifically said so in his newspaper; and I asked him in the committee whether he did not favor the repeal of the Johnson Act.

Here is the exact statement:

Senator HOLT. Colonel, you have never advocated the extension of credit to England and to France, according to your statement; is that correct?

Colonel KNOX. No; that isn't correct.

Senator HOLT. You have advocated it?

Colonel KNOX. I have not. I said I had no objection to it if they were in desperate straits, and needed our help to that extent.

Senator HOLT. Wouldn't that be an advocacy of credit?

Colonel KNOX. It would.

Senator HOLT. And you would favor, if they need our money, extending credit to them?

Colonel KNOX. If they are in a desperate situation, and some of our money would help them to resist and prolong a war, and give us a better opportunity to get ready ourselves, I would be willing to give them the money; I wouldn't lend it to them.

Then later he said that he did not know that it was necessary. But his paper has been harping for the repeal of the Johnson Act, to make Uncle Sam "Uncle Sap" once again. The repeal of the Johnson Act is one thing in which some are interested. He wants to repeal that act and allow these defaulting nations once again to come here and get money from us to fight the war over in Europe, with America needing all the money it can get right here, with the thousands and millions of unemployed and many others not on relief upon whom we could spend the money for our betterment.

ADVOCATES REPEAL OF NEUTRALITY ACT

He also advocated the repeal of the Neutrality Act, not just the repeal of part of it, but the repeal of the Neutrality Act. What did that mean? It meant sending our ships—it could mean nothing else—into the war zone. He said that could be controlled by Executive order. But he knows definitely, as we all do, that Executive order does not stop the transportation of supplies to nations in war, as was the case in the last war, as was so ably said by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Bone] yesterday. Colonel Knox advocated repeal of the Neutrality Act, and repeal means allowing our ships to go into the war zone, possibly to be sunk.

I asked him if that did not mean allowing American citizens to travel anywhere at their own risk, and he said "Yes." Here is the testimony:

Senator HOLT. You agree with the sentiment of allowing Americans to go anywhere any time on any ship?

Colonel KNOX. That is an inherent right.

Senator HOLT. Do you agree with that right?

Colonel KNOX. We abridged that right by act of legislation.

Senator HOLT. Do you think we should go back to that?

Colonel KNOX. We should repeal the neutrality law.

Allowing American citizens to go anywhere at their own risk, and then have one of them killed, and, as I stated on the floor of the Senate at other times, from that would be the spark that would cause a declaration of war itself.

A moment ago I spoke about the vital interests, and this is what Colonel Knox had said as to how far we should go to protect our vital interests. He said that our vital interests were at stake in the war in Europe. That is what he said:

The primary duty of those charged with the conduct of our relations with the rest of the world is the protection at whatever cost of the vital interests of the United States.

"At whatever cost." In those three words lies many a coffin. In those three words lies possible war, whether they say so or not. He himself said that vital interests were tied up in the war, and he said we should protect those interests at "whatever cost." Of course, he did make a number of statements which I was very glad to hear. I think, frankly, we made a more definite isolationist out of him than he was when the hearings opened. But his past record has been consistent, regardless of the statements of the Senator from Illinois, and he has been an interventionist as I define intervention. Speaking of intervention, some think it possible to intervene in a contest by standing in a window and throwing rocks at people on the outside, and not expect to get into a fight. You cannot safely be halfway in and halfway out.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. BONE. In connection with the doctrine of the freedom of the seas, I wish to read a line or two from a colloquy before the committee dealing with the question of the use of belligerent waters by our own vessels:

Senator BONE. Colonel, may I ask what part do you believe the sinking of our vessel played in getting us into the World War?

Colonel KNOX. A great deal.

Senator BONE. It was a major factor, was it not?

Colonel KNOX. I think it was.

Senator BONE. So that when a vessel, flying the American flag, entered waters teeming with submarines, she was in immediate danger of being sunk?

Colonel KNOX. That is true.

In the face of that record Colonel Knox wants these vessels to again enter belligerent waters, and his argument in that behalf is that to surrender that right is to surrender a vital American right, and he characterizes a vital American right as a right worth sustaining by war. I think that record is plain enough, even for the gentleman whom he identifies as a "craven Congressman."

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, this is an exact quotation about the repeal of the Neutrality Act. This is the exact language of Colonel Knox:

It has repeatedly said, since the repeal, that the whole law should never have been enacted and should best be repealed now.

He speaks about the Daily News supporting repeal. The actual repeal itself was supported by that paper.

"A FEARFULLY GRAVE DECISION"

Before the Committee on Naval Affairs he said we were doing everything we could to help the Allies; that there was nothing else to be done; we were giving all the aid we could possibly give; but this is what he said on the 28th day of May 1940 in his paper, speaking about the destruction of Leopold's army in Belgium and the invasion of France. These are Colonel Knox's own words:

When that hour strikes—

If anyone wants the whole statement, I shall be glad to put it in the RECORD, but he speaks about the hour in which those nations now called Allies would fail—

When that hour strikes—and nothing but a miracle can prevent it—only a cowardly shrinking from facing the truth, a weak and imbecile refusal to confront stark reality would explain, but not condone, a failure of the leadership of America to tell the American people that a fearfully grave decision must be made.

I wish to repeat that. Perhaps I had better read the first two paragraphs so that there will be no question about it. This is what he said:

We are looking today upon the threatened collapse of European civilization.

It is literally impossible to exaggerate the seriousness of the Allied situation produced by the unconditional surrender of King Leopold's army in Belgium, which leaves the left wing of the French and British Army in Flanders open to the swift onslaught of Hitler's tanks, armored cars, and bombers.

News of the utter destruction or the surrender of the encircled armies, betrayed by the treachery of a weak king-commander, and cut off from supplies of ammunition and food, cannot be long delayed.

When that hour strikes—and nothing but a miracle can prevent it—only a cowardly shrinking from facing the truth, a weak and

imbecile refusal to confront stark reality would explain, but not condone, a failure of the leadership of America to tell the American people that a fearfully grave decision must be made.

What did he mean by a fearfully grave decision? Before the committee he said that we have given all the aid we can. There is only one implication from that statement about a fearfully grave decision. He said then:

If we become convinced that France and Britain will be defeated without our assistance, are we going to help them, or are we to stand by and permit Germany to become dominant on both land and sea in Europe?

That is the important part. He said that we had given every assistance possible, and then he said:

If we become convinced that France and Britain will be defeated without our assistance, are we going to help them, or are we to stand by and permit Germany to become dominant on both land and sea in Europe?

If we have done everything we can, what did he mean by helping them more? There is only one avenue left along which to help them, and that means sending boys. That is the only avenue left if we continue to go in further. Is that the fearfully grave decision of which he speaks?

Of course, it is not yet proper to say that we will send boys over there, just as the Senator from Illinois said that no one wanted to send boys across. As late as February and March 1917 the very men who got this country into the World War were telling the people of this country that they were not going to war in Europe. What did Secretary Lansing say in 1915? That the people were not educated to go into the war at that time. Then in 1916 he made statements saying that we were not going into the war.

Some of us said last fall that the repeal of the arms embargo was a step toward war. We did not say it was a declaration of war; we said it was a step toward war, as it was. The President himself had said at Chautauqua, quite truly, that it was a day by day decision that would lead us into war, and the day by day decisions have all been in the direction of intervention and involvement in the war.

APPOINTMENT OF ADVOCATE OF WAR

The people are not quite enough "educated" to get this country into war; it is too close to an election to get them into war; but there are some men in this country who want us to go to war. Why did the President of the United States appoint as chief economist to the National Defense Council Mr. Stacy May, shortly after Stacy May made the statement that we should declare war against Germany?

Why was such an individual appointed at that time? The man who is economist of the Council of National Defense went on record publicly asking for a declaration of war against Germany.

There is no need to try to be smug and hide behind the facts. There is a movement to take us into war. The same old slogan is being used. The only reason why we have not come closer to it today than some of us feel we seem to be is the fact that no actual overt incident affecting America has occurred which would take us into war, but let an overt incident happen which affects America, let a spark occur that would set off the dynamite, and we would see how close we really are to war. Today some persons are trying to break down the defense against such overt incidents occurring. You do not always go into war by choice; you may go into war even if you desire not to go into it. Why create possibilities? If you send ships overseas, and they are sunk, if you open the avenue so one of them could be sunk, war would probably result. There is no one within the sound of my voice who does not know that if an overt incident were to occur America might become inflamed toward war overnight. America has not developed to that point yet, but do not fool yourselves; do not believe that the sentiment is not being spread by an interventionist group for such a reaction.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The other night a public-forum discussion occurred. One of the speakers was Colonel Breckenridge. The colonel proceeded to declare war right then and there. He said, "If I had the power to declare war, I would declare war tonight." As I understand, he is not very far away from the administration.

WAR ADVOCATE SAYS "APPOINTMENT MAGNIFICENT"

Mr. HOLT. Let me say what Colonel Breckenridge said about the appointment of Colonel Knox. He said, "His appointment is magnificent." The man of whom the Senator from Minnesota speaks, when questioned about the appointment of Colonel Knox in New York the day following the appointment, made the statement that Knox's appointment was magnificent. Of course, it is magnificent to all those who would involve us in intervention. I should like to have a single Senator rise on the floor of the Senate and name one interventionist, one individual who has asked for a declaration of war, who has protested against the appointment of Colonel Knox or the appointment of Colonel Stimson. Why is it that they say, "These appointments are magnificent"?

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] referred to the fact that some one spoke of the Cabinet as being a war Cabinet. Let me say that the English themselves seem to know that. This data was given to the Senate Monday by me. In discussing Colonel Stimson's appointment day before yesterday I stated in the RECORD that we all know that his appointment was made because, as Colonel Knox said, "The viewpoints are in accord with those of the President." They have discussed the question with the President, and they agree on the question of foreign policy as it affects the Navy. Does the President want to repeal the Neutrality Act? Does he desire the destruction of the Johnson Act? Does he feel our vital interests are at stake now? If so does he feel that we should intervene at whatever cost when our vital interests were affected?

Let us realize one thing. It is said, "No; we have not made a declaration of war yet." I hope we never do. But step by step we are taking actions that are bringing us close to the brink, and it is too dangerous to play on the avenue to war. I know and you all know that the appointment of Colonel Stimson and the appointment of Colonel Knox to be members of the President's Cabinet was a gesture toward intervention, when the Allies and others needed to have their morale bolstered by America.

I do not condemn the nominees personally when I say that. They have their viewpoint. But I do not think their viewpoint expresses the viewpoint of America, which wants to stay out of this war, and does not want to experiment and play around in Europe at the expense of the boys of America.

So far as I am concerned, I shall use the same judgment that the Senator from Illinois used. He said he was going to resolve the question of doubt in favor of Colonel Knox. I am going to resolve the question of doubt in favor of the American boys, the boys who would have to die as the result of a policy of intervention—a policy which is not publicly stated but privately made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Frank Knox to be Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Capper	Gillette	Johnson, Colo.
Andrews	Caraway	Green	King
Ashurst	Chandler	Guffey	La Follette
Austin	Chavez	Gurney	Lodge
Bailey	Clark, Idaho	Hale	Lucas
Barbour	Clark, Mo.	Harrison	Lundeen
Barkley	Connally	Hatch	McCarran
Bilbo	Danaher	Hayden	McKellar
Bone	Davis	Herring	McNary
Bridges	Downey	Hill	Maloney
Bulow	Eliender	Holman	Mead
Burke	George	Holt	Miller
Byrd	Gerry	Hughes	Minton
Byrnes	Gibson	Johnson, Calif.	Murray

Neely	Radcliffe	Shipstead	Tobey
Norris	Reed	Smith	Townsend
Nye	Reynolds	Stewart	Vandenberg
O'Mahoney	Russell	Taft	Van Nuys
Overton	Schwartz	Thomas, Idaho	Walsh
Pepper	Schwellenbach	Thomas, Okla.	White
Pittman	Sheppard	Thomas, Utah	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Frank Knox to be Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. LUCAS (when Mr. SLATTERY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SLATTERY] is unavoidably detained on important public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MEAD (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is unavoidably absent. If he were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FRAZIER. On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. If the Senator from Alabama were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] is absent on account of public business. Were he present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. My colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] is absent on important public business.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. On this question I am paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is unavoidably detained. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. BYRD. My colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably absent. Were he present he would vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My colleague [Mr. TRUMAN] is necessarily absent. I am not advised how he would vote if present.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS]. These Senators are necessarily absent. If the Senator from Montana were present and voting he would vote "nay"; and if the Senator from New Jersey were present and voting he would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—66

Adams	Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Andrews	Downey	King	Reynolds
Ashurst	Ellender	Lodge	Russell
Austin	George	Lucas	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard
Barbour	Gibson	McNary	Stewart
Barkley	Green	Maloney	Taft
Bilbo	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Hale	Minton	Tobey
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Townsend
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hayden	Norris	Walsh
Chandler	Herring	O'Mahoney	White
Chavez	Hill	Overton	Wiley
Connally	Holman	Pepper	
Danaher	Hughes	Pittman	

NAYS—16

Bone	Clark, Mo.	La Follette	Reed
Bulow	Gillette	Lundeen	Smith
Capper	Holt	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Nye	Van Nuys

NOT VOTING—14

Bankhead	Glass	Slattery	Wagner
Brown	Lee	Smathers	Wheeler
Donahey	Schwartz	Truman	
Frazier	Shipstead	Tydings	

So the nomination of Frank Knox, of Illinois, to be Secretary of the Navy was confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of Colonel Knox's nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the nominations of sundry citizens for appointment in the Foreign and Diplomatic Service of the United States.

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

POSTMASTERS

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the remaining nominations on the calendar be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT DURING RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee and other Senate committees be authorized to submit reports during any recess or adjournment of the Senate.

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

COMPOSITION OF NAVY AND NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2051, House bill 10100, to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with amendments.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to offer a brief explanation of the bill.

This is the fourth naval bill which the Committee on Naval Affairs has reported to the Senate this year.

The first bill authorized an expansion of approximately 11 percent, and increased the authorized number of naval airplanes to 4,500.

The second bill increased the number of naval airplanes to 10,000, authorized the creation of facilities to train 16,000 naval aviators, and authorized the construction of additional naval air bases, both continental and overseas.

The third bill authorized the speeding up of naval shipbuilding and the procurement of naval airplanes. It author-

ized the Secretary of the Navy to negotiate contracts for vessels and planes, and removed the statutory limitation with respect to the cost of vessels and naval construction projects.

The Committee on Naval Affairs in its report recommending the passage of the first naval expansion bill, the 11 percent increase bill, stated:

It is true that we would be more secure if we maintained a fleet in the Pacific and a fleet in the Atlantic, each superior to any which could be brought against it. In the future we may have to consider the possibility of building and maintaining two fleets.

That statement was written in the early part of the present session before the situation in Europe became so alarming from the standpoint of our own security as it is today. The bill now before the Senate would authorize the building in the immediate future of such an increase in our Navy as would enable us to have a fleet in the Atlantic and a fleet in the Pacific.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator says the result to which he refers is to be achieved in the near future. Can the Senator indicate when we may hope to complete the program to which he now addresses himself?

Mr. WALSH. Not, possibly, before 1946.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So up until 1946 it would not be a bad idea, would it, to maintain in the Far East a diplomatic attitude as reasonably friendly as possible?

Mr. WALSH. I agree with the Senator.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The total authorizations for the Navy, including those in this bill, will be approximately \$10,000,000,000, will they not?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, and I will come to that directly.

Mr. President, the authorized under-age tonnage of the Navy today is 1,724,480 tons. This bill proposes an increase of approximately 70 percent in that tonnage; namely, an increase of 1,325,000 tons.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I desire to ask whether or not the appropriations which heretofore have been made at the present session and the last session and the previous session are not sufficient to occupy fully the facilities which the Government has and which it may acquire before it enters upon the program which the bill now under consideration calls for?

Mr. WALSH. It is my information that the money already appropriated will necessitate the use of all the private and public shipbuilding facilities this country now has. We have already, in addition to those facilities, appropriated substantial sums of money to enlarge existing facilities.

Mr. KING. Then, if I may make a further inquiry, the appropriation which is authorized by this bill will probably not be drawn upon for 1 or 2 years?

Mr. WALSH. I understand a request is to be made for an appropriation from the present Congress to provide additional facilities which will make possible commencing next year the building of some of the ships provided for by the pending bill.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator refer to facilities provided in the bill which is now under consideration?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

I may briefly state what the pending bill provides:

First. It increases the authorized composition of the United States Navy in underage combatant vessels by 1,325,000 tons.

Second. It authorizes an appropriation of \$150,000,000 for essential equipment and facilities at either private or naval establishments for building or equipping any complete naval vessel or portion thereof heretofore authorized, or authorized by this bill.

Third. It authorizes an appropriation of \$65,000,000 for essential equipment and facilities for the manufacture of ordnance material or munitions at either private or naval establishments.

Fourth. It authorizes an appropriation of \$35,000,000 for the expansion of facilities for the production of armor at either private or naval establishments.

Fifth. It authorizes the President to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of—

(a) Patrol, escort, and miscellaneous craft as may be necessary to supplement the tonnages heretofore authorized or authorized by this bill.

(b) One hundred thousand tons of auxiliary vessels.

Sixth. It provides that no vessel, ship, or boat—except ships' boats—now in the United States Navy or being built for the Navy shall be disposed of by sale or otherwise except as is now provided by law.

Seventh. It increases the number of useful naval airplanes from not more than 10,000 to a total of 15,000, and provides that this total may be exceeded if, in the judgment of the President, this number is not sufficient to meet the needs of the national defense.

I now call attention to costs. The estimated cost of the construction of the vessels authorized by this bill is \$3,760,000,000; the cost of additional shipbuilding, armor, and ordnance facilities is \$250,000,000, making the estimated total cost of the bill, exclusive of planes, \$4,010,000,000.

Now, as to the estimated cost of airplanes. The estimated cost of procuring the additional planes authorized by this bill—and that is optional, of course—is \$600,000,000. So the total estimated cost of this bill, if all the authorizations are translated into appropriations, is \$4,610,000,000.

The estimated costs of procuring the additional planes, ordnance equipment, and personnel, and the estimated cost of constructing the additional aviation facilities authorized by the act approved June 15, 1940, are as follows:

(a) For additional planes, \$1,150,000,000.

(b) For additional shore facilities, \$410,000,000.

(c) For training of pilots, \$90,000,000.

(d) For procurement and training of additional personnel, \$300,000,000.

(e) For ordnance equipment, bombs, torpedoes, ammunition, and so forth, \$300,000,000.

Making a total of \$2,250,000,000.

The additional appropriations required to complete the large number of vessels now under construction are \$2,800,000,000.

The gross total is \$9,660,000,000.

So if for every vessel now being constructed and every naval plane heretofore authorized the necessary appropriations are made, and all the planes authorized by this bill and all the increases in the Navy authorized by this bill are translated into appropriations, the total cost to this country between now and 1946, which is the earliest time when this program can be completed, will be \$9,660,000,000.

The Navy Department is authorized to spend, approximately, \$10,000,000 during the next 6 years for the construction of naval vessels and naval airplanes and for additional shore facilities. This figure of \$10,000,000 is in addition to the annual maintenance appropriation which will be required, and it is also exclusive of the cost of replacement of naval vessels and naval aircraft which will become over-age or obsolete during the next 6 years. In other words, these figures do not include the maintenance cost that will continue from year to year. Furthermore, they have nothing to do with and do not relate to the replacement of vessels which will become obsolete and require replacement in the future.

As the Senate knows, whether a naval vessel is over-age or under-age is determined by law, and the Navy Department, without any further authorization, can come before the Appropriations Committee and ask for a replacement of battleships, cruisers, destroyers, submarines, or aircraft which have become over-age by reason of having been in use for a given number of years—26 years in the case of battleships, 20 years in the case of cruisers, 16 years in the case of destroyers, and 13 years in the case of submarines.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WALSH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Do the figures given by the Senator relate only to the authorization made for the Navy?

Mr. WALSH. That is all.

Mr. GEORGE. They do not include anything for the Army?

Mr. WALSH. Nothing whatsoever.

Mr. GEORGE. Not even for the Air Service?

Mr. WALSH. Not even for the Air Service of the Army. They relate simply to vessels and aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps, solely and alone, and to the establishment also of naval bases and the increasing of the facilities for constructing naval vessels and aircraft at expanded navy yards and expanded private yards.

Mr. GEORGE. The recommendations submitted in the President's message today are, of course, additional to the amount which the Senator has mentioned?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. These are additional authorizations.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Unless the Senator intends to cover the subject later, I should like to inquire about the number of personnel now in the Navy and how much of an increase will be required by the completion of the program now under way. I also should like to have the Senator tell us whether, in his opinion, conscription will be required to build up the personnel of the Navy?

Mr. WALSH. The present personnel of the Navy is, for the Regular Navy, 10,817 officers and 139,060 enlisted men. The number of retired officers on active duty—men who have been retired, and have been called back because of the emergency—is 527. In the Naval Reserve there are 15,216 officers and 40,204 men. The Reserve personnel on active duty, however, is but 2,437 officers and 4,886 men. This number includes aviation cadets and Fleet Reserve and Naval Reserve men. So the number of officers now on active duty is approximately 13,000. The number of enlisted men on active duty is approximately 143,000 or 144,000. The appropriation bill of this year authorized an increase in the enlisted personnel to 170,000.

The Senator asks me what will be the increase in the personnel. I can answer him only indirectly. The increase that we are proposing is an increase of 70 percent in the size of our Navy; so it would follow that there would be a 70-percent increase in the number of enlisted men and in the number of officers. I understand that approximately 17,000 officers and 226,500 men are required for the Navy now built and building. I assume that a 70-percent increase in officers and men over the figures given will be required for the expansion authorized by the present bill.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to direct the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to section 8 of the pending bill.

Mr. WALSH. Pardon me: In the figures I gave the Senator from California, I gave him only the number of officers and enlisted men in the Navy. I should have added the number of officers and enlisted men in the Marine Corps; and I will add those now, so that they may be connected.

In the regular Marine Corps there are 1,336 officers, 139 warrant officers, and 26,450 enlisted men. In the Marine Corps Reserve there are 1,128 officers, 17 warrant officers, and 15,000 enlisted men. Of aviation cadets there are 42. The number of retired officers on active duty is 89, and 6 warrant officers. The number of Reserve officers on active duty is 270, 1 warrant officer, and 94 enlisted men.

That means a total of approximately 27,000 men now, but in the appropriation bill of this year provision was made for increasing that number by 9,000, so that we shall have in the Marine Corps an enlisted personnel of approximately 36,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me while I point out—

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I merely want to point out to the Senator that my question also asked him to discuss his opinion of the necessity of increasing the personnel in the Navy through some sort of conscription plan, such as we are discussing for the Army.

Mr. WALSH. The Navy, unlike the Army, has had practically no trouble in enlistments, and that is true also of the Marine Corps. For some reason or other, which I assume Senators have detected in their applications for appointment to the Naval Academy, there seems to be much more willingness to enlist in the Navy than in the Army. I have observed it, as we all have, in our applications for both academies. I have observed, as probably all Senators have observed, that the number of applicants for appointment to the Naval Academy is at least three or four times as great as for the Military Academy; and I am sorry to say that I have observed—it is only personal—rather a reluctance on the part of our young men to enlist in the Army. That, however, is only personal observation, and perhaps conversation, rather than figures or statistics. I judge, from the figures presented here, that I am probably mistaken in that conclusion; but that situation at least does not apply to the Navy, and I do not think there is any doubt whatever that we can get all the enlistments that the Navy needs; and, of course, its needs increase as new ships are commissioned. The present number of 170,000 enlisted men authorized for the Navy in the next fiscal year will be ample, in my opinion; but the new vessels that are coming forth and being commissioned each year will require increased personnel, and we are training men now for that purpose.

The serious problem, the real problem, is the matter of pilots for airplanes. As the Senator knows, in the previous bill which came from this committee provision was made for increasing our aviation schools, so that, instead of having only one school, that at Pensacola, we shall have several others for training purposes; and instead of training 150 a month, we hope to turn out 400 trained pilots per month. The time for training has been reduced from a year to about 8 months. Also, the Navy proposes to reduce the requirements for admission to the aviation training schools from a full college requirement to 2 years of college, and that will be quite an advantage.

I am pleased to say that so far as the Navy is concerned there is no question about filling up our needs, and there seems to be a rather popular appeal for the Navy. Of course, as the Senator knows, for an ambitious boy there is very much greater opportunity for advancement in the Navy than in the Army. A young man who is mechanically inclined, and goes to the Navy schools, can rapidly increase his compensation from the \$31 a month he gets in the beginning up to \$80, \$90, \$100, \$120, or even as high as \$150 a month, and that is an inducement; and a large number of the young men are not only going to the Navy schools, taking advantage of all the educational facilities we have, but they are taking correspondence courses and attending classes on the ships with their officers and showing a disposition to advance themselves and progress.

Since I have been in contact with the Navy, I think I have been more impressed with the personnel of the enlisted men than with anything else in the Navy, even more than with the officers; and that is saying a good deal, because I think the Navy has a very high quality of personnel. But Senators would be proud of the enlisted personnel in the Navy if they knew them as I happen to know them, and as the officers speak of them.

Only yesterday I made a trip down the river on one of the mosquito fleet boats, the only one we have here. It is at the navy yard, and I am sure Senators would be interested to go down and see it. I took the trip down to Mount Vernon in this boat, which ordinarily goes at the rate of about 27 knots and can speed up to 45 or 47 knots. The boat was manned entirely by enlisted men.

There was an officer in command, but all the mechanical work of running the boat was done by the enlisted men; and

I assume probably they are paid a substantial wage, perhaps ninety or one hundred dollars a month.

I cannot speak too highly of the enlisted men of the Navy. I have never heard an officer speak of them who has not spoken in the most eulogistic terms of their devotion, their zeal, their intelligence, and their pride in their positions. Officer after officer has said to me, "We just could not exist without the spirit of the enlisted men." That is why I have a great deal of confidence in the personnel of our Navy; and after all, as I have said before on the floor of the Senate, it is not steel that wins naval battles; it is the capacity, the ability, the spirit, and the courage of the men who man the guns.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if I may interpolate a few words there, the statement the Senator from Massachusetts has made is very, very encouraging; and our Navy is a very bright spot in our national defense. I think we are all very happy over it; and we here in the Senate give a great deal of credit to the chairman of our Naval Affairs Committee for the very able way in which the affairs of the Navy have been carried on.

May I ask the Senator a further question? I assume that the remarks he has made as to the personnel of the Navy apply equally to the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. Yes. In the Marine Corps, however, advancement is not as rapid as it is in the Navy. There is a real problem there. It has not the opportunity for advancement that exists in the Navy. The members of the Marine Corps are soldiers, and they have only the advancement that the Army has, and it is very limited. Their wages on the average, as the Senator knows, are less than those of men in the Navy—as more of them are in the lower-pay grades. They are, however, supplied with their clothes. The marine must look spick-and-span. In this country he is a good deal on dress parade, and a man who, besides his duties as a soldier, acts as guard, and so forth.

But we have provided, in one of the bills before the committee—a bill which I shall later take up—to increase the number of first-class privates in the Marine Corps from 40 percent to 50 percent. We increased it 2 years ago from 25 to 40 percent, and we increase it in this bill from 40 to 50 percent; and we are also providing for the same wages to be paid young marines who are working on planes, doing the mechanical work on planes, that are paid to naval enlisted men. That will be some inducement, but I have been very much disturbed about the fact that, for example, when I was on the west coast and inspected the fleet, and when I have been at other places, I have asked the guard of marines who extend the courtesy of honoring guests who come to the vessels of the fleet, to raise their hands, those who would seek reenlistment, and I have been very much surprised to find that very few of them reenlist.

That is a disadvantage, and yet it is somewhat of an advantage. By reason of their occupation and the nature of their work, in time of war, as the Senators know, they are the ones who must leave the ships and go ashore and begin the attack ashore. They must be the soldiers on board the vessels of the Navy; and that kind of service requires young men, while in the Navy a man may be 35 or 40 years of age, and be mechanically inclined, and be just as useful as if he were 21 or 24 years of age.

So the turn-over in the Marine Corps, while it is very rapid, has that one single advantage, and I have personally interested myself in finding some way to induce these men to remain longer, and to provide for some system of promotion, which I hope we will be able to work out.

Senators will be interested to know, too, that the Navy Department recently, much against my judgment—I was not consulted, of course—increased the period of enlistment to 6 years from 4 years. I was reluctant to think it was a wise move. I was afraid it would result in a decrease in enlistments, taking 6 years from a boy's life, from 18 to 24, being a pretty valuable gift to his country. But there has been no diminution in enlistments.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does that relate to the Marine Corps, or the Navy?

Mr. WALSH. Just to the Navy, I think. So enthusiastic was I about the enlisted men and their devotion to duty and their capacity that in making a speech not long ago before the Daughters of the American Revolution, when referring to the personnel of the Navy and the enlisted men, I said to them:

You never should meet an enlisted man on the street without going up and shaking his hand and thanking him that he was for \$31 a month giving 6 years of his life in training to protect you and me, our lives, our homes, our fortunes, our institutions.

In the Marine Corps the personnel is quite different from that in the Navy. The Marine Corps personnel is a finer physical group. The marines are all fine appearing, solid, substantial physical types, and their training is the training of a soldier. I would say that man for man, from the physical standpoint, the Marine Corps would make a better showing and a better appearance, but I do not think they are any better in their love of their work, their devotion to duty, than the enlisted men in the Navy, or as good.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does a first-class marine receive \$31 a month?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; he gets that as a reward of merit. Very few of them get that until after they have been in the service for some time. They begin at \$21 and then they can go up to \$36. Up to last year only 25 percent of the privates could be privates first class, then it was raised to 40 percent, and this year it is being increased to 50 percent, as an inducement to the men to render meritorious service. Twenty-one dollars is pretty low pay.

I wish to tell a story about some enlisted men. Before I had the position I now occupy, or before I was known as occupying this position, I was on a boat in Newport with some friends and wanted to go over to visit a destroyer where there was an officer whom I knew, and whom I wanted to visit. I hailed a naval barge that was passing, told them who I was, and asked if they would take me over. I got on the barge and was taken to the ship. When I left the barge I threw \$2 at the four men on the barge for their kindness in taking me over. Two or three days afterward the commanding officer sent me the \$2. The boys had turned it in, because it was against the regulations to accept such a gift. Of course, I could send them cigarettes, as I did afterward. But I thought that was indicative of a high sense of honor and of character and loyalty, and it impressed me very much. I could give many such illustrations.

Seventy to eighty percent of the enlisted men in the Navy send home to their folks money out of their scanty pay. So we have every reason to feel proud of our Navy. I am very happy to say these things publicly, because I think our people have a natural affection for these Navy men, and I like to have them know it is not misplaced, that the Navy is deserving of the best that can be said of it.

As I have said before, so far as the officers are concerned, there is no body of men in the United States, in any profession, who study more and are required to study more to improve themselves, and to pass examinations which recur every 7 years, than the naval officers. There are the medical and the legal professions and the ministry, but no other profession requires the exacting hours of work and study the Navy requires. Man after man at the Navy Post Graduate School has told me that he has not known a single night he was free, except occasionally Saturday night. The intensity of their studies is very remarkable. I have been very much impressed.

No man completes his work or his effort to improve himself in the Navy until he gets to the grade of admiral, then he folds his arms and takes it easy, as he probably is entitled to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further comment?

Mr. WALSH. I am very glad to.

Mr. DOWNEY. I first wish to say that what the Senator has said has been intensely interesting to me, and I believe to most of the Senators present.

I have recently been informed that in the Army only about 10 percent of the privates become what they call first-class privates, entitled to \$30 a month. I would suggest that if the Army could somewhat follow the principle now being suggested by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and increase the percentage of first-class privates along the lines indicated by the Senator, it would be a very wise thing.

Mr. WALSH. I think so, too. There is this difference between the Army and the Navy. The naval officers live with their men. They are all on shipboard together. They come in contact morning, noon, and night. They do not mess together, but there is a friendliness and an intimacy that does not interfere with discipline, but makes for a common bond.

I was surprised not long ago to have someone tell me that he had picked up some Marines coming from Quantico, who were thumbing for a ride. They told him they had never yet had an officer refuse to give them a ride, that their officers bring them back to the post frequently. This treatment outside of the post shows a good spirit. The moment an officer gets out on the highway, he is no longer an officer, so far as associating with the men is concerned.

I wish to say one other thing, and I say it only for our consideration, and not in criticism. I suspect there is a feeling that the inadequacy of the Army and the lack of modern mechanism and complete preparation, for which we are all to blame, has had a deterrent effect on enlistments in the Army. I suspect that from things which have been said to me. I do not repeat them in criticism, but I am trying to make a contrast between the two services.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to direct the Senator's attention to section 8 of the bill, and with that section before the Senator, I wish to read two sentences from the committee report dealing with that particular section. The committee advises us:

Ten thousand airplanes is the number required for our Navy now built and building.

The concluding sentence of the committee report dealing with section 8 states:

The committee are of the opinion that an authorization for 15,000 useful naval airplanes is justified at this time.

That the total of 15,000 includes the 10,000 referred to in the report?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. The committee having concluded that an authorization of 15,000 is justified at this time, will the Senator please explain the remaining language of the section, which reads:

Provided, That if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, the total number of airplanes authorized herein is not sufficient to meet the needs of the national defense, he may, with the approval of the President, make such plans for procurement as the situation may demand.

Let me say to the Senator that I know of no other bill, though my research, I admit, has been scant, that contains such a clause, and I should be happy if the Senator would explain whether that is the language of the committee, and what they intend by it.

Mr. WALSH. One of the difficulties we have had with all of these bills, including the one before us, was not to have the construction program get too far away from the Congress. I think that is what the Senator has in mind. We have guarded that situation very much in the legislation. I thought at times that if we kept making these sweeping authorizations, the Committee on Naval Affairs might as well go

out of business, there would be nothing for us to do, that all the Navy would have to do would be to go and get the money. So an effort has been made to limit the number of payments. In one other bill, at least, similar language is used, and the Navy construe their authorization to be the number indicated, the same language being employed.

The reason for the legislation is that there was an assumption that Congress might adjourn for 6 months, and if there really was a crisis developing in this country, or a threatened crisis of much more severity than we anticipate now, this sweeping power should be given to the President.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The power, let me say to the Senator, is not being given to the President. But, above all, the Senator does not expect that the 15,000 planes herein authorized will be built during the next 6 months, does he?

Mr. WALSH. No. The proviso reads, "with the approval of the President."

Mr. DANAHER. Yes, I understand it says "with the approval of the President." But it goes on to say that if the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy is to the effect that this authorization is not sufficient, he may, with the approval of the President, make plans for additional procurement.

The Congress certainly is perfectly acquiescent in granting naval defense appropriations, is it not?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. And it is expected, of course, that this new bill will be passed?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. And by it we are increasing the authorization from 10,000 planes, which we do not even now have, to 15,000 planes, which we will not have in 6 months.

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. Is there any reason why we should not strike out the language beginning with "Provided," in section 8, on the ground that if and when there be a need demonstrated, the Congress will readily acquiesce and give the Navy whatever it requires?

Mr. WALSH. That proviso was added in the House. We accepted it in the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate. It was inserted in the House because the Army has exactly the same authority to build unlimited numbers of planes for 2 years. We have sinned on the side of being too liberal. I do not desire to make comparisons, but we have had a good deal of difficulty in holding back the Navy from demanding the extreme authorizations that have been granted to the Army, the Navy's coworker in the field of national defense.

I personally have no objection to that language going out of the bill. We cannot build before another session more than 15,000 planes. But I wish to say that whenever we have inserted a number, as in this case, the Navy Department has construed that number to be the limitation.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me point out to the Senator that, in the very sincere judgment of several earnest Senators, there has been much justifiable criticism of an attitude of mind on the part of the Secretary of the Navy whose nomination was confirmed only this afternoon. Now we find language to the effect that if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, the total number of airplanes is not sufficient to meet the needs of the national defense, certain things shall be done. Let me point out to the Senator that there is no definition provided of the term "national defense." Let me point out further that when we passed Public, No. 671, less than a month ago, we talked then in terms of defense of the United States.

Mr. President, there is a difference, and I submit to the Senator from Massachusetts himself that he demonstrated his own views on the subject of what is national defense in a splendid speech he made here a few days ago. What may be the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, now incumbent, as to national defense and what may be necessary for the defense of the United States may easily take two very different and widely divergent lines and may be judged from two very different and opposed points of view.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, there is always the further step of proving before the Committee on Appropriations the need and the requirement in order to get the necessary amount of money. The committee, of course, also had that in mind. Furthermore, it is to be assumed that the Secretary of the Navy, whoever he may be, will be reasonable and will not enter upon an expensive and extravagant program of building planes which are not absolutely needed for national defense. The President himself spoke about 50,000 planes, as the Senator from Connecticut knows.

I have felt that the Congress at this time ought not to put itself in such a position that the Navy Department or the War Department could accuse it of being responsible for not building up the national defense. One former Cabinet officer has attempted to place some blame on the Congress without justification.

Of course, he is a candidate for office, and that may explain why he takes such a position. But I have felt that we ought not to put the Congress in such a position that someone could say, "We asked for this, and Congress did not give it to us. The Congress is therefore responsible. We wanted these vessels, and Congress did not give us the appropriation for which we asked."

Before adjournment I shall try to have a complete record of all that has been done by the Naval Affairs Committee during the time I have been chairman of it, going back to 1934, and during the time when the late Senator Trammell was chairman, to show that we have provided everything for which the Navy has asked.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, as I recall, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut made a speech about 2 or 3 weeks ago in which he bemoaned the fact that we had not made greater military and naval appropriations. Now he wants to strike out the proviso which would authorize the Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, to secure additional planes. Before he could obtain them he would have to get the Appropriations Committee to provide the money, of course.

The country wants this program speeded up. We all want it speeded up. I do not think the proviso ought to go out of the bill. For God's sake, let us let the Navy proceed and build these planes; and if 10,000 planes are not enough, let us provide 15,000 or 25,000, if it is necessary for the defense of the country. The Secretary of the Navy and the President are not going to have those planes built unless they think it is necessary, and the Congress is not going to give them the money unless it thinks it is necessary. I am not in favor of hampering or hog-tying or hobbling the Navy and the War Department. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut should be rejected and that the proviso should stay in the bill.

I commend the Senator from Massachusetts. He has always been in favor of an adequate navy. For myself, I have always been classed as a big navy man. A year and a half ago I spoke in this Chamber and pointed out that sooner or later we would have to have a two-ocean navy, a navy which could dominate the Atlantic—we cannot depend on the Canal entirely—and another navy capable of dominating the Pacific. Then, when we get that sort of a Navy, if we want to make faces at Europe, we can do it; and if we want to tell the Japs what we think of them, we can do it. I understand that this bill gives us a two-ocean navy.

Mr. WALSH. This bill provides what the Senator has advocated and what I advocated 3 years ago, a proposal which was received with very much criticism at the time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, there was criticism all over the country. But it is not criticized now. Our people today want a two-ocean navy. This bill will give us a two-ocean navy, and for God's sake let us go on and get it, and not tie the Navy and the Army in the matter of appropriations.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a moment again?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me point out that the Senator from Massachusetts has frankly and honestly admitted that we do not have 10,000 planes now for the Navy. This very bill will increase the authorization limit to 15,000 planes, and that is quite all right. We are all in favor of that, because it is coincident with and collateral to the program which is outlined in the bill.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has stated "we will not get the 15,000 planes in the next 6 months." We will not get them in 18 months, as a matter of fact. But the Congress will be back here, and if and when plans needed for additional aircraft expansion, for naval expansion, or any other expansion, are required, the whole situation can be submitted to the Congress, and the Congress will then be able to be in a position properly to evaluate the program and, of course, will provide the money if the Navy Department needs it.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his courtesy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I will finish the discussion of this question by reading for the information of the Senate the composition of the Navy when this program is completed. It is very interesting:

Composition of Navy when program is completed: When the vessels authorized by the present bill are completed in 1946 or 1947, the United States Navy will be composed of vessels approximately as follows:

Battleships.....	35
Aircraft carriers.....	20
Cruisers.....	88
Destroyers.....	378
Submarines.....	180
Total.....	701

We have now 301 vessels in commission and 72 out of commission. Only 150 of these vessels are under-age. We have about 137 vessels building. Then those in this bill, which would be completed by 1947, would give us a total of 701 vessels, which will be almost 100 percent increase over the present naval strength as of March 1, this year.

Of the above, the following vessels will be over-age in 1947:

Battleships.....	13
Aircraft carriers.....	2
Cruisers.....	10
Destroyers.....	123
Submarines.....	74
Total.....	222

One of the difficulties of the naval program is that all the time vessels are becoming over-age and have to be replaced.

The following combatant vessels were under construction on July 5, 1940. These are the latest figures:

Battleships.....	10
Aircraft carriers.....	5
Cruisers.....	21
Destroyers.....	61
Submarines.....	40
Total.....	137

I think that completes the information.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have been very much interested and I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts.

What, if anything, is the Navy doing toward putting on more than one shift? We talk about building ships for 1946, but if we were to have a war in 1942 or 1943 those ships would not be of much utility. Why does not the Navy require the contractors to put on a double shift, or why do we not put on double shifts in our navy yards? We have many navy yards, have we not?

Mr. WALSH. In some instances it is being done, but only in connection with essential vessels and certain essential items.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are all essential, or we ought not to spend any money for them.

Mr. WALSH. I am now giving my own opinion. I do not know what the answer of the Navy Department would be, except that it has not yet been done.

Mr. CONNALLY. It ought to be done.

Mr. WALSH. I agree with the Senator, but one of the difficulties is the overtime.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about two or three shifts.

Mr. WALSH. Draftsmen, designers, and specialists of various kinds are very difficult to obtain. In fact, we are draining personnel from our private yards into our navy yards for the purpose of obtaining specially skilled and highly trained experts. We can obtain enough common labor, but one of the difficulties is to obtain enough specialists to carry on certain types of work.

Let me say to the Senator that I am in accord with his view. I know that the Navy is contemplating taking such steps as fast as possible, but one of the handicaps is that which I have mentioned. Furthermore, persons are being trained in schools to qualify them for this specialized work.

Mr. CONNALLY. Some of the personnel may require such training; but the best training on earth is to put a man to work at a job. He then learns it. I certainly think the Army and the Navy ought to put on at least two, and if possible, three shifts a day. Several million men are unemployed throughout the country, and we are still pursuing the old way of building ships.

Mr. WALSH. What the Senator suggests is being done, but not to the sweeping extent which the Senator from Texas, myself, and others would like to see.

Mr. CONNALLY. It ought to be done.

Mr. WALSH. There are some difficulties, and time is required to develop and work out the program.

However, I understand that it is the purpose and intention of the Navy Department to do as the Senator suggests. As the Senator knows, in a previous bill speeding up construction we have given the Navy Department unlimited authority in that direction. We provided that overtime should not be paid on jobs for which persons could be found to do the work. I am sure the Senator agrees with that policy.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. That policy is now a matter of law. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will do his best to wake up some of the sleepy old admirals and put them to work.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I notice that the schedule which the Senator read calls for 180 submarines by 1946.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that enough submarines for a two-ocean navy?

Mr. WALSH. The bill was drafted by the Navy Department on the basis and theory that that number would be sufficient, but we are now developing a small 70-foot motor torpedo boat and other small boats. There is one now at the navy yard, and I think it is leaving tomorrow. It would be well worth while for every Senator to see it. It is thought that such vessels would to some extent take the place of submarines.

The President has a very excellent idea in this connection. He does not believe so much in a large number of big, clumsy, slow-moving ships as in an overwhelming number of small, speedy vessels. I concur in his view in that respect. I was informed that Germany now has operating 400 fast-moving mosquito-fleet vessels. Their speed is only 33 knots, as against our speed of 45 knots. Yesterday I rode down to Mount Vernon in one of the boats, part of the way at 45 knots.

That type of vessel is a very remarkable new development. It first appeared in the Mediterranean 2 years ago under the Italians, at the time of their fight with Ethiopia. Perhaps the Senator read the story, which indicated how surprised the British were to find a cluster of torpedo boats running all around them. Of course, they did not open fire on them, but the demonstration was a revelation at any rate. It is said that Germany has 400 such boats in operation.

A couple of evenings ago I either read or heard on the radio a remarkable story of destruction of commercial vessels by such fast-moving, speedy boats. The same naval officer who gave me the information about the 400 boats told me that since 1938 Germany had had 6,000 men employed in

building this single type of vessel. Having been deprived under the treaty of the opportunity to build large cruisers and battleships, she has concentrated on submarines and smaller vessels.

The Senator has raised a question which I cannot answer. I can only say that this is the Navy Department's bill. I think there is a movement—which I am disposed to favor—toward an overwhelming number of small, swift-moving craft which carry a few torpedoes, and which can go out of our harbors and prevent any raids being made or any attempts to land on our shores, supplementing the fleet itself at some distance from land. I think the Senator has raised a question which I should like to look into.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the importance of the small boats, and yet they are surface boats. They are frail. They are bound to be frail.

Mr. WALSH. And they will not last very long.

Mr. BARKLEY. They will not last very long. They must be frail, because they are only about 70 feet long.

Mr. WALSH. I think most of them are wooden boats.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the effective depredations which have been made by submarines, both in the World War and in this war, I think we should not neglect that phase of the matter. The submarines are able to slip up on their prey. That does not appeal to me as a sportsman-like way to fight, but still we must deal with conditions and not with theories. It rather struck me that 180 submarines for two oceans is a small number. I appreciate the fact that I am not an expert on either submarines or surface craft, but it seems to me important that there should be enough submarines, as a part of our Navy, to meet all requirements in any sort of naval warfare.

Mr. WALSH. Amplifying what the Senator says, when we learn, as the statistics show, that Italy alone has over 100 submarines, the number seems small.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me small.

Mr. WALSH. I am somewhat surprised to find that the able Senator from Kentucky, who knows so much about general legislation, is so familiar with technical naval terms and has so much technical knowledge of the Navy. I required a long time to obtain what knowledge I have, and I am surprised to see that the Senator's questions indicate a familiarity with the subject equal to that of any member of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have learned much on the subject of naval construction from the Senator from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am interested in the observations made by the Senator from Kentucky. As the Senator may recall—I have forgotten whether or not he was on the Naval Affairs Committee at that time—for several years I was a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. I believed that those in charge of the Navy were a little too inert, a little too old-fashioned, and I was so out of patience with them that I resigned from the committee, having other assignments, of course.

The point I wish to make is that we had an investigation as to the efficacy—indeed, the imperative necessity—of submarines. I had Admiral Sims and Rear Admiral Fullam appear before the committee. The head of the Navy—I shall not mention his name—and others were resistant to the proposal that the Navy should have a considerable number of submarines and airplanes.

Mr. WALSH. Was this after the World War?

Mr. KING. This was immediately after the World War. Admiral Sims testified as to the importance of submarines, and challenged attention to the fact that the British Fleet had to flee, as the Senator will recall, and take refuge in Scapa Flow after the battle of Skagerrak because the submarines were too much of a menace. Notwithstanding the great fleet which the British had, they had to flee and take refuge at Scapa Flow. Admiral Sims stated that one of the imperative needs of the Navy was the submarine, and that we must build more submarines.

I offered a resolution to create a bureau of submarines and a bureau of airplanes. It did not meet with favor in the

Navy Department. The Navy Department officials were "sold" on the battleship and the big cruiser, and they were indifferent to the new method of warfare; namely, the submarine and the airplane.

I am glad to see that there has been an awakening, and that we are beginning to appreciate the fact that we must have submarines. They are an indispensable part of the Navy.

I rose particularly to inquire of the Senator whether or not recent investigations have demonstrated that the battleship and the battle cruiser are playing as important a part in naval warfare as it was believed they were called upon to perform a number of years ago, before we had the submarine and the airplane.

Mr. WALSH. There has been no real test as yet. The battleship's value would depend to a great extent upon the result of an open fight between two fleets at sea. If that occurred, I am convinced from my investigations of the subject that the battleship would be found indispensable if the opposing fleet had battleships.

As I have said before, the battleship is a fortress at sea. An airplane carrier is a landing field at sea. The battleship has the heaviest guns that can be carried; it has the longest range guns; and it is like moving a fort that is on land, in a harbor, out into the middle of the sea. When the attack comes the battleship is the most deadly and destructive of all.

If other fleets did not contain battleships it might not be necessary for our fleet to contain battleships; but, however powerful and effective our fleet might be, if the enemy had a battleship or two it could raise havoc, because it could stand far away from the reach of our guns, and pour its fire into our fleet, and destroy it.

Mr. KING. I noticed in the newspapers a few nights ago that in the case of a French battleship in the harbor of Oran, or perhaps at Alexandria—I have forgotten which—a brave Englishman in a little motorboat took a depth bomb and discharged it under the stern of the battleship, and so ruined it that it partially sank.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that the ship was aground, and could not move.

I will ask the members of the committee whether I am correct in the statement which was made before our committee that no battleship yet has been destroyed by a bomb dropped from the air. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] says I am correct in that statement. We went into that subject. Cruisers have been so destroyed. The armor plate on the battleship and its defenses against airplane and bombing attacks are very great. Of course, the weakest of all our vessels from the standpoint of their own defense are the airplane carriers, because they are lightly constructed, carry a heavy load, and have great speed.

I should say that up-to-date events show that we cannot discard the battleship.

Mr. KING. I rose primarily to support the view expressed by the Senator from Kentucky as to the importance of the submarine. I cannot forget the very clear and concise and strong testimony of Admiral Sims, who was one of the greatest naval men of his day. I do not know whether we have his equal now or not.

Mr. WALSH. I detected in the early days—not so much recently, especially with the lessons of the World War—a disposition on the part of the men who went up through the Navy and became admirals to have an affection, which I suppose was natural, and a fondness for the weapons they themselves used. Most admirals, of course, came from the fleet, where battleships are considered supreme, and therefore there was a little reluctance on their part to accept the value of the submarine, or even the airplane. I am happy to say that that is all gone now.

Mr. KING. Admiral Sims, of course, was overseas, as the Senator knows. He had charge of our fleet, and I think he brought new life into the British Navy, and the result of his fine work made an important contribution to the ending of the war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. In confirmation of what the Senator from Massachusetts said about the value of the battleship and heavy armor, were not all those aspects vindicated in the recent battle between the English Fleet and the French Fleet? Were not the French vessels put out of business by the heavy armament and the heavy artillery of the British Fleet?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Texas is absolutely right.

Mr. CONNALLY. They were not put out of business by the airplane.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. A few minutes since, when the Senator from Massachusetts so graciously yielded to me, we did not have at hand the exact number of planes which the Navy now has; but the committee's report sets forth in two paragraphs exactly what the situation is. I ask unanimous consent that that part of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point for ready reference.

Mr. WALSH. I shall be very happy to have that done.

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

Planes: One thousand seven hundred and eighty-six useful naval airplanes were on hand on June 1, 1940. Of this number approximately 1,367 were useful combatant planes.

The committee were informed that the Navy Department's airplane-procurement program contemplated approaching the present authorized limit by July 1, 1942.

Mr. WALSH. I ask now to have action taken on the amendments reported by the committee. There are only a few of them. Then there are two or three other measures, which will take only a short time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 2, line 23, after the word "authorized", to strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$65,000,000", and in line 25, after the word "material", to strike out "at either private or naval establishments, which shall include the authority to purchase land at such locations as the Secretary of the Navy with the approval of the President may deem best suited to the purpose, erect buildings thereon, and acquire the necessary machinery and equipment, and \$20,000,000 for the expansion of facilities, which shall include the authority to acquire land and erect buildings for the production of armor at either private or naval establishments" and insert "or munitions at either private or naval establishments, and \$35,000,000 for the expansion of facilities for the production of armor at either private or naval establishments. The authority herein granted for essential equipment and facilities, and for the expansion of facilities, shall include the authority to acquire lands at such locations as the Secretary of the Navy with the approval of the President may deem best suited to the purpose, erect buildings, and acquire the necessary machinery and equipment", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act, including not to exceed \$150,000,000 for essential equipment and facilities at either private or naval establishments for building or equipping any complete naval vessel or portion thereof herein or heretofore authorized, \$65,000,000 for essential equipment and facilities for the manufacture of ordnance material or munitions at either private or naval establishments, and \$35,000,000 for the expansion of facilities for the production of armor at either private or naval establishments. The authority herein granted for essential equipment and facilities, and for the expansion of facilities, shall include the authority to acquire lands at such locations as the Secretary of the Navy with the approval of the President may deem best suited to the purpose, erect buildings, and acquire the necessary machinery and equipment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 24, after the word "Patrol", to insert "escort, and miscellaneous", and in

line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. The President of the United States is hereby further authorized to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of—

(a) Patrol, escort, and miscellaneous craft at a total cost not to exceed \$50,000,000; and

(b) One hundred thousand tons of auxiliary vessels of such size, type, and design as he may consider best suited for the purposes of national defense.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 14, after the word "boat", to insert "(except ships' boats)", and in line 17, after the word "scrapped", to strike out "without the consent of the Congress" and insert "except as now provided by law", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. No vessel, ship, or boat (except ships' boats) now in the United States Navy or being built or hereafter built therefor shall be disposed of by sale or otherwise, or be chartered or scrapped, except as now provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill, as amended, is now before the Senate for disposition.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have nothing more to say.

COMMON SENSE NATIONAL DEFENSE, NOT MADNESS AND HYSTERIA

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, before any action is taken on the bill, I wish to say—and I am not relying upon my own judgment in the matter; I have talked to many experts—that it is my belief that if we took the appropriation for some of these great capital ships and used it in the construction of airplanes and submarines and small, swift surface craft we should be greatly strengthening the defense of America.

ADMIRAL SIMS AND BATTLESHIPS

I cannot forget the statement Admiral Sims made, which has been referred to so many times, that the safest place for battleships in the next war is just as far up the Mississippi River as possible. I still believe he knew what he was talking about.

SECRETARY EDISON AND THE NAVY

I remember that not long ago the Secretary of the Navy of the United States gave us a report in which he admitted that our ships were not ready for battle, and that they would have to be rebuilt and somewhat reconstructed in order to meet the menace of the warplane. I do not want to enter into any debate about the matter, and I am sure it is not necessary, but I want to be on record on this subject.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] spoke about the bright spot. I believe he referred to the Navy as the bright spot.

Mr. WALSH. The personnel of the Navy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. And the personnel; and we are glad about that. We are happy about that; but let us see to it that the air force of America is not our blind spot.

For 25 years I have advocated a separate department of the Air Service in the United States. I introduced the first bill on the subject in 1919, and I was supported in it by Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell, the greatest of them all. We still have the Air Service split up and scattered around among these great services. They are doing very well, of course; but the French, the Italians, the great British Empire, the German Reich, and Japan all have separate departments of the Air Service—all of them.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR SERVICE

We should have a separate department of the Air Service. We are coming to that in the not distant future. Why not now? Why always have hindsight; why not a little vision and a little foresight?

THE GREAT MADNESS

Mr. President, we are appropriating \$10,000,000,000 for the Navy, more billions for the Army and the Air Service until we approach \$20,000,000,000 in this great madness. So far as 1940 and 1941 are concerned, these huge sums will avail

us nothing. It will all end in a great financial debacle—no real planning—no blueprints for the future—only fumbling in the past. I am for common-sense national defense. I am not for madness and hysteria—that will not take us anywhere. I cannot rid myself of the feeling that we are building for offensive warfare—not for defense, but offense. I am against that sort of building.

We must heed the lessons of the second World War in Europe. The war plane has all but driven the surface navy off the sea. We ought to be able to see that by now. The only real sea defense is to achieve supremacy of the air and then the Navy can operate and function, but without that air supremacy the Navy is driven into hiding.

In view of the statements which have been made today, I believe that swifter, smaller vessels filling our harbors and swarming the sea about our coasts would constitute a great measure of safety. I believe in that. I am not sure that I should want to dispense with all our battleships, but I am afraid we are overdoing that part of our naval defense. I am afraid we are still back in the days of yesterday a little too much.

ERICSSON AND THE MONITOR

I remember reading that when Ericsson came to the Navy with his *Monitor*, the Navy scoffed at it. The President had to rescue the situation. We must look into the future. We must try to have a little vision. Certainly we ought to study the lessons of this war, the great second World War. I think the airplane has shown the world a new picture of warfare.

Certainly we must not rely on one form of defense. I am not advocating that; but I think we should emphasize the Air Service more than we have. We should unify it, take it away from the jealousy of the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, and all that sort of thing, and put it in one great department. I absolutely agree with the able Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] when he talks about the submarine. Certainly the submarine justified itself in the first World War, and it is very destructive now.

MORE WAR PLANES, LESS SUPERDREADNAUGHTS

I am not relying upon my judgment as a layman but on talks I have had with admirals, generals, and our eagles of the air who have been kind enough to give me information. If I had my way about it I should like to turn one or two of these superdreadnaughts into just as many airplanes, submarines, and sea sleds as the money would provide for—more war planes, more submarines, and more faster and smaller vessels that will increase the safety of our country.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I previously had a colloquy with the Senator from Massachusetts with reference to the language on page 4, line 23, and I move as an amendment that the proviso beginning at that place be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the proviso beginning in line 23 on page 4, down to and including line 2, on page 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 10100) was read the third time, and passed.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF TRAVEL IN THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6884) to encourage travel in the United States, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BILBO. At the request of and on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. BAILEY], I move

that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. BILBO, and Mr. VANDENBERG conferees on the part of the Senate.

USE OF OBSOLETE NAVAL VESSELS AS TARGETS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2056, Senate bill 3008.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3008) to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, be, and he is hereby, authorized to use as targets for experimental firings vessels of the United States Navy stricken from the Navy Register pursuant to the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296; 34 U. S. C., sec. 491): *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall first determine that the interests of the Government would be best served thereby: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall make an annual report to the Congress of all vessels disposed of under the provisions of this act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there should be a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. A reading of the bill states its purpose. It provides:

That the Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, be, and he is hereby, authorized to use as targets for experimental firings vessels of the United States Navy stricken from the Navy Register pursuant to the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296; 34 U. S. C., sec. 491): *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall first determine that the interests of the Government would be best served thereby: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall make an annual report to the Congress of all vessels disposed of under the provisions of this act.

Under the act of 1882 a board sits in judgment and determines what vessels are obsolete and cannot be repaired, or are no longer useful. Then it requires that they should be offered for sale and sold at auction. This measure would permit vessels which are half burned, or are useless, when a certificate is filed by the Secretary of the Navy, and with the approval of the President, to be used for target purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF GRAVING DRYDOCK IN NEW YORK HARBOR

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2048, Senate bill 4165.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4165) 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, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 3, line 3, to strike out "size" and insert "site", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider such proposals as may be made by the Port of New York Authority to provide an adequate site in New York Harbor or its vicinity and to construct or cause to be constructed thereon a graving drydock and facilities appurtenant thereto, under the powers and jurisdiction conferred upon said authority by the compact of April 30, 1921, between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey (42 Stat. 174), consented to by the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States (42 Stat. 174), to purchase, construct, lease and/or operate a drydock in the port of New York district and under the powers conferred on said authority by the comprehensive plan for the development of the port of New York, adopted under and pursuant to the aforesaid compact by the States of New York and New Jersey, which comprehensive plan was consented to by the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States (42 Stat. 822), and, in the event that a proposal satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy is received, to submit, subject to approval of the President,

to the Congress, an estimate for an appropriation of an amount equal to one-half the cost of said drydock and facilities appurtenant thereto, including the cost of any land acquired therefor, but in any event not to exceed \$7,000,000, which shall be available for the purposes and subject to the limitations hereinafter stated.

Sec. 2. The location of the proposed drydock and its appurtenances shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Sec. 3. Any amount appropriated under the authority contained in this act shall be available only for the construction of a graving drydock with dimensions and structural strength sufficient, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, to accommodate the largest naval or merchant vessel built or building, together with an adequate site therefor, and shop, transportation, weight handling, and other incidental appurtenances and facilities, according to designs and general plans and specifications to be submitted with said proposal by the Port of New York Authority (hereinafter called the port authority) as a part thereof.

Sec. 4. (a) Any amount appropriated under the authority contained in this act shall be available for payments on account of a contract to be negotiated and entered into between the Secretary of the Navy and the port authority for the purposes herein stated.

(b) The contract so negotiated shall require the port authority to construct or cause to be constructed the graving drydock and to provide the appurtenances and facilities contemplated by the accepted proposal, to be completed and ready for use within such a time as may be specified in said contract by the Secretary of the Navy, without risk or expense to the United States, except as herein provided, and in accordance with plans and specifications to be approved by the Secretary of the Navy or at his direction by the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

(c) From and after the time said graving drydock and drydock facilities are ready for use, priority service shall be given in the drydock, or by means of other drydock facilities of the operator thereof acceptable to the Secretary of the Navy, to naval and other public vessels of the United States and to commercial vessels owned by the United States or by any corporation of which the majority of the stock is owned by the United States. The charges for docking such vessels shall be the actual direct operating costs plus a predetermined allowance for profit and overhead charges, which overhead charges shall not include any interest or amortization upon the amount appropriated by the United States under this act and paid to the port authority on account of the contract to be negotiated and entered into between the Secretary of the Navy and the port authority as aforesaid.

(d) In time of war or national emergency, as declared by the President of the United States, the United States shall have exclusive priority for the use of said graving drydock and appurtenances.

(e) The said graving drydock and appurtenances shall be owned by the port authority, but may be leased to such private operator or operators as may, in the judgment of the commissioners of the port authority, be best suited to operate and maintain said drydock. The drydock shall be maintained continuously to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy.

Sec. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

Sec. 6. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent and in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby suspended during the period in which such provisions of this act are in effect to the extent of such inconsistency or conflict.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there are so few Senators present that I think this bill should go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WALSH. I shall be very happy to have it go over. It is understood the measure will be the first business for tomorrow in case the Senate takes a recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

DE SOTO NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4119, which is an emergency defense measure, which has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and has the unqualified approval of the Department of Agriculture and the War Department. The purpose is to transfer 65,000 acres from the De Soto National Forest to the War Department, upon the request of the War Department to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4119) to provide for the transfer of certain land in the De Soto National Forest to the Secretary of War for use for military purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "select", to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That in the event the area transferred pursuant to the provisions of this act shall cease to be used for military purposes, it shall

revert to its former national-forest status", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon request of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer to the Secretary of War, for military purposes, such tracts of land, not in excess of 65,000 acres, contiguous to the Camp Shelby State Military Reservation, Miss., and now included within the limits of the De Soto National Forest, Miss., as the Secretary of War may select: *Provided,* That in the event the area transferred pursuant to the provisions of this act shall cease to be used for military purposes, it shall revert to its former national-forest status.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry. Is this property located in Mississippi?

Mr. BILBO. It is.

Mr. McNARY. It is owned by the Government?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. The bill provides for a transfer from one agency to another?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. It does not involve any consideration?

Mr. BILBO. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COL. DONALD H. CONNOLLY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to affix his signature to Senate Joint Resolution 283, which has been passed by the House and is on the Speaker's desk, but he cannot sign it until it goes back into the House after the consideration of the Hatch bill. It is important that this be done so that the President may appoint Col. Donald H. Connolly Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN PERSONS TO ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the amendments adopted by the Senate to H. R. 9576, relating to the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of persons resident or domiciled in the Virgin Islands of the United States, were, in identical language, incorporated as a part of section 3 of the "Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941," which has become a law.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the passage of H. R. 9576, together with the vote ordering the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill, and the votes agreeing to the committee amendments, may be respectively reconsidered, and that the amendments be disagreed to.

If the consent is given, the bill may be passed without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, July 11, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 10 (legislative day of July 8), 1940

NAVY DEPARTMENT

Frank Knox to be Secretary of the Navy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Curtis W. Legette

To be majors

James E. Jones	Adolph Zuber
Charles F. Cresswell	Robert E. Hogaboom
Samuel K. Bird	Francis H. Brink
Martin S. Rahiser	James Snedeker

To be captains

First Lt. Charles A. Miller	Henry W. Buse, Jr.
Ralph K. Rottet	Robert E. Hommell
Samuel R. Shaw	Frank C. Tharin
Robert S. Fairweather	Samuel F. Zeiler

To be first lieutenants

Paul R. Byrum	Hewitt D. Adams
James C. Bennett	James R. Bromeyer

To be second lieutenants

Virgil W. Banning	Alan R. Miller
John H. Blue	William E. Pierce
William F. Frank	Gene N. Schraeder
Harry H. Gaver, Jr.	Homer W. Sharpenberg
John W. Hughes	

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

Norman R. Billieu, Westport.

IOWA

Charles J. Cash, Jr., Anamosa.
Benjamin Roy Bogenrief, Hinton.

KANSAS

Fairfax Barnes, Oswego.
Paul E. Tubbs, Turon.

LOUISIANA

Henry E. Knight, Ferriday.

MASSACHUSETTS

William F. McNamara, Clinton.

MICHIGAN

Myron P. Hancock, Holt.

MINNESOTA

Theodore H. Lohrke, Balaton.
Mary E. Snyder, Canton.
Eric Lind, Chisago City.
Lloyd W. Ohman, Deer Creek.
Clifford J. Fitzgerald, Dilworth.
Elmer Reseland, Fertile.
Herman Frajola, Gilbert.
Stephen Singer, Goodridge.
Raymond P. Nolan, Janesville.
Marcia Russell Tysseling, Stewartville.

NEBRASKA

Weaver Jennings Holliday, Stuart.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ralph M. Dysart, Bellwood.
Ralph L. Bell, Burgettstown.
Catherine M. Golden, Lykens.
William M. Cramer, Mifflin.
Delia Dina Fornataro, Russellton.
John B. Brennen, Wilcox.

TEXAS

Leon W. Rutland, Commerce.

VIRGINIA

Louise J. Taylor, Beaverdam.
Anne L. Bowman, Bonny Blue.
Walter E. Groves, Buckroe Beach.
Ashby W. Mayo, Scottsville.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bennie D. Wiley, Athens.
Oscar R. Conaway, Barrackville.Rupert B. Mapel, Farmington.
Reuben Williams, Glen Rogers.
Anna F. Cole, Hundred.
Arthur Jackson, Littleton.
Alva O. Shelton, Peach Creek.
Rose B. Crabbe, Ranson.
Maurice C. Carpenter, Reedy.
Charles C. DuLowe, Jr., Whitesville.
Benjamin H. Oxley, Yawkey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Herschel M. Reed, pastor of the Greenfield Christian Church, Greenfield, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our most gracious Heavenly Father, we are grateful to Thee because we are citizens of this, a great country. We pray this morning that Thou wilt guide the actions and the decisions of this group, upon whose shoulders rest such tremendous responsibilities. Wilt Thou, our Father, have a vote in their decisions, and grant that in the hours that are so heavy upon us we may not fail to look to Thee, because we know that when nations forget Thee they fall. So wilt Thou guide the actions of this body, and wilt Thou bless each and every one, that they may serve Thee and serve their country, to the end that there may be experienced by us all eternal freedom, which we prize so highly, and the love of American citizenship, that is to us so great because that privilege was given us by men who sought freedom to worship Thee. Wilt Thou bless this body. In the name of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Saviour, our hope. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 29. An act to authorize the use of certain facilities of 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. 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.

MARINE AND WAR-RISK INSURANCE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 582) making an appropriation to enable the United States Maritime Commission to establish the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this is a bill to provide a revolving fund of \$40,000,000 to take care of the operations of the Bland Act, which was passed here a couple of weeks ago. I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia will not explain the bill somewhat, so the Members may know about it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was amended by the act of June 29, 1940, authorizing the United States Maritime Commission to provide marine insurance and reinsurance for American vessels and their cargoes and crews. It authorizes a revolving fund. This \$40,000,000 is the beginning of that revolving fund, and it will likely be the only amount re-

quired to be appropriated. The purpose of it is to provide insurance on American vessels and cargoes and crews which cannot be secured in the ordinary insurance market.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is not this another New Deal adventure, setting up the Government in the insurance business in competition with private industry? I realize there are times when there are hazards and probably Government insurance is wanted that Lloyd's will not come over here and do some insuring, but the fact is that we in this act of 1940 have set the Government up in the insurance business.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; the gentleman is not right.

Mr. RICH. I am right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is very positive in his opinion, and doubtless nothing I can say would change his ideas.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. As I understand, this is the situation: The American companies at the time of the World War were able to provide hardly anything in the nature of insurance. We had this type of insurance on a much broader scale at that time, and it was operated so that it covered other than American bottoms. This is confined to American bottoms. To start with, we have an insurance capacity, as far as the vessels are concerned, of approximately \$4,500,000 on any given vessel, and approximately \$5,000,000 on any cargo, exclusive of this Government insurance. It has been customary for Lloyd's to carry most of this insurance in the past, but they are limited at the present time. They have \$45,000,000 deposited here. This does not put the Government in competition with private business, but only supplements it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit, the law specifically provides that the Maritime Commission shall not take advantage of this Government insurance if they can get private insurance coverage.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to enable the United States Maritime Commission to establish the marine and war-risk insurance fund as authorized by and in accordance with title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by the act entitled "An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for marine war-risk insurance and reinsurance and for marine-risk insurance, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$40,000,000, of which not to exceed \$150,000 may be expended by the Commission for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, printing and binding, and other necessary administrative expenses: *Provided,* That expenses incurred in the temporary employment of experts in marine insurance, including attorneys, in connection with the investigation and settlement of claims shall not be considered as administrative expenses hereunder.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AT UNVEILING OF PAINTING OF SIGNING OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably (Rept. No. 2744) a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 73

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the proceedings, held in the rotunda of the United States Capitol at the unveiling of the painting depicting the scene of the signing of the Constitution of the United States, be printed, with illustrations, in such form and style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, as a House document; and that

2,000,000 copies be printed, of which 500,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,500,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, strike out "two million" and insert "five hundred thousand."

Line 8, strike out "five hundred" and insert "one hundred and twenty-five."

Line 9, strike out "one million five hundred" and insert "three hundred and seventy-five."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a suggested program for National Aviation Day.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSCONTINENTAL FLIGHT OF STRATOLINER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there crossed the continent a T. W. A. stratoliner from California to New York. The flight was made in approximately 12 hours' time, at an altitude of about 17,000 feet, and with an average speed of between 240 and 250 miles an hour.

Thus another noteworthy achievement is added to the thrilling and progressive transportation story of this Nation.

We in the United States of America lead the world in the advancement of civil aviation. Fortunate are we, as citizens of this Republic, to possess a great air-transport industry in times of peace; and if in times of war this country faces peril, we will be able to call on this growing network of air lines from the standpoint of more adequate national defense.

Onward and upward are the flight orders of America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

SMALL-BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this morning a resolution (H. Res. 548) authorizing the appointment of a special House committee to conduct a research survey of the problems of independent small-business enterprises and their relationship to reemployment and the national-defense program. I hope the resolution will receive consideration, for I believe such an investigation is of real importance for more reasons than one.

I have introduced this resolution for several reasons. In the first place—because it is the intention of the President and the Democratic Party to assist the honest-to-God small-business man who, unfortunately, is being used now as a cat's-paw by some racketeers and Republican politicians who, under the new power-interest party will stop at nothing to utilize every avenue of publicity in charging, despite the progress that has been made under the Democratic administration, that the small-business man has been forgotten.

I have in my possession several bulletins issued by the National Small Business Men's Association, with headquarters in New York, Chicago, and several other cities, which so-called association is now being used by the big interests and the Republican Party to circulate lies and falsehoods for the purpose of injuring the administration. An honest investigation of this so-called businessmen's association, whose publicity releases do not, strange to say, carry the signatures

of its officers—or, indeed, any other names—will disclose the fact that a few racketeers heading this organization are being financed by the Republican Party. I have been reliably informed that over \$50,000 has already been turned over to them for the spreading of false propaganda even against this Congress and the administration of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

All the resolution aims to accomplish is to obtain actual facts as to how the small-business man may be aided and assisted and most assertedly not principally to investigate the bunk National Small Business Men's Association.

The extent to which the Republicans will go is made evident by the full-page advertisement appearing in today's issue of the Washington Star. Two of the three signers are former members of Congress, namely, John O'Connor, of New York, and Samuel B. Pettengill, of Indiana. The latter gentleman, though at one time elected as a Democrat, is, I know, in the employ of the Dawes Oil Co., and is being used as a publicity man for the Republican Party.

In fact, even during the time he served in Congress, I was satisfied as to his tie-up, which, since he is out of Congress, has been definitely established. The less I say as to my former colleague, Mr. O'Connor, who called my attention to the advertisement, the better. I asked him, however, whether he paid for the advertisement, and he replied in the negative, and knowing that Mr. Pettengill did not pay for it, I would like to know just who did foot the bill and how much has been allowed them by the Republicans.

If the Republicans, by utilizing the names of former Democratic Members of Congress in the dissemination of this false propaganda, hope to gain the election, they have another guess coming. The people know how and by whom Mr. Willkie was nominated and for what purpose, and they are far too smart to follow the dictates of the Wall Street power and banking interests. The latter gentry are the very ones that, by general discrimination and by deliberate and willful violation of the Antitrust Act, are responsible for the condition of the small-business men of the country. And it is they who have denied them aid in any way to save them from destruction. Their unfair tactics will not only be resented but will be condemned by the American people who have, with the exception of the Wall Street manipulators, the utmost confidence in President Roosevelt, who has accomplished so much in the last 7 years and who saved these same big bankers and industrial leaders from destruction by the crash of the Republican Hoover administration. Today every financial report discloses that thousands of large corporations have made more in 1939 and 1940 than at any time in their entire history, and that these profits are being made at the expense of the small-business man whom we are going to try to honestly aid, so that in the future no private secret agreements can be entered into to their detriment.

The resolution covers 10 major phases into which I desire the committee to conduct its inquiry:

First. The extent and character of the problems of small-business men.

Second. Their relationship to employment.

Third. Their relationship to national defense.

Fourth. The extent to which these problems and those of small farm owners may be interrelated.

Fifth. Their causes, relationship, and effects upon the general economic conditions of the country.

Sixth. The comparative status of the financial resources of independent small businesses as a class today, compared with 25 years ago.

Seventh. The present need for equity capital on the part of small-business enterprises, its available sources through private channels, the chief causes, if any, that tend to restrain the flow of private capital into such enterprises.

Eighth. What means, if any, may be devised under democratic procedure, for the presenting annually to and keeping the Congress advised on the true national small-business viewpoint on governmental affairs.

Ninth. To examine into any or all small-business organizations and associations professing or purporting to represent small-business enterprises and to determine their means and method of financial support and the identity of their financial backers or contributors; and

Tenth. All other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in remedial legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two particulars: First, by inserting an address by the Reverend Thomas B. Cannon, Society of Jesus, on the Story of the Jesuit Missions; and, secondly, by inserting a radio address by Mr. Frederick E. Hassler, of New York City; and, Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a radio address of George E. Ernenwein, of the United States Federation of Postal Clerks.

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

There was no objection.

BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. HILL, acting chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, submitted a conference report and statement on the 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 power plant by the United States directly or through agents, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a poem printed in one of the newspapers of my district.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in reference to House Joint Resolution 520.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, one a letter from the Regional Forester of my district, addressed to me, and in the other extension to include some excerpts on the nomination of Mr. Willkie.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald entitled "When France Awoke."

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

There was no objection.

W. P. A. MURALS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House and the country a situation that has developed in the W. P. A., which indicates that the investigation we have had was not as thorough as it ought to have been. The heading of the newspaper article states, Four protests charge W. P. A. murals are communistic, and these protests come

from the Women's International Aeronautics Association, the Flatbush Chamber of Commerce, and Floyd Bennett Post of the American Legion. They declare that the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk are shown in Russian peasant costumes and that prominently displayed is a "red" statue of Joseph Stalin, with a fallen aviator at his feet.

I am glad that Colonel Somervell, the W. P. A. Administrator at New York City, has at last started out to clean up this situation. It is a situation that has been a disgrace to the American Government for a long time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a speech delivered by John H. Connaughton, general counsel for the National Vegetable Growers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

NEWARK (N. J.) AIRPORT

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 I brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States the unequitable, unfair, and unjust closing by the Civil Aeronautics Authority of the Newark Airport in New Jersey, and the removal therefrom by the major air lines to LaGuardia Field, in New York. I pointed out at that time the advantages of the Newark Airport over the LaGuardia Field, since which time, and according to the public press, the air lines which were forced to remove by the action of the Civil Aeronautics Authority have admitted to a loss of approximately 20 percent of their air-line business, due to weather conditions, fog, and inaccessibility by air of the LaGuardia Field under such inclement weather conditions, as well as the inadvisability of use because of inaccessibility to air lines at the New York field by New Jersey residents.

It is most gratifying to note the air lines, realizing their error, are again contemplating and will, in all probability, start the use of Newark Airport within a week, provided the Civil Aeronautics Authority will admit their error and allow the opening of the field.

Also located at port of Newark, N. J., is another expenditure on the part of the Federal Government and of taxpayers' money, as represented by the old Army-Navy base of World War days. In 1917 the Federal Government, recognizing Port Newark's 4,000 feet of northern water front and its easy accessibility to the Atlantic Ocean, and yet its safety behind the coast defense of the port of New York, constructed the largest Army base and shipyard on the Atlantic coast. Twenty thousand men were employed in this area during the war, and constructed 118 steel ships. Ten thousand more men were employed at the Army base adjacent to this area. There still stand at that plot 25,000 creosoted piles, representing an investment by the Federal Government of approximately \$500,000. This area is served by 3 railroads, is adjacent to the Newark Airport, within 20 minutes by truck of the port of New York and New York City, is within a short distance of the Federal Shipbuilding Co., now constructing many destroyers for the United States Navy, and is in many other ways a perfect location for the erection of the Navy's contemplated dry dock on the North Atlantic coast as appropriated by this Congress this year.

I have this day introduced a resolution calling on the Navy Department to negotiate with the city of Newark for the use of the port of Newark for that purpose and to thereby realize on the \$500,000 investment now there and to save the tax-

payers that much on an additional expenditure at some other location. I hope it will be given favorable consideration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include some excerpts from books on economics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a letter therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an address by James Scott Kemper, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, delivered June 30, 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for indefinite leave of absence for my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] who has been called home on account of the serious illness of his mother.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

POLITICAL RACKETEERING

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, called attention to what he considered to be some racketeering activity. Any Member of the House who is interested in real expert racketeering along political lines should read the article by Mr. Flynn in the current number of Collier's Weekly, telling about the activities of the Kelly-Nash machine in the city of Chicago, the home city of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. The gentleman from Mississippi so often talks about utility. If you want to get some real—

Mr. RANKIN rose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A point of order, Mr. Speaker; the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. RANKIN. But the gentleman referred to me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I referred to the gentleman from Mississippi. The gentleman represents 4,000 people down there, and my district has 80,000 votes; but you read that Collier's Weekly article, if you want some real information about how funds collected from vice gambling by Democratic officeholders is used for political purposes. How much of that money will be used at the Democratic convention next week?

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

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1932

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the plank in the Democratic platform of 1932 about undue bureaucracy. Mr. Speaker, you promised to eliminate departments and consolidate bureaus. Let me read this plank of the platform, I quote:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of Government expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagances to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government—

And so forth. What has been the result? You have established more bureaus and put on the Government pay roll more people than were ever on the Government pay roll at any one particular time, not excepting the World War.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. No; I cannot yield at this time.

The number of Government employees December 31, 1932, was 568,345, and December 31, 1939, the number of Government employees amounted to 932,305, so that instead of decreasing Government bureaus and Government employees 25 percent you have increased employees 60.9 percent and established more bureaus twice over than any three other past administrations. No woodpecker ever put more holes in a plank than the Democratic Party has shot into that plank. Where is there any honesty in promising to do a thing in a party platform and then doing exactly the opposite? Will the American people always be fooled? Will the politician continue to humbug the American voter? I say "No"; the people will protest these promises in November. "You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." America will repudiate a dishonest politician. In November America will do it. They will win with Willkie.

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

SURPLUS-PROFITS TAX

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. THOMAS F. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to incorporate a resolution of the State federation of labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the P. W. A. and to insert a short editorial from the Evening Star of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MARSHALL was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Gen. Charles G. Dawes, former Vice President of the United States, delivered by him on June 19, 1940, on the subject of preparedness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF COAL AND WOOD FOR PUBLIC USE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2751) 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 with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "Public, No. 453, Seventy-fifth Congress" and insert "52 Stat. 139."

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

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain what this is all about?

Mr. COCHRAN. When this bill passed the House there was reference made to the public law number. The Senate amendment cites the statute rather than the number of the public law. That is all there is to it.

Mr. MICHENER. It is a mere formality, correcting the citation?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF ACT TO PREVENT PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 3046) 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.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3046, with Mr. McCORMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, one thing I am afraid of about this bill is that it will be used as a club to intimidate uninformed voters to keep them away from the polls.

I am for clean politics, I am for clean elections, and I practice what I preach. [Applause.] I am rather of the opinion that you are going a long way here toward totalitarianism in intimidating the voters of this country, closing the mouth of everyone who deals with a governmental agency—State or Federal—and leaving the hired henchmen of the utilities unrestrained. I expect to offer an amendment to make this law apply to the employees of public utilities; and if the friends of the Power Trust vote it down, then I shall vote against the bill.

I notice in the paper this morning a headline which says that Mr. Wendell Willkie, the new candidate for President, comes out and condemns the investigation of the utilities' telegraphic campaign at the Philadelphia convention.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am sorry I cannot yield. I am not surprised that Mr. Willkie, who comes out in favor of this bill as it is written, does not want the same rule applied to those employees and those hired henchmen, those "fifth columnists" of public utilities that carried on the "blitzkrieg" at Philadelphia a few nights ago. He wants to close the mouth of everyone who deals with his State or Federal Government, but leave the corrupt hirelings of this utility fascist free to do to the American people what they did to the Republican Party at Philadelphia.

One of the most unusual things I have ever known was the way former President Hoover was treated at that convention. I said then, and I say now, that Mr. Hoover made the greatest speech ever delivered before a Republican convention. He might as well have been speaking out here in Statuary Hall. For some reason, in some mysterious manner, it seems that the "fifth column" had got in its work. I am told by people who were there that the condition of the loud speaker was such that, although we heard his speech all over the country, they could not hear it in the convention hall well enough to understand him. In addition to that, although it was July—and when you warm an old-guard Republican above 32° F., he commences to smother—yet they turned on the heat during Mr. Hoover's speech in the convention, I am told, and made it so uncomfortably hot that those people who wanted to hear him could not do so with any degree of comfort.

That was one of the demonstrations of the "fifth column" technique used by this utility Fascisti. I will point out more later.

You Old Guard Republicans from Michigan, Illinois, and Pennsylvania who are prating about clean politics and then opposing this provision to curb the most corrupt influence America has ever seen are merely keeping the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope of the honest voters

you are supposed to represent. In 1920, when these predatory interests bought a seat in the United States Senate for a man by the name of Newberry from Michigan, I heard Mr. Newberry say that his campaign expenses in the Republican primary amounted to \$196,000. It was so rotten that the Senate threw him out. You do not touch a man like that. You refuse to vote to curb those corrupt influences, although your party is the latest victim of their "fifth column" tactics, having paid the death penalty at Philadelphia.

Remember the people of Michigan are paying "through the nose" to maintain this Power Trust Fascisti, this supergovernment, that through these useless holding companies is trying to get control of every State government, every legislature, every public service commission, and is now trying to get control of the Federal Government. In 1938 the people of Michigan were overcharged \$40,030,420 for electricity, according to the T. V. A. rates; \$49,415,023, according to the Tacoma, Wash., rates; and \$47,596,533, according to the Ontario rates, just across the border.

Again the utilities in Illinois, under the leadership of Samuel Insull, whom Wendell Willkie succeeded as the Hitler of the Power Trust, bought a seat in the United States Senate for a man named Smith, a few years ago. They spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to control that election. But the Senate treated him just as it did Newberry; it threw him out, or refused to let him take his seat.

Remember that in 1938 the people of Illinois were overcharged for electric lights and power \$69,915,257, according to the T. V. A. rates; \$85,480,273, according to the Tacoma rates; and \$79,735,032, according to the Ontario rates. The utilities in Illinois could afford to buy a seat in the Senate if they could get away with it.

They had a vote-buying, ballot-stuffing contest in Pennsylvania between a man by the name of George Wharton Pepper—I had not heard of him in years until he showed up on the floor of the Philadelphia convention the other night—and a man by the name of William S. Vare, a few years ago. Vare was the Republican boss from Pennsylvania. He sat right there in the front row in the Sixty-seventh Congress and told a Member from Pennsylvania, "You will not come back to the next Congress because you did not vote the way I told you." And he kept his promise; the man was retired—he was not renominated. Vare and Pepper put on an old-fashioned Republican campaign. Pepper's crowd spent \$500,000 trying to get him nominated, and the Vare crowd spent about \$900,000, with the result that Vare was declared nominated by about \$400,000 majority. The Republican Governor of Pennsylvania, for whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] probably voted, sent Vare's commission down here with this notation, "Partly bought and partly stolen."

The Senate refused to seat Vare.

About that time the Republican administration sent the marines to Nicaragua, as they said, "to see that they held honest elections" down there. One progressive Republican Senator, who has since quit the party, said, "Why in the heck didn't they send them to Philadelphia or Pittsburgh?"

Of course, Pepper and Vare did not put up all that money. The utilities put up most of it, if not all of it. Why not? They had \$100,000,000 worth of real estate that was escaping taxation in Pennsylvania—large office buildings that they were using or collecting rent on. They were getting out light. Besides the record shows that in 1938 the electric-light and power consumers in Pennsylvania paid overcharges amounting to \$72,513,570, according to the T. V. A. rates, \$105,004,244 according to the Tacoma rates, and \$76,835,607 according to the Ontario rates. Although electricity can be generated by Pennsylvania coal, oil, or water power and distributed all over the State at the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma rates, or the Ontario rates without loss on legitimate investments.

But this bill does not reach these corruptionists. You are leaving them footloose and free to participate in the coming campaign.

If you Republicans—if there are any left—would hold a convention and nominate Herbert Hoover for President on the Republican ticket, he would get twice as many votes as

Wendell Willkie in every single State in the Union. And the Democrats would beat both of them. [Applause.]

Mr. O'BRIEN. Would the gentleman vote for him?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman asks me if I would vote for Herbert Hoover against Wendell Willkie? If they were the only two candidates, I would have to vote for Hoover.

They tell you that they made us pay from ten to twenty million dollars more than that property was worth in the Tennessee Valley, and offer that as an evidence of Mr. Willkie's ability. I know we paid all it was worth, and probably more. I was consulted in advance and I said, "Yes; let us get their loathsome hands out of the pockets of the people of northern Mississippi and northern Alabama and Tennessee." If a thug comes into your office and puts a gun to your head and says, "Give me part of the money in your cash drawer or I will take it all," you are going to give him what he asks for.

We had to take it because the power companies were robbing the people of Tennessee of over \$7,000,000 a year, the people of Alabama \$7,000,000, and the people of Mississippi \$4,600,000 a year in overcharges for electric lights and power.

Understand this same Commonwealth & Southern still has its hands in the pockets of the people of south Mississippi and of central and southern Alabama. But the people in the area where these facilities were purchased will save at least \$10,000,000 a year on their rates, and at the same time pay these properties out in a few years.

But the Power Trust still has its hands in the pockets of the people in every other State in the Union and is taking from them about \$1,000,000,000, or more, in overcharges every year, for which they get nothing in return. These overcharges are in addition to reasonable returns on legitimate investments.

Between September 12, 1926, and June 30, 1933, the Commonwealth & Southern, of which Wendell Willkie was president, was buying practically the entire output of electricity at Muscle Shoals. That was during the Republican administration. During that time it purchased 2,367,043,931 kilowatt-hours, for which it paid \$4,818,476.73, or an average of 2.04 mills a kilowatt-hour.

During the first 11 months of the fiscal year 1940 the T. V. A. sold 3,347,059,822 kilowatt-hours of electricity, wholesale, for \$13,816,700.62, or an average of 4.13 mills a kilowatt-hour—or more than twice as much per kilowatt-hour as the Republican administration sold this power at wholesale to this Commonwealth & Southern from 1926 to 1933.

During the time the Commonwealth & Southern was buying this power at 2.04 mills a kilowatt-hour it was selling it to the residential consumers in that area at the following rates:

First 30 kilowatt-hours a month, 10 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 170 kilowatt-hours a month, 8 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 300 kilowatt-hours a month, 7 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 350 kilowatt-hours a month, 6 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Excess, 5 cents a kilowatt-hour.

Today this same power, for which the Government is getting 4.13 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale, instead of 2.04 mills a kilowatt-hour, is being sold to the residential consumers at the T. V. A. yardstick rates, which are as follows:

First 50 kilowatt-hours a month, 3 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 150 kilowatt-hours a month, 2 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 200 kilowatt-hours a month, 1 cent a kilowatt-hour.
Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours a month, 4 mills a kilowatt-hour.
Excess, 7½ mills a kilowatt-hour.

The residential rates at Tacoma, Wash., are as follows:

First 20 kilowatt-hours a month, 4½ cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 400 kilowatt-hours a month, 1 cent a kilowatt-hour.
Excess, one-half cent per kilowatt-hour.

The average Ontario residential rates are as follows:

First 50 kilowatt-hours a month, 1.8 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Excess 7.2 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Any intelligent person can take his own light bill and figure out his overcharges for himself.

When one realizes what this means to the average household then he can understand why we agreed to the settlement with the Commonwealth & Southern, of which Wendell Willkie was president, in order to get their hands out of the

pockets of the people in the Tennessee Valley area. We simply had to accept their proposition or continue to be robbed in this manner for all time to come. We chose the lesser of the two evils. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman think that if we could have a "blitzkrieg" every day just like the one we have just listened to that it would elect the full Republican ticket in November?

Mr. HOFFMAN. We do not need even that. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, it is always interesting to listen to the gentleman from Mississippi, but we over on the Republican side are much concerned as to the state of his health. Certainly there is something wrong when he shows so much concern for the welfare of the Republican Party. Why should he be worried about our impending defeat, as he calls it? Is not that the thing he as a Democrat wants? Why does he mourn rather than rejoice? Does he really mean what he said? And why is it that he does not get the record straight?

What Willkie said, according to the paper, was that "they might investigate forever so far as he was concerned." The gentleman talks about this bill and says he feels it will intimidate the voters if it becomes a law. He certainly is not thinking of the voters in Michigan or in any of the Northern States. I notice from the RECORD that in the district represented by the gentleman from Mississippi there were cast at the last election 4,384 votes. [Laughter.] All of the Congressmen from Mississippi received a grand total of 35,441.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the Chair to enforce the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield. The Chair suggests in view of the fact that two Members have asked that the rules be enforced that those desiring to interrogate the Member in control of the floor address the Chair so that the Chair in turn may ask the Member on the floor whether he will yield. The Chair recognizes that this is unusual, because the practical angle would demand that the Member on the floor meet the situation, but in view of the fact that the Chair has been twice specifically requested to enforce the rules, the Chair asks all Members to cooperate by addressing the Chair first.

The gentleman from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Going back a moment. The total vote in Mississippi for all Congressmen, 7 of them I think, was 35,441. Now, 1 Republican received in the Fourth Michigan District 49,279 votes, and there was cast in that district a total of 83,191 votes. If there was any intimidation anywhere around, it must have been down South somewhere. It must be that some people down in Mississippi do not vote. I wonder why. Intimidation?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not just now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There may be a reason for the gentleman's tirade against the utility companies; I do not know. However, I do know from the record the fact that the people of Mississippi pay in per capita \$12.38 and that the folks of Michigan contribute \$263.48 per capita to the Federal Government. I notice that the gentleman's constituents, the people of Mississippi, get a return per capita of \$127.23, while in Michigan we get a per capita return of but \$129.80, or only \$2.57 more per capita in Michigan than in Mississippi.

The gentleman spoke about corruption. I admit, and we all must admit, that all political parties have at times been corrupt. But there is this distinction, and it is a vital one, in my opinion at least, so far as corruption is concerned be-

tween the Republican and the Democratic, or, more properly, the New Deal parties. We Republicans, if we have been corrupt, and when we have, assuming that we have, have at least used our own money. We have never by virtue of Federal statutes collected money from the workers and taxpayers, as was done, according to the report of the Senate Democratic committee, in the last campaign, and then used that money, relief money, money that was voted to buy clothing, shelter, and food for the poor and the unfortunate, to buy votes. Can you think of anything more corrupt than that? I notice the gentleman from Massachusetts agrees with me. It is unthinkable that these righteous, lily-white gentlemen over here would take relief funds, would take money from the poor, the crippled, the blind, and the lame to buy votes. You talk about intimidation! A little less hypocrisy, you may say, would be a fine thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like more time. A week would not be enough to tell about the political sins of the majority party. A week would not be long enough. The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Rules Committee, has been here the longest of any man in the House, and, by the way, I want to again call his attention to that article in Collier's Weekly where it tells about his home city of Chicago in which this great, free, and untrammeled convention is going to be held next week—that is, if the President permits. I suppose you are going out there to get your orders. To do the will of the "big boss." Collier's Weekly tells how the Kelly-Nash machine out there has violated the laws of the city, the State, and the Nation by collecting funds from vice, gambling, and all those things and contributing it to the election of the New Deal and Democratic candidates. Now, read it, because Collier's is financially responsible, and if it is lying, sue them for libel. Make them eat it. Those statements are not made on the floor of the House where the question of privilege protects from suit for slander. There is something you cannot get around and as the old farmer said, "It is black on white." Set your teeth into it and make them retract, if it is not true. Make them take it back.

As I was about to ask, can any Member on the Republican side recall when Republicans or Republican organizations, in violation of Federal statutes by the sale of campaign books and by the sale of printed matter on which the President's signature was written, obtained campaign funds? Is there anything as crooked as that in our record? Is there anything as reprehensible as that? I ask the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, in all your long career as a minister of the gospel, did ever a sinner come to you with a confession of a crime as repulsive as that? Can you think of anything like that?

Mr. EATON. No; I cannot recall any.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This country of ours has been asleep too long. You folks will remember how in pre-revolutionary days Rip Van Winkle went up into the Catskill Mountains and fell asleep and after some 20 years awakened. The American people have only been asleep for about 7 years, going on 8 years now, but they are awakening. They are learning what has happened to them. I notice the gentleman from Pennsylvania who takes such great delight in reading the Scripture smiling, but does he recall that old incident where Samson went to get his hair cut? He listened to Delilah just the same as our people have listened to this charmer down here, and we have had our hair cut a plenty.

However, we are aroused by the shock of what has happened in Europe, by the destruction of nation after nation over there, by the alteration of the boundaries of those countries, and by the enslavement of their people. We have discovered that like Samson we have sold ourselves into slavery. He spent his last days, until the very final one, when he pulled down the whole temple upon himself in slavery. Is that what you are going to do at Chicago? Pull down the American Government and destroy our Nation to satisfy the ambitions of a Roosevelt? The Lord only knows.

Yes, we are awake, and, God willing, we are going to do something about it. We began over at Philadelphia and we are going on through until November, in spite of what the gentleman from Mississippi may have to say about it.

Mr. PATRICK. Can the gentleman yield now?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot now.

Mr. PATRICK. We have waited for you to say something.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, there are some people, you know, who, having ears they hear not, and having eyes they see not, and some people do not even understand, which is not our responsibility, we cannot help it, and I do not know of anything we can do about it, or we would have done it long ago.

Yes, we have accepted without question all these blessings which our country and our people have enjoyed for, lo, these many years, but now the day of reckoning has come. No longer are we listening to the gentleman down here, the master magician, who has pulled the white rabbits and all the other tricks out of the hat. We have discovered now to our sorrow and grief that after all a man must work if he would eat, and the destructive influence of this administration will be routed out on a subsequent date from the floor of the House. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was just reading in this rule that debate was to be confined to the bill. I have not raised the point heretofore, but may I say that we have a very important bill before us and we have had a showing on both sides. After this I shall ask gentlemen on each side to confine the debate a little bit more closely to the bill.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we know we want clean politics. We want honest politics. That is what this Hatch bill is supposed to give us. We know that if we take politics away from governmental employees and do not intimidate them we will probably elect honest officials.

For some reason or other, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Manual was sent to me. How they ever made such a terrible mistake as to send any New Deal literature to me I cannot understand. This came in the envelope of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CLARENCE CANNON, and it was edited at the instance of James A. Farley.

I looked this manual over this morning, but I cannot find in it any statement to the effect that they will tell the truth or that they will carry out the planks they put in the platform at the Democratic convention in Chicago next week.

I want to call your attention to a number of planks they put in the platform of 1932.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I must ask the gentleman to confine his remarks to the bill.

Mr. RICH. I want to show you that we need clean politics; that is what the bill is for. If we have the Hatch bill enacted into law they cannot do what they did at the national convention in 1932. Paid Government workers will not be intimidated any longer at conventions or at the polls. They put a lot of planks in that platform, and let me show you what the woodpeckers have done to those planks. They have pecked them so full of holes that you cannot see the planks any more. The Democrats had planks for national economy, plank for tax reduction, plank for a balanced Budget, plank for anti-bureaucracy, plank for unemployment cure, and plank for prosperity. Where are all these planks now? Full of holes, shot to pieces; the woodpecker picked them to pieces.

The situation is just this, Mr. Chairman: If you make a plank and put it into your platform, you ought to carry it out. Do an honest job. You ought to see that it is fulfilled, and that the word of a national political party is just as good and just as honorable as any promise you would make in business or any standard you would set up in your own home in trying to regulate it. So I believe you should at this Democratic convention get the Democratic Party to obey the planks they put in the platform and give to the American people. Why be dishonest? Why not do as you say you will

do? The New Deal wrecked the platforms of the Democratic Party of 1932 completely.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that a few moments ago the gentleman from Mississippi made the statement that in the Republican convention in Philadelphia you could not hear the speech of Herbert Hoover in the convention hall. That is a falsehood, no truth in the statement, because I was sitting at the back of the platform and I could hear every word of that speech very audibly. Order was perfect and no disturbance of any kind. It was a masterpiece, as the gentleman from Mississippi said it was, in common sense and statesmanship. It told the American people the truth. Herbert Hoover is one of the greatest Americans this country has ever known, but the gentleman from Mississippi would not support a man like that. He is following after the New Deal, and he will go down the line 100 percent when the time comes for the New Deal, Roosevelt, and ruin. We want Willkie.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I believe we ought to have more Members here. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCORMACK). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, to me, this bill is one of the greatest pieces of hypocrisy I have seen since I have been a Member of this body. There is not a man in this House who at some time in his political life has not gone before a Rotary Club, a Kiwanis Club, or the graduating class of a high school and, with all the pontifical bearing he could muster, said that it is the duty of every American to take part in politics. Now you come here and, with hypocrisy in your soul, try to legislate people out of their constitutional rights. It is the right of every man, regardless of his position, to have something to say about the Government of his country.

I know the profound admiration that certain Members of this House have for political machines. I know how the Republicans have nominated a Tammany Hall Democrat from the Grover Cleveland Club in New York as their Presidential candidate, and I know that they recognize that politics is the game that you make it. If you want to make it a dirty occupation and a dirty way of making a living, it can be dirty; but if you want to make it a clean way, it is up to you. Perhaps the sponsors of this bill in the other body recognize more about the seamy side of politics and are more familiar with it than those who are against the bill.

I plead for honesty in government. I plead with you not to deprive thousands of governmental employees—State, municipal, or Federal—of the right to take part in the Government. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I supported the original Hatch Act of date, August 2, 1939, which was necessary to protect Federal employees from intimidation and coercion by those in charge of them, the assessment of them for campaign funds and the protection of the taxpayers of the Nation.

I favor the Hatch bill now before us in order to protect State employees from such coercion, intimidation, and assessment of those State employees whose salaries or wages in whole or in part are paid from Federal funds, and workers on so-called State projects, the funds of which are provided in whole or in part by Federal appropriations.

These measures are designed to cut out coercion, intimidation, favoritism, and politics, and make the Federal workers as well as the workers on State projects free to support and vote for the persons they desire. It grieves me to know that in this great democracy such measures are necessary to prevent the corruption, intimidation, and coercion of our citizens, and especially our needy citizens. We show deep

concern for the democracies across the sea. Over there the people are coerced with the bayonet. Here in the United States, according to the reports and evidence, we have coercion by threatening to withhold from our needy people food, clothing, and shelter if they are unwilling to surrender their freedom and their rights to vote as their consciences dictate.

The use of money for corrupt purposes in elections has been condemned in this country throughout the years. We have passed stringent laws to keep private citizens and corporations from using their money to coerce and intimidate the voters. It has been pointed out on the floor of the House today that in some few States some years ago a few hundred thousand dollars were used in several States to carry each one of those States. Such action must be condemned, and it was condemned by the refusal of the United States Senate to seat those who were the beneficiaries of these corrupt practices. It is immeasurably worse when we reach down into the pockets of the taxpayers of the Nation and take the tax money from the widows and orphans, the rich and the poor, and use it for partisan political purposes and to intimidate, coerce, and corrupt the voters of this country, and how can we find words to condemn those in charge of the activities of our Government using the taxpayers' money to threaten and browbeat needy men, women, and children to surrender their rights as American citizens, and to indulge in favoritism and partiality?

MR. ROOSEVELT'S ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBLE

Now, these conditions about which we complain and which cause every honest and decent citizen in the Nation to bow his head in shame can be laid directly at the door of Mr. Roosevelt and his administration, and a subservient Congress that has supinely submitted to the President's demands. During the last 7½ years subservient Congresses at the behest of the President have turned over to him more than \$20,000,000,000 in so-called blank checks to be used almost as he pleased. These billions have been handed out to various groups in the 48 States, and many of these billions were used to build political machines and for partisan political purposes. Every State received millions upon millions of dollars. Some States received hundreds of millions of dollars in a single year. These millions wielded powerful political influences in each of the several 48 States.

There has never been such a saturnalia of corruption. There has never been such a waste of the taxpayers' money, or so much of intimidation and coercion as grew out of the distribution of these billions of dollars. There has never been anything to compare with it in this or any other country in the world's history. These are not the statements of unfriendly partisan critics of the administration. These statements are borne out by official statements and records made by Democrats, new dealers, antinew dealers, and the press of the country.

KENTUCKIANS COERCED AND INTIMIDATED

Kentucky is a typical State in the use of taxpayers' money to corrupt, coerce, browbeat, and intimidate voters. Two distinguished Democrats of Kentucky were seeking the Democratic nomination in our State in 1938 for United States Senator. Let me read you a few lines from a letter written by the manager of one of these Democrats who were seeking the nomination. What has this great Democrat to say in a letter to President Roosevelt on May 23, 1938?

For the first time in our observation, the Works Progress Administration, which was conceived and established to feed the families of the unemployed, irrespective of the politics, race, or creed of those to be served, through its directing heads, is seeking what? To drive hungry and destitute people to vote for a certain candidate for office. Meetings and conferences have been held in practically every county in the State by key men in places of importance with the Works Progress Administration, at which definite instructions were given selected agents that no one should be placed on Federal relief except on the advice of campaign managers of the candidate. Furthermore, these same agents have been required to inform all those individuals seeking Federal assistance that unless they are for the candidate for Senator whom the heads of the relief administration are supporting, there will be neither relief funds nor jobs for them.

That is not a Republican speaking. That is a distinguished Democrat and judge of Kentucky. This Democrat says further in his letter:

It is unthinkable that any relief agency of the Federal Government engaged in a charitable and a humanitarian task would be deliberately prostituted by politicians for the benefit of a man seeking public office. The Work Projects Administration in Kentucky has been converted into an out-and-out political machine. Those with starving mouths to feed are forced to surrender their one remaining privilege of choosing for whom they shall vote; otherwise, they and their dependents must go hungry and naked.

Whose money was being used to accomplish this coercion and intimidation? It was not the money of the candidates or their backers. It was the taxpayers' money. Yes; with the taxpayers' own money—taking it from the rich and poor, from the widows and orphans alike, to browbeat, coerce, corrupt, and intimidate the people of Kentucky themselves. This letter also points out that many persons were put on the W. P. A. and other rolls not to render service to the people of Kentucky or the Nation, but to travel about over the State and perform political services for a certain candidate—their salaries and expenses paid by the taxpayers. Instead of being helpful to the people of Kentucky and especially the needy people, they were busy in attempts to corrupt, intimidate, and coerce them. Many affidavits were secured and published showing that the W. P. A. trucks with foremen and bosses of the W. P. A. were used to gather up needy people and carry them to the county courthouses to have these needy persons to change their registrations and exacting promises from them to vote for a certain man.

A certain political organization was set up in Kentucky to go among the W. P. A. workers to collect money from these poorly paid persons to help finance these campaigns. These persons were warned to get cash and take no checks except "payable to cash," so that they could not be traced. The State administrator in a letter ordered one of his State directors in charge of organizing and collecting this money to destroy his records. Many of these cases of sand-bagging these poor, needy workers came to me personally. Among these I recall a lady living in one of my counties and working on the W. P. A. for \$30 per month. She had a husband confined to his bed with TB and her four young children. The support of this husband and the children and their education depended upon her meager salary. These politicians demanded of her \$10 out of her \$30 as her campaign contribution for one of these candidates. She had pledged this money for medicine, food, and clothing for her husband and children and could not make the contribution. Soon after the primary was over she was let out with the statement that she had failed to cooperate. It is admitted that she was a very industrious, capable worker.

The purpose of the Hatch Act of August 1939 and the purpose of this act is to protect our needy people from favoritism, coercion, and intimidation, and to prevent their being required to give of their meager wages or salaries provided by the taxpayers of this Nation to finance politicians or any party or faction of a party. The average fair-minded Kentuckian revolted against such practices. This relief money does not belong to the politicians. It was intended to go to the needy without regard to party affiliations, race, creed, or color. If the hundreds of thousands of political officeholders receiving large salaries and expense accounts had been eliminated at least a million of the needy people of this country that have been denied jobs and relief could have been helped.

Let us pass this wholesome measure and thereby declare ourselves for clean politics. Let us administer this money taken from the taxpayers impartially for the relief of the needy. Let the small wages and salaries received by those needing jobs and relief be free from assessment by politicians. Let us cut out attempts to corrupt, intimidate, and coerce our citizens so that they may stand up as freemen and exercise their priceless privilege as American citizens. [Applause.] The ballot must be free. Our forefathers gave freely of their lives and of their fortunes to create a great, free nation on this side of the Atlantic. I do not propose to sit idly by and see a

lot of politicians for their own selfish purposes and through partisan politics, coercion, and intimidation, consume the taxpayers' money and at the same time take away the liberties and freedom of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

UNITED STATES SENATE GETS BUSY

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. This corrupt use of the taxpayers' money and the attempts to corrupt, intimidate, and coerce the citizens of this country became so flagrant that a committee of United States Senators, composed largely of Democrats, investigated conditions in Kentucky, New Mexico, and other States, and this committee fully confirmed all that had been said about the misuse of the taxpayers' money and the mistreatment of needy citizens. They found that the W. P. A. rolls increased in Kentucky as the primary-election day approached and increased in the Nation as the regular election day approached and the years in which a national election was held. These relief rolls fell off after the election and in the middle of winter. There was left no room for doubt that the taxpayers' money was being used in large amounts to build and maintain political machines.

This investigation also developed the fact that the taxpayers' money appropriated by Congress, the millions of dollars turned over to the States for old-age pensions and other pensions and to construct highways, buildings, and other projects, all of the expense of which was contributed to by the Federal Government, was used to build and maintain political machines in the States. This ran into millions of dollars annually, and the political machines in the States turned their attention to the use of these large sums of money and the jobs for political purposes.

The administration-backed candidate for United States Senator in Kentucky and his friends boldly declared that the old-age-pension money and other sums furnished to the State were being used by the State crowd to coerce voters to vote for the man backed by the State crowd for the nomination for United States Senator. It was said by the national administration candidate that the old people of Kentucky, receiving less on an average than \$9 a month, were forced to change their registration and cast their vote according to the wishes of the State administration or be denied old-age pensions or be removed from the pension rolls. Many affidavits were submitted and published on this subject; and those employed on these State-controlled projects but financed wholly or in part with Federal money were forced to vote as the State machine dictated. To my own personal knowledge, these Federal funds were used to aid both factions in Kentucky, needy old people were promised pensions, needy people were promised jobs if they registered and voted right; and it was not confined merely to national and State elections. These huge sums of money and jobs were used to corrupt, intimidate, and coerce voters in city, county, and district elections, and in one particular case known to me these funds and jobs were used in a county wet-and-dry election. All in all, it reached that point in Kentucky where it was spoken of frequently that we no longer had elections but public auctions, and it was the United States Treasury against the State treasury.

It has been the great American ideal that governments exist for the benefit of the governed and by and with their consent. We call that democracy. The ballot box is the place where the American people give their consent. It is here that they select their public servants—not masters. It is here that they approve or disapprove of policies of government. The ballot box must be kept clean and pure. It must be free of coercion and intimidation. No great nation has ever fallen by reason of attacks from the outside if it is sound inside. They fall from within first. This Nation cannot be successfully as-

sailed from without if we remain true to the principles and ideals of this Nation within.

The purpose of this Hatch bill is to take the hands of the spoilsmen out of the pockets of the taxpayers and from the throats of the voters and especially the needy voters of this country, so that they may go to the polls unafraid and vote their honest sentiments and chart their own destinies and preserve the principles and ideals of the founding fathers. We need not fear so long as the Nation has clean elections and they are free from attempts to corrupt, coerce, or intimidate.

These billions of dollars sent to the States mean tremendous power. We must not sit idly by here and permit selfish men to use these billions to perpetuate bureaucratic control and their own selfish interests. Last year we put the halter on the Federal officeholders who indulged in these practices inimical to the welfare of the people of this country. The bill before us, the new Hatch bill, puts a halter on State officeholders and agents whose salaries or wages in whole or in part are paid out of the Federal Treasury, the people who are handling these billions of dollars that are being spent in the States. This bill reaches out and says to these politicians, Federal or State, in whose hands has been placed this tremendous power, that it cannot be used to corrupt, intimidate, or coerce the voters of this country.

These billions were appropriated to help the needy and to improve our country. The direct and indirect obligations of this country exceed \$50,000,000,000. We are developing a great program of national defense costing billions of dollars. There will be additional burdens placed upon the backs of the taxpayers of the Nation. Congress should see to it that no part of these taxes is used to promote the political fortunes of any person, any party, or any group, or any faction.

We owe it to the needy people, to the taxpayers, and to the American people to pass this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, so many misstatements have been made about the provisions of this bill that it would take a much longer time than 10 minutes to explain the entire scope of the legislation. This bill simply extends the provisions of the original Hatch Act to those State employees who are paid in full or in part from Federal funds. The entire purpose is to provide this additional group of public employees with the same safeguards and protection accorded Federal workers by the original law. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] yesterday said that if a janitor was employed at a little schoolhouse and a W. P. A. project was set up providing for the painting of that schoolhouse, and that janitor should put paper on the floor to cover it so that it would not be stained by dropping paint, he would come within the provisions of the act. That is ridiculous. I cannot understand why a man should make a statement of that kind, and certainly I would not be critical about my friend from Alabama—and he is my friend—except to say this: When he cuts it, he surely cuts it thick, and he has the ability to cut it smooth at the same time. No person comes within the purview of this act who is not receiving directly funds from the Federal Government. I contend it is the duty of the Members of this House and the Members of the Senate of the United States, when they vote appropriations from the Treasury of the United States to so safeguard those funds that they will be expended for the purposes for which they are appropriated, and not diverted into campaign funds. Having been born in the State of Pennsylvania, I have had some experience with political set-ups. I also had some experience in New York. I lived in Missouri for a time, and in Oklahoma, but now I have the good fortune to live in the State of New Mexico.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. On page 13, section 12, of the bill, we find the following language:

No officer or employee of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency.

Will the gentleman please explain how far that goes?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It goes just as far as that says. I think that is a very splendid provision.

Mr. BULWINKLE. All right.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me answer the gentleman's question. For instance, we will say an engineer in a city is appointed by the city authorities.

A W. P. A. project is set up in that city. He spends a month on that project, but that is not his principal employment. That is only a small part of his employment. He in no way comes under the provisions of this act.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But this says "whose principal employment is in connection with any activity." It does not say it has to be the activity. You can take a county attorney, where the county has a W. P. A. fund, and that county attorney may have a part of his work with it. You may mean it the way you say it, but this does not read that way.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think, if the gentleman will read other provisions of the act, he will find the interpretation he is suggesting does not apply, at all. Yesterday when one of the Members of the House was speaking, this question was asked—

Mr. BULWINKLE. Let me ask the gentleman—

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield. I want to finish if I can. I will be glad to yield when I have made my statement.

Yesterday this question was asked: In the construction of highways, where the Federal Government participates with the State, would the men who work for the contractors be permitted to attend a precinct meeting? Every Member of this House knows that the contracts are let by competitive bidding to a contractor. Workers on his pay roll are in private employment, not in the employ of either the State or the Federal Government. The contractor in no way comes under the provision of this bill, nor does a single individual working for that contractor. The only man who does come under it in connection with the project is the Federal inspector for the Public Roads Administration.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman mean to say that the other officials of the highway commission of a State, where there are hundreds of them, are in no way affected by the provisions of this bill?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I did not say that. I say they are completely under the provisions of the bill. The highway engineers in the States which receive these grants from the Federal Government—that is their principal occupation, to spend that money, and they do come within the purview of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Not only them but the State inspectors.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. A moment ago the gentleman said only the United States engineers.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Oh, I did not say engineer at any time. I said the contractor or his men in no way came under the purview of this bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. But say all inspectors in the highway department?

Mr. DEMPSEY. All inspectors in the highway department, which is expending funds of the Public Roads Administration, would come under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. They are using them in my State today in a senatorial primary.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is the great necessity for this amendment—the very thing you are talking about. We are voting hundreds of millions of dollars to build roads. Instead of building roads, we are building up campaign funds.

That is exactly what we are doing with the money, and the very thing this legislation is intended to stop.

Mr. COCHRAN. Has the thought come into the gentleman's mind at all as to what might happen to this bill when it goes into conference? The House has stricken out everything after the enacting clause and substituted new language. Does not the gentleman think the best thing to do, in order to make sure we will get a law, is to pass the bill as it was passed by the Senate, so that it will go to the President and we may get some advantage in some of the primaries? Watch out it does not find a resting place in conference.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the bill does not leave here in good form, yes; but I think the bill in some way is improved as compared with the form in which it left the Senate. For instance, there is a provision that the gentleman from Alabama spoke about yesterday relating to the dismissal of an employee or the suspension for a period of 18 months of an employee who has been found guilty of pernicious political activity. The gentleman from Alabama has placed in the bill a clause which makes it necessary, if the employee demands it, to provide a jury trial. Never in the history of this Government, as far as I know, has it been necessary to give a man a jury trial when he is dismissed from public employ for cause, even though that cause be based upon prohibited political activity. Now, what does the Hatch bill provide? What does the author of the bill desire? He says if a man is charged with prohibited political activity, the Civil Service Commission will investigate. If the Commission finds sufficient reason to give him a hearing, he is given one.

If it is determined at this hearing that he is guilty of the offense, the man can then appeal to the district court. The district judge finds not only on law but on fact, and if he finds the commission erred, the man is not discharged from his employment. If the court finds that the man is guilty, there is nothing in this bill that requires, without alternative, the dismissal of that man or his separation from the service. The State has that right, and the State can say, "We propose to retain him in his present position." When they do the Federal Government says to the State, "All right. You are going to be penalized for that to the extent of twice the amount of that man's annual salary." We are not going to do like the gentlemen of the House voted to do for the Social Security Board—have them fine a State, as they did the State of Ohio, \$1,300,000. There is no discussion around here about that, but the minute we try to clean up a putrid political situation there is immediate condemnation from some sources. Many of the people who are voicing criticism around here and who oppose this bill come from States where, the records show, the grossest violations of the law—at least of the moral code of ethics—have occurred.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Does the gentleman realize that this is a criminal act?

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is one part of it that is intended to be criminal law. That is the part which provides penalties for coercion and intimidation of voters and similar infractions. In such cases a jury trial is, of course, provided.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Where do they get a jury trial except on making demand? They have to file a petition for it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, they get it. Any person charged with crime may ask for and be granted a jury trial. I was talking primarily, however, about persons involved in cases under the legislation where no criminal penalty is provided.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill S. 3046—the Hatch bill—had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—NATIONAL DEFENSE (H. DOC. NO. 874)

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of its armed forces, I come again to the representatives of the people in Congress assembled, to lay before them an extraordinary estimate of funds and authorizations required for the national defense.

In my opinion, it is necessary now that the people of this Nation and their representatives in Congress look at the problem of the national defense with utterly dispassionate realism. Never have we as a nation attempted to define the word "defense" in terms of a specific attack at a certain place at a certain time or with specified land and sea forces. In the long sweep of the century and a half since our defenses have been concentrated and unified under the Constitution, it has been a prime obligation of the President and Commander in Chief promptly to advise the Congress with respect to any world circumstances calling for either increased or diminished defense needs.

From time to time during the last 7 years I have not failed to advise the people and their representatives of grave dangers threatening the United States and its people, and the institutions of democracy everywhere. From time to time I have availed myself of opportunities to reassert and to implement the right of all the nations of the American Hemisphere to freedom from attack or control by any non-American power.

A year and a half ago, on January 4, 1939, in my address to the Congress, I referred to the fact that I had felt it necessary on previous occasions to warn of disturbances abroad, and the need of putting our own house in order in the face of storm signals from across the seas. On that day I said that a war which threatened to envelop the world in flames had been averted, but that it had become increasingly clear that peace was not assured. I said then that all about us raged undeclared wars, military and economic. I said then that all about us were threats of new aggression, military and economic. I said then that the storms from abroad directly challenged three institutions indispensable to Americans—religion, democracy, and international good faith.

Unhappily, many Americans believed that those who thought they foresaw the danger of a great war were mistaken. Unhappily, those of us who did foresee that danger were right.

A week later, on January 12, 1939, I submitted a program considered by me as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and by my advisers to be a minimum program for the necessities of defense, saying that every American was aware of the peaceful intentions of this Government and of this people, and that every American knew that we have no thought of aggression and no desire for further territory. The Congress granted that request for the minimum program then deemed necessary.

At the beginning of September the storm broke, and on the 21st of that month, in a message to the extraordinary session of the Congress, I said that this Government must lose no time or effort to keep this Nation from being drawn into the war, and I asserted my belief that we would succeed in these efforts. We have succeeded. I believe we shall continue to succeed.

In September last, I increased the strength of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation within statutory authorizations made by the Congress. In January 1940 I submitted a budget to the Congress which included provision for that expansion of personnel, as well as estimates for the national defense, amounting to approximately \$2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1941.

LXXXVI—594

On May 16, in a message to the Congress, I pointed out that the swift and shocking developments of that time forced every neutral nation to look to its defenses in the light of new factors loosed by the brutal force of modern offensive war. I called attention to the treacherous use of the "fifth column," by which persons supposed to be peaceful visitors were actually a part of an enemy unit of occupation, and called special attention to the necessity for the protection of the whole American Hemisphere from control, invasion, or domination. I asked at that time for a sum totaling \$1,182,000,000 for the national defense.

On May 31, 1940, I again sent a message to the Congress, to say that the almost incredible events of the then past 2 weeks in the European conflict had necessitated another enlargement of our military program, and at that time I asked for \$1,277,741,170 for the acceleration and development of our military and naval needs as measured in both machines and men.

Again today, in less than 2 months' time, the changes in the world situation are so great and so profound that I must come once again to the Congress to advise concerning new threats, new needs, and the imperative necessity of meeting them. Free men and free women in the United States look to us to defend their freedom against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Those enemies of freedom who hate free institutions now deride democratic governments as weak and inefficient.

We, the free men and women of the United States, with memories of our fathers to inspire us and the hopes of our children to sustain us, are determined to be strong as well as free. The apologists for despotism and those who aid them by whispering defeatism or appeasement, assert that because we have not devoted our full energies to arms and to preparation for war that we are now incapable of defense.

I refute that imputation.

We fully understand the threat of the new enslavement in which men may not speak, may not listen, may not think. As these threats become more numerous and their dire meaning more clear, it deepens the determination of the American people to meet them with wholly adequate defense.

We have seen nation after nation, some of them weakened by treachery from within, succumb to the force of the aggressor. We see great nations still gallantly fighting against aggression, encouraged by high hope of ultimate victory.

That we are opposed to war is known not only to every American, but to every government in the world. We will not use our arms in a war of aggression; we will not send our men to take part in European wars.

But, we will repel aggression against the United States or the Western Hemisphere. The people and their representatives in the Congress know that the threats to our liberties, the threats to our security, the threats against our way of life, the threats to our institutions of religion, of democracy, and of international good faith, have increased in number and gravity from month to month, from week to week, and almost from day to day.

It is because of these rapid changes; it is because of the grave danger to democratic institutions; and, above all, it is because of the united will of the entire American people that I come to ask you for a further authorization of \$4,848,171,957 for the national defense.

Let no man in this country or anywhere else believe that because we in America still cherish freedom of religion, of speech, of assembly, of the press; that because we maintain our free democratic political institutions by which the Nation, after full discussion and debate, chooses its representatives and leaders for itself—let no man here or elsewhere believe that we are weak.

The United States is the greatest industrial Nation in the world. Its people, as workers and as businessmen, have proved that they can unite in the national interest and that they can bring together the greatest assembly of human skills, of mechanical production, and of national resources, ever known in any nation.

The principal lesson of the war up to the present time is that partial defense is inadequate defense.

If the United States is to have any defense, it must have total defense.

We cannot defend ourselves a little here and a little there. We must be able to defend ourselves wholly and at any time.

Our plans for national security, therefore, should cover total defense. I believe that the people of this country are willing to make any sacrifice to attain that end.

After consultation with the War and Navy Departments and the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense, I recommend a further program for the national defense. This contemplates the provision of funds and authorizations for the material requirements without which the manpower of the Nation, if called into service, cannot effectively operate, either in the production of arms and goods, or their utilization in repelling attack.

In broad outline our immediate objectives are as follows:

1. To carry forward the naval-expansion program designed to build up the Navy to meet any possible combination of hostile naval forces.

2. To complete the total equipment for a land force of approximately 1,200,000 men, though of course this total of men would not be in the Army in time of peace.

3. To procure reserve stocks of tanks, guns, artillery, ammunition, and so forth, for another 800,000 men, or a total of 2,000,000 men if a mobilization of such a force should become necessary.

4. To provide for manufacturing facilities, public and private, necessary to produce critical items of equipment required for a land force of 2,000,000 men, and to produce the ordnance items required for the aircraft program of the Army and Navy—guns, bombs, armor, bomb sights, and ammunition.

5. Procurement of 15,000 additional planes for the Army and 4,000 for the Navy, complete with necessary spare engines, armaments, and the most modern equipment.

The foregoing program deals exclusively with matériel requirements. The Congress is now considering the enactment of a system of selective training for developing the necessary manpower to operate this matériel and manpower to fill Army noncombat needs. In this way we can make certain that when this modern matériel becomes available, it will be placed in the hands of troops trained, seasoned, and ready, and that replacement matériel can be guaranteed.

I take this occasion to report the excellent progress being made for the procurement of the equipment already ordered under authorization by the Congress. Every week more and more is being delivered. The several branches of the Government are working in close cooperation with each other and with private manufacturers.

We are keeping abreast of developments in strategy, tactics, and technique of warfare, and build our defenses accordingly.

The total amount which I ask of the Congress in order that this program may be carried out with all reasonable speed is \$2,161,441,957, which it is estimated would be spent out of the Treasury between now and July 1, 1941, and an additional \$2,686,730,000 for contract authorizations.

So great a sum means sacrifice. So large a program means hard work—the participation of the whole country in the total defense of the country. This Nation through sacrifice and work and unity proposes to remain free.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 10, 1940.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that this will complete the program of national defense. These are tremendous sums added to what has already been authorized and appropriated.

I take this minute in order to say a thing that has been rather on my heart for some time. The United States of America, in my opinion—and I think I speak the heart of America when I say this, the heart of America from the head of the Government down—intends that not one dollar of

this money shall ever be used to equip an army of aggression, because we covet not one foot of soil over which the flag of any other nation flies today. And may I say further that as far as I am concerned, and I still feel that I speak the heart of America from the head of the Government down, that not one dollar of this money shall ever be used to equip and send American boys to fight on European soil. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF ACT TO PREVENT PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3046.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 3046) to prevent pernicious political activities, with Mr. STARNES of Alabama in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 1 hour and 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Kansas has 37 minutes remaining.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, if I may be privileged to speak it, considering all our circumstances the bill now before the Committee is perhaps the most important bill that has been considered by this Congress in 25 years at least. I am certain that I am not considering this bill from a partisan standpoint, and I am not considering it from the standpoint of any of the factions within any party. We are assembled here today at a time when democratic government is in peril the whole world over, including our own country.

Democracy is a government by the people. Do not forget that. In order for a government by the people to function two things are absolutely necessary: There must be governmental machinery through which a democracy can function, and there must be a governmental capacity on the part of the people capable of operating a democratic system of government. This bill strikes deeply into the vitals of each of these requirements. There is not the slightest question about that. These are sound propositions on which everyone ought to agree.

Democracy in America is in danger from what we are doing to democracy. In Europe the conflict is between democracy and that type of government functioning from the top downward, designated as totalitarian government. The danger to democracy in America is not from that type of government but from another type which also functions from the top downward—a Federal bureaucracy.

An interesting thing is that democracy in the world seems to be under attack by that thing which in each situation could do the most hurt to democracy. In this bill democracy is under attack by the Congress, many Members of which have been deploring the development of Federal bureaucracy.

We are not discussing persons but a system of government. The individuals who make up this rapidly developing bureaucracy are fine American citizens. They are doing the work assigned to them. They are not originating this new power. Congress is doing it. They are not declaring to the world that our democracy is so complete a failure that our States cannot be entrusted with the control of their State employees and State elections. Congress is doing it.

Before we go any further, suppose we examine briefly our structure of government.

The statements of our friends that we began this noble experiment on this continent are entirely erroneous. The facts are that through the long processes of time the democracy of the Anglo-Saxon peoples has been in process of development. When we established our governments in Amer-

ica—first the colonies and then the States—the plan of those governments was that of a democracy, the very nature of which placed responsibility in the main in the small communities which were close to the people, because it was to be and was the people's government. When you examine the governmental structure of our States you see there the possibility of popular control, because most of the business of the States is carried on through cities, and counties, small units of government where the democrat, the person, the human being, elect the chief officers and has a chance to have his influence felt, a chance of control. It is close to him.

When you examine progress in democratic systems of government you find that all progress in those systems from the time they were established has been in that direction which puts power to govern and necessity to govern closer and closer to the individual. That is common sense. It is an absolute necessity.

It has got to be closer and closer to the people because the people are the Government. It has got to be closer and closer to the people in order that the people may have the responsibilities of and may deal with the problems of government and increase thereby their capacity to govern by dealing with the problems of government. I do not suppose anybody will question any of those statements I have made thus far. If they are sound this bill is unsound.

What does this Hatch bill propose to do in the particulars that have been under discussion? It is a most remarkable bill and the thing that is most remarkable to me is to see my friends on the Republican side who have been criticizing bureaucracy and the centralization of government and those who have been talking about State rights, favoring this bill.

The same is true of those on the Democratic side. We get up here and talk about preserving democracy in the world, yet right here we are doing the thing which we know by common sense and the experience of people in the realm of government is removing governmental power away from the people and centering it here in Washington at the place where you say it ought not to be. That is a remarkable thing. We all love our friend from New Mexico, Mr. DEMPSEY, but the gentleman and the rest of you have never once discussed the big feature in this bill, and that is what you are doing to the necessary, the indispensable functioning machinery of our democratic system of government.

We all agree that there should not be political corruption, but that is not the big question. The big question in this proposed legislation is, Will you remove the responsibility of the people to govern from their communities up here to Washington? Will you put it within the power of a bureaucratic organization to deal with a State election, even a primary election in a local community, as is proposed by this bill?

If this legislation is necessary, it is only because the States cannot be entrusted to take care of their own elections and of their own officials. That is the implied charge contained in this bill. There is no governmental responsibility more important or more completely within the governmental capacity of the States unless it be true, as this bill implies, that our democracy cannot govern.

If the States cannot be entrusted to control the elections of their officials, as this bill implies, it is true, as the enemies of democracy claim, that our democracy ought to be abolished. It is utterly ridiculous for anybody to talk about having any respect for our States in connection with his advocacy of this bill, and I say that the only reason which you can offer to your people when you go back to them as to why you voted for this bill is the excuse that you do not think your State and your people can be entrusted with preserving the purity of their elections. You tell your people and you tell the world how in this critical hour, when democracy is on trial, when many people are questioning it, when the friends of democracy ought to demonstrate their confidence in it and adopt those governmental policies calculated to preserve and strengthen it, you declare, "We do not believe the people of a State can be trusted with the protection of the purity of their own local elections."

This bill does not abolish any power to coerce a vote. It shifts the power from those whom the people can control and punish to a Federal agency whose personnel the people cannot punish or control.

You are going to turn over to a Federal bureaucracy the power to coerce the people of my State. I know what I am talking about. You put it in the power of a Federal officer, a part of a bureaucratic machine, to go into the State of Texas, for instance, and bump off the pay roll a State employee in the State of Texas because of local political activities. There is no one who can challenge that. That is where you are putting the power. You are not protecting anybody. You are moving the power of control from the people of the States, who elect their public officers, to somebody from Washington who, under this bill, could go into my State and say to my people: "You put that man off the pay roll and if you do not we will fine you 2 years of his salary." What are you going to do about it? The poor devil involved goes off the pay roll that minute under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield if my statement is not true.

Mr. HANCOCK. Charges must be preferred.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; by somebody connected with the Federal organization.

Mr. HANCOCK. And he must be found guilty by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes, by another part of the same agency. I cannot yield further. A bureau in Washington makes the charges and conducts the investigation. A bureau in Washington makes a finding and demands of the State or employing community that it discharge this employee—its own employee—and if it does not it fines the State 2 years' salary for not taking him off, and there is no one can controvert that statement.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If I have made an incorrect statement.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. I want to correct the gentleman. Your complaint comes from the State or local agency and it is called to the attention of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Oh, no; it is not.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Read the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The State does not have a thing to do with it except to do what it is told to do. That is the truth about the matter. Read the bill yourself.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. I have read it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The complaint is made by somebody connected with a Federal activity; then the Civil Service Commission makes an investigation; they tell the State to turn him loose and if it does not turn him loose it is fined 2 years' salary. There is no one can controvert that who has read the bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No. I want to talk to those who have been hollering their heads off here about developing bureaucracy in this country and yet are supporting this bill. This bill is the farthest reach of bureaucratic powers into the vitals of democratic institutions and in favor of bureaucracy that has been proposed in this Government since the beginning of the Government. I say to you people who have been complaining about the destruction of our democracy and the substitution therefor of a bureaucratic Government, this thing is not proposed by the bureaucracy itself. It is proposed by the Congress of the United States to give to a Federal agency the power to coerce and dominate a sovereign State in a matter of its most intimate and vital governmental responsibility.

Tell it what it has to do with regard to its own employees and its own elections and tell its citizens what they have to do or lose their State and community jobs.

You think of that, you think of the Congress of the United States, the Members of which are talking about

democracy and professing concern that somebody may do something to our democracy, adopting a program and supporting a bill that carries with it a declaration to the world that we do not believe the people can be trusted to govern themselves.

This is the attack on our democracy: The Federal Government goes out into the States and gets more money from the States by taxation and the sale of bonds than is spent for Federal purposes. Then a part of that money is sent back to the States for various projects with an attached power of control. Then Congress comes along and says to these bureaus: "We will enact a law and give you the power to use this money to blackmail the States to compel the States to submit to your demands. You can tell a State that if it does not fire one of its employees whose dismissal is demanded by a Federal agency we will take 2 years of his salary away."

What do you think about that? If you can do it to control an election and to determine whom the States may employ and whether an employee of a State may keep his job, you can do it to control schools; you can do it to control every power that a State exercises. You are endorsing that policy of government when you pass this bill. You are setting a precedent. Nothing has been proposed like this since the organization of the Government. No more serious charge has been made by Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, or the "fifth column" against the governmental dependability and capacity of the people than is contained in this bill. Talk about a people being able to govern, being able to operate a democracy and then denying to them a duty and a responsibility so intimate as their elections and the right to determine their own employees is the height of absurdity.

You send into your States a Federal agency to control with reference to State employees and State elections, and then go hollering your heads off about this development of Federal bureaucracy. We are discussing governmental power. In the allocation of governmental power it is not only what may be done in a particular respect but what may be done with the power thus located which statesmen must consider. The most remarkable thing perhaps about the whole matter is the lack of evidence of any hesitancy to use the control of this money to exercise a power over the States denied to the Federal Government by the Constitution which we are sworn to defend. It is admitted by Senator HATCH, whom we all respect, that it cannot be done through the Constitution. My distinguished friend will admit the same thing. The Constitution of the United States protects the States in their right to control their own elections in their precincts and to select and retain their own employees and protect these employees from being dependent upon any Federal agency for the retention of their jobs. This is not merely contrary to our written Constitution but it is contrary to common sense to have an agency of government like a State that the public interest requires should be responsible to the people and yet is denied complete responsibility and power in the selection of its own agents through whom that responsibility must be discharged.

You cannot go through the Constitution. Everybody admits it; that is the remarkable thing, talking about the Constitution, talking about the reserved rights of the States, and what do you propose to do? You would break through the constitutional barrier if you could. That is evident. You cannot get through. So what do you do? I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate proceedings, March 5, 1940, page 2339:

Mr. HATCH—

Regarding control over State elections—

There are several grounds upon which we may enact this type of legislation.

The Senator—

Mr. MINTON—

asked me the specific question what power the Federal Government had to control directly State elections when no Federal officer was

involved. I answered that question, "none"; but we do have control over the funds we appropriate from the Treasury. * * *

Mr. MINTON. The Senator has admitted that we have no control over the conduct of a State election. Does the Senator contend that the Federal Government may use some power that it does have in order to coerce a State and State employees and State electors in a field in which the Federal Government has no power at all to act?

Pages 2340 and 2341:

Mr. HATCH. Section 3 of the bill which I had started to discuss is the one which affects directly the employees of the States in vast numbers, and provides, in substance, that they shall not engage in political activities. That provision, Mr. President, was the one which gave us difficulty in drafting. * * * All we had to do, of course, was to copy the language of the existing law, the civil-service rule, or adopt new language making such prohibition. * * * We do not have such means with reference to the States. The Congress of the United States could not say that if a particular man did the prohibited act he must be discharged, and then proceed to discharge him or have him discharged. There is no such power as that. There was the question of how far the Congress should go with such legislation. * * *

* * * We adopted the theory of first forbidding political activities of State employees as we have forbidden them on the part of our own employees, * * * not to punish the State but to procure compliance with the nonpolitical provision of the law, which, I take it, the Senator from Indiana is going to say is a method and means of coercing the States and forcing them to comply with standards which we set up.

You lead these bureaus around behind the Constitution, you men sworn to defend it, and make a rear attack on the Constitution that you are sworn to defend. You make a rear attack upon the reserved rights of the States and upon the liberty of speech and action of these citizens. Talk to me about preserving democracy and the right of the people to govern! Of course, there are things in the States that ought to be done. If there was not there would be no need for a State government. But when did you discover that because a thing connected with a State government ought to be done you ought to have a Federal bureaucracy do it? When did anybody discover that every time there is some business to be attended to in a State you have to holler for Uncle Sam to come and do it?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman asked when we discovered that. We discovered it when the Federal Government commenced to do these things in the States which should be done in the States, but which have been done by the Federal Government and the bureaus almost entirely within the last 10 years.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Fifteen years ago I directed the attention of this House to the development of this bureaucracy, and I am going to put those statements in the RECORD. But because this was done that ought not to have been done, you come along and you say, "You have been pikers at this job; we will show you how to do it." You could not get through the Constitution; you are barred. You say, "If you will follow us, Mr. Bureau, we will show you a route around the Constitution where you can attack these States from the rear and compel a sovereign State to yield to the dictation of a Federal bureau, or take the money from them." That is what you are doing.

When you get out on the stump this fall, and we get out on the stump this fall, this bill will come up to confront every man who is appealing to the American people to give democracy in this country the right to exist. If the people of a State cannot be entrusted governmentally with things so intimate and so important as the election of their own public officials and the control of their own employees, in the name of common sense, why do you want a government by the people? Who is going to answer that? I am talking to you as Americans, as the responsible representative of a sovereign people, not as somebody that is being bossed by somebody on the Republican side or on the Democratic side. There has been a good deal of talk here from the Republican side about having some "rubber stamps" on this Democratic side. Well,

we do have a few; we have too many. But it looks to me as if you are going to demonstrate that you do not have "rubber stamps" over there, but you do have wooden ones. People are supposed to vote with their heads.

The thing just does not make sense. It just does not make sense to be up here talking about a democracy, taking about the power of the people to govern, when really we are declaring to the world that in the greatest democracy on earth the people cannot govern. You just take that and think about it. This bill declares to the nations of the earth that the people in the States, in their local communities, cannot govern and you are compelled to send in a Federal bureaucracy to coerce the State. You cannot keep this sort of thing up and preserve democracy in this country. The only way you can preserve democracy is to keep the people in responsibility. It is a tragic thing that is about to happen in this House.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the situation. Your candidate for President has endorsed this bill, the President of the United States has endorsed the bill, and we are told that the leadership on both sides is for the bill. I am doing my best to discharge my responsibility. I believe in a democracy, in the right, and in the capacity of the people to govern but only if they are kept in governmental responsibility. If ever there was a time on the face of this earth when individuals in responsibility, like you and myself are in responsibility, should be willing to be guided by the best judgment that God Almighty has given us, instead of being dictated to by somebody else, that time is now. The people of this country are thinking as they have never thought before.

I have just got back from home. The people of this country want another chance to try to preserve democracy and free government in this country. The people are getting tired of somebody coming down from Washington and telling them what they can do or cannot do. [Applause.]

The men out on W. P. A. aspire for something better for their children than to have to follow in their footsteps. These million people on the Federal pay roll—if this thing keeps on and every person keeps climbing on that raft out in the water, the first thing we know the whole thing will sink and they will all be in the water. These Federal employees know that. This having the State and Federal Governments working at the same job has got to quit. There is a limit beyond which the expense of government cannot go.

The people want this sort of business stopped. I have talked with my people. The people of this country are willing to do the job, in a free country. You have the responsibility of leadership and you preach the doctrine of defeatism again from this forum and tell them they cannot even control their own elections.

I want to tell you it is a pretty serious thing we are doing in this country now. What are we going to do about it? Let us see what we are fixing to do. We have a great form of government in America. Unquestionably, we have got the greatest possible—we have the most perfect possible for the functioning of a great democracy that ever developed in the world. First, you have the people; above the people the small units of government; above the small units of government the States; and above that the Federal organization.

When these 13 independent States as a Nation took counsel with reference to their situation they decided that they needed a common agency to look after their diplomatic matters; that they needed a common agency to deal with their Army and their Navy; that they needed one system of weights and measures, and a few other things like that; and they created this Federal organization to act for them in these matters. There never was any purpose to make it a government of general responsibilities.

The people cannot operate so big a system of government dealing with general government responsibilities and they had sense enough to know it, and so they provided that only those powers which they specifically delegated to this central organization should that central organization have, and they reserved all the other powers to themselves and to the people.

Now, I do not mention this as one who makes a fetish of the Constitution, but I mention it as a logical, sensible arrangement of governmental powers.

What are we trying to do? We are trying to make this Government function from the top down. We are trying to send a Federal bureaucrat into my State and yours to deal with a State election. We are attempting by this bill to authorize a Federal bureaucrat to go down there and, in a measure, determine who is to be employed by the State.

We are giving to this great Federal organization the power to go down to that State and say to your State and my State—think of it—you people who come from these States—think what you are authorizing them to do—to go down to your State and say, "If you do not fire this State employee, we will fine you 2 years of his salary." Now, that is what you are voting, and go back there and blah, blah to your people about how much sense you think they have got, and about our great democracy. And today you are going to cast a vote which declares to the world you do not believe what you are saying.

What is the use of the States if we cannot trust them to take care of their State elections and determine who is to do their work? Now, just ask that in your own minds. What is the use of paying the expense of a State government if the State government cannot be entrusted to take care of its own elections and its own employees. If we keep on doing this sort of thing and saying this sort of thing to the people of the country, they are going to say that there is not any use, and there will not be any use for this reason.

When you continue to take these powers from these States, our only agencies through which democracy can function, they will continue to lose power, to function, and that is how we are destroying the States and this democracy. We are taking from these States specific powers, one after another, and every time we take a power from the States, under a law of nature that power to do that thing departs from that State and we leave that State weaker and weaker and weaker with reference to the discharge of its other remaining duties until finally it cannot do the job. In proportion as you take these powers away from the small units of government where the people have responsibility, where they have the necessity to govern, the people lose the capacity to govern, because that same universal law of God Almighty will not permit power to remain anywhere where it is not used, and the day will come when you will undertake to send some of these powers back into the States and they will not be governmentally able to receive them and that will be the end. Are we so blind that we cannot see this or are we so indifferent that it is of no concern to us?

And who will be responsible? We will be responsible. We are doing the trick now. We are destroying these States now. We are destroying the governmental capacity of the people now. We are destroying this democracy now. I do not care who advocates this thing. I try to be loyal to my party, but in this hour of my Nation's peril, when I know that democratic institutions are under challenge everywhere, so help me God, I am not going to do that which I think will destroy my country. [Applause.] This is a solemn hour for us here in this House. No responsibility equal to ours has rested on anybody in this country in 50 years at least. Will we measure up to it? It is an individual responsibility and an individual challenge. There is not a human being in this House who does not know that this proposed legislation, this authorization of a bureaucratic power to do this thing, is against the fundamentals of democracy and is against the increase of the capacity of the people to govern; and whenever the problems of this Government get larger than the governmental capacity of the people, then government turns from that people and lays its hands on a bureau or a Hitler or some other nondemocratic agency. You know that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes more.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Here is the thought that occurs to me: I think I share this guilt with the gentleman from Texas. The States have already admitted their incapacity to take care of their problems, because they come as suppliants to the Government and ask for money to discharge their functions. Can they very well escape the burdens and accept only the benefits? Must they not come under such restrictions as are necessary to see to it that there is no misuse of the funds that they may receive from the Federal Government?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I agree with what is in the gentleman's mind. I think the States originally are responsible, but they are your people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And yours.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. And mine—you bet your life, and I am standing here, as I believe, protecting not merely the interest of this generation, and their opportunity to govern themselves but of the generations that are to come.

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

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MAY. We must remember in connection with the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the Federal Government does not have a dollar in the world except what it gets out of the people of the States.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am going to say something about that right now. I agree thoroughly that the States are remiss in the first instance, and I recall when first I was here how my State was urging me and urging others to take the liberties of the people, the governmental opportunities of the people which our ancestors had given their lives on a hundred battlefields to obtain, and bring them here and sell them at the door of the Treasury of the United States; but the State is not the entity, a thing apart from our people. We are talking about the people and the responsibility is ours, and the question is, Shall we go on and on and on until we reach the destination you know and I know we are heading for, or will we stop here now and attempt at least to not go further in that direction? Stop the retreat.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The trouble is that we cannot undo the things that have been done in the last 8 years and we have to reckon with a condition rather than a theory.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But does not the gentleman think that this is the first step to destroy democracy and bring a dictatorship to this country?

Mr. MASON. The first step?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is the starting.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As soon as I make a statement. This thing did not start 8 years ago. I examined this matter a good many years ago. I quote from a statement I made 15 years ago in which I pointed out then that we were engaged in a concentration of governmental power and the development of a bureaucracy which would bring peril to this country:

Contrary to our traditions, to our philosophy of government, contrary to all the things we profess to believe and against all the warnings of history, we are placing the three powers of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—into the hands of the same personnel, not one of whom is elected by the people.

In 1932 I made a speech before the American Bar Association in which I made a similar statement. I shall put some excerpts in the RECORD.

I quote the following from the speech I made before the American Bar Association, October 14, 1932:

When we look about us today, conscious of that responsibility, we cannot be happy in any sense of duty well performed. With a rapidly unequaled in the history of governments, we are changing the distinctive characteristics of our system from a representative government, the thing which we inherited, to a bureaucratic government, in many respects, of all systems, the most extravagant, most susceptible to tyranny and corruption, and the most destructive of the governmental capacity of the people.

VIOLATING NATURAL LAW—MOVING TOWARD BUREAUCRACY

Save one, our most basic philosophy of government finds expression in the three separate, coordinate branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial. It is the fashion of our orators to have much to say about the wisdom and natural harmony

of that arrangement, and the necessity to preserve this separation, but when we come to examine the direction in which our policies are moving us, we find that we are constantly consolidating these powers of government, and that, too, in an appointed personnel. They are given the power to make rules, which insofar as the average individual is concerned, have all the force of law, the power to construe these rules, and the power to enforce them; all the powers a king ever had.

This is not all. With a rapidity which makes the heart sick, we are reducing the States from the station of sovereignty to that of vassalage to a great Federal bureaucracy.

With even greater rapidity, by moving power to govern and necessity to govern from the smaller units of government, where the average private citizen has the greatest power to govern and necessity to govern, we are destroying the governmental capacity of the private citizen. We are destroying his self-reliance, his consciousness of responsibility, his pride of position, and making him a mendicant at the door of the Federal Treasury. There is nothing more destructive than nonuse. Nature will not waste its energies. Cease to use the arm, it loses the power to do. Fish in the Mammoth Cave have no eyes. Cease to exercise the power to govern, and the power to govern departs.

NECESSITY OF STATES TO GOVERN

The right of the States to govern was never important, but the necessity of the States to govern in those matters which fall within their governmental capacity is of fundamental importance. Go to the various Federal agencies today and what do you see? Go to the agencies of the Federal Government dispensing credit and gratuities; there you see the private citizen, the municipality, the other divisions of the States; you see the banks, the railroads, other corporations; and you see sovereign States arguing and pleading with appointed persons for the privilege of borrowing money contributed in taxes by their citizens and money raised by mortgaging the tax-paying resources of their citizens for years to come. Whether these beggars, these mendicants, these once sovereign States get a part of this money or not depends upon what these appointed persons decide to do about it.

Mr. Chairman, ours is a joint responsibility. This development was in full operation 15 years ago. This is not a partisan matter. No party is solely responsible for what has happened, but we are responsible for what is happening now, today, here in this Chamber. The people after the World War were indifferent, and things drifted along. There is a community of responsibility and now there is a community of duty.

Mr. BREWSTER. I followed the gentleman's argument with a good deal of interest. Would it result in logical effort to wipe out the entire civil-service system?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am not wiping it out. I am now trying to wipe out this bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the gentleman agree that would be the logical end of his argument?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Oh, no, I am talking about this bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. And I am asking about the philosophical end of it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Oh, the philosopher is not here, and I do not want to mix in anything like that.

May I call your attention again to this speech made in 1925?

There is no use complaining of bureaucracy so long as the total of governmental responsibility concentrated in Washington is beyond the capacity of a government of the representative type to discharge.

When the capacity of the ordinary machinery of the Federal Government becomes overloaded, these bureaus are the only agencies to which the overload can be shifted. When these bureaus have transferred to them such powers of government as it is necessary now to place in them, and they exercise those powers without effective supervision by elected agents of the people, as is now the case, we have a great Federal bureaucracy far toward its full development, regardless of what the Constitution provides.

Is there anybody in position to know the facts—Democrat, Republican, Socialist, or what not—who does not know that the total of governmental responsibility concentrated at Washington is beyond human capacity to discharge through any agency susceptible of popular control?

REACTIONARY MOVEMENT

Gentlemen, the present direction of movement is not progress. It is reaction; I do not care what sort of brand the individual puts upon himself who advocates it. I lay down this proposition, sound in theory, sound in governmental philosophy, and established by history, that after the completion of the formative period of a popular government, all true governmental progress, by the very nature of that system of government, must be in that direction which moves governmental power away from the central established by history, that after the completion of the formative period back toward the people into those governmental agencies

more directly and more completely under popular control. The reasons for that are not founded in theory; they are founded in necessity. We face that necessity now. This is not left to the will of statesmen. It is fixed in the economy of nature. Popular government is not an accident. It is necessary for human development, and nothing necessary for human development is left to chance. Human respect for nature's plan is secured by natural laws which human beings must respect or pay the penalty. We are paying the penalty not only here but in the States.

DESTROYING STATE EFFICIENCY

We are not only destroying the efficiency of our system of government at the Federal end by an overloaded governmental machinery but we are destroying the efficiency of the States. If we want to destroy the States as virile, efficient agencies of popular government, there could be no more effective method than our present policy of taking from them the necessity to discharge the powers that rest naturally within the scope of their governmental jurisdiction. That is what we are doing and doing largely by State and popular surrender as distinguished from Federal usurpation. That is a most remarkable fact. Can anybody question that the States are losing their dignity, their independence, their importance, and their vigor as sovereign units of government when he sees them bereft of responsibility, begging at the door of the Federal Treasury? That is not a beautiful figure.

That is not all. We are not only destroying the efficiency of the Federal Government by the overload, and the vigor and governmental capacity of the States by this process, but we are doing a far greater harm than that. By taking governmental responsibilities from those units of government that are close to the people we are taking from the private citizens the necessity of a more direct grapple with the problems of their Government, which problems and the necessity to work them out in good providence come to develop them for the bigger responsibilities of tomorrow.

SYSTEM DEPENDENT UPON GOVERNMENTAL CAPACITY OF CITIZENS

If this system of government is to endure, it must depend for its strength in the crises that are to come not so much upon its laws or upon the written provisions of its Constitution, or even upon the capacity of men in official position, but upon the virtue and the governmental capacity of its private citizenship. The present policy of creating a feeling of dependence upon a great central government is not calculated to develop such a citizenship. It is the sense of responsibility that sobers judgment, that develops civic virtue; it is the strength which comes from the struggle, from the grapple with the difficulties incident to the operation of a system of popular government which gives capacity. Nor can the lesson, taught by the penalty imposed for mistakes made, be dispensed with. How can we hope to develop a citizenship capable of dealing with the greater difficulties of tomorrow when we are constantly moving the power and responsibility, the necessity to govern, away from the people, away from those units of government wherein the private citizen has the more direct control and the larger share of responsibility? We have turned our backs on the lessons of history and are trying to operate our system of government from the top downward, in violation of the laws of its nature, and in violation of the laws of human nature as well.

I do not care what the form of that government is; I do not care what the political philosophers say, if you injure the governmental capacity of the people you strike at the foundation of governmental strength and at the ability of the people to protect their right against governmental and private oppression. We have not only to stop concentration but we have to begin an intelligent decentralization of governmental responsibility.

I am making the same speech this minute. If you want to destroy the States, you cannot do it more effectively and you cannot adopt a better means than to take from them the necessity of doing these things that are within the governmental capacity.

That is what we are doing, and doing largely by State and popular surrender as distinguished from Federal usurpation.

Today it is congressional leadership of Federal usurpation. Today you cry: "Those of us who have been complaining about Federal usurpation, we show you the route around the Constitution. You cannot get through the constitutional barrier, but you just follow us. We have got a slick way to do it. We will just tell these States if they do not come across and let us boss them we will fine them." The Congress is approving that policy by this bill. Is it not remarkable that you, with your philosophy of government and with all the things that are happening to democracies in the world, would consider for a split second leading the attack of bureaucracy upon your State and its power to control State elections?

I will tell you, this will face you all the days of your life. Nobody ever proposed such a thing as this before. This Congressional thing I am talking about. We are endorsing it. What can you say about the bureaus in the future doing these things? You say, "Come along. You have been a bunch of pikers. I will show you how to get in the back door. You cannot control these States through any constitutional

power, but you follow me and I will show you how you can do so. I will show you how you can tell my State you have got to fire that man. I will show you how you can pursue a State employee and make him afraid of somebody up here in Washington."

Talk about pernicious political activity. When we have advanced a little further in this development of bureaucracy in America, do you believe that anybody connected with a government determined to perpetuate itself in office will discover much pernicious activity among those who are trying to keep them in office?

Why do we not use common sense? You know, the most pernicious activity in the world is that of those trying to get those in power out of power. You are putting it into the power of bureaucracy to go into your State and if a man is not voting right bump him off. How many bump-offs will there be before everybody gets to voting right? You are a smart bunch. Talk about control. You are removing this power to coerce the voter from those whom the people can control; those whom they elect and can depend upon—to somebody that they do not elect and cannot control—and you know it. It is the most astonishing thing—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will take 10 more minutes.

I appreciate your attention. I know, absolutely, that if the country had time to look beneath the surface, to see what this bill really does, it would not be permitted to sail under the false colors of preventing pernicious political activity. People have been deceived by the title of this bill. It is our duty to see what the thing is. That is our business. That is what our people sent us here for. You cannot run this Government with a bunch of back-seat drivers, like those putting pressure on the individual Members of this House, not in an hour like this. Do not be afraid your people will not stand by you if you vote against this bill when you go home and tell them what you have done, because the people of America are getting tired of having somebody in Washington tell them whether they may do it every time they want to take a long breath. People want to govern themselves one more time. They are in the right humor to do it. They are willing to pay the price. By this bill you say "You cannot do it. You cannot even run your elections."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield briefly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would say there is something more involved than purity of politics; rather the preservation of the two-party system, because it is the last effort on the part of Congress to grope for the preservation of that system. Mussolini said in 1934, "The first attribute of the corporate state is one political party." Here we are today writing a bill in the hope that we can hold on to the two-party system because your administration has pushed us so far in the direction of the corporate state. That is what I think is involved here.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Now, you are a pretty smart gentleman. I want to show you how little sense you are using on that. You are putting it into the power of the party in power to scare the life out of every State employee in your State. That is how smart you are. I am telling you the truth and you know it when you stop to think about it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Well, just briefly.

Mr. CHURCH. You have already given power to the Federal Government to control them because of the money given out by the Federal Government.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Now, I cannot yield further.

Mr. CHURCH. This bill means control against bribery or unfair use of that money.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; and you propose to extend bribery further by bribing the State into surrender of control over its elections in order to get the money.

Mr. CHURCH. This bill prevents the bribery.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; you are bribing them, and browbeating them, and blackmailing them, saying to the

States that if they do not come across here in accordance with the views of somebody in Washington, if they question the infinite wisdom of the Washington bureaucrats as to what they ought to do, we will make you regret it.

And then, take that poor little fellow on the State pay roll. In the bill you exempt the governors and the elected fellows, but here is a poor little fellow working for a living and he is not voting just "right." Who is going to pass on it in the first instance? Washington. Washington has him removed; one or two are enough, and the rest will not have to be bothered with. Now, you know that just as well as you know anything about practical politics.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. But the right to vote as one pleases is a right preserved by the Constitution.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Oh, yes! And who administers it, who administers the voting laws? The outfit that is trying to stay in office.

Mr. HANCOCK. The Civil Service Commission and the courts.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; and the courts. What can this little fellow who is ousted from his job do? The gentleman from New York has a great remedy for him. He said the other day that the poor little devil could go to the Supreme Court of the United States. [Laughter.]

Mr. HANCOCK. That is the last resort of both great and small.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. He can go to the Supreme Court of the United States and have himself restored—this poor man working at an ordinary State job who has already had his pay stopped.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does not the gentleman from Texas feel that if this bill becomes a law it will, like the prohibition law, be more honored in the breach than in the observance; that it will create disrespect for all law?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I understand what the gentleman is driving at. Here is an interesting thing I want to call to your attention. You do not have a chance to pass a Federal law until you get the people stirred up to the point where you do not need it. That is a strong statement.

I mean to make it strong. You have got to have a condition of public opinion that is getting ready to do the job in the local governments if let alone for a little while before you can get enough public opinion to scare these fellows here into voting for a Federal law. I do not like to bring up things that I have talked about on other occasions, but take the antilynching bill for instance. When there were 230 lynchings in the country there was not a demand for a Federal law, but in the last Congress, when there had been but 3 lynchings in a year, some 20 bills were introduced. Sentiment was so strong the matter was petitioned out of the committee and passed by a vote of 2 to 1; and in the last 12 months, when there has not been a lynching in the United States, if it had not been that the Senate had more sense than we have, you would have passed it. The States and their communities would have been robbed of the credit and everybody would have been hollowing "See what Uncle Sam has done."

The tragedy of this concentrated Federal responsibility is that it weakens the States. Responsibility is what makes a responsible people but the very minute the Federal Government steps in the States step out. There is a revolution in this country against corruption in public office, but now you come in and instead of letting that revolution force its way back into the States, into the local communities where the people everywhere are starting to clean house, instead of letting them do the job and get strong from their efforts, more capable of sustaining a democracy, the author of this bill or those favoring it jump in here and want to rob them of the glory, the confidence, and the strength with which nature would have rewarded them by passing the Hatch bill. Then the people back home will give up and say, "I guess

we'd better let them do it; I guess we could not do it anyway." And thus progresses the destruction of a great democracy.

If we are to preserve democracy we must let the people do the job of governing. I repeat what I said a little while ago, American democracy is in danger. American democracy has its back to the wall fighting against the absorption of all power by a great Federal bureaucracy and the Congress is opening up the way around and is directing the rear attack. Democracy's back is to the wall in America. You keep this thing up and even if Mr. Hitler could get over here there would not be much left for him to do. You cannot preserve a democracy unless you preserve the governmental capacity of a people able to operate it; and you cannot preserve that capacity by taking from the people in the small units of government the necessity to do those things that fall directly within their governmental capacity. I lay that down as a proposition sound in reason and absolutely established by history. I am making the best fight I can. I am not responsible for result. I know I am right. I do not think the historian will pay any attention to me, and I do not give a hoot, but if he did I would have no concern as to his verdict.

I stand here before you gentlemen who speak the judgment of the Nation in the most critical hour of democracy in the history of the world and I plead with you not to send out to the world the expression of judgment of the United States that the people—your people—cannot be entrusted with the responsibility of preserving pure elections in their State. If they cannot, the end of this democracy already has been reached. There is not any excuse for this legislation excepting on that theory.

I thank you. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I respond with some timidity to the learned, scholarly, and shall I say ingenious argument of the gentleman from Texas. Obviously, I cannot speak with authority on how they conduct elections in States where they have but a single party, but I think I can speak with some authority about my own State, where the two-party system still prevails. May I say that everyone who has spoken thus far in the manner of the gentleman from Texas thoroughly underestimates the resiliency, the robustness, and the independence of the American voter. You give the authority as couched in the language of this bill, and I am satisfied that the people in my State, whenever a politician or a machine seeks to push them around, will stand up and resolutely tell them to go to hell, because they do not have to do it. [Applause.]

The voters will enforce this bill. That is the answer. My good friend from Alabama yesterday talked at great length about how the machines will dominate and administer this bill. The gentleman from Texas echoed the same sentiment today. But I am satisfied that if this goes on the statute book the American voter who will be illegally assessed in contravention to the spirit of the bill, or whose freedom of choice in elections is the subject of interference by a political boss, will stand squarely behind his statutory rights and will take care of the enforcement of the bill. That is the answer to the very ingenious but altogether inconclusive argument that has been advanced here today by the gentleman from Texas. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND].

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Chairman, it is most difficult to get up before this Committee and follow the eminent chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and take perhaps the opposite viewpoint to him on some of the points involved in this bill. During the year I have been on that committee I have learned to love and respect our chairman and to realize that his cool judgment and cool thinking are sometimes best in the long run; but even at that good lawyers sometimes disagree.

Some question has been raised on the part of certain Members of the House as to just where I stand on this particular

bill. I think I owe it to myself and to those who have raised the question to have it straight in the minds of those who do question the fact that I have always been for the principles of this bill and am now for the bill. I have never been against it. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have tried at all times to respect the rules of the committee with reference to not revealing that which happens in executive session. Unfortunately some word has gotten out, and I have been criticized in the public press about statements with reference to some action taken in the committee. As long as someone else has perhaps violated that rule, may I tell you now why I voted as I did on some of the procedure in committee?

As this bill came from the Senate, after consideration by that body, there was a section in the bill I want to read to you, if I may.

Section 12 of the Senate bill provided that—

No officer or employee of any State or local agency who exercises any function in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States.

Let us consider that wording for a minute:

No officer or employee of any State or local agency who exercises any function in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States.

Let us take an exaggerated example of that situation. A police officer walking down the street sees a stone fall into a W. P. A. ditch, and to keep it from hitting a man on the head he seizes that stone and puts it on the bank. Now, that officer would come within the purview of this law because he is exercising a function in connection with an activity. In my opinion, that wording was carrying the Federal Government and the control of Washington too far down into municipalities and States.

As a matter of fact, the Federal Government has entirely too much control at the present time over our local situation. But the Judiciary Committee has amended the bill and it was not until the committee amended it I felt the bill should be reported to the House. Incidentally I was a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill and studied it. I voted to report it with amendments to the full committee and I voted to report it to the House. Section 12 of the bill now reads, including an amendment offered by my good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]:

No officer or employee of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with.

Mr. HOBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VREELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. May I ask the gentleman if section 2 does not substantially read, with regard to administrative employees of a county or municipality, just as section 12 read before the Hancock or Gwynne amendment?

Mr. VREELAND. The gentleman is correct. May I paint the picture of a situation that happened in a community close to mine just prior to an election where the administrator of a particular department stood at the door and told the employees that unless they contributed their 10 percent to the party then in power some heads would be rolling in the dust. That is the situation that has to be cleared up, and if the States cannot clear it up, so far as Federal elections are concerned, it is our job down here to do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I find myself today opposing my distinguished and beloved friend from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and my friend from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], as well as my able colleague from Georgia [Mr. GIBBS], who is a member of this distinguished committee; but it seems to me the philosophy expounded here by the gentlemen from Alabama and Texas is the philosophy of locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen.

In my judgment, this bill does not extend the power of the Federal Government in the States. On the contrary and to the opposite, in my judgment, it will prevent a thing that

is now entirely possible, and in some cases has happened; that is, the ordering of the conduct of State agencies by Federal bureaus in Washington because they have control of the funds.

We have heard a great deal of talk this afternoon about the people and the Government. Who is the Government and who are the people? There are 4,500,000 people in the United States who hold public positions, local, county, State, and Federal. There are 130,000,000 people who pay the bill and do not have any such jobs. This bill is designed to protect the 130,000,000 people from those who would manipulate the 4,500,000 for the purpose of controlling the Government in the local communities, in the States, and in this Nation. That is the purpose of the bill and that will be the effect of the bill. It will not give the bureaucrats in Washington, if you want to call them that, any authority which they do not have today. I make this statement, may I say to you, not on the basis of any theory, because my practical experience in contact with governmental units encompasses not only the legislative, the judicial, and the administrative branches of the Government, but includes service in city, county, and State and Federal Governments during a period of 33 years. I know what Government is. I know what politics is. I know how the game is played. I know that as long as anybody can control the job of an employee he is going to tell him how to vote, and he does tell him how to vote. This bill is designed to stop that practice. It is designed to protect the employees of the States, the counties, and the cities in their right to exercise their ballot as they please without anybody being able to tell them how to do it. That is why I am supporting this legislation.

I say to you in all frankness that I would prefer to see the method different. I would prefer to see the merit system established in local government so that employees could be protected in that way rather than through the method which this bill proposes. But I am going to take the opportunity that is at hand.

May I say to you that this is not a precedent, as the gentleman from Texas said it was, because in the Social Security Act Congress said to the State agencies set up to comply with that act, "You must select your employees under a merit system." Therefore, we have the precedent for it. Any of us who have dealt with these agencies where Federal grants are made to the States know that even the Supreme Court of the United States has upheld the right of the Federal Government, when it gives money to a State, to tell that State how to spend it, and they do it every day in every one of the agencies where the Federal Government grants money to State agencies. The Federal Government may tell them how they may spend it.

I remember in 1929, when I was a member of the Georgia Legislature, a committee of which I was a member was considering the conduct of the agricultural department of the State university. It developed that the Federal Government had made them change some professors in that college and reassign them, and change the curriculum. This was accomplished by threats to hold up the Federal funds provided by an act of Congress. Precedent? Why, the precedent was started way back in the early days of the service of my distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas, and that is the point where the argument ought to have been made. We are trying here to prevent these agencies from controlling the vote of the State and local employees in our States. We are trying to prevent anybody from controlling them and to make them free. That is why I support this legislation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, this bill will do more to break down the two-party system in the United States than any act we could design for that purpose. In my judgment, the weakness of our democracy lies in the fact that by custom and through the rules of Congress this two-party system is

perpetuated. If this bill will do what I think it will, I am most enthusiastically for it. Since I have confidence that the result will verify my prediction, I will vote for it.

Under this two-party system those in power cannot build a strong organization without the political aid of those who hold political positions under the Government. It is a natural thing for those holding jobs to speak and influence the body of voters to retain in power the party responsible for their position. Furthermore, employees in the Government, no matter which party is responsible for their appointment, become naturally interested in serving the people and interested, therefore, in the program of their party. An employee who is not interested in his work, and his party, and its aims and purposes cannot be found in any democracy. These employees make up a formidable array in political campaigns. Under this bill these employees will not dare venture out in the political arena to defend what they believe to be for the best interests of the country. The party in power, therefore, is much more liable to defeat.

Under our two-party system, the party out of power always tries to get in, and it cannot be said that they do not have also a formidable array of office seekers who are always willing to fight desperately to get into office. They know that under this system they will get all the "gravy" if their party wins. Under this bill these "outs" when "in" will likewise be eliminated from any further political activity, and the party to which they belong will be much more easily defeated.

As long as we cling to this two-party system, this proposal should become a law and through it the people who do the voting will be aided materially in at least changing parties often. When it becomes easy to remove a party, the voters themselves will no doubt try to build a party which is pledged to serve the people. Such a party can be built then because no party has any chance to perpetuate itself through the political influence of officeholders of the party in power, and the second party, which is out of power and wants to get in power, will meet the same fate as its predecessor. In this way the voters may have an opportunity to build something different along party lines than to be compelled to follow the dictates of one or the other of the two great parties.

The voters have very little to say what candidates shall be selected by political conventions. Conventions can be steam-rollered, ballyhooed by artificial public opinion, and when the two conventions are over, the people, if they vote at all, are compelled to take one or the other of the candidates named in a political convention.

We see how this two-party system works here in Congress when this Congress gets into action. Is there any fundamental difference between many Republicans of the East and some Democrats from the South? They vote exactly alike. Is there any fundamental difference in the views which I hold and the views held by many Democrats? We vote exactly alike on all matters of importance. Yet when the election comes around I am supposed to defeat, or at least assist in defeating, the gentleman from Montana, who holds views similar to my own, merely because he is a Democrat. I must do this as a Republican, even though I aid in electing a Republican who is diametrically opposed to every political view I have. This is what your two-party system does. Why should the people not have the right to vote for men and principles instead of blindly voting along strict two-party lines?

I will venture this prediction, that until the voters will vote for men and principles, regardless of party lines, they will never experience any government for which they are directly responsible. The party bosses will feed us the candidates, and we can vote for one or the other of their selection or not vote at all. That is not democracy. If this bill passes, it will be a step in the right direction. The people may be able to break up this tight-laced two-party system and have a voice in not only independent voting but in the selection of candidates of their own choice. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the bill now before the Committee. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, the war in Europe, which may conceivably disorganize the whole world, has made a vivid and indelible impression upon the American people. They are taking stock and want to know what we have done to prevent the tragedy of Europe engulfing this country. They have seen the insatiable ambition of dictators, coupled with military power perfected to the last degree, run roughshod over practically every democratic nation in Europe. They have seen the peaceful dreams of the idealist thrown into the scrap heap and the immortal doctrine of the Prince of Peace held up to be scoffed at. They have witnessed the downfall of the peaceful neighbor and have seen his lands overrun by the pirate armed to the teeth. They have seen nations lulled into a false sense of security by promises, later only to be broken, and peace treaties signed only to be proved scraps of paper. They have felt in their own hearts the agony of the millions of people driven from the homes of their birth and from the acres where their ancestors have lived for centuries. They have seen the peaceful and unprepared nation go down to ignominious defeat at the hands of the nation prepared with every known terrible instrument of modern warfare.

Is it any wonder, then, that the American people are demanding that Congress stay in session until every necessary step has been taken, until definite plans have been outlined to the end that what has happened to the downtrodden in Europe will not happen here. Our country may in a few months be the last citadel of liberty in the world, and it is my solemn belief that Congress should stay in session and will stay in session as long as there is anything left undone in our common desire to prepare this country against assault from without or treason from within. We have had our lesson, and I trust there is no one here willing to jeopardize the future welfare of this country by inaction now, or who is so blind as to not profit by what we see around us.

The ideal, the true ideal, of a democratic country and a democratic people is peace. The Christian ideal is peace. Though in the early history of this country she may have been guilty of acts of aggression of which we are not now proud, for almost a hundred years our policy has been founded on respect for the rights of all peoples. Never during this time have we refused to arbitrate our differences with any nation. Never have we espoused the cause of force and aggression. Never have we placed brute force above ideals of humanity. But there comes times in the affairs of men and nations when a definite stand must be taken, when the world must know that we are willing to fight and intend to fight for the ideals we believe in. Holy Writ teaches us:

If any provide not for his own, more especially those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel.

If there was anything that impressed the American soldier of the last World War more than the horrors of war itself and the utter folly of war, it was that flesh and blood alone, no matter how brave or how patriotic, cannot stand up against the prepared soldier and the prepared army provided with all modern means of warfare and destruction. Since I first came to Congress I have preached preparedness, not by choice but from necessity. I have addressed this House on more than one occasion on this subject. I believed then in preparedness, I believe in it now, and I will continue to advocate a strong national-defense system for this country until this world becomes imbued enough with Christian ideals to settle differences around the counsel table; and I fervently hope that this dream of universal peace and good will will not forever remain in the far horizon, but will come to make its home among the children of men. Then, and then only, can we beat our swords into plowshares. Then, and then only, will there be wars no more.

I long ago learned that if a bully is running rampant on the street that he will never cease his bullying until someone calls his number. To successfully call his number he must be met at his own game, and that game is not played under the rules of chivalry. There have been times when bandits and

gangsters have disorganized whole communities in our own Nation. It would have been folly for our law-enforcing officers to go out to meet and capture them with their bare fists. To suppress them it was necessary to meet bullets with bullets, knife with knife, and machine gun with machine gun. It is only in this way that law and order can be preserved within a country, and it is only in this way that a peaceful nation can demand respect of those who rule by force and international lawlessness.

But, Mr. Chairman, we owe one thing to Hitler—even with all the widows and orphans he has made and all the tears that have been shed for his glory. Hitler and his army chiefs have shown us what it takes to win a war in this day of mechanization and machinery. If we had made all of the appropriations that we are now called upon to make, in the name of national defense 2 or 3 years ago, it is entirely possible, in the light of recent events, that we would have had to scrap them all and begin over again now. Just as the battle between the *Merrimac* and the *Monitor* revolutionized sea warfare and overnight scrapped the usefulness of wooden ships, so have the ruthless invasions of Hitler shown that all old concepts of military organization, equipment, and training must go by the board. We have had conclusive evidence that just as machinery in our ordinary day life here in America has largely supplanted manpower, just as one machine in peacetime is now doing what 25 men used to do, 1 tank or 1 airplane is filling the place of a hundred or a thousand soldiers on the battlefield.

This is no time to get hysterical; there is no cause to become panicky; this is the occasion for cool deliberate reasoning and cool deliberate planning to meet the happenings of a world gone mad. It is just hard common sense that this country should prepare, not for war but to preserve peace for our country. In the world of today, the word of the United States will be heeded only in proportion to our evident ability to back up our words and warnings with force. If my two sons are needed by their country in future wars, I owe it to them and the thousands of other mothers' sons not to send them out to the battlefield with naked hands.

Now, let us look over what has been done lately for our national defense; let us consider the matter without partisanship or political rancor. Most Democrats and Republicans here love this country and will fight for it, but, gentlemen, you will remember that only 2 or 3 years ago, when preparedness plans were advanced before this Congress, many Republican brethren and a few Democrats charged those of us who supported these plans with warmongering. Remember, too, that Hitler has accused every democratic nation in Europe, before he overran them, of being warmongers whenever they expressed any fear of him or showed any intention of preparing themselves against him. The warmonger accusation is the strongest form of propaganda used by those who do not want to see an anticipated victim prepare to defend himself.

Let us take stock; let us see how our Army, Navy, and air force stack up today. Figures will show that we are not so weak now, and Providence gave us the great oceans as protection while we grow strong. Before making this speech, I consulted many experts on the subject here, from the War Department and the Navy Department.

NAVY

It is my considered judgment that we have the most efficient and powerful Navy in the world today, and the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has the same opinion. Our Navy far exceeds anything that Germany, Italy, France, or Japan have. It is as strong and as powerful as Great Britain's Navy now, even though we may not have quite so many small units. President Roosevelt has been accused on some sides of being responsible for the fact that we are not prepared in every department of the defense arms of our Government. But allow me to call to your attention that when President Roosevelt was inaugurated as President in 1933 he began then, and has never ceased since, to emphasize to the Congress and the American people that a strong Navy is essential to our welfare. Since 1933 the Navy has been built up step by step

until we can hold our own with any in the world. It must be remembered that during President Hoover's 4 years in the White House, not one single battleship was launched by the American Navy. It will be remembered that during President Harding's administration, as a result of the Washington conference, we scrapped some of the best ships we had in the name of peace, and built none, while some other nations were scrapping only blueprints. In 1933 we had sunk to the rating of a second-rate naval power; today we are the strongest in the world. Since 1933 this administration has constructed a total of 111 ships, divided into the following categories: Three airplane carriers, 11 cruisers, 26 submarines, 7 auxiliary ships, 62 destroyers, and 2 gunboats. Further, the Navy has today 68 additional units under construction, as per authorization by Congress in 1934 and 1938. Here are the units being laid now under the authorization: Battleships, 6 of 35,000 tons; 2 of 45,000 tons—it takes 4 years to build a great battleship, and the new ones mentioned should be completed within the next 2 years; two of them are about three-fourths completed now—one airplane carrier, 20,000 tons; 6 cruisers, from 6,000 to 10,000 tons each; 26 destroyers, ranging from 1,600 to 1,800 tons each; 14 submarines, 1,500 tons; and 12 auxiliary craft.

Let us remember, too, that during this Congress, funds were appropriated to cover past authorization for the building of the following naval units: 2 battleships, 1 aircraft carrier, 2 cruisers, 8 destroyers, 60 submarines, and 5 auxiliary ships. These have been laid down in recent weeks, but real work has hardly commenced. In the light of events in Europe, this Congress has also decided to authorize 3 additional aircraft carriers of 24,000 tons each and from 6 to 10 cruisers of varying tonnage; and in addition to that, 21,000 tons for submarines.

A little figuring, therefore, will show that the Navy now has a total of 106 ships, either under construction or authorized, in addition to the units already prepared to go to the battle lines.

It is further understood that upon the advice of Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, the President and Secretary of the Navy will request of Congress authorization to increase our fleet an additional 70 percent. The fall of the democratic nations on the other side of the Atlantic makes it imperative that we prepare ourselves to defend the Atlantic alone against all comers. It can be seen that if we place the bulk of our fleet in the Atlantic, we lay ourselves wide open to possible enemies in the Pacific, and Japan, by recent actions and utterances, is gradually convincing the American people that she is a potential enemy. It may, therefore, become necessary for us to have a gigantic fleet in both the Atlantic and the Pacific. If this program is completed, we will then be able to take on any power or any combination of powers that may come against us. Our natural line of defense in the Pacific Ocean extends from Alaska to the Aleutian Islands, Hawaii, and Samoa Islands to the Panama Canal. Our naval defense stations in that circle are being provided with air bases and sufficient up-to-date anti-aircraft equipment. On the Atlantic coast, navy yards are being expanded and coast anti-aircraft defenses improved. On the coast of Puerto Rico is now being built one of the strongest naval bases in the world. That island, along with our other Caribbean possessions, is essential to the defense of the Panama Canal, which is the life line of our commerce. In addition to that, the Navy's job is to see that no aggressor nation gains a footing by force on South American or Central American soil.

The Navy also has between 2,500 and 3,000 up-to-date planes in service in its air branch. These planes and the pilots to fly them are among the best in the world. Still we need 10,000 more up-to-date planes in the Navy and will have them shortly. The Navy is O. K. now.

ARMY

Our Regular Army today has an authorized enlistment of 285,000, though, under the volunteer system we have only reached about 250,000 enlistment. The authorized enlistment will necessarily be increased shortly to 400,000. It

should be remembered that in this day of mechanized warfare 400,000 men will take the place of a million in the wars of a few years ago. A great many people seem to think that when we speak of our Army we only refer to the Regular Army. The Regular Army itself is backed up by the National Guard, the Reserve officers, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the Citizens' Military Training Corps.

Our National Guard is made up of about 250,000 enlisted men and officers. We have 120,000 Reserve officers now, and we have many more in training under the R. O. T. C. system. We have 5,500 military planes of all types; some of them are obsolete now.

As compared to the figures given, it might be well to remember that at the beginning of the World War our Regular Army hardly consisted of more than 80,000 men and officers. Our National Guard had 8,323 commissioned officers and 119,087 enlisted men. The Army only had 13 experimental airplanes at that time. We had practically no guns and artillery. The total expenditures for military purposes for the year 1914 was \$114,500,814.39.

It must be never lost sight of that wars these days require the finest type of machinery of destruction that can be built, and this country is blessed in that we are the most highly developed industrialized country in the world. We have inventive genius, industrial genius, administrative genius, and the most intelligent labor in the world. No other nation can compete with us in mechanical equipment and progressive manufacturing methods. This is the only nation in the world that could within a few months be geared up to mass production of any known instrument or machine. This Congress, realizing this, has already provided for \$600,000,000 to be spent for the purchase of the finest automatic rifles, armored tanks, motorized artillery, ammunition, and other up-to-date instruments of war. Further enactment of laws for Army expansion are to follow. Only this morning the President requested of Congress an additional authorization and appropriation of over \$4,000,000,000 to complete and sustain our Military Establishment in the future. The request will no doubt be granted.

Our Army staff seems to realize that there must be reorganization of our land forces from the ground up. Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, has already begun organization of a new Army corps, patterned after Germany's Panzer mechanized divisions. The corps will consist of two armored divisions totaling 18,000 men, 1,400 tanks, 13,000 semiautomatic rifles, and 600 pieces of artillery. This new corps will be a model for others to come later.

Even though fully realizing that this is a machine age for both war and peace, we must realize, too, that behind it all must be trained up-to-date, intelligent manpower. War today may not need so many men, but those selected must be the best. If we now need an Army largely made up of mechanized units, we also need an Army of intelligent and trained mechanics to run it.

C. C. C. MILITARY TRAINING

Realizing that the time could come when we would need the youth of our country to defend us from aggression, I introduced a bill here on February 1, 1939, which would provide 1 hour a day training in military tactics and drill for the boys in our C. C. C. camps. I have spoken on the floor of the House on more than one occasion in favor of this bill, and I am still of the honest opinion that the bill should be passed. I have never yet been able to fully understand why my bill, in the hearings before the committee, was strenuously opposed by the War Department and the Director of the C. C. C. I have not given up the fight yet.

Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware that the C. C. C. set-up is not an ideal set-up for the military training of the youth of our country. Under ordinary circumstances and conditions it might not be wise to use this great organization for that purpose. I would not destroy for anything in the world the great peacetime achievements of the C. C. C., but I assert here and now that the C. C. C. with its enrollees receiving no military training is evidence of a peace-loving nation gone to

sleep. During the past 7 years, over 2,000,000 of our young men have been enrolled in C. C. C. camps. The cost to the Government per enrollee is \$1,000 per year. The annual cost per soldier in the Regular Army averages only \$853.33. The C. C. C. camp enrollees, other than war veterans, range between 17 and 23 years of age. These boys are within the ages to be called first to the service in case of our involvement in war. Why not give them and the country the advantage of this training? We now have approximately 275,000 enrollees in our C. C. C. camps. The average length of service in the C. C. C. is 10 months. If we had given these boys 1 hour military training per day during their service, we would have had a nucleus of over 2,000,000 young men already partly trained in the rudiments of warfare. Every soldier must be first trained in ordinary tactics and drill before he is ready for assignment to a specialized branch of the service, such as artillery, air force, tank service, and so forth. We would thus have saved this Government over \$2,000,000,000 preliminary training costs in case we become involved in war.

I do not mean that the original purposes of the C. C. C. must be abandoned—these camps have done a great work in soil conservation, forestry, and national and State parks. This work should continue to be their primary duty, and the 1 hour per day military training which my bill suggests would not detract one whit from the work they are now doing. In fact, the increased efficiency of the enrollees, because of this limited military training and the added discipline it would bring, would enhance the value and the volume of his work in the conservation field. I do propose that the camps should serve a twofold purpose—one, conservation; the other, a link in our national defense system.

It must be remembered, too, that this military training for C. C. C. enrollees would not cost our sorely harassed taxpayers an additional dollar. The camps are already there, the uniforms are there, the food is there, the Reserve officers to train them are there, and the physically fit manhood of our country is there. All that will still be needed are the rifles, and the United States Army now has enough obsolete military rifles to take care of that need.

GENERALS AND ADMIRALS

One of the great obstacles France and England faced in their plans to prepare for modern warfare was some of the very generals and admirals they depended upon to carry out these defense plans. These officers were trained for old-fashioned warfare, they were wedded to old principles and obsolete tactics; they were too conservative and could not adjust themselves to this day. The admiral who still contends that only the battleship makes a great Navy is, himself, obsolete; the general who still contends that infantry alone is the backbone of the Army has qualified himself only for retirement.

It remains to be seen whether our own admirals and generals have become too wedded to Navy and Army tradition to face facts as they are today. Unless they present evidence to the contrary, they should be relegated to the trash heap along with their fossilized ideas. In fairness, though, I should say that General Marshall, Chief of Army Staff, General Arnold, and Admiral Stark, Chief of our Navy, have shown that they are fully awake to the potentialities of modern warfare and the needs of modern defense.

AIR POWER

Air power is the greatest new development of this war. Hitler's achievements can be traced more to predominant air power than to anything else. Without a great number of fighter and bomber airplanes, our great Navy and our growing Army will be practically useless. We have now about 3,200 up-to-date flying planes with our naval force and about 2,500 with our Army. Industry in our country is now manufacturing planes at the rate of 700 per month. Before the end of 1940, this production should amount to at least 1,200 per month. Construction expansion is going on in practically every plant in the country. Plants not up-to-date are being reequipped with tools and machinery. Industrial genius in our country, and there is none better anywhere, has set its shoulders to the wheel, and there need be no fear that

we are not definitely on the road to mass production of this essential branch of our national-defense program. Henry Ford, General Motors, Packard, Chrysler, and other automobile, airplane, and motor-manufacturing concerns have offered their services and have been awarded contracts by the Government. The goal of 50,000 planes set by President Roosevelt is not an idle dream. To man these planes we must have experienced pilots and mechanics. The Army Air Corps and the Naval Air Corps and the Civil Aeronautics Commission have given the full-speed-ahead sign for the selection and training of these men. Summing it all up, I am convinced that no nation in the world could attack the immediate shores of this country with success even now. With what has been done and with what will be done, I have no doubt that we will in the near future be adequately armed on land, on sea, and in the air. We have in the White House and at the head of the State Department two men who had the vision and the courage months, even years, ago to warn this country and the American people that we must be prepared if we are to retain our liberties and demand respect from potential foes. The wishes, the dreams, and the plans of a democracy are always based on peace. This is as it should be. But the tragedy of it all is that democracies often do not see danger from outside powers until the danger is upon them. Then it is too late. We have learned our lesson from Austria, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Holland, and Belgium. They waited until it was too late, and today they are under the heel of the conqueror. The rights of men and the liberties of the individual citizen are things now spoken of in Europe only in a hushed voice. The dead on a hundred fields of battle in Europe cry aloud to us, "Prepare!" The little child in Belgium beating on its dead mother's breast cries to us, "Prepare!" The echo from every hill and vale in France pleads with us, "Prepare!" England, with all her faults, still the cradle of liberty, with her back to the wall and her children and women dying on every hand, cries to us, "Prepare!" We must heed these warnings.

No; we cannot be blamed that England and France and the others were not prepared. We are not responsible for their errors and faults, but if we have learned our lesson we will heed their warning now. There is little that we can do for them, because the very things they need and want we have not. They still have money, they still have men, and still billions of gold and credit in this country to buy supplies and machinery of war. We are now providing them with every airplane and all other military equipment that we can possibly spare. It may not turn the tide, but in letting them have this equipment we are not only helping them in their battle against aggression, but also are helping ourselves by development of our defense machinery and the gaining of time in which we can get ready.

MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. Chairman, Congress recently reasserted the Monroe Doctrine, by almost unanimous vote. By that reassertion, we have pledged ourselves to keep dictators and nations hostile to the democratic form of government out of the Western Hemisphere. We have added more coastline to be defended, more nations to be protected, and more oceans to be patrolled. There should be full realization here and everywhere that we intend to fight if necessary to preserve freedom for this country and for this hemisphere. President Monroe announced this doctrine to the world over 12 decades ago. It was respected then by other nations, though we were weak then. We demand that it be respected now because we are strong—strong not only in the worldly sense, but in the righteousness of our cause as well. If we do not want to see Trojan horses in the United States, we must keep them out of this hemisphere.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I doubly feel the weight of responsibility resting on the shoulders of all Members of Congress today. It is through this Committee that any resolution or declaration of war must come. I trust that in the trying days ahead I may never be called upon to vote

to send our boys to the horrors of the battlefield; but I am firmly convinced that, if we really intend to prevent war, we must be strong enough to demand and preserve peace, particularly in this hemisphere.

ENEMIES WITHIN

Before closing, allow me to comment briefly on one other great danger to our beloved country. For years and years we have opened our hospitable shores to immigrants from all over the world. They have come here by the thousands and by the millions. They have found freedom and happiness and sustenance here. Many have become good citizens and we are proud of them. But literally thousands of them have proven that they came here to get what they could and give nothing. They accept benefits but assume no responsibility. Our flag is a dirty rag to them. We now have about 4,000,000 aliens in this country. From these come the potential "fifth columnists"; they will be the first to attempt to betray this country.

Congress has been gradually tightening up on our immigration laws, but they are not tight enough yet. The law recently passed requiring aliens to be registered and fingerprinted is a good start. The recent placing of immigration administration under the Department of Justice was a good move.

Hitler, to win his victories, has counted mainly on two factors—overwhelming instruments of war and treason in the camp of his victims. Treason can come from only those who do not love and revere the flag they live under. So we must prepare against enemies within and without. It is a big job, but we can do it. We are on the road now. Our Army, Navy, and air force must be built up, but the job should not be done hysterically or spasmodically. Our plans should be sound, our purposes definite, our goal clear. When we reach that goal we must not go to sleep again, for in these trying times as never before eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each Member may have 5 legislative days in which to extend his remarks in the RECORD on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from Texas that that request must be made in the House.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to reemphasize a few words spoken by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH] on yesterday:

Each party must, of course, be afforded equal opportunity to live and equal opportunity to win elections. The Hatch measure, first and last, seeks only to protect equality of opportunity for the party out of power by preventing the party in power from doing what no decent party should do but which practice allows, using public money for partisan effect.

I think that is important, because it seems to acknowledge that the party in power did what no decent party should have done. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH] is honest, and he cannot stand for what the investigations disclosed.

Further on he says:

Let us back up our deepest patriotism, not our shallowest partisanship, in the effort afforded by this rule to win through to the higher level of politics: The sportsmanship of losing graciously and of winning justly.

I thank the gentleman for those words. I think they were well chosen. All the ridicule which the gentleman from Alabama tried to pour upon him because of his great command of language could not lessen the effectiveness of those carefully selected words of condemnation and the persuasive appeal. It was, indeed, an acknowledgment of the pernicious activities of his own party in power.

I want to repeat what others have called to mind, that we do not live in Alabama or other States where we might be elected by perhaps about 3,000 votes. They fight only among themselves and neither faction perhaps has the advantages of full control of funds such as have been used by Democrats against Republicans so shamelessly in other States.

This morning I listened to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] again talk about three United States Senators

sent here by the Power Trust, according to his viewpoint. He has told the story often.

As I have said before, some day I may take the time to tell you about Boston Democrats. I might tell you about New Orleans Democrats and about Kansas City Democrats, and I could tell about so many of them that the few Republicans they can find to parade before us will be as nothing compared with the great numbers of Democrats tarred with so-called pernicious political activity.

I regret that I cannot follow the chairman of this committee. Fundamentally, he is probably right; but his Democratic Party has failed, miserably failed. Conditions brought about by his party are so thoroughly bad that they make me vote for this bill in spite of my desire to agree with him on fundamentals. During the last 7 years I have watched him vote for many measures that do not square with his fundamentals. Democracy ought to be what it apparently is not. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, it is now after 3 o'clock. This matter has been thoroughly debated for 2 days. I do not believe there is much anybody can add to the general debate. It is expected to complete this bill and vote on it tonight. The time one takes in general debate, therefore, requires us to remain here just that much longer tonight. I expressed my views at the beginning of the debate and am not going to take any more time, nor am I going to yield back any time. Let us read the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired; all time has expired. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful for (1) any person employed in any administrative position by the United States, or by any department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States (including any corporation controlled by the United States or any agency thereof, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by the United States or any agency thereof), or (2) any person employed in any administrative position by any State, by any political subdivision or municipality of any State, or by any agency of any State or any of its political subdivisions or municipalities (including any corporation controlled by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality, or agency, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality, or agency), in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States, or by any such department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States, to use his official authority for the purpose of interfering with, or affecting, the election or the nomination of any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner from any Territory or insular possession."

With the following committee amendment:

"That section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to prevent pernicious political activities,' approved August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful for (1) any person employed in any administrative position by the United States, or by any department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States (including any corporation controlled by the United States or any agency thereof, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by the United States or any agency thereof), or (2) any person employed in any administrative position by any State, by any political subdivision or municipality of any State, or by any agency of any State or any of its political subdivisions or municipalities (including any corporation controlled by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality, or agency, and any corporation all of the capital stock of which is owned by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality, or agency), in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States, or by any such department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States, to use his official authority for the purpose of interfering with, or affecting, the election or the nomination of any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector,

Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner from any Territory or insular possession."

"Sec. 2. The third sentence of section 9 (a) of such act of August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows: 'All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates.'

"Sec. 3. Section 10 of such act of August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 10. The provisions of this act shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other provision of law."

"Sec. 4. Such act of August 2, 1939, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Sec. 12. (a) No officer or employee of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall (1) use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or a nomination for office, or affecting the result thereof, or (2) directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any other such officer or employee to pay, lend, or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes. No such officer or employee shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. For the purposes of the second sentence of this subsection, the term "officer or employee" shall not be construed to include (1) the Governor or the Lieutenant Governor of any State or any person who is authorized by law to act as Governor, or the mayor of any city; (2) duly elected heads of executive departments of any State or municipality who are not classified under a State or municipal merit or civil-service system; (3) officers holding elective offices.

"(b) If any Federal agency charged with the duty of making any loan or grant of funds of the United States for use in any activity by any officer or employee to whom the provisions of subsection (a) are applicable has reason to believe that any such officer or employee has violated the provisions of such subsection, it shall make a report with respect thereto to the United States Civil Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). Upon the receipt of any such report, or upon the receipt of any other information which seems to the Commission to warrant an investigation, the Commission shall fix a time and place for a hearing, and shall by registered mail send to the officer or employee charged with the violation and to the State or local agency employing such officer or employee a notice setting forth a summary of the alleged violation and the time and place of such hearing. At such hearing (which shall be not earlier than 10 days after the mailing of such notice) either the officer or employee or the State or local agency, or both, may appear with counsel and be heard. After such hearing, the Commission shall determine whether any violation of such subsection has occurred and whether such violation, if any, warrants the removal of the officer or employee by whom it was committed from his office or employment, and shall by registered mail notify such officer or employee and the appropriate State or local agency of such determination. If in any case the Commission finds that such officer or employee has not been removed from his office or employment within 30 days after notice of a determination by the Commission that such violation warrants his removal, or that he has been so removed and has subsequently (within a period of 18 months) been appointed to any office or employment in any State or local agency in such State, the Commission shall make and certify to the appropriate Federal agency an order requiring it to withhold from its loans or grants to the State or local agency to which such notification was given an amount equal to 2 years' compensation at the rate such officer or employee was receiving at the time of such violation; except that in any case of such a subsequent appointment to a position in another State or local agency which receives loans or grants from any Federal agency, such order shall require the withholding of such amount from such other State or local agency: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Commission require any amount to be withheld from any loan or grant pledged by a State or local agency as security for its bonds or notes if the withholding of such amount would jeopardize the payment of the principal or interest on such bonds or notes. Notice of any such order shall be sent by registered mail to the State or local agency from which such amount is ordered to be withheld. The Federal agency to which such order is certified shall, after such order becomes final, withhold such amount in accordance with the terms of such order. Except as provided in subsection (c), any determination or order of the Commission shall become final upon the expiration of 30 days after the mailing of notice of such determination or order.

"(c) Any party aggrieved by any determination or order of the Commission under subsection (b) may, within 30 days after the mailing of notice of such determination or order, institute proceedings for the review thereof by filing a written petition in the district court of the United States for the district in which such officer or employee resides; but the commencement of such proceedings shall not operate as a stay of such determination or order unless (1) it is specifically so ordered by the court, and (2) such officer or employee is suspended from his office or employment during the pendency of such proceedings. A copy of such petition

shall forthwith be served upon the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record upon which the determination or the order complained of was made. The review by the court shall be on the record entire, including all of the evidence taken on the hearing, and the court shall affirm the determination and order of the Commission if, in the opinion of the court, they are supported by the preponderance of the evidence; if, in the opinion of the court, any such determination and order be not so supported, the court shall make such orders and render such judgment as the ends of justice may require: *Provided*, That any person at the time of filing his petition for review, may demand a trial by jury, and in any such event trial by jury shall be granted, and such trial shall be de novo. If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence may materially affect the result of the proceedings and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, the court may direct such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Commission may modify its findings of fact or its determination or order by reason of the additional evidence so taken and shall file with the court such modified findings, determination, or order, and any such modified findings of fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. The court shall affirm the Commission's determination or order, or its modified determination or order, if the court determines that the same is in accordance with law. If the court determines that any such determination or order, or modified determination or order, is not in accordance with law, the court shall remand the proceeding to the Commission with directions either to make such determination or order as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law or to take such further proceedings as, in the opinion of the court, the law requires. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals as in other cases, and the judgment and decree of such circuit court of appeals shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States on certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, secs. 346 and 347). If any provision of this subsection is held to be invalid as applied to any party with respect to any determination or order of the Commission, such determination or order shall thereupon become final and effective as to such party in the same manner as if such provision had not been enacted.

"(d) The Commission is authorized to adopt such reasonable procedure and rules and regulations as it deems necessary to execute its functions under this section.

"(e) The provisions of the first two sentences of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to any officer or employee who exercises no functions in connection with any activity of a State or local agency which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency.

"(f) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term "State or local agency" means the executive branch of any State, or of any municipality or other political subdivision of such State, or any agency or department thereof.

"(2) The term "Federal agency" includes any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the United States (except a member bank of the Federal Reserve System).

"Sec. 13. (a) It is hereby declared to be a pernicious political activity, and it shall hereafter be unlawful, for any person, directly or indirectly, to make contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of \$5,000, during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office (including the offices of President of the United States and Presidential and Vice Presidential electors), or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party.

"The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons. The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution.

"It is further declared to be a pernicious political activity, and it shall hereafter be unlawful for any person, individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons to purchase or buy any goods, commodities, advertising, or articles of any kind or description where the proceeds of such a purchase, or any portion thereof, shall directly or indirectly inure to the benefit of or for any candidate for an elective Federal office (including the offices of President of the United States, and Presidential and Vice Presidential electors) or any political committee or other political organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party.

"Any person who is engaged in a pernicious political activity in violation of any provision of this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years. In all cases of violations of this section by a partnership, committee, association, corporation, or other organization or group of persons, the officers, directors, or managing heads thereof

who knowingly and willfully participate in such violation, shall be subject to punishment as herein provided.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit the making of any contribution which is prohibited by any provision of law in force on the date this section takes effect. Nothing in this act shall be construed to alter or amend any provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, or any amendments thereto.

"Sec. 14. For the purposes of this act, persons employed in the government of the District of Columbia shall be deemed to be employed in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, except that for the purposes of the second sentence of section 9 (a) the Commissioners and the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia shall not be deemed to be officers or employees.

"Sec. 15. The provisions of this act which prohibit persons to whom such provisions apply from taking any active part in political management or in political campaigns shall be deemed to prohibit the same activities on the part of such persons as the United States Civil Service Commission has heretofore determined are at the time this section takes effect prohibited on the part of employees in the classified civil service of the United States by the provisions of the civil-service rules prohibiting such employees from taking any active part in political management or in political campaigns.

"Sec. 16. Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission determines that, by reason of special or unusual circumstances which exist in any municipality or other political subdivision, in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in the States of Maryland and Virginia or in municipalities the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States, it is in the domestic interest of persons to whom the provisions of this act are applicable, and who reside in such municipality or political subdivision, to permit such persons to take an active part in political management or in political campaigns involving such municipality or political subdivision, the Commission is authorized to promulgate regulations permitting such persons to take an active part in such political management and political campaigns to the extent the Commission deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons.

"Sec. 17. Nothing in the second sentence of section 12 (a) of this act shall be construed to prevent or prohibit any officer or employee of a State or local agency (as defined in section 12 (f)) from continuing, until the election in connection with which he was nominated, to be a bona fide candidate for election to any public office and from engaging in any political activity in furtherance of his candidacy for such public office, if (1) he was nominated before the date of the enactment of this act, and (2) upon his election to such public office he resigns from the office or employment in which he was employed prior to his election, in a State or local agency (as defined in section 12 (f)).

"Sec. 18. Nothing in the second sentence of section 9 (a) or in the second sentence of section 12 (a) of this act shall be construed to prevent or prohibit any person subject to the provisions of this act from engaging in any political activity (1) in connection with any election and the preceding campaign if none of the candidates is to be nominated or elected at such election as representing a party any of whose candidates for Presidential elector received votes in the last preceding election at which Presidential electors were selected, or (2) in connection with any question which is not specifically identified with any National or State political party. For the purposes of this section, questions relating to constitutional amendments, referendums, approval of municipal ordinances, and others of a similar character, shall not be deemed to be specifically identified with any National or State political party.

"Sec. 19. As used in this act, the term "State" means any State, Territory, or possession of the United States.

"Sec. 5. (a) No person or firm entering into any contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof, either for the rendition of personal services or furnishing any material, supplies, or equipment to the United States or any department or agency thereof, or selling any land or building to the United States or any department or agency thereof, if payment for the performance of such contract or payment for such material, supplies, equipment, land, or building is to be made in whole or in part from funds appropriated by the Congress, shall, during the period of negotiation for, or performance under such contract or furnishing of material, supplies, equipment, land, or buildings, directly or indirectly, make any contribution of money or any other thing of value, or promise expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use; nor shall any person knowingly solicit any such contribution from any such person or firm, for any such purpose during any such period. Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit any action which is prohibited by any provision of law in force on the date this section takes effect.

"Sec. 6. Such act of August 2, 1939, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 20. No political committee shall receive contributions aggregating more than \$3,000,000, or make expenditures aggregating more than \$3,000,000 during any calendar year. For the purposes of this section, any contributions received and any expenditures made on behalf of any political committee with the knowledge and consent of the chairman or treasurer of such committee shall be deemed to be received or made by such committee. Any violation

of this section by any political committee shall be deemed also to be a violation of this section by the chairman and the treasurer of such committee and by any other person responsible for such violation."

Mr. DEMPSEY (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean that amendments may be offered to any part of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY and Mr. RANKIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Mexico rise?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico, a member of the committee. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY to the committee amendment: Page 17, beginning with the word "and", in line 14, strike out down to and including "de novo", in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and shall extend to questions of fact and questions of law."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out that provision providing for a jury trial for an employee accused of pernicious political activity. It gives the employee a hearing before the Civil Service Commission. If the Civil Service Commission finds him guilty he can appeal to the District Court on either the questions of law or the questions of fact.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. I understand this amendment would put the bill in the shape it was when it left the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It will put the bill in the shape it was when it left the subcommittee, and also when it left the Senate.

Mr. GWYNNE. Furthermore, would not this amendment bring this procedure in line with the usual procedure throughout the Government service and in accordance with the provisions and the theory of the Logan-Walter Act?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact the amendment providing for a trial by jury was not put in by those who favored the bill, was it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It was put in I think to destroy the bill, and that is what it would do if a jury trial were to be given to an employee not charged with a criminal offense punishable by fine or imprisonment. This amendment has to do with those employees who are charged only with violation of regulations governing their employment, not with a crime. Under my amendment they are given the same treatment that is accorded to civil-service employees, and if one is found guilty by the Civil Service Commission he may appeal to the district court on either the facts or the law. If the district court disagrees with the Commission, the matter, of course, is reversed.

The amendment I have offered is in keeping with the fundamental purpose of the original Hatch Act and the legislation now under consideration—that is, to safeguard and protect the public employee, whether Federal or State—the so-called little fellow—who receives remuneration from the Federal Treasury. It is intended to shield him from political persecution and at the same time to prevent, through that employee, a diversion of Federal Treasury funds into political campaign and machine channels.

This amendment leaves the employee amply safeguarded. It does differentiate, and properly, between those who are

merely charged with violation of regulations under which they are employed and those who violate the criminal sections of this law. I never have heard the charge made that civil-service employees are discriminated against because no jury trial is provided in event of charges being brought against them. Why then should the non-civil-service employee be accorded a jury trial, unless he is charged with the commission of a crime? This bill gives him the right to a court review—something the civil-service employee does not have. Let us not be confused about this matter because of attempts to befog it.

Much has been said here about bureaucrats going into your district, or your State, or my State. When I first came to Washington I had some trouble with bureaucrats for about 6 months. I really could not understand why their attitude was as it was or, in some instances, still is. So I checked into the situation and I have had no trouble for a long period of time. What I do now is to find out what Member of the Senate or the House appointed the bureaucrat and I go to his office and work on that individual. The bureaucrats with whom we are having trouble are those who were placed in positions in payment for political service. They are the people who cause the trouble. Many of them are incompetent to do the job to which they were appointed.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the gentleman's amendment he proposes to give to the Civil Service Commission the same functions that would deprive the employee of a trial by jury.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; wait a minute. It gives to the Civil Service Commission the same authority the Commission now has where civil-service employees are involved, but in addition it gives the employee affected the right to have his case reviewed by the district court on both the facts and the law.

Mr. MAY. As a matter of fact, though, it does not allow the accused employee the right of a trial by jury.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is strange to me that the gentleman from Kentucky, for whom I have great respect, takes the stand he does. Most certainly he cannot be blind to the fact that little employees of the Federal Government have been dismissed because they vote as they want to, and without hearing or trial by anybody.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not for a minute.

There has been no trial or hearing granted when people have been dismissed because they exercised their right to vote. There has been no appeal when they refused to contribute and because of that refusal were dismissed. For political activity you attempt to take a man out of service, but this bill does not take him out of service. If the State says, "No; we refuse to remove this man," the only thing the Federal Government can do is what the bill provides, and that is to say, "All right; then we will assess you twice that man's salary for 1 year." This is not the case with the Social Security set-up, where the State of Ohio was assessed a fine of more than a million dollars. Why all this talk about some person, an official, if you please, some supervisor, who attempts to coerce them and attempts to interfere in political matters?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am not talking about firing some fellow who holds a small job. I am talking about the fundamental principle of law involved in the right of trial by jury by every citizen of this country. In my State constitution it is guaranteed, and in the Federal Constitution it is guaranteed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that my friend from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY], than whom there is no finer man in this House, does not know his own bill. I say that advisedly. I do not mean to say that he does not know it, but I do mean to say that Jupiter nodded if he knows it.

We will be gracious and say he has forgotten. This whole bill is nothing but an amendment to the act passed last year, which is a criminal statute and provides for a fine of not exceeding \$1,000 and imprisonment for not more than 12 months for any violation of the first seven sections of the act. Therefore, when you amend one of those sections of that act you do not change the criminal penalty. That is still in there and still obtains as the basic "mud sill" of this whole legislation.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is it not a fact that in the original Hatch Act the penalty of a \$1,000 fine and 2 years' imprisonment applied only to that section which had to do with misuse of official authority and that the penalty in the act and in the amendment for an employee who was subject to dismissal is simply dismissal?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not so construe it, and I know that in the debate in committee it was not so construed. I know that that was one of the motivating causes actuating the committee in adopting my amendment to preserve the right of jury trial. There cannot be any question about it.

Even if your contention be correct, for it is just as much a punishment for crime to take away a man's job and put him on the blacklist for 18 months as it is to fine him. I would rather be fined and imprisoned for 12 months, than be fired and hounded during the period of the duration of the blacklist. Shades of Uncle Tom's Cabin! Now, a vindictive Government is going to put a pack of its bloodhounds on the trail of these slaves to the rule of the bosses whose will this act will make supreme.

I say it is obligatory upon us to treat every citizen fairly, and to observe our oaths to uphold the Constitution. Yet, in this bill, if the Dempsey amendment be adopted, an employee may be convicted, fired, and blacklisted for 18 months, thereafter, without a right to even ask for a jury trial though that right is guaranteed him by the Constitution. Never before in the history of the Government has there been a blacklist established by law until now.

The victims of this outrageous piece of legislation ought to have a chance to submit their cause to the adjudication of a fair and impartial jury.

I want to read to you a few excerpts which I have taken from the Declaration of Independence, listing the causes of the American Revolution.

He has obstructed the administration of justice by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, and, unacknowledged by our laws, giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation.

Now, here is another ground for our revolution:

For depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury. For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses.

In other words, to Washington.

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies.

Now, I quote the following from the Constitution of the United States:

ARTICLE III, SECTION II, 3. The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.

AMENDMENT VI

In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the wit-

nesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

AMENDMENT VII

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed \$20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of the common law.

In the name of justice, how can you take the right of trial by jury from the people you are supposed to represent?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is no occasion for any misunderstanding as to what is being done here and what will be done by the proposed amendment. As I stated before, there is nothing in this bill which provides any punishment for any person, so far as criminal punishment is concerned, without proper trial. If you will take the original Hatch bill you will find that the first seven sections have to do with miscellaneous matters with reference to the W. P. A., and among others there is a provision prohibiting any administrative officer in the Federal Government from using his official authority wrongfully. Then comes section 8 which reads as follows:

Any person who violates any of the foregoing provisions of this act shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than a thousand dollars or imprisoned for not more than 1 year or both.

Then, next, section 9. This is the section of the original act which prohibited Federal employees from taking an active part in politics. The penalty provided for their violation of that part of the act is contained in section 9A, paragraph (2):

Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person.

In this bill the committee has followed the same procedure as far as the penalty provisions are concerned. The particular thing we have under discussion now is that part of the bill which refers to an employee—

Whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency.

There is no criminal penalty provided for any employee if he violates that section. The only thing he has to fear—and I admit it is something to fear—is that he will be discharged from his employment.

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

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Punishment, of course, is the basis of any penal statute. How much more punishment is it to me, if I am an employee of the Federal Government or a State government, drawing \$100 salary per month, if I am fired for 5 months or 18 months, than if I am fined \$10?

Mr. GWYNNE. The only point I am making now is that this does not provide for any criminal punishment as we understand it. For example, almost every State has a workmen's compensation law. People come in there and try their cases before the tribunal provided by law. They do not have an appeal de novo and cannot demand a jury trial. This procedure follows exactly the theory we were contending for in the Walter-Logan bill, which called for a fair trial before some tribunal with an appeal thereafter to a court which had authority to review the law and had authority to set aside the verdict and finding if not sustained by substantial evidence.

I submit that the provision contained in this bill, and which will be in the law if the amendment now offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] is not adopted, will not be in accordance with the procedure adopted in most of the States of the Union and will not be in accordance with the procedure heretofore adopted in regard to appeals from the Civil Service Commission.

There, as you know, a person may be separated from his employment and he has an appeal, but he has no appeal with

a right to jury trial. We are doing nothing here except what we have done all along the line in cases similar in their nature.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman does not think, does he, that it is a comparable illustration to cite the Walter-Logan bill, which merely provides for appeal from administrative tribunals in the exercise of their duties, which relate merely to details of administration in accordance with the laws we write? Does not the distinguished gentleman realize that this is essentially a criminal statute, punishing for pernicious political activity, which is at least a misdemeanor?

Mr. GWYNNE. No criminal punishment is provided. This bill simply provides that if a man is found to have violated the law he may be removed from office. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I will vote against this bill, which I consider to be almost ridiculous. Certainly I shall oppose the Dempsey amendment. It is a little hard for me to understand the argument that is being made in support of the Dempsey amendment, in the United States, where the personal rights of the people are the things we hold dearer than anything else.

This is a quibble as to whether or not if a man is to be punished under this act it is a criminal punishment. Certainly no one will argue with me that it is not a personal right of his which is being interfered with. You are passing this bill to make politics pure and holy. The test is, find a man who has done something wrong or who has failed to do something that somebody thinks he should have done, and for that and for no other reason you discharge him. Not only do you discharge him but you mark him with having been guilty of pernicious—that is a pretty severe word—pernicious activity of some kind. Thus you take from him a personal right, his right to hold his job as long as he is capable of discharging the duties of that job. How well he is doing the work is not the test under this bill; it is simply whether or not somebody thinks he has done something he should not have done, something disconnected with his work entirely. We hear men stand in the well of this House and say you are kicking this man out of Government employment or some other kind of employment in order to clean up the employment, and you say you are doing that to protect democracy. Then you deny him the right to be heard, by whom? By a jury. A terrible thing, is it not? What is the matter with jury trial? Are you afraid of it? You are certainly not afraid that a jury in your county is going to do something wrong, are you?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. No.

No, Mr. Chairman; of course the bill is going too far. The distinguished gentleman from Texas made one of the ablest arguments I have ever heard made against this bill. I wish it were within my power to go as deeply into this question and talk as convincingly against it as he does. You are striking at the very heart of American liberty and freedom in this bill.

You struck at it in the original Hatch Act which should never have passed, and should never have been placed on the statute books.

When my friend from Alabama said yesterday that the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico was going to offer an amendment to take this right of trial by jury out of this bill I could not believe it. I could not believe that the author of the original bill in the House would stand here before you and advocate such a thing. If I were to support this amendment I would be ashamed to go home and look my free constituents in the face when I would have to say to them that I voted for and supported an amendment which would deprive them of their Constitution-given right of a trial by jury. I do not believe this House will adopt the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one would judge from listening to the argument of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama that something new and unusual had been written into this bill and that now a great threat at democracy is involved because of an attempt to take away the right of trial by jury.

I do not know anything about the laws in the State of Alabama, but I do know something about them in some other States and I wanted to ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama how it is that the thing operates in the case of any removal statute. If a proceeding is instituted to remove a police officer in my State he has a trial before the fire and police commission without any jury and if he is convicted by that commission he has a right of appeal to the court which hears the evidence on a certiorari proceeding.

If a school teacher has a complaint filed against her, her charges are heard before the school board, and the school board, upon the evidence, sitting as a board, issues a removal order. She again has the right of appeal to the court through certiorari proceedings, and there is no jury trial involved at all. In the District of Columbia itself, who has the removal power of your police and firemen in the District? It is vested in a board that has the power to appoint and the power to remove such officials. Those are jobs, are they not, and there is not a jury trial involved any place along the line, and for very good reasons. I could cite instance after instance, in State after State, where in removal proceedings—and that is all this is—the question of jury trial is never involved. A Governor of a State may be removed by impeachment by the legislature. Elective officials in my State and, perhaps, in your State can be removed by a removal body who pass upon evidence, with the right to go into court without a jury trial and with the right of the court to pass upon the questions of law, and, in many cases, upon the sufficiency of the facts adduced at the hearing.

Where is there something new or novel in the suggestion of the gentleman from New Mexico that the same procedure that is universal throughout this country in the matter of removal proceedings, should be written into this law? I would like to have the gentleman answer me.

Mr. HOBBS. I would be most happy to. I deny, sir, most vehemently that this bill is a mere ouster or removal bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Then if the gentleman denies that, while we are on the subject I call his attention to the very wording of the bill itself on page 15:

After such hearing, the Commission shall determine whether any violation of such subsection has occurred and whether such violation, if any, warrants the removal of the officer or employee.

And so forth. This is the identical language that is found in removal statutes throughout the length and breadth of this land. It is the identical language that provides for removal of public officers and is the same language found in State removal statutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Now will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. I did not say that it was not a removal statute. I said that it was not merely a removal statute.

Mr. KEEFE. What else is there involved except a removal in this particular section?

Mr. HOBBS. If the gentleman will allow me to give my answer—

Mr. KEEFE. I will be very happy to, because I wanted to ask the gentleman that question when he had the floor.

Mr. HOBBS. You will find that this bill amends section 2 of the original Hatch Act. Section 2 of the original act, of course, precedes section 8 thereof, which is the general penal section. Therefore the penal section in the original Hatch Act applies to section 2 thereof as it will be amended by this act. But I care not whether this be construed as a criminal statute or not. If it be purely civil, in any case under it wherein more than \$20 is involved, the victims are entitled to jury trials under the Constitution of the United States.

I cannot see to save my life why you bring up civil-service and ouster proceedings arising in private or similar employment, where the oustering authority has been paying the salary in connection with this criminal statute. Such cases have no more to do with this bill than the price of wheat on the moon.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman has answered and has done so out of my time and I now want to make this statement. I am not referring to the civil-service procedure, I am referring to the fact that the removal statutes in every State provide substantially the same method of removal as is provided in this law, provided you strike out that jury-trial provision.

Mr. HOBBS. And the position we take is that we have no control over a State nor over the laws of a State. If a State provides by its law for ouster without trial by jury that is no precedent that we may invoke to justify our denial of the right of trial by jury as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It occurs to me that some of our good friends in this debate have strained at an academic gnat and swallowed a political camel whose humps are mountain high with all sorts of abuse. Much is said here about these fellows who have the administration of these funds, part of which are contributed by the Federal Government, not having a jury trial if they get caught doing something they ought not to do. As has been suggested and said by my able friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], removal statutes, and in many States they are called ouster statutes, provide for the summary removal of an unfaithful official, an elected official, when found guilty, and that without trial by jury. The statement has been made that if more than \$20 is involved, a party litigant must have a trial by jury. Such is not the law. In respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority, it has been held that in condemnation proceedings for the condemnation of property even though the value of it extends up to \$100,000, no jury trial can be had. Just what jury trials have some of these poor men had who worked on P. W. A. projects, and who were thrown out of their jobs by some petty political boss because they would not make political contributions or vote according to the way the political whip was cracked? I hold in my hand the front page of a recent issue of the Knoxville Journal, published in my city, and headed "More W. P. A. workers blame shake-down for job loss," and here is a picture of one of the fellows who had to cough up a dollar out of his meager, paltry pay. Here is the picture of the family: His wife is lying in bed with a newborn child, and there are six more standing by. Just what sort of a jury trial does a fellow like that have when his foreman shakes him down and fires him because he does not come across? In that connection those men who shook those fellows down have been indicted in the Federal court and some have pleaded guilty, and others have been tried and convicted and sentenced to prison terms.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is for the protection of the poor and the needy. This bill is to prevent the playing of politics with human misery. This bill is to stop men from laying the heavy hand of political oppression on some poor fellow who feels holding to his coattails the hands of his hungry children and his helpless wife when he is about to lose his job. I wish that we could put ourselves in the shoes of a fellow like that, the man who is thus beset by poverty and by woe on the one hand by his wife and children and by the coercion of a political boss on the other side.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Not now. Somebody has said here that he would hate to go home and look at some of his constituents after voting for this amendment. I am not ashamed to go home and look at my constituents after I have supported this amendment and this bill in its entirety, even though I have to look at some of them through bars in jail where they properly are. [Laughter.] I think it is

a good bill and ought to be passed, and this amendment ought to be adopted. You know some of our friends have gone on here so long with these relief funds, that they think they have acquired a proscriptive right to use them for political ends. There was an old fellow in my country who had been stealing hogs all of his life. Finally they caught him and indicted him and convicted him. The prosecutor finally said, "Now, Bill, we were boys together, and our children go to school together, and our wives belong to the same church, and if you will sign this agreement not to steal any more hogs, I will turn you loose." Bill said, "Jim, I'll be darned if I will. I am not going to sign away my liberties in any such manner as that." [Laughter.]

This act is the expression of the enlightened and outraged public opinion of the people. The facts that demand its passage constitute a black chapter in the history of this country. It is designed to protect the public, to safeguard the needy. The man who by political power has the control of the right of a poor man and his family to eat, be clothed, and sheltered to a large and dangerous degree is in a position to dictate the vote of that poor man thus dependent on his favor. One of the indictments of George the Third was that he made judges dependent on his will for the payment of their salaries and the tenure of their offices. If a judge can thus be coerced, how much more can a man on relief or on a Government job be put on the spot and his vote controlled? What right has anyone clothed with a little brief authority to prostitute it for political ends; to build a machine held together by the cohesive power of public plunder; and to drive the poor and helpless to contribute from their meager earnings and thus by this unholy coercion rob the Government and oppress the poor? Let us pass the bill and stop the racket.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the Dempsey amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. That will not affect the gentleman's amendment. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think in discussing the matter of the jury trial and the whole question of penalties in connection with this bill, we are perhaps overlooking the main beneficence of the bill itself. Insofar as the Hatch Act is effective in actual practice, it is not primarily because of the penalties assessed, including removal, threatened. I have had some experience with the first Hatch Act in the State of Illinois, and I have seen public officials who hitherto neglected during campaigns the duties of their office, now out of prudence staying with the duties of their office. They hesitated "to stick their necks out" so long as the Hatch bill was in force, for fear that the opposing faction or party would use it to political purposes against them or their party.

The greater effectiveness of the Hatch bill will, I think, grow out of the fact that in a two-party system we are hesitant to perform functions that we know we ought not to perform when there are other people watching our conduct, people who will use it to political disadvantage of our party or ourselves. More than with most laws, the Hatch Act is self-enforcing.

With reference now to the question of removal, whether you call it punishment or not, may I call attention to this fact: Much talk about this jury question seems to presume that people who hold political office have some right to the political office, independent of the performance of the duties of the office itself. There is no invasion of the rights of citizenship in removal from any office or job of anybody for doing something pernicious and something quite beyond the duties of the office which he holds. The only removal that is threatened in this case is of people neglecting their duties and doing instead what is so far from duty as to be here

branded pernicious. Consequently, the removal, punishment or not, of course, invalidates no citizenly rights. The penalty involved in this is merely the punishment that a man brings on himself when he accepts office upon the pains of performing the duties of the office and then proceeds to do something else instead of performing the duties. To declare that a man is entitled to a jury trial in such a case is, to say the least, disingenuous.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman has talked about officeholders. Will the gentleman address himself to the employee, the man who works for a drainage district or for an irrigation district, which happens to have a loan from the Government? Will the gentleman address himself to that man who is discharged from his position and not permitted to have a job for 18 months, simply because he goes out and takes part in your election? Will you address yourself to that man and talk a little about the employee and not about the man who holds the job?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. That is exactly the man I have been talking about, if he abuses his office as herein described. This bill proposes to stop misuse of public funds by whomsoever. It proposes to stop it by simply letting the citizen give up the job to which he has not any rights when he ceases to perform its duties.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Is it your contention that you cannot grant an officeholder removal under constitutional form of government, and is it constitutional form of government that a man is not entitled to a trial by jury?

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. The constitutional form of government expects a man, I hope, to perform the duties for which he is publicly paid—and not something else instead. Whatever provision we here make, under the Constitution, for his removal, when he fails of his duty, is constitutional enough for me.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired on this amendment.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DEMPSEY) there were ayes 108 and noes 79.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DEMPSEY and Mr. NICHOLS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 131 and noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY: Page 20, line 12, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 20 beginning in line 13 strike out down to and including line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons;

"(2) the term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether legally enforceable to make a contribution."

Page 21, line 7, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following language:

"Provided, That nothing in this sentence shall be construed to interfere with the usual and known business, trade, or profession of any candidate."

Page 21, line 8, strike out "any person who is engaged in" and in lieu thereof insert:

"(d) Any person who engages in."

Page 21, line 17, strike out "(b)" and insert "(e)."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the amendment just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to make clear that the bill is not intended to limit Federal offices to people who had no business or occupation. The paragraph to which it is added, in the minds of many of us, was open to the interpretation that it would have been unlawful for anyone to buy "goods, commodities, advertising, or articles of any kind or description" from anyone who was a candidate for an elective Federal office.

The language of the bill is:

Where the proceeds of such a purchase, or any portion thereof, shall directly or indirectly inure to the benefit of or for any candidate for an elective Federal office.

That would seem to have made it unlawful for anyone to have bought groceries from a grocer, wheat from a farmer, advertising from a printer, or articles of any kind from anyone who was a candidate for an elective Federal office, under threat of 5 years imprisonment and a fine of \$5,000. Obviously, if that was the correct interpretation it would have limited running for Federal office to persons who had no business, who had other means of support, or who would abandon their businesses while a candidate.

No one contends that was the intention of the bill. An interpretation suggested by some is that the language was meant to cover sales only where the proceeds were directly used in the candidacy of the candidate. It would be difficult, however, to divide the personality of the candidate. When would he be farmer, grocer, or businessman selling in his normal occupation, and when would he be candidate? Naturally, he would use the proceeds from his normal occupation in defraying some of his expenses as a candidate.

The intent of the bill is to curb and prevent pernicious political activity, not normal business activity. To prevent the possibility of an unintended construction, the amendment just adopted was worked out. It provides that the paragraph shall not be construed to interfere with the normal and known trade, business, or profession of a candidate for an elective Federal office.

A number of Members on this side of the aisle were concerned with the language as it stood and should be credited with working out the language of the amendment. They include the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK]. The acceptance of the amendment by the author of the bill and its adoption by this body is appreciated.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY: Page 26, line 3, after the period, insert "The terms used in this section shall have the meaning assigned to them in section 302 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, and the penalties provided in such act shall apply to violations of this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY: On page 26, strike out all of line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VREELAND: On page 20, line 12, after the words "national political party", insert "This subsection shall not apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee or other State or local organization."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas) there were—ayes 93, noes 74.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: On page 13, beginning with line 18, strike out all of section 12.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike out of this bill the provision dealing with State employees. The matter has been thoroughly discussed. I feel I ought to offer the amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. If we strike out what is suggested in the gentleman's amendment, do we not strike out the heart of the bill?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. You strike out that part of the bill that ought never to have been in it. If that is the heart of it, that is what I am after.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Page 21, after line 7, insert: "It is further declared to be a pernicious political activity, and it shall hereafter be unlawful, for any officer or employee of a public utility holding company registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, or of any subsidiary company thereof, (1) to take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, or (2) to use his authority or influence as such officer or employee for the purpose of interfering with an election or a nomination for office, or affecting the results thereof, or (3) directly or indirectly to coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any other such officer or employee to pay, lend, or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill. Does the gentleman from New Mexico desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this amendment is germane. If you are really in earnest about wanting clean politics, about wanting to stop corruption in politics in America, you cannot do anything to that end more directly than to stop the corruption of the public utilities, their representatives, their agents, and their henchmen.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be very glad to hear from the gentleman on the point of order that has been raised.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not addressing himself to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure the gentleman will proceed in accordance with the existing order to address the Chair on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am addressing myself to the Chair on the point of order.

This is a bill presumably to clean up politics, to try to bring about honest elections in this country; this is a bill

allegedly to try to stop corruption in politics, the corruption of elections. It is a matter of common knowledge, and every man within the sound of my voice knows there has been more corruption at the hands of public utilities recently than there has been at the hands of all the Government employees combined. I submit that if this bill means what it says, if this measure is to be passed for the purpose of bringing about honest elections and stopping corruption in politics, the one thing we should do is to put a stop to these utilities not only corrupting elections but controlling conventions as well as primaries.

Mr. MICHENER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] desire to address the Chair on the point of order?

Mr. MICHENER. If the Chair desires to hear me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is always glad to hear from the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, this is 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. Only such matters are relevant and germane in the way of amendment as are included within the title of the act.

This act deals with whom? It does not deal with electric-light companies; it does not deal with railroad companies; it does not deal with fertilizer manufacturers; therefore any amendment offered extending the act to any one of these several agencies which I have mentioned would not be germane and would not be in order.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is addressing the Chair on the point of order, and the Chair feels that the gentleman should confine his remarks to the Chair and not yield at this point.

The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to section 13, on page 20. In view of what the gentleman states in reference to the title, the Chair may say that we have to look to the body of the bill itself, and the Chair calls the attention of the gentleman that section 13 declares to be a pernicious political activity certain acts which relate to individuals, covered by the first paragraph of section 13 and in the third paragraph of section 13, having to do with another group.

The Chair would like to have the gentleman's views as to whether or not, the bill covering more than one subject, a third subject of a related nature, an amendment of this sort, would be germane.

Mr. MICHENER. The Chair is undoubtedly correct in that suggestion, but the section to which the Chair refers only has reference to contributions. The agencies included in the Rankin amendment receive no compensation or contributions from the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair also calls attention to the third paragraph, which has to do with any person, individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and so forth.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; those individuals or groups receive contributions in an indirect way. This bill does not deal with any person or any group or any class of persons excepting such groups or classes as receive their pay or compensation wholly or in part from the Federal Government; therefore, if the Rankin amendment is germane, you can just as well extend this bill to automobile manufacturers or to any other industry. This bill deals with those receiving compensation from the Government. If those industries received their pay or their compensation in whole or in part from contributions of the Federal Government, then the gentleman's amendment would be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is addressing the Chair on a point of order.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to suggest unless I may answer some further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will state his point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the reading of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] there was so much confusion in the Chamber that I know a great many Members did not grasp its import. May I ask unanimous consent that it be again reported before the argument on the point of order proceeds?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the Rankin amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the Rankin amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, upon hearing the amendment read again I want to accentuate what I said. It might be just as reasonable to include within the list of those prescribed by the gentleman's amendment—the attorney in Tupelo, Miss., who represents the utilities in Tupelo but who receives no compensation from the Federal Government.

Mr. RANKIN. There are no Power Trust attorneys in Tupelo.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. COX rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. However, the Chair would be very glad to hear from the gentleman from South Dakota and the gentleman from Georgia on the point of order. Does the gentleman from South Dakota desire to address the Chair on the point of order?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wish to point out that the point made by the gentleman from Michigan in regard to the subject matter of the amendment is pertinent because the language of the amendment proposed deals with the activities that are described in section 12, and if this amendment were germane it would be germane to section 12 rather than to section 13, which deals primarily with the subject of contributions and not with the subject of participation in campaigns. A great deal of the amendment is devoted to the subject of participation in campaigns, which is covered in section 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Georgia on the point of order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has in part touched upon what I had in mind. It occurs to me that the bill proposes to lay a restriction on individuals or the agents or employees of individuals who receive some character of favor from the Government. In this particular case, the gentleman from Mississippi, by the amendment which he offers, undertakes to reach out and extend the Federal power to the regulation of the conduct of people who have no connection, direct or remote, with the Government, and who are in no wise agents or employees of individuals who receive such favors.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard for just a moment in answer to the gentlemen who have spoken on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Very well, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCORMACK). The Chair is in complete agreement with so much of the observations of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] as relates to the amendment's not being germane if the bill were confined to one group. The Chair would have no hesitancy in ruling if the bill confined itself and its operations to employees of a State or of any political subdivision.

However, the Chair is very much concerned by the provision of section 13, which brings in another class, declaring it to be—

A pernicious political activity * * * for any person, directly or indirectly, to make contributions. * * *

Then in the third paragraph of section 13 there is brought in another class:

It is further declared to be a pernicious political activity * * * for any person, individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons to purchase or buy any goods, commodities, advertising, or articles of any kind or description where the proceeds of such a purchase, or any portion thereof, shall directly or indirectly inure to the benefit of or for any candidate for an elective Federal office. * * *

There is a well-recognized rule of the House, which has been passed upon on many occasions, that where a bill confines itself to one subject, another subject, even if related, would not be germane, but where a bill covers two or more subjects a related subject would then be in order.

The Chair, naturally, recognizes the power in the argument made by the gentleman from Georgia and others on the merits of the amendment, but it is not the responsibility of the Chair in passing upon a point of order to pass upon the merits of an amendment. What the results of an amendment may be is not properly a matter for the Chair to pass on.

This being a related matter, and the bill covering two or more groups, it seems to the Chair that another group could be included therein, which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi undertakes to do. For the reasons stated, therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Would it be proper to include in this bill another group which has nothing to do with the Federal Government and where the compensation of the group is not received directly or indirectly from the Federal Government?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter the Chair would pass upon if it were presented to the Chair. The Chair is sure that the gentleman from Michigan himself appreciates that the Chair would be giving gratuitous advice if he undertook to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that every Member of the House will vote for this amendment. It is offered in good faith. It is very necessary if we are to check political corruption in this country.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio because I believe he is probably one man who ought to fall in line, above all others.

Mr. SECCOMBE. I merely wish to ask the gentleman if he would be willing to include the moving-picture industry in his amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that if he has the courage to offer such an amendment I shall give it serious consideration. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for a question.

Mr. JOHNS. If this amendment applies to all public utilities, would that include the employees of the R. E. A.?

Mr. RANKIN. They are already covered. You need not worry about them. You have already tied up the R. E. A. and the T. V. A. and all the other governmental agencies, so you need not worry about them at all, but this will put a stop to these utilities or their agents corruptly influencing or trying to influence elections or controlling conventions. If it had been in effect before the Philadelphia convention, the chances are they would have nominated a candidate of their own choice.

Now, if you really want clean politics, if you really are trying to clean up politics in this country, if you really want decent elections, and honest conventions, if you really want to stop the most pernicious political activity this country has ever known, then support this amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 83, noes 129.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. RANKIN and Mr. DEMPSEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 84, noes 120.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEYER of California: On page 13, strike out lines 15, 16, and 17, inclusive, and insert the following: "Sec. 4. (a) Such act of August 2, 1939, is further amended by adding after section 1 the following new section:

"SEC. 1. (a) It is unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the authority of the laws of a State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote at any election for a President or Vice President or Presidential elector or Member of the Senate or Member of the House of Representatives of the United States."

And after the figure 4 in line 15 insert (b).

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to that section of the bill or those sections of the bill to which it is addressed nor to any section of the bill.

Mr. GEYER of California. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. HOBBS. I will not.

Mr. GEYER of California. The gentleman will not?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir.

Mr. GEYER of California. I would like to be heard on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOBBS. I would be delighted to be heard if the Chair wishes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this point of order, it seems to me, is so patently well taken as not to require argument. This is a bill the avowed purpose of which is to prevent pernicious political activity on the part of those in authority or employees who have anything to do with projects financed in whole or in part by loans or grants by the Federal Government. It is perfectly manifest that this amendment is an attempt to overthrow our dual system of government by restraining the States from exercising their indisputable right to control their own elections and to make their own laws. There is no provision of law whatsoever that even remotely attempts to justify such an outrageous rape of the sovereign powers of the States.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not confining himself to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes the gentleman from Alabama is addressing himself to the point of order and the Chair will hear the gentleman from California later.

Mr. HOBBS. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the amendment relates to the exercise, by a so-called sovereign State, still thought by some to be sovereign of its own power to legislate for the people of the State with respect to its own election machinery, I submit that it is so patent as to require no argument that this amendment is not germane to any portion of the bill.

I read, at the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBBS], this quotation from the case of *Breedlove v. Suttles* (302 U. S. 277):

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

Then follows a number of other citations and this language:

The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States, and not those that spring from other sources.

Mr. Chairman, I really see no purpose in prolonging this argument, unless the Chair has some question in mind that

I might be able to answer. If so, I would be very happy to try to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman questions later, possibly. The Chair will hear the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, I call attention of the Chair to the decision just made on the Rankin amendment. I think this is a parallel case. In addition to that, I point out that the bill before us has as its purpose the purification of politics, and stops the pollution of representative government at its source. The poll tax puts the dollar sign on the right to vote, in violation of section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment, which reads as follows, in part:

But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crimes, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion in which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

My amendment prohibits the purchase of a vote by denying the right, first, to demand poll-tax receipt, before the voter can vote. The evidence before the Committee on the Judiciary of this House on this very point shows the practice of buying poll-tax receipts en bloc, that is, paying the tax for another, is common. This amendment prohibits further political activity.

AMENDMENT TO HATCH ACT TO ABOLISH POLL TAXES

This amendment has been endorsed by A. F. of L., C. I. O., railway brotherhoods, Y. W. C. A., National Negro Congress, and others.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It prohibits the charging of a price for the privilege of exercising the American right of casting one's ballot.

This applies only to the election of national officeholders, President, Vice President, Presidential electors, Members of the Senate or Members of the House of Representatives.

It will give the ballot to the low-income groups in the eight Southern States that are still following the old Roman system that was in operation when Mary and Joseph presented to the world the Babe of Bethlehem.

My good friend from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] was unable to answer a question propounded yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH]. I will now answer it.

The percentage of voters to the total population for the year 1934 in Alabama was 10.15 percent. The percentage of voters for the 40 States that charge no head tax as a prerequisite for voting was 31.24 percent—10 as against 31. This is for the primary election.

Now, let us look at some general-election figures. In 1936—a Presidential election—adult population.

Percent of poll-tax States	
Virginia.....	25.7
Arkansas.....	18.5
Texas.....	26.2
South Carolina.....	14.1

Percent of non-poll-tax States	
West Virginia.....	92
Missouri.....	80
New Mexico.....	94
North Carolina.....	75

About 64 percent of the white voters in these States are disfranchised. Is this democracy? Can any Member of this body who believes in our Government refuse to support this amendment? Let us do our saving of democracy right here at home, or rather let us get it ourselves first.

We have 78 Representatives from these poll-tax States. If we enforced our fourteenth amendment and cut down our vote as provided therein, do you know how many we would have from the poll-tax States? Only 13—13 instead of 78 by the 1936 figures.

Our friend from Alabama asks us not to punish our colleagues. Now I do not blame any Representative for not wanting the political equilibrium disturbed in his district,

especially if he has been here so many years as to be chairman of his committee. I claim that no feudal lord was more secure behind his stone walls than the Congressman fortified behind his poll-tax barricade.

Even Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin are not more secure in tenure of office under their one-party system than is the Representative from a one-party State if reenforced by the poll-tax restrictions on the ballot.

The other 387 of us must consider labor, the unemployed, the slum dweller, the sharecropper, and racial minorities, for these groups may reward or punish at the polls in our States.

The only punishment that may come to these Representatives from non-poll-tax districts will come to those who have been forgetting these classes and refuse to change. I am sure the politically astute will easily make the proper adjustment in his thinking and in his voting if such adjustments are necessary. Surely we cannot be wavering as to our proper duty as between asking our colleagues to make such an adjustment, and the denying to this vast army of people the right to vote.

They will tell you it is a local matter. Did they say that when they asked us to tax all the people for the benefit of the T. V. A.?

Were my people concerned when the lord high executioner of the W. P. A. came out of Virginia, or the leader against the wage-hour law came from Georgia? Was it the concern of the people of Illinois when the State of Tennessee furnished the leader of the fight to kill the slum-clearance program? Was it a local matter only when the impetus to weaken the National Labor Relations Act sprang from the "cradle of democracy," Virginia?

Let the opponents of this amendment answer these questions before they say the poll tax is of local concern only. Let us have a real democracy here in the United States. Let us give people the right to adjust their wrongs in the American way—at the ballot box—so there will be no temptation to settle them some other way. How long before the trodden worm will finally turn? Let us cast our vote for democracy and scuttle autocracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. HOBBS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. HOBBS. To advance an additional reason to the argument already made. It violates the Constitution of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that he should rule upon the effect of the amendment offered in respect to its being germane to the bill.

The Chair listened with a great deal of interest to the citations and excerpts from a Supreme Court decision which the gentleman from Alabama referred to. The Chair distinguishes clearly between the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is in no way related to the provisions of the pending bill; that is, in no way related so as to make the amendment germane in accordance with and under the rules of the House. The amendment relates to the franchise of the voters in the several States, and the bill under consideration so far as the Chair can observe, and the Chair has read it carefully, in no way enters that field. For the reasons stated, and principally and wholly upon the ground that the amendment is not related to the bill under consideration, and wholly eliminating the constitutional question or any other question, the Chair holds that the amendment is not germane, and sustains the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 12, line 24, after the comma, following the word "States", insert "or (3) any labor or-

ganization or any official or employee thereof", and, after the word "authority", at the end of said line 24, insert "or any of the funds of any labor organization."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the three amendments that I have at the desk, which are all for the same purpose, may be considered at this time, and that I may have 5 minutes on each amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the other two amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 15, after the word "persons", strike out the period, insert a comma and the words "including labor organizations and the officers and employees thereof."

Page 1, line 2 of the title, after the word "Columbia", insert "and to labor organizations and the officials and employees thereof."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the Committee, I shall not use a third of the time allotted to me.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, may we have order?

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield now. We have been talking about doing away with political corruption. This bill is for that purpose. The gentleman from Mississippi offered an amendment which would have prevented individuals and employees in a certain line of business from taking any part in political campaigns.

In my judgment that was not a good amendment for the reason that it denied a civil right of the individual to an unnecessary degree. There is this distinction between the amendment which he offered and the one which I am offering. These amendments—there are three of them—one to the title, one to each of two sections of the bill, offered at one time so as to avoid the point of order raised against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, are all directed toward the purpose of preventing the use of the funds of a labor organization as distinguished from the funds of the members of that organization, for any political purpose. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi applied to the individuals. These amendments do not apply to members of a union. They apply only to the funds of a union, used by the officials of the union, by the employees of the union.

The reason for these amendments is plain. If we are to have Federal corporations preventing contributions for political purposes, if we are to limit political contributions made by individuals, is there any reason why contributions from organizations which, with the aid of the Federal Government—I mean aided by the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, the National Labor Relations Board in collecting not \$1,000,000 but approximately \$10,000,000 a year from the workers of this country, organizations which have made political contributions of as much as \$700,000 in 1 year, should not be limited in their contributions?

Now, here is the report of the special committee appointed to investigate campaign expenditures of Presidential, Vice Presidential, and senatorial candidates in 1936, pursuant to Senate Resolution 225. On page 127 of that report—and do not forget, this committee was appointed by a Democratic Vice President and the policy of the committee was controlled by Democratic Senators, so there is no political discrimination as against the Democratic or New Deal Party, and there can be none in this report.

Here is a part of that report.

The following recapitulation shows total contributions, and so forth:

The committee desires to point out that the labor contributions referred to in the following tabulation do not include contributions by individual local unions to various local organizations, such as county political committees. These compilations are from records as filed in detail with the Clerk of the House.

Recapitulation of labor organization campaign contributions, campaign of 1936, to the Democratic National Committee, \$129,000, direct cash contribution. Advertising books of the Democratic National Convention of 1936, \$7,500.

For the moment I will skip the others.

The total is \$770,324.35, all contributed to the New Deal.

Then there is also a loan in there to the Democratic Committee of \$50,000, which I understand has since been repaid. From a political standpoint, how can any Republican refuse to end such an advantage enjoyed by the New Dealers? Is it not enough that they have had the Federal Treasury to draw upon? Should they not be satisfied with the amounts which they have been able, during the past few years, to chisel from the relief appropriations? Can they not be satisfied with the sale of the President's signature on campaign books? Has not the political trough, out of which they have been feeding upon, been wide enough, deep enough, and long enough to satisfy the most greedy and shameless political pap sucker? Is there any reason why one single Republican should now by his failure to vote for this amendment again permit them to sell John L. Lewis a part of the New Deal administration?

Is there any reason in the wide world, if we are to prevent contributions by corporations, why we should not prevent a contribution of \$770,000, all made to the Democratic Party—or more properly to the New Deal campaign fund? You Democrats will recall the embarrassment that followed those contributions. Here was a man whose organization contributed some \$440,000 to the New Deal campaign fund. Was it a free-will offering? Perhaps the New Deal campaign committee so regarded it, but, much to the embarrassment of the Democratic Party, after the election was over along comes Lewis, and by the statements which he made and by his conduct here in the House and at the White House, he virtually claimed that he had bought a part of the administration—an absurdity on the face of it; but he was able to make that claim because we had not prevented the making of such contributions.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Briefly.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Did not Mr. Lewis at the Republican convention in Philadelphia plead failure of consideration—that he had not gotten value received? [Laughter.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was not there; but I will say this, if he did, he certainly was most ungrateful, for any man who can buy, for even a million dollars, control of the National Labor Relations Board over a period of 3 or 4 years, favored as he has been—I say for even a million dollars—he made a good bargain, if the corrupting of an administrative board can ever be considered a good bargain. John Lewis and his C. I. O. would not be anywhere if he had not had the support of the N. L. R. B. in his organizing campaigns. That is a known fact. For every dollar his organization contributed it received the value of ten.

Now, we are talking about political corruption—

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. I am in perfect agreement with you in what you are saying. I would like to say also that the garment workers contributed large sums of money in 1938.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I know.

Let me quote from a newspaper article showing that fact. The article is as follows:

"POOR" CLOTHING WORKERS HELP A RICH POLITICIAN—WE'RE TOLD THEY LIVE IN SLUMS, BUT NEEDLE BOYS EASILY HAND UP "SO GRAND"

Following are the amounts of funds contributed by the "impoverished" Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, controlled by Sidney Hillman, one of the big three of the C. I. O., to the various Roosevelt campaign funds in 1936, as compiled by the special United States Senate committee from the union's own reports:

June 25. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	\$5,000.00
July 21. To American Labor Party.....	4,000.00
Aug. 27. To American Labor Party.....	2,137.80
Aug. 29. To American Labor Party.....	1,500.00
Sept. 25. To American Labor Party.....	120.00
Oct. 2. To American Labor Party.....	100.00

Oct. 5. To American Labor Party.....	\$1,000.00
Oct. 6. To American Labor Party.....	500.00
Oct. 7. To American Labor Party.....	1,000.00
Oct. 13. To American Labor Party.....	253.50
Oct. 14. To American Labor Party.....	1,605.00
Oct. 15. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	5,000.00
Oct. 22. To American Labor Party.....	371.75
Oct. 26. To American Labor Party.....	5,000.00
Oct. 28. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	5,000.00
Oct. 30. To American Labor Party.....	4,843.84
Nov. 3. To American Labor Party.....	5,000.00
Nov. 3. Loan from Amalgamated Bank to American Labor Party.....	7,500.00
Nov. 10. Same as above.....	1,000.00
Nov. 18. Same as above.....	1,500.00
Nov. 19. Contribution from Amalgamated Bank to American Labor Party.....	25,000.00
Undated. To Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party.....	4,350.00
Undated. From Sidney Hillman to Democratic National Committee.....	500.00
Total.....	82,281.89

Here is another:

"SWEATSHOP" HELP POURED GOLD IN PRESIDENT'S LAP—DUBINSKY, WHO GAVE MORE TO SPANISH "RED," HAL THEM BETTER DORIS DUKE'S GIFT

Following are the amounts of funds contributed by the "impoverished" International Ladies Garment Workers, controlled by David Dubinsky, one of the Big Three of the C. I. O., to the various Roosevelt campaign funds in 1936 as compiled by the special United States Senate committee from the union's own reports:

June 25. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	\$5,000.00
July 21. To American Labor Party.....	5,000.00
Aug. 29. To American Labor Party.....	5,000.00
Sept. 10. To American Labor Party.....	1,150.00
Sept. 22. To American Labor Party.....	3,000.00
Sept. 25. To American Labor Party.....	200.00
Sept. 30. To American Labor Party.....	300.00
Oct. 24. To American Labor Party.....	5,000.00
Oct. 27. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	5,000.00
Oct. 27. To American Labor Party.....	5,000.00
Oct. 29. To American Labor Party.....	7,792.00
Oct. 30. To American Labor Party.....	1,843.85
Nov. 3. To American Labor Party.....	5,000.00
Nov. 18. To American Labor Party.....	100.00
Undated. To Labor's Non-Partisan League for use in New Jersey.....	2,500.00
Undated. To Labor's Non-Partisan League for use in Pennsylvania.....	2,500.00
Undated. To Labor's Non-Partisan League for use in Illinois.....	2,000.00
Undated. To Minnesota Farmer Labor Party.....	5,000.00
Total.....	61,385.85

And still another:

"STARVING" MINERS GAVE BIG FORTUNE TO RICH ROOSEVELT—MEN WHOSE LEADERS SAY THEY ARE STARVING RIVAL DU PONT'S, MORGAN, AND ROCKEFELLER

Following are the amounts of funds contributed by the "impoverished" United Mine Workers of America, controlled by John L. Lewis, leader of the Big Three of the C. I. O., to the various Roosevelt campaign funds in 1936 as compiled by the special United States Senate committee from the union's own reports:

Apr. 1. For advertisement in Democratic Convention Book.....	\$5,000.00
Apr. 30. For copies of Democratic Convention Book.....	1,250.00
May 29. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	5,000.00
Aug. 12. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	10,000.00
Aug. 15. To Roosevelt Nominators' Division.....	185.00
Sept. 1. To Roosevelt Nominators' Division.....	295.00
Sept. 21. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	18,850.00
Sept. 28. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	18,850.00
Sept. 29. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	10,000.00
Sept. 30. To Roosevelt Nominators' Division.....	50,000.00
Oct. 1. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	100.00
Oct. 5. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	18,850.00
Oct. 6. To Progressive National Committee.....	35,000.00
Oct. 8. To Democratic National Committee.....	50,000.00
Oct. 12. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	18,850.00
Oct. 16. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	9,128.00
Oct. 19. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	18,850.00
Oct. 28. To Democratic National Committee.....	50,000.00
Oct. 31. Loan to Democratic National Committee (still unpaid).....	50,000.00
Nov. 3. To Labor's Non-Partisan League.....	20,000.00
Dec. 3. To Democratic National Committee.....	100.00
Undated. To Labor's Non-Partisan League for use in Pennsylvania.....	12,500.00
Undated. To Labor's Non-Partisan League for use in Luzerne County, Pa.....	7,500.00
Undated. To Labor's Non-Partisan League for use in 3 Pennsylvania counties.....	3,500.00

Undated. To Pennsylvania Democratic State Committee.....	\$40,000.00
Undated. For campaign buttons.....	3,091.43
Undated. For advertisement in J. David Stern's Philadelphia Record.....	800.00
Undated. For campaign pamphlets.....	2,597.97
Undated. For campaign postage.....	3,531.51
Undated. To Congressman McLaughlin.....	520.00
Undated. To Democratic Senatorial Committee.....	6,000.00
Total.....	470,348.91

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. If the gentleman will look at the contribution from the Du Ponts to the Republican Party, he will find that labor is a piker when it comes to making contributions. It is in that same book.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know.

The exact amount of money contributed by the Du Ponts and of all others who contributed to the Republican Party is shown in this report. If you will examine it you will note that they contributed of their own funds; they contributed money which belonged to them, money which was their individual property.

These labor organizations contributed the funds which they held in trust for their members, funds which had been collected through the check-off, through the fear of the loss of jobs, if payment was not made; from men who could ill-afford to make those contributions. Another thing the Du Ponts and others who contributed to the Republican Party made a gift to promote a cause in which they believed. Money which these labor organizations contributed for political purposes was all too often contributed to an organization and for a purpose in which the men who earned that money, the man from whom it was taken, had neither faith nor confidence.

These amendments extend and carry out the announced purpose of this bill. The purpose of the bill, as announced in the papers, is to prevent, as far as possible, the improper use of money, of influence in political campaigns. If the purpose of this bill be as announced by those sponsoring and supporting it, to prevent the influencing or the purchasing of nominations or elections; of buying, through the use of money or of influence, the office of President, of Vice President, of Congressmen, and of Senators, then there is no reason why a labor organization should be permitted to contribute hundreds of thousands of dollars toward the purchasing of public officials, or if you prefer, toward the election of public officials who will do their will.

Experience demonstrates, and the records show, that for the purpose of controlling legislation, John L. Lewis and labor organizations, according to this report of the Senate committee, spent more than \$770,000.

Republicans know that that money was spent to defeat their candidates. Democrats know that it was spent to elect new dealers and that some of these organizations used their influence to defeat Democrats. Republicans, if they want equal opportunity to present their views to the voters next November, should vote for these amendments. They should not handicap themselves by the failure to adopt these amendments. They should not exempt from the provisions of this bill contributors to their political enemies while voting to limit contributors to their own party.

Republicans should at least insist upon competing upon an actual basis. Republicans and Democrats who announce that they believe in clean politics should by their vote on these amendments demonstrate their sincerity. These amendments are a test of the sincerity of those who state that they wish to place the office of President, of Vice President, of Members of Congress, beyond the reach of those who believe that such offices can be purchased. These amendments are a challenge to the courage of every Member of this House who says that he wants to do away with contributions to political parties which lead toward corruption.

If you wish to do something toward furthering the cause of clean politics, here is your opportunity. If you fear re-

taliation through the political activities of certain labor organizations, let me say to you that the organization which would seek to buy you today will cut your political throat tomorrow.

Let me say to you that if through fear of the votes of a labor organization you vote against these amendments, you have not the slightest assurance that that organization will support you; that it will not give aid to your political opponent. And remember this, that those who use money to corrupt the voters are fickle bosses. More than that, they are tyrants, and the moment you cease to do their bidding, an order for your political execution will follow.

This reasoning applies as well to independent Democrats as it does to Republicans.

Let me repeat, here are amendments which place you squarely on the spot. They test your sincerity, your courage, your independence. Here is your opportunity to take a long, long step to free all political parties from the domination of labor racketeers.

The whole record is here. As I understand it, corporations are now limited in the amount which they may contribute, and we propose in this bill to limit the contributions of individuals. Why not limit the contributions of labor organizations, which are making politics a part of their business? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendments again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan, which will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN) there were—ayes 50, noes 86.

So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: On page 19, line 10, after the period, insert:

"The Civil Service Commission shall have power to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to any matter pending before the Commission. Any member of the Commission may sign subpoenas, and members of the Commission and its examiners when authorized by the Commission may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

"Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. In case of disobedience to a subpoena, the Commission may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence.

"Any of the district courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, or to produce documentary evidence if so ordered, or to give evidence touching the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"The Commission may order testimony to be taken by deposition in any proceeding or investigation pending before the Commission at any stage of such proceeding or investigation. Such depositions may be taken before any person, designated by the Commission and having power to administer oaths. Such testimony shall be reduced to writing by the person taking the deposition, or under his direction, and shall then be subscribed by the deponent. Any person may be compelled to appear and depose and to produce documentary evidence before the Commission as hereinbefore provided.

"No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary evidence or in obedience to a subpoena on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled to testify, or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, before the Commission in obedience to a subpoena issued by it: *Provided*, That no person so testifying shall be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As near as I can gather from the reading of the amendment, it proposes that the procedure prescribed for, and the powers therein granted to, the Civil Service Commission shall apply generally and without specific limitation to the provisions of the pending bill. I may have misunderstood the reading of the amendment, but that is the way I understood it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, there is no question about the fact that the authority conferred by this amendment could be used in other matters. It also relates, however, to the investigations and the hearings required to be made by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question. The first sentence of the amendment reads:

The Civil Service Commission shall have power to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to any matter pending before the Commission.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. It goes beyond the scope of this bill, but I point out that the Commission is directed in this bill to investigate complaints made under this act; and the purpose of this amendment is to give them the power of subpoena, which they do not now have under the civil-service law, to comply with the directions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas insist upon the point of order?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to insist upon the point of order. It may be that this would be proper legislation when properly considered, but to propose an amendment as comprehensive as this without an opportunity on the part of the Members to study it compels me to insist upon the point of order. For this reason alone I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard upon the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I point out to the Chair that for the amendment to be germane to the bill under consideration, the power of subpoena given to the Civil Service Commission and the right to invoke the aid of the courts ought to be limited to the matters contained in this bill. I suggest that because it is not so limited, it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Georgia admits that the amendment goes beyond the provisions of the pending bill. The amendment, of course, is not germane for that reason.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUNCAN: Page 13, line 17, after the word "sections" add a new section to be known as section 12, to read as follows:

"Sec. 12. No person shall be appointed (1) to any administrative position by the United States or by any department, independent agency, or other agency of the United States (including any corporation, all of the capital stock of which is owned by the United States or any agency thereof), or (2) be appointed to any administrative agency of any State or any of its political subdivisions or municipalities (including any corporation controlled by any State or by any such political subdivision, municipality, or agency, and any corporation, all of the capital stock of which is owned by any State or by any such political subdivisions, municipality, or agency), where the United States contributes any sum, directly or indirectly, toward the payment of the salary of such position, within a period of 18 months after such person shall have been a member of any political committee created pursuant to any provision of law, or of any campaign committee for any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner from any Territory or insular possessions, or as judge or clerk of election where names of candidates for the above-named offices have been

on the ballot used in such election, or any person who shall have contributed any sum or sums in money or in services of value to any political committee, campaign committee, or person who shall be a candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner from any Territory or insular possessions, or any person who shall have actively campaigned for any person who has been a candidate for any of the above-named offices.

"Before any person shall be appointed to any position as herein defined such person shall file a statement with the appointing authority, duly verified by affidavit, stating that such person has not been guilty of any of the acts defined herein."

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, when the original Hatch bill was up last year, I contributed my feeble efforts to bring about its defeat. My efforts, of course, did not appeal to anybody. With the collusion of a few Democrats and a lot of Republicans it became a law. At that time I felt it was undemocratic and un-American, and I feel the same way about it today. The amendments to the Hatch Act now before us attempt to bring within its provisions State employees. This is not only undemocratic and un-American but it is unfair and discriminatory; it is an attempt on the part of this Congress to do indirectly what you all know you have no right under the Constitution to do directly. It is an attempt to take away from a small portion of the employees of a State or municipality the rights enjoyed by others getting their salaries from approximately the same source with the exception of a few dollars. I say it is discriminatory because it attempts to abridge the right of these employees to go out and make a speech they may want to make in behalf of a political party or an individual in whom they believe. I believe it is un-American. I believe it is discriminatory because it separates and sets apart a few employees in the State as against others.

When I offered this amendment I wanted to test your good faith. You who are going to vote for this bill, I want to test your sincerity, your honesty of purpose. You say you want clean politics. One of the peculiar things I have observed throughout all the propaganda that has been distributed over this country by a Republican press which wants this bill has been the great cry that it takes politics out of relief. Every man and every woman in this House today knows that in the relief bill passed last year and also in the one passed this year a direct provision was written in taking politics out of relief. No man of you who has any degree of honesty wants to compel any person to contribute to a campaign or to force him to vote other than he wants to, to use coercion. On the other hand, any fair-minded man or woman is not going to attempt to take away from either a Federal or a State employee the right to stand up and advocate the thing or the person they believe in.

I say to you that if it is wrong to play politics from within, it is wrong to play politics from without. Why is it any more of a crime for a man or woman who holds a Government job or State job to go out and defend that job and defend the party or the Government, of which they are a part, than for a man or woman on the other side of the political fence or in the other faction to go out and exert every form of political influence known to politicians to take their job away? I submit to you as fair-minded men and women of this committee that if one is wrong the other is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen over here would not be interested in that, of course, because during the past few weeks after the mushroom grows up, they have gained considerable hope and confidence that they may possibly elect a President of the United States and control this House, but I may say in that connection that sunshine causes mushrooms to wither and die as soon as it hits them. They would not be for anything like this because they want to go out and use every device known to politics in this land, and they are past masters at it, and do all of those things, gather in all the money they can get from the corporations, the Power Trust, and others who are interested in their cause, but they would not be interested in this because those men and women who serve on committees, who go out and make

speeches for them, would not be eligible under my amendment to hold office for 18 months after they have gone through the cleansing process, after they have been washed white from all the effects of pernicious political activity. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly obvious from the gentleman's remarks that his amendment is not offered in good faith. He offered the amendment, then for 5 minutes proceeded to show us its absurdity. If the amendment should be seriously considered and passed by this Committee it would mean that nobody could ever run for office or accept appointment to any Government position until 18 months after he had ceased all participation in politics. At least, that was the impression I had when I heard the proposed amendment read a moment ago.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is directed to two things. We are trying to stop the misuse of official authority to control the votes of men on the pay roll of the United States and we are trying to save them from being gouged for campaign funds whether local or national. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is not in accord with the principles of this bill and is not designed to improve it or help it to final passage. I hope you will vote down the ridiculous amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DUNCAN), there were—ayes 44, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 13, line 10, add a new paragraph at the end of section 9 as follows:

"(c) No provision of this act shall prohibit an employee of the Federal Government or any State Government from (1) participation in local elections either individually or as a member of a citizen's association or other civic organization; (2) sponsoring candidates, principles, and improvements for local election or determination at the polls; (3) seeking election to office in the local government."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a minor amendment to which I hope there will be no opposition. There is no partisanship in it and there are no politics in it. The amendment is offered to correct a wrong that has been inadvertently done people working for the Government who predominate in communities near Washington and elsewhere. They are deprived under the Hatch Act from participation in their local elections. For instance, in some communities there are so many Government employees that unless a Government employee can run for the school board, using that as an example, we are deprived of some of the very best material in that community for our local officials.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think that what the gentleman has in mind has been taken care of in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will be glad to say why it has not been taken care of in the bill. The provision in the bill which is designed to take care of this situation does not, as a matter of fact, take care of it because it leaves these people at the mercy of the Civil Service Commission. They cannot participate unless they are exempted by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Has that not been the condition for many years and have they not by Executive order done the very thing that this bill states they can do?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to correct that condition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman's amendment, however, is not limited to Washington and its environs?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It applies all over the country.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the danger of the second proviso of the gentleman's amendment. Let us take a local election involving a county judge who appoints the members of the election board and those who serve as judges and clerks of election. What you do is to contribute to the setting up of a political machine that may affect the result of a Federal election. That is exactly what it will do in every metropolitan center in the country.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There are not enough Government employees in the sections to which the gentleman refers to have that effect.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Contrary to the observation of the gentleman from Illinois, most of the people the gentleman seeks to aid are individuals who serve at a sacrifice. There is no salary attached in most instances?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They are practically all non-salaried positions. We are in that situation where the very best material in communities in the neighborhood of Washington do not have the opportunity to participate in their local affairs.

I am told that a condition like that prevails in Boulder City, which is a city of something like 5,000 population, where practically all the residents are Federal employees. How are they going to elect their local officials? How are they going to get their best people to serve if their best people are disfranchised and prohibited from serving their communities under the provisions of the Hatch Act?

Now, going back to the civil-service proposition, here is what happened under the civil service. It used to be that the Civil Service Commission, if it saw fit, could grant that relief to communities. I had this experience. I presented the same proposition from Arlington County and from the city of Alexandria at the same time, under the same conditions, and with the same argument, and asked for the same relief. They granted it in Arlington County and refused it in the city of Alexandria. We just do not want to be left under any such arbitrary situation as that.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. After next January we will have a new Civil Service Commission, which will not function the way the gentleman described.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have served with them in both Democratic and Republican administrations, and I do not see much difference. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will not be adopted. Part of the amendment is bad, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The net result would be that it would allow people under this act to participate in city elections all over the country. The good part of the gentleman's amendment is already in the bill, in section 16. Similar provisions have heretofore been enforced by the Civil Service Commission, and they have been made to apply to towns in Maryland and Virginia such as Takoma Park, Kensington, Garrett Park, and so forth.

There is an additional provision in the bill to which I refer you, section 18, which would allow employees covered by this act to participate in some local matter pertaining strictly and entirely to their own municipality, and which was not and could not be hooked up to partisan Democratic or partisan Republican politics. For that reason, I trust that this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What suggestion does the gentleman make for relief under the situation I mentioned, where the same proposition is presented to the Civil Service Commission for two communities at the same time and one is granted and the other is refused? In other words, you leave it in the hands of an arbitrary body to determine the very vital rights of these citizens.

Mr. GWYNNE. The law is adequate. If the operation of the law by some commission is not fair and just, that is something else again.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; but why should the Civil Service Commission have anything to do with the exercise of people's political rights? That is not what the Civil Service Commission was set up for.

Mr. GWYNNE. If we adopt the amendment the gentleman offers it will simply mean that a large part of the operation of this bill throughout the country will be seriously interfered with.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Just specify how this amendment will hurt your bill. How is it going to hurt your bill? There is nothing partisan about it and it affects a very few people, except in the area next to Washington. How is it going to hurt your bill? Just specify.

Mr. GWYNNE. If I understood the amendment correctly, it is not restricted to municipalities adjoining Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is not confined to them, but I would be glad to accept an amendment that would confine it to them.

Mr. GWYNNE. I understand it applies all over the country, which is, as I say, the bad part of the amendment.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Would the gentleman be willing to grant rights to the people of Maryland and Virginia that he would deny to the people of Iowa and Illinois?

Mr. GWYNNE. No. Of course, we realize, and the bill realizes it, too, that there are some small communities around Washington where the population is made up almost entirely of people working for the Government, and necessity compels the making of an exception there so that these people may manage their own little city. That is taken care of in the bill.

Mr. KELLER. Why not give that same right to the people of Iowa, Illinois, Kentucky, and the rest of the States?

Mr. GWYNNE. Because the fundamental purpose of this bill is to keep these employees out of partisan politics.

Mr. KELLER. Out of national, but not out of local politics, surely.

Mr. GWYNNE. No. In that connection I call the attention of the gentleman to section 18 of the bill, which gives the citizens of any town the right to participate in those things which are strictly local and strictly municipal, but they cannot be mixed up in partisan matters.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer to the gentleman from Illinois as to whether an exception ought to be made is simply this: We already make a constitutional exception in the case of the people of the city of Washington, and do not even give them the right to vote. That is the answer, certainly.

Mr. KELLER. That is not the question here at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You are simply adding one more exception here to an exception that already constitutionally exists.

Mr. KELLER. Is the gentleman willing to deny it to Illinois?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would just as leave resist that provision as any other.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 43, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAVENNER: Page 21, after line 7, insert: "It is further declared to be a pernicious political activity, and it shall hereafter be unlawful for any officer, employee, or agency of a public-utility holding company registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, or of any subsidiary company thereof, to contribute any money derived either directly or indirectly from payments made by rate payers for public-utility services to any candidate for an elective Federal office (including the offices of President of the United States and Presidential and Vice Presidential electors) or to any representative or agent of such a candidate, or to any political party, political committee, or other political organization engaged in furthering, advocating, or advancing the nomination or election of any candidate for such office, or the success of any national political party."

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would specifically prohibit the expenditure of moneys collected from the ratepayers of America by public-utility corporations for the purpose of influencing elections.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. Are not the contents of the gentleman's amendment already the law of the land?

Mr. HAVENNER. I do not think so.

Mr. HANCOCK. Corporations are now prohibited from making campaign contributions.

Mr. HAVENNER. I will say to the gentleman that I have tried very earnestly since I have been a Member of Congress to find some statute of this kind that was effective and I have been unable to find one.

Mr. HANCOCK. I would suggest the gentleman read the Corrupt Practices Act and certain sections of the penal statutes, beginning at section 208.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that there is not now statutory authority to carry out the purpose of the amendment which I have offered.

The amendment, Mr. Chairman, strikes at the greatest source of political corruption in the history of modern government. If we prohibit, by law, the expenditure of public-utility funds for political purposes, we shall have taken the greatest step ever taken toward the ideal of purity of elections. There is nothing so repugnant to the American sense of decency as the outrageous expenditure of the money collected from the people of America for light, heat, and water, and the necessities of life in order to control the Government of this Nation. As one distinguished American statesman said not many years ago—and incidentally he was a member of the minority party here today, the public utility corporations are picking the people's pockets to poison their minds.

This amendment will outlaw this pernicious practice and I urge its adoption, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAVENNER) there were—ayes 59, noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 26, line 3, after the word "violation", insert a new section to read as follows: "Sec. 21. Nothing in this act shall be construed as in any way affecting educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, or cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, together with the officers and employees thereof."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer what is known as the Brown amendment, and which was adopted in the Senate. It aims primarily to protect academic freedom and to eliminate any interference with certain schools and land-grant colleges. I think the so-called Brown amendment has much merit. Many of our schools and universities which directly or indirectly receive a certain amount of Federal money are apt to be jeopardized by the mere expression of

some underling connected with the school or university. I think it is a very dangerous situation to contemplate. I think that this amendment, without much ado or discussion, ought to be agreed upon because there is no harm in it, and I can see much good. I am sorry that I have not the time to make any lengthy reference, such as is contained in Senator BROWN'S discourse delivered on the floor of the Senate, but I would refer Members to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2621, which illustrates very graphically and clearly the merits of this amendment. I think that the school teachers in every city and town in every State in the Union will be proscribed from inculcating or teaching political economy. Their expressions may be misinterpreted and they might be charged with partisanship or pernicious political activity and the school or university to which they are attached penalized by the loss of its grant from the Federal Government. There is nothing partisan in my amendment, and I think both sides of the aisle could very well afford to restore this provision to the bill. Without this amendment the teachers of America in certain schools face a restriction which is tantamount to "muzzling." It is the first step toward applying shackles to our educational freedom. To me it is as important as the freedom of speech and of the press.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Gladly, to my friend from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Merely to make the suggestion that I think the amendment is a very meritorious one and should be adopted.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for his valuable opinion.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was considered in the committee and rejected. There is no more reason why the teachers and the preachers and the social workers of this country, living wholly or partly on Federal funds, should be allowed to engage in pernicious political practices than why anybody else should. As a matter of fact, I think there are very strong reasons for providing safeguards to protect our children in the Sunday schools and in the public schools and institutions from political indoctrination. The bill will not interfere with the teaching of economics, unless the professor becomes active in a political campaign and his "economics" become stump speeches. The proposed amendment was rejected almost unanimously by the committee and it ought to be turned down here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] has an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SASSCER to S. 3046: Strike out all of section 16, on page 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 22. By reason of special or unusual circumstances which exist in incorporated cities, towns, and villages, any part of which is within 50 miles of the District of Columbia line, no provision of this act shall prohibit any employee of the Government of the United States or the District of Columbia, or any other person to whom this act is applicable residing in such city, town, or village, from taking part in political management or in political campaigns involving such city, town, or village, nor from holding office in said city, town, or village: *Provided*, That the compensation from said municipal office shall not be in excess of \$600 per annum."

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I rise with as much sincerity in respect to this amendment as anyone who has ever addressed this House. I ask you to give me your attention for a moment, and I shall briefly explain. When the last Hatch Act was passed, it was not intended that it should apply to small municipalities here close to the District of Columbia, or in fact possibly anywhere where the officers serve with little or no compensation. A situation arises which is crucial and critical to the environments of Washington, where these towns—some of them—have 80 or 85 percent of their citizens made up of Federal employees. Therefore, in order to correct that situation the author and sponsors and

those in favor of the bill, realizing that a peculiar situation existed in these localities, wrote section 15 into the act, which permits the people in those towns who work in the Government, to serve their little communities after they get home at night, in most instances, without compensation.

This amendment merely does two things. We have in the bill established the policy of exempting these small communities which are made up, as I said, practically of Government employees who serve for nothing. The bill, however, leaves it to the discretion of the Civil Service Commission. All I am asking the House to do is to do all the way what you partially do in the bill. Instead of leaving it to the discretion of the Civil Service Commission to determine what is the immediate vicinity of Washington, or leaving it to the Civil Service Commission to decide whether special or unusual circumstances exist, and promulgate rules in connection with the elections in these 24 little towns adjacent to Washington, to just exempt them all the way, as you intended to do under the original Hatch Act.

The difference between my amendment and that of my colleague from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is simply this: It meets the objection made that it is Nation-wide in its scope and may get into a big city political machine. I put 50 miles in the amendment because on the water front in lower Maryland there is one particular case that is involved. The distinguished physician of this House, Dr. Calver, is mayor of that town. There are numerous other instances of fine public servants, who, on account of the pernicious activity phase of the Hatch Act, which did not intend to go that far, had to resign and could not serve their towns for nothing. So I am simply asking to do all the way what you partially do in section 15, and not leave it to the discretion of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The limitation of 50 miles, which the gentleman carries in his amendment, would extend beyond the environs of Baltimore. Is there any reason why it should be more than 25 miles to reach these towns that are predominantly made up of Government employees?

Mr. SASSCER. I am willing to make it 40 miles. North Beach, the town to which I had reference, is probably 30 miles away.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course you could not reach everywhere.

Mr. SASSCER. Baltimore City would not be under this amendment, because we say where the compensation is under \$600 for the office. I am willing to make it 40 miles.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Sections 15 and 16 were inserted in this bill at the request of the United States Senators from Maryland to meet the situation the gentleman has described here. I understand this language is entirely adequate to meet that situation.

Mr. SASSCER. It is adequate, with this exception, that it leaves to the Civil Service Commission to decide whether unusual circumstances exist, and it does not define what is "the immediate environs of Washington." Chicago is close to Washington as compared with California. North Beach, 30 miles away, may be not in the immediate environs compared to Hyattsville. We are not in any particular controversy. I think everybody is in accord. I am just asking to do what we are intending to do and not leave it to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike out "50 miles" and insert "40 miles."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SASSCER) there were ayes 76 and noes 119.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: On page 19, line 10, after the period, insert:

"The Civil Service Commission shall have power to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to any matter pending, as a result of this act, before the Commission. Any member of the Commission may sign subpoenas, and members of the Commission and its examiners, when authorized by the Commission, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

"Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. In case of disobedience to a subpoena, the Commission may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence.

"Any of the district courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, or to produce documentary evidence if so ordered, or to give evidence touching the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"The Commission may order testimony to be taken by deposition in any proceeding or investigation which, as a result of this act, is pending before the Commission at any stage of such proceeding or investigation. Such depositions may be taken before any person designated by the Commission and having power to administer oaths. Such testimony shall be reduced to writing by the person taking the deposition, or under his direction, and shall then be subscribed by the deponent. Any person may be compelled to appear and depose and to produce documentary evidence before the Commission as hereinbefore provided.

"No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary evidence or in obedience to a subpoena on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled to testify, or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, before the Commission in obedience to a subpoena issued by it: *Provided*, That no person so testifying shall be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word about this. The Civil Service Commission, under this law, is charged with an enforcement job which they did not seek and do not crave; but they have no power of subpoena, and if you want them to do the job under this act they must have power. It is now limited to things arising under this act, and gives them the power to subpoena persons and documents so that they can get evidence relating to violations that are charged.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCORMACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 3046) 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. Pursuant to House Resolution 514 he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BALL. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BALL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas) there were—ayes 103, noes 182.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on the passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 122, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

YEAS—243

Allen, Ill.	Englebright	Jonkman	Rich
Allen, La.	Faddis	Kean	Rockefeller
Allen, Pa.	Fenton	Keefe	Rodgers, Pa.
Andersen, H. Carl	Ferguson	Kinzer	Rogers, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Fish	Kirwan	Routzohn
Anderson, Mo.	Flaherty	Knutson	Rutherford
Andresen, A. H.	Flannery	Kramer	Ryan
Andrews	Gamble	Kunkel	Sabath
Angell	Gartner	Lambertson	Sadanger
Arends	Gathings	Landis	Schafer, Wis.
Austin	Gearhart	Lanham	Schiffer
Barton, N. Y.	Gehrmann	Larrabee	Secombe
Bates, Mass.	Gerlach	Lea	Secrest
Beckworth	Geyer, Calif.	Leavy	Seger
Bender	Gifford	LeCompte	Shafer, Mich.
Blackney	Gilchrist	Lemke	Shanley
Bloom	Gillie	Lewis, Colo.	Short
Boehne	Goodwin	Lewis, Ohio	Simpson
Bolles	Gore	Luce	Smith, Conn.
Bolton	Gossett	Ludlow	Smith, Ill.
Boren	Graham	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Bradley, Mich.	Grant, Ind.	McDowell	Smith, Ohio
Brewster	Griffith	McGregor	Smith, Wash.
Brooks	Gross	McLaughlin	Somers, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Guyer, Kans.	McLean	Stearns, N. H.
Burdick	Gwynne	McLeod	Stefan
Byrne, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin A.	Mahon	Sumner, Ill.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hall, Leonard W.	Maloney	Sutphin
Carlson	Halleck	Marshall	Sweeney
Carter	Hancock	Martin, Iowa	Sweet
Case, S. Dak.	Harter, N. Y.	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Chiperfield	Harter, Ohio	Mason	Talle
Church	Hartley	Massingale	Terry
Clason	Havenner	Michener	Thill
Clevenger	Hawks	Miller	Thomas, N. J.
Cluett	Healey	Mills, La.	Thomas, Tex.
Cochran	Hennings	Monkiewicz	Thomason
Coffee, Wash.	Hess	Monroney	Tibbott
Cole, Md.	Hill	Mott	Tinkham
Cole, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Mouton	Tolan
Colmer	Hoffman	Mundt	Treadway
Cooper	Holmes	Murdock, Ariz.	Van Zandt
Corbett	Hope	Murdock, Utah	Vorys, Ohio
Costello	Horton	Murray	Vreeland
Crosser	Houston	O'Brien	Wadsworth
Crowther	Hull	Oliver	Wallgren
Curtis	Hunter	Osmers	Walter
Davis	Jacobsen	Pearson	Ward
Dempsey	Jarman	Pfeifer	Welch
Dickstein	Jarrett	Pierce	Wheat
Dirksen	Jeffries	Pittenger	Wheelchel
Disney	Jenkins, Ohio	Plumley	Whittington
Ditter	Jenks, N. H.	Poage	Wigglesworth
Dondero	Jennings	Polk	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Jensen	Powers	Winter
Doxey	Johns	Ramspeck	Wolcott
Dworshak	Johnson, Ill.	Randolph	Wolfenden, Pa.
Eberhart	Johnson, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.	Wolverton, N. J.
Edelstein	Johnson, Okla.	Reed, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Elliott	Jones, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.	Youngdahl
Elston	Jones, Tex.	Rees, Kans.	

NAYS—122

Ball	Brown, Ga.	Cooley	Edmiston
Barden, N. C.	Bryson	Courtney	Evans
Barnes	Buckley, N. Y.	Cox	Fay
Barry	Bulwinkle	Cravens	Fitzpatrick
Bates, Ky.	Burgin	D'Alesandro	Flannagan
Beam	Caldwell	Darden, Va.	Fries
Bell	Camp	Dingell	Fulmer
Bland	Cartwright	Duncan	Garrett
Boland	Claypool	Dunn	Gavagan
Boykin	Coffee, Nebr.	Durham	Gibbs

Grant, Ala.	Kleberg	O'Toole	Smith, Va.
Gregory	Kocialkowski	Pace	Smith, W. Va.
Hare	Lesinski	Patman	Snyder
Harrington	Lynch	Patrick	South
Hart	McAndrews	Patton	Sparkman
Hendricks	McArdle	Peterson, Ga.	Spence
Hobbs	McGranery	Rabaut	Steagall
Hook	McKeough	Rankin	Sumners, Tex.
Izac	McMillan, Clara	Rayburn	Tarver
Johnson, Luther A.	McMillan, John L.	Richards	Tenerowicz
Johnson, Lyndon	Mansfield	Robertson	Vincent, Ky.
Johnson, W. Va.	Marcantonio	Rogers, Okla.	Vinson, Ga.
Kefauver	May	Romjue	Warren
Keller	Mills, Ark.	Sacks	Weaver
Kelly	Moser	Sasser	West
Kennedy, Md.	Myers	Satterfield	Williams, Mo.
Kennedy, Michael	Nelson	Schuetz	Wood
Keogh	Nichols	Schwert	Woodrum, Va.
Kerr	Norrell	Shannon	Zimmerman
Kilday	O'Leary	Sheppard	
Kitchens	O'Neal	Sheridan	

NOT VOTING—66

Alexander	Crowe	Ford, Thomas F.	Peterson, Fla.
Arnold	Culkin	Green	Risk
Bradley, Pa.	Cullen	Harness	Robinson, Utah
Buck	Cummings	Kee	Robison, Ky.
Buckler, Minn.	Darrow	Kennedy, Martin	Schaefer, Ill.
Burch	Delaney	Kilburn	Schulte
Byron	DeRouen	McGehee	Scrugham
Cannon, Fla.	Dies	Maas	Springer
Cannon, Mo.	Doughton	Maclejewski	Starnes, Ala.
Casey, Mass.	Drewry	Magnuson	Sullivan
Celler	Eaton	Martin, Ill.	Taylor
Chapman	Ellis	Merritt	Thorkelson
Clark	Engel	Mitchell	Voorhis, Calif.
Collins	Fernandez	Norton	White, Idaho
Conner	Folger	O'Connor	White, Ohio
Crawford	Ford, Leland M.	O'Day	
Creal	Ford, Miss.	Parsons	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Byron (for) with Mr. Martin J. Kennedy (against).
 Mr. Martin of Illinois (for) with Mr. Cullen (against).
 Mr. DeRouen (for) with Mr. Arnold (against).
 Mr. Kilburn (for) with Mr. Scrugham (against).
 Mr. Schaefer of Illinois (for) with Mr. Green (against).
 Mrs. O'Day (for) with Mr. Maclejewski (against).
 Mr. Celler (for) with Mr. Schulte (against).
 Mr. Eaton (for) with Mr. Robinson of Utah (against).
 Mr. Alexander (for) with Mr. Crowe (against).
 Mr. Cannon of Florida (for) with Mr. Buck (against).
 Mr. Casey of Massachusetts (for) with Mr. Thomas F. Ford (against).
 Mr. Crawford (for) with Mr. Folger (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Culkin.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
 Mr. Collins with Mr. Springer.
 Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Engel.
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
 Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Harness.
 Mr. McGehee with Mr. Maas.
 Mr. Dies with Mr. Darrow.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Risk.
 Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Thorkelson.
 Mr. Parsons with Mr. White of Ohio.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Kee.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Cannon of Missouri.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Delaney.
 Mr. Ellis with Mrs. Norton.
 Mr. Creal with Mr. O'Connor.
 Mr. Taylor with Mr. Cummings.
 Mr. Conner with Mr. Merritt.
 Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. McKEOUGH, was unavoidably detained. Had he been here, he would have voted "nay" on the bill just passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 86

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, July 11, 1940, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, July 22, 1940.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 552

Resolved, That notwithstanding the recess or the adjournment of the House until July 22, 1940, the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to preside over the House tomorrow as Speaker pro tempore.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution I introduced in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution by the National Guard Association of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Hon. Francis Biddle, Solicitor General of the United States, before the Philadelphia Forum on March 7 this year entitled "America's Maturity."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short article from today's Washington Times-Herald entitled "Britons Call Americans Yellow."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to make an inquiry of the majority leader.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable questioning as to what the program will be for tomorrow. The membership would like to know what we have scheduled.

Mr. RAYBURN. There will be a bill from the Appropriations Committee making an appropriation for an additional dam in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It has been definitely determined to call that up?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understood there was some opposition to that matter.

Mr. RAYBURN. My first impression was it was going to be unanimous, but I think some opposition has developed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill is going to be called up.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would it be possible to have that go over until the 30th?

Mr. RAYBURN. May I make this statement to the gentleman. I sat in the hearings on this bill yesterday for awhile. Mr. Knudsen, Mr. Stettinius, and Mr. Dunn, who is one of the great electrical engineers of the country, and who had a great deal to do with the Tennessee Valley Authority, usually in opposition to it, were present, and they made the statement, as I remember, and I can be corrected by the gentleman from Virginia or by the gentleman from New York if I am in error, that it was one of the most essential links in our whole defense program, that it was vitally necessary that additional power be had at the earliest possible moment in order to manufacture aluminum to build airplanes.

Further, it was stated that days count, and that it would take until the winter or early in 1942 to finish it. It was stated that it is essential to be finished by that time in order to catch the spring flood.

Those are some of the arguments of the defense council for the bill and its early consideration. They stated that even 90 days' delay in the passage of the bill might delay the whole project for 12 months.

Mr. FADDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. Where does the Appropriation Committee at this time get the authorization or legislation necessary to bring this matter out?

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman will have to ask the gentleman from Virginia or some member of the Appropriations Committee. I assume it has the authority to make this appropriation or they would not have done it.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe there is any authority for the steam plant which is proposed.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman does not know absolutely?

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, those matters might well be threshed out tomorrow.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a little more information from the majority leader. Does the bill that will come before us tomorrow provide for steam plants in the T. V. A. or does it cover only an additional dam?

Mr. RAYBURN. It is an additional dam.

Mr. TABER. Both. It provides for a dam on the Holston River and for a steam plant to produce 120,000 kilowatts, the idea being to take care of the peak loads so that the dry seasons will not affect them and they will have adequate power.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will go into that tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HOFFMAN, and Mr. GRANT of Alabama asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution from an American Legion post in Georgia.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, the warning bell in the corridor in which my office is located being out of order, I did not have sufficient time to get here to vote on the Hatch bill. Had I been present I would have voted yea.

LXXXVI—596

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER, has asked me to announce that he is ill in New York and unable to be present. If present, he would have voted in the affirmative on the Hatch bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would have voted "yea" on the Hatch bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a labor union in my district.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may be permitted to sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REGISTRATION AND REGULATION OF INVESTMENT COMPANIES AND INVESTMENT ADVISERS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

House Resolution 553

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 10065, a bill to provide for the registration and regulation of investment companies and investment advisers, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by the Aviation Defense Association.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two brief statements relative to highways.

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

There was no objection.

ANTAL OR ANTHONY OR TONY ZAICEK OR ZAICZEK

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and by instruction of that committee, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6056) for the relief of Antal or Anthony or Tony Zaicek or Zaiczek, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, strike out all after "warrant" down to and including "States" in line 11.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. I will make an explanation to the House, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

This is a bill to allow an alien to stay permanently in the United States. The bill was reported out by the committee, passed by the House, and passed by the Senate.

In the House an amendment was added that the alien could never become a citizen. The Senate struck out that amendment. This request is to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What was the reason the House adopted the amendment in the first place?

Mr. LESINSKI. Some gentleman inserted an amendment in the bill, as, of course, he has a right to do if the House agrees to it. There is no argument about that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this matter should be brought up at this time. I must ask that the request be withdrawn.

Mr. POAGE. I withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain official tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole certain tables and a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter by our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] on the subject of do Congressmen pay taxes. I further ask unanimous consent to include in another extension of my remarks a short editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press, in my congressional district, entitled, "Ambition Which Didn't Quibble."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a table on our trade with South America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the words of an exceptionally fine song entitled "God Keep America," which was written and composed by Martin Brandon, J. V. DeCimber, and Woody Dreyfuss, program director of radio station WISN, of Milwaukee, Wis.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. SPRINGER, who was called home today on account of the serious illness of his mother, thus missing his first roll call in 2 years, has asked me to announce that had he been here he would have voted "yea" on the passage of the bill under consideration today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] for 1 week to act as chairman of the Democratic organization of Richmond County, N. Y., for Red Cross drive.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

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.

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.

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.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 11, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House at 10 a. m., Thursday, July 25, 1940, for the consideration of H. R. 10092, relative to the use of laid-up fleet for export of certain commodities.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1833. A letter from the Chairman of the National Munitions Control Board, transmitting the fifth report of the National Munitions Control Board for the period January 1, 1940, to June 30, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 876); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1834. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting emergency supplemental estimates of appropriations for the further strengthening of national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, totaling \$2,161,441,957, cash, plus contract authorizations totaling \$2,686,730,000; consisting of \$1,662,265,417 cash and \$2,249,730,000 contract authorizations for the War Department; and \$499,176,540 cash, and \$437,000,000 contract authorizations for the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 875); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 582. Joint resolution making an appropriation to enable the United States Maritime Commission to establish the marine and war-risk insurance fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 2743). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 73. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the proceedings at the unveiling of the painting depicting the signing of the Constitution of the United States as a document (Rept. No. 2744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 9877. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to put into effect charges for electrical energy at Boulder power plant, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 2745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DIMOND: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 8474. A bill to further amend the Alaska game law; without amendment (Rept. No. 2746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DIMOND: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 9571. A bill to authorize the incorporated town of Sitka, Alaska, to purchase and enlarge certain public utilities and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of \$200,000 in excess of present statutory debt limit; with amendment (Rept. No. 2747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 553. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 10065, a bill to provide for the registration and regulation of investment companies and investment advisers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2748). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. EDELSTEIN:

H. R. 10195. A bill to authorize the exemption from jury duty in the courts of the United States of any person who shall have taken 2 or more consecutive weeks of Federal military or naval training in the preceding year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 583. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year 1941 to provide facilities to expedite the national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. J. Res. 584. Joint resolution for the return of the Wright airplane to the United States of America, to be placed on permanent exhibition under such conditions as may be jointly approved by Mr. Wright and the Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 548. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a research and survey into the problems of small-business enterprises and their relation to reemployment and national defense; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 549. Resolution calling on the President for information concerning sale and shipment of surplus Army supplies to the Allies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. Res. 550. Resolution requesting information from the President concerning any existing secret pact, agreement, or understanding between the United States and Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VREELAND:

H. Res. 551. Resolution authorizing the Navy Department to negotiate with the city of Newark, N. J., for the use of Port Newark as a drydock and base; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROWE:

H. R. 10196. A bill for the relief of Frank P. Boyd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 10197. A bill granting a pension to Ameer Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 10198. A bill for the relief of Bell Lyons; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

9029. By Mr. EDELSTEIN: Petition of the American Labor Party, Eighth Assembly District, New York City, protesting against the provisions of House bill 5138; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9030. By Mr. HAVENNER: Memorial of the Associated Master Barbers of America, Chapter 151, San Francisco, Calif., urging that the Congress of the United States enact legislation designating barbers' services as surplus and creating an agency to allocate moneys appropriated by Congress, earmarked for stabilization of the barber profession, said moneys to be distributed to relief clients in the form of stamps to be expended only with those engaged in the profession and licensed to practice under the State laws and regulations governing the profession in the States in which such stamps are distributed; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9031. By Mr. LEA: Petition in the nature of a protest of the Marine Cooks and Stewards Association of San Francisco, against nonagreement on their demand for an 8-hour day as approved by Congress under the act of 1892; to the Committee on Labor.

9032. By the SPEAKER: Petition of G. A. Knobel, of New York, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to prayer and repentance, seeking dependence on God; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9033. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kenyon, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 280, concerning block-booking and blind selling; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9034. Also, petition of the Lions Club of district 42, Auburn, R. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9035. Also, petition of the International Workers Order, Branches Nos. 79 and 224, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9858, immigration legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 11, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, July 8, 1940)

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

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

Almighty God, the Supreme Governor of all things, whose power no creature is able to resist, to whom it belongeth justly to punish and to show mercy, save and deliver us, we humbly beseech Thee, from the hands of all enemies of this Nation, that we, being armed with Thy defense, may be preserved evermore from all perils from within and without, to glorify Thee, who art the only giver of all victory. Through the merits of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, July 10, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 10th instant, After the recess of the Senate on yesterday the President pro tempore affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 283) authorizing Col. Donald H. Connolly to hold the office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in the Department of Commerce, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.