

and most important of which is the chemical patent cartel. Through selfish refusal to allow the use of these patents by anyone other than those who are members or associates, the German I. G. Farbenindustrie has successfully stifled further advance or improvements in the materials or processes covered by their patents.

It is a mistake to think that money itself is the consideration. Control of the antimalarial medicines, quinine and its synthetic substitutes, is of immense strategic significance, involving as it does the ability of the human race to cure and control one of its greatest destroyers, and possession of this control conveys to the owner an economic power out of all proportion to the money involved.

The total amount of money represented by the gross sales of atabrine would probably be less than \$20,000,000. This is a pittance compared with the immense sums involved in the totals paid for such strategic commodities as metals, fuels, and rubber. Nevertheless, the strategic importance of quinine and the antimalarial substitutes, both from a military and economic standpoint, places these medicines on a par with these other indispensable materials.

We cannot fight in tropical or subtropical war theaters without a plentiful supply of atabrine.

History amply confirms the immense military significance of malaria and the part it plays in the fortunes of war. Malarial fever has been responsible for the break-down of many military campaigns, notably the attempt by Napoleon I to reconquer the Haitian Republic. His army of 8,000 veteran French regulars became so riddled with malaria in a few weeks that they fell easy prey to the ill-armed and unorganized Haitians. Our own Spanish War in Cuba and Puerto Rico of 1897-98, and the Philippine campaign of 1899-1903, when malaria incapacitated approximately 4 soldiers to every 1 incapacitated by the enemy action, demonstrates beyond any question the military necessity to prevent contraction of the disease.

In the absence of quinine, the control of the manufacture and production of synthetic antimalarial medicines constitutes economic power of the first magnitude.

If, as is highly probable, the Japanese destroy the cinchona plantations of Java, Java being ultimately recaptured, the world's shield against the scourge of malaria will be atabrine and plasmochin for years to come. Africa, Latin America, and eastern Asia would soon become untenable to the white race without it, and such native races as remain will quickly be rendered impotent—economically, physically, and psychologically.

Our own Southern States will share this danger, and in all probability other regions of our country heretofore free from malaria for three generations may again become areas of infection.

Retention of the tremendous economic power inherent in the control of these strategic and critical medicines is the object of the I. G. Farbenindustrie and

their satellite corporations in other countries. If the vast power of this and other similar controls can be retained, it will make little difference to the German octopus as to which army gains the ultimate military decision. Power over processes and materials held by virtue of patent ownership may well cause us to lose the peace even while the eagle of military victory perches proudly upon our banners.

It is not sufficient that these important medicines be manufactured in ample quantity. We must be assured that power represented by the ability to produce them is spread out over a great enough number of loyal American producers to assure that it can never be concentrated against us by antisocial forces, either at home or abroad.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask what is being done to meet this critical situation? What is our supply? Has the free flow of this indispensable medicine—quinine and its substitutes—been interfered with? Is there, as it has been so persistently whispered about in the cloakrooms, a world-wide cartel, an unlawful conspiracy among monopolists that are fattening rich upon the suffering of the poor, the helplessly sick? Is it true that we lost the battle of Bataan because the supply of this strategic medicine ran out? Is it true that our soldiers, sailors, and marines are today threatened with disablement because of a scarcity of this indispensable medicine? What are our war leaders doing about this all-important problem?

The American people are entitled to know, and to know right now.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 7, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COCHRAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

#### PLUMLEY'S PLATFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, primary day in Vermont is on the 8th day of September, on which date every Vermonter who is determined to defend, preserve, and protect the freedoms he has enjoyed and the liberties guaranteed to him under the Bill of Rights will go to the polls to exercise and to enjoy his right and prerogative of suffrage.

Vermonters appreciate all we are fighting for, and they know full well that no man or woman ever had a better opportunity to serve the country than is afforded under our form of government in the right to vote one's own convictions, to play a part as an individual in the running of this Government of and for and by the people. They recognize it as a duty to support those who under our

form of government represent them. They also consider it a privilege.

Speaking from a personal standpoint and with respect to my own candidacy, Vermonters in a preponderant majority know that I have undertaken to represent them, as evidenced by their repeated and continued approval, in general, of the positions which I have taken. Eighty thousand or more of them have over and over again, by their ballots, signified to me that, despite the fact that they did not agree with all positions which I have taken, they nevertheless wished to express their confidence in me. Certainly any man ought to be humble but proud of such confidence.

Now as to what happened prior to 1940, time and time again the people of Vermont have expressed their opinion with respect to my positions and have certified to me by their votes their general satisfaction with my record.

#### THE RECORD

The question now is brought down to my record and my votes in the Seventy-seventh Congress. I stand on that record. There are very, very few votes I would change today, if any. It is needless for me to say that I have worked for the interest of every citizen of the State of Vermont and for the welfare of the country at large.

I voted every time and on every single issue as I thought was right, without fear or favor, despite the pressure groups some of which now attack me, and never with any thought of how my vote would affect me personally or politically in the future.

Vermonters very well know that there is no such phrase as "political expediency" in my vocabulary.

Here is my record in brief as seen by somebody other than myself, and I quote an editorial appearing in the Fair Haven Era of July 9:

#### PLUMLEY ANNOUNCES

The announcement by CHARLES A. PLUMLEY that he will be a candidate in the coming primary and election to succeed himself as the one and only Congressman from Vermont will surprise no one. In fact it would be surprising if Mr. PLUMLEY has any opponent for the nomination strong enough to give him any serious anxiety, notwithstanding earlier rumors of a mysterious candidate.

Congressman PLUMLEY is not exactly an easy man to beat even in normal times when campaigns turn on domestic issues, party loyalty, or the personal equation. For a year when the war and related issues are uppermost in the minds of voters, Mr. PLUMLEY has a voting record which does not make an easy target. He was a leader among that group of Republicans who early saw that not only freedom in Europe, but also freedom here in America was threatened by the fanatical followers of those two international outlaws, Hitler and Mussolini. Placing patriotism above party, he supported nearly all of Roosevelt's foreign policies designed to aid those nations battling for freedom. Back in 1939 he voted for repeal of the arms embargo and relaxation of the neutrality law. In 1940 he favored the draft law. Coming down to 1941, he voted for the Lend-Lease Act, to extend the draft law, to arm merchant ships, and reopen combat zones. In all the list of outstanding foreign-policy issues there were only two "no" votes. One was cast against the bill to fortify Guam Island in 1939 and the other against renewal of the trade pact

in 1940. Our guess is that PLUMLEY would today acknowledge the first of these two "no" votes to have been a mistake.

Taken as a whole, we submit that this is the record of a man who had the vision to see the trend of future events in a time when the minds of other public men were still clouded with the fog of an outdated isolationism. If wartime issues are to predominate in the coming election, then it is not easy to make out a case for replacing a man whose votes on foreign questions public opinion now acknowledges to have been right.

I stand on that record. Perhaps I ought to say that there never was any measure before Congress providing for the fortification of Guam, and so I did not vote either for or against it, despite the erroneous classification of the vote with respect to the dredging of the harbor at Guam.

As to the so-called reciprocal trade treaty pacts, of course I voted against them. The futility of these pacts has been demonstrated.

If the people of Vermont are for America 100 percent—and they are—if they are for our form of government and its continuance as against wasteful extravagance, social experimentation at the taxpayers' expense, the octocean growth of bureaucracy, and those so-called liberals, radicals, and fifth columnists and others who work so subversively to attack those of us who are fighting for America—and they are—if the people of Vermont would preserve and conserve their liberties and pass them on to posterity as worth fighting for—and that is what we are fighting for—then they can help their Representative in Congress carry on their fight by again giving him their vote of confidence, as they have done heretofore, and will again.

Knowing Vermont as I do and have over all these years, I am well satisfied as to what her citizens will do. I have a right so to speak. I appreciate their loyalty, their confidence, and their devotion which have already been evidenced so many times, while I recognize my responsibility as I try to represent them to the best of my ability.

The people of Vermont will not forget that the primary is on the 8th of September. Their life and their liberty are involved. They know it is more important to them that they remember the primary than it is to me. There is no neutral ground in this fight. Ballots are bullets these days. The people of Vermont will govern themselves accordingly. The significance and importance of their vote cannot be underestimated. Life and liberty and our American standard of living are at stake. I have done my best to preserve and to conserve and to continue them.

That the good people of Vermont overwhelmingly approve my attempt to represent them is a matter of record made by the Legislature of the State of Vermont officially and by so many of them as individuals as to leave no question as to their position. They will confirm their position by their votes on September 8. They should.

There can be no question. If America and our democratic form of government are to survive, all that is needed, as

Calvin Coolidge once said, is "for us to give what we think America is worth."

We must be fit in order to be free. I am for freedom. Are you? Let your vote on September 8 be your answer. The responsibility is on your doorstep.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald of yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a newspaper article from the Chicago Tribune.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Record.)

#### QUIT IT, OR WE ARE LICKED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we could lose this war, said the Government Office of War Information a few days ago. That is an official statement.

On August 14, the United States News, a reliable, responsible, and unusually accurate weekly publication published at Washington, where it has its editorial and executive offices, carried on its first page the statement:

This war is being lost as it's now going.  
\* \* \* United States and Britain simply can't seem to get going.

On July 3, General Somervell, who of all men should know his facts and weigh his words, told an audience in Michigan that—

A grim and brutal task lies ahead in fighting an enemy from whom we've taken a terrific shellacking all around the globe.

\* \* \* \* \*  
The things that yet have to be done are appalling. You can't win today's battles with tomorrow's weapons.

\* \* \* \* \*  
So far, we've lost a lot of nearly everything but our sense of smugness and smugness never won a war, nor did wishful thinking. We can't win this one with boastful headlines

or with slogans or alibis or threats or promises.

A few days later, Congressman LYNDON JOHNSON, a Democrat, returning from the front, told a startled country that he would rather ride the tail of a box kite than take the chance of meeting a Jap Zero fighter in a certain Navy plane.

On July 27, over in the Senate, Oklahoma's Senator JOSH LEE, an ardent New Dealer, referring to the German submarines on the Atlantic Coast, said—  
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6864:

Therefore, it is folly, utter folly, for us to continue to try to build ships faster than Hitler can sink them.

This war is so widespread, so total, that, if those who are in charge were all-wise and had in mind but the single purpose—which they have not—of defeating our enemies, many mistakes would be avoided.

When we know, as we do, that many of those upon whose efforts the success of the war depends are not only incompetent, but that others are dividing their attention and their efforts between the winning of the war and their own personal interests, the future of our country looks black.

There has been, and there is, controversy and bickering, pulling at cross purposes, between the Army and the Navy and various Government Departments and between various Government agencies themselves. Just a few days ago, a committee of the Senate charged that the Navy Department's Bureau of Ships was guilty of "negligence or wilful misconduct" in connection with the construction of tank-landing boats. Contradictory orders, rules, regulations, and directives are almost a daily occurrence and, meanwhile, the war is being lost.

It is all too true, as stated by the Government's Office of War Information, that we could lose this war. We not only could lose this war, but we shall lose, unless those in charge quit following a course which makes for discord and disunity, and which may create a situation which will lead to open civil strife.

This war cannot be won by the efforts of the before-Pearl-Harbor interventionists or warmongers. This war can be won only by a united people. Those who were isolationists before Pearl Harbor are not only growing impatient because of the false and malicious charges of disloyalty which are being hurled at them by a group which is serving the cause and the purpose of Hitler, and by those who seek political advancement and the perpetuation of the New Deal, but they have arrived at the decision that they no longer propose to remain silent or inactive under such charges.

The New Republic, PM, and some others which follow the same trend, and some individuals who, if they were weighed in accurate scales, would be found totally lacking in those qualities which will enable us to defeat our enemies, seem to think—and certainly they act as though they, and they alone, were patriotic. They assume and they act as though they were the sole possessors of patriotism.

They ignore the fact that, while they and those who believed with them have been shouting for war, when war came, the people from that section of the country which most vigorously opposed the war have given of their money and their sons unrestrainedly, wholeheartedly, while the warmongers and the rabid interventionists have failed to meet the acid test of loyalty afforded by bond purchasing, industrial production, or enlistment. All those who have been trying so hard to purge so-called isolationists who, prior to Pearl Harbor, wanted to keep us out of this war; all who wanted to first prepare for national defense before becoming involved in the World War, should by this time have learned their lesson. Even those with the mind of a child should now know, if they are capable of understanding, that the people of America have no need for their advice; have no intention of following their demands.

Throughout this country of ours, from coast to coast, in almost every election here the people have had an opportunity to express their will, they have repudiated the *New Republic*, *Life*, *PM*, and the views advocated by similar publications. All of these publications did their utmost, by false statements, by vilification, and downright personal abuse, to defeat HAMILTON FISH. On Tuesday of this week the people of his district gave their answer—by a vote of 17,179 to 10,057—to these propaganda sheets.

Having been repudiated by the American people, let them now mend their ways, repent in sackcloth and ashes, and devote their efforts to the defeat of our common enemy. Let them quit following a course which tends to stir up civil strife.

Here in Washington yesterday or the day before, the President seemed surprised when his attention was directed to the ever-increasing wildcat strikes, and the morning paper tells us that here in America, with our national existence at stake, the War Board, because of the vacillating labor policy of this administration, is considering the question of asking for the calling out of the troops to force American citizens to render patriotic service in a war-production plant.

This Congress has given the President every dollar and all the authority which he asked to prepare for war, to carry on the war, to defeat our enemies. If the war is going against us; if, as the Government's own agency said, we could lose the war, then the responsibility rests upon those in charge—not upon the people, not upon Congress.

It is time that those who are hurling the charge of disloyalty at loyal, patriotic citizens cease their shouting, bend their backs to the task which confronts us, and contribute something to the war effort.

It is time that the administration call off those who are persecuting individuals and publications who are telling the truth about the incompetency of those in charge.

Because the Chicago Tribune printed the story of the Coral Sea battle, written by Stanley Johnston, an eyewitness, it is to be hailed before a Federal grand jury. The Tribune charges that Secre-

tary of the Navy Knox, who is drawing \$60,000 a year from his Chicago paper, a competitor of the Tribune, uses his high office to further his own commercial activities, his own financial interest.

If Attorney General Biddle wants to render a service to the Nation, let him investigate that charge. If the Attorney General thinks the publication of the truth, long after it would be of any value to the enemy, gives aid and comfort to that enemy, what does he think of the charge that the Secretary of the Navy is using his office not only for political, but for commercial purposes? We heard not a little in days gone by about driving the money changers from the temple. What about getting them out of the administration?

At least one individual who but echoed the sentiments of Churchill, expressed before Congress on the 26th day of December 1941, is to be called to account for that utterance before a Federal grand jury.

Stanley Johnston, the Tribune reporter, was commended for his patriotic service. His acts on the sinking *Lexington* earned him the commendation and the recommendation for a citation by his commanding officers. But to date the citation has not come through. Is Secretary of the Navy Knox holding it up?

Instead of calling to account publications like the *New Republic*, *PM*, and others which are falsely and viciously making attacks upon Congress and individual Congressmen and flooding some districts with propaganda which must bring joy to the heart of Hitler, the Attorney General threatens to investigate the Chicago Tribune, which has long enjoyed a reputation for factual statements, patriotic utterances. The *New Republic*, and others which echo its charges are the ones who impair the morale of our armed forces. They are the ones who should be investigated to ascertain whether they are not guilty of sedition.

Yes, it is time for unity. It is time that we get together, cease fighting among ourselves, devote our whole attention to our common enemy. But that day will never arrive until those who are using the war to establish their own political theories; until those who are using the war to overthrow our Government; until those who are using the war to purge all who believe in the United States of America, quit the course which they have been following.

If they think that they can, by their slanders and their libels, by their scurrilous, false, malicious, and vicious charges, silence those of us who have faith in our country, in the courage and the determination of our people, they will learn to their sorrow that they are in the minority and that, ere long, they will meet the just and righteous retribution of a long-suffering indignant but patriotic people.

I hope that now the *New Republic*, *PM*, similar publications, *Ingersoll*, *Luce*, the *Chicago Sun*, and others of those who have just been spending their time kicking the isolationists instead of kicking Hitler, would just direct their energies in some other direction, let us alone,

do as much as we are doing to defeat our enemies, and follow along in the war effort. Then maybe, with the help of the Lord, and we are never going to do it without His help, we can give Hitler a licking. I do not expect any answer, but I know what the answer should be. Let me add—let us alone, because we are not going to be kicked around any more without doing some kicking ourselves.

To show just what these creators of disunity are doing, I attach hereto, as a continuation of my remarks, an article from the Chicago Tribune of August 11, 1942:

#### RECORD SHOWS KNOX FAVORS HIS NEWSPAPER— TRIBUNE HEREWITH CITES THE FACTS

The Chicago Tribune today charges that Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox has used his official position for the advantage of his own newspaper in Chicago.

In laying the case before the public the Tribune offers the record of unfair acts on the part of the man who is trying to run the Navy on the seven seas and at the same time is carrying on his private business on the bank of the Chicago River far away.

Knox has played a major role in the campaign of political persecution arising from demands of the Tribune for an all-out effort to win the war and the removal of those incompetents, including Knox, who have stumbled the ball in this life and death struggle.

#### THE CHARGES LISTED

Political persecution of the Tribune reached a peak when on the recommendation of Knox, Attorney General Biddle ordered a grand jury investigation of the Tribune and of Stanley Johnston, writer of the epic series on the battle of the Coral Sea, thus throwing into jeopardy Johnston's entire future as a war correspondent. Biddle asks the grand jury to find that Johnston gave secret naval information to the Tribune and that the Tribune printed it in violation of law.

#### Principal charges against Knox are:

1. Knox, who is drawing \$60,000 a year from his Chicago paper in an "advisory capacity," has repeatedly favored afternoon papers and his own in particular by releasing Navy battle news to them first. This over the strenuous protests of the Tribune and other morning papers.

2. Knox's own paper once ballyhooed an exclusive release in a front-page ad 24 hours ahead of time, showing prior knowledge of or complicity in the time of release.

3. A Tribune story on the fight in the Java Sea was bottled up by the Navy for 2 weeks and not released until a correspondent of Knox's paper in the Pacific was allowed to enjoy a scoop on it.

#### OWN VERSION ISSUED

4. When the Tribune had the exclusive story of the Coral Sea battle, Navy censorship held it up with one hand while Navy press relations issued its own version for the afternoon papers.

5. Knox's paper, knowing the Tribune's dramatic Coral Sea series was awaiting official clearance, published a trumped-up story to take the edge off, and the Navy let the latter clear first.

6. The Navy held up one of Johnston's stories for more than a month on the excuse it revealed certain information to the Japs, but the Navy made public this same information in an official communique. When the Tribune pointed this out, part of the Tribune story was cleared. However, certain geographic information the naval (Knox) censors deleted, and this was later carried specifically in Knox's paper.

7. The Navy discriminated against the Tribune in organizing a cruise for newspaper correspondents.

Hereafter follows the evidence supporting these charges:

**HOW KNOX HATCHES NEWS—RELEASES NEWS TO FAVOR HIS NEWSPAPER**

One of the perquisites of the present Secretary of the Navy is that he can sit on a big story like a clucking hen until the publishing time of his own newspaper rolls around—and he usually does.

The favored treatment Secretary Knox gives his own paper and the unfair breaks he hands to competitors are strikingly illustrated in the news handling of two great sea engagements—the Marshall and Gilbert Islands raid and the battle of the Coral Sea.

A number of newspaper men were assigned with the Navy on the thrust at the Marshall and Gilbert Islands. Only one correspondent was an eyewitness to the battle of the Coral sea and he was Johnston of the Chicago Tribune. His series on the sinking of the aircraft carrier *Lexington* and the Navy's heroism has been called the greatest story of the war.

But how did the Navy handle these two affairs?

On Lincoln's birthday, February 12, there appeared a big promotional advertisement on the front page of Navy Secretary Knox's paper, Big, black type heralded:

"Great story of the United States fleet's raid on Marshall and Gilbert Islands. Starting at 11 o'clock in tomorrow's Daily News."

For the sake of the record, it should be stated that the Tribune was not alone in protesting this frank discrimination against Knox's competitors. The deal Knox handed out was so raw that other papers demanded to know why the story, if ready, could not be released immediately. Papers that protested were the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, New York News, Philadelphia Inquirer, and even a Chicago morning newspaper which is printed on Knox's own presses.

**PROTEST BRINGS ACTION**

The New York Times, for example, had paid cable tolls on 7,000 words from Foster Hailey, its correspondent with the Pacific Fleet, on the same story 2 weeks before and didn't take kindly to the idea of letting Knox's afternoon paper have the complete break.

Aside from the question of journalistic or governmental ethics, it was pointed out that the American people, who were sending their sons off to war, had a right to the earliest possible news from any battle front.

Finally, red-faced naval officials in Washington agreed to hand out a skeleton story on the night of February 12 for publication in the morning papers for the following day. This communique gave out some results, such as the news that 16 enemy ships were destroyed.

Contrast this behavior with the reception of Johnston's Coral Sea battle account. Bear in mind Johnston was the only newspaper correspondent who was an eyewitness to that great victory for American arms.

**JOHNSTON STORY HELD UP**

Johnston sent his stories to the Navy for censorship on June 3. Along with them at the request of Knox's agents he turned over 13 pictures which he brought back with him on his perilous homeward voyage over the rolling vastness of the Pacific after he and his mates scrambled off the sinking *Lexington*.

But when the Navy finally released the Coral Sea communique on June 12, it went to the afternoon papers, including Knox's, of course, despite the fact that the only newspaperman on the battle scene was Johnston, employed by the Tribune, a morning paper. Adding a little more insult, identical pictures

to the ones Johnston carried back were also released for afternoon publication.

On the front page of Knox's Chicago paper was a picture of the stricken aircraft carrier *Lexington*, sinking beneath a pillar of black smoke. Also on the front page of Knox's paper was a story from one of his own correspondents, dated lined "With the Pacific Fleet at Sea, May 7."

**SINKS SHIP A DAY TOO SOON**

"From where we sit in the hot mugginess of the Coral Sea it would appear that the battle is over," Mr. Knox's correspondent wrote. "The battle of the Coral Sea is over and our side has won. We ride northward, etc."

An interesting footnote on this account was that the battle was not over on May 7 and the *Lexington* wasn't hit and sunk until May 8. The correspondent who wrote it was 500 miles away at the time, and didn't arrive in the Coral sea until May 12, four days after the shooting was over.

**NAVY BOSS HOLDS WHIP—TRIBUNE NOT ALONE IN MAKING PROTEST**

One of the difficulties of voluntary wartime censorship of news is that a Secretary of the Navy who owns a newspaper can manipulate the releases to the advantage of his own property and to the detriment of a rival publisher, as was shown in the handling of the Johnston Coral Sea series as contrasted with that of the Marshall-Gilbert Islands raid stories.

Publishers have complained for sometime that Knox, who is simultaneously attempting to operate his own paper in "an advisory capacity" at \$60,000 a year and the Navy at \$15,000, was juggling releases for his own private advantage. News of the Navy's battles in the air and on the sea has been dished out first and foremost to afternoon papers, of which the Secretary's paper is one.

But Knox has gone further than that. In one case, of which the Tribune possesses undeniable proof, Knox gave his Chicago paper a clear beat on a story which the Tribune obtained 2 weeks previously and was forbidden by the Navy to print.

**MAKES STRONG ACCUSATION**

Arthur Sears Henning, chief of the Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau and dean of the correspondents in the Nation's Capital, sent a letter of protest to the Secretary of the Navy. Henning declared the manipulation of news for the benefit of the Secretary's own paper was not only a gross injustice to competitors but "a breach of public trust."

The letter tells the story. Here it is:

APRIL 8, 1942.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY:

SIR: I am constrained to protest to you against the publication by your newspaper of war news which your paper's competitor, the Chicago Tribune, was forbidden by the Navy Department to publish on the ground that it was a military secret, the disclosure of which would aid the enemy.

I call your attention to the enclosed clippings from the News of a dispatch by George Weller describing the sinking of the destroyer *Peary*, which dispatch bears the date line of an American Navy base in the Southwest Pacific, April 2, and appeared in the News of that date.

The Tribune's Washington bureau obtained information on or about March 20 that in addition to the losses in the battle of Java, announced by the Navy Department on March 13, the United States had lost the aircraft tender *Langley* and two other warships. The Navy Department declined to confirm that information. The Tribune withheld its publication in accord with the voluntary censorship.

Notwithstanding the refusal to authorize the Tribune to print its information the

Navy Department permitted the Weller dispatch containing a part of that information to clear an American Navy base on April 3. On April 3, 24 hours after your newspaper had been enabled to score a beat on your competitors, the Navy Department made official announcement of the loss of the *Langley*, the *Peary*, and the *Pecos*.

I submit that the manipulation of war news by the Navy Department for the benefit of the Secretary of the Navy's newspaper is not only a gross injustice to your competitors but a breach of public trust.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR SEARS HENNING,  
Washington Correspondent,  
Chicago Tribune.

As may have been expected, Knox has never answered Henning's letter nor acknowledged receipt of it.

**ANOTHER BLACK MARK—TRIBUNE CAN'T PRINT IN NAVY RELEASES IT**

Another incident smacking of discrimination against the Tribune was the bottling up of one of the stories written by Stanley Johnston after his memorable excursion into the Coral Sea.

This was an account of the American attack on the northern New Guinea ports of Lae and Salamaua. The naval censor's ostensible objection was that the enemy didn't know the route the American flyers had taken and printing any part of the story might give away this secret.

Lae and Salamaua are ports occupied by the Japs as possible springboards for invasion of Australia. It is 1,500 miles around the southeastern tip of New Guinea to Port Moresby, the Allied base. As the crow flies it is only about 100 miles, but in the interior of New Guinea are towering, uncharted peaks of 14,000 to 16,000 feet which the Japs apparently thought protected them from an aerial attack launched from Port Moresby.

Johnston's story told how American ingenuity and heroism solved the problem. Flyers from the aircraft carrier *Lexington* and a sister ship found a way over the mountains and the torpedo planes, bombers, and fighters swarmed down on Jap shipping and land installations.

**APPEALS FOR RELEASE**

The story was submitted to the Navy on June 10 and the Tribune continued week after week to ask for its release. Then toward the end of July an astonishing fact was discovered by Wayne Thomis, the Tribune's aviation editor.

Reading over the official communique of the citation of 37 airmen from the sunken carrier *Lexington*, which was made public July 3, Thomis was amazed to find the Navy Department itself had given out information it was refusing to let the Tribune print.

On this point the communique read:

"A task force assigned to raid Japanese installations at Lae and Salamaua, located 15 miles apart in New Guinea, steamed to within 125 miles of their objective without being detected by the enemy and early on the morning of March 10 the *Lexington* launched her planes.

"The planes—dive bombers, torpedo bombers, scouts, and an escort of fighters—flew those 125 miles over uncharted mountains and jungles and pressed home an attack that left the harbors of those two ports littered with sinking and damaged vessels of many types.

"So completely surprised were the Japanese by the over-the-mountain assault that when the planes returned to their carrier the ships in the task force shoved off from the area without encountering a single enemy plane or vessel."

**TRIBUNE HEWED TO LINE**

When this was called to the attention of the censor, the Navy finally released the

lbum story, written by Stanley Johnston, and it was printed in the July 27 editions of the Tribune. But, still at the insistence of the Navy, the Tribune did not tell in detail how the American aviators found their way to Lae and Salamaua.

It was astonishing then later to pick up the New Deal papers here in Chicago and to find the methods used by the Americans to surprise the Japs described in great detail. George Weller, writing for the Secretary of the Navy's paper in Chicago from Australia, described the tabooed bit of geographic information at great length and in great detail. Carleton Kent, correspondent for the Chicago Times in Australia, likewise drew a real picture of the forbidden data.

#### NAVY DENIES BLAME

This discrimination against the Tribune was called to the attention of Vice Admiral Russell Willson, Chief of Staff to the commander in chief of the United States Fleet, Admiral Ernest J. King.

Admiral Willson blamed the whole thing—guess who? Gen. Douglas MacArthur, those censors, the admiral said, had cleared Weller's copy.

In addition there was the episode in the summer of 1941 when the Tribune asked the Navy for permission to send a man along on the Atlantic neutrality patrol. The Navy replied that several other newspapers were desirous of the same thing, and in all probability the trip would be arranged.

But Frank Knox's Navy left the Tribune off the list. This was done despite the fact that Navy public relations for many years had regarded the size of circulation in determining who should be taken along on such assignments.

It goes without saying almost that Frank Knox's paper had a man on the cruise as did a number of smaller papers. When the Tribune protested to Navy public relations the answer was that it was "just an accident" the Tribune had been slighted.

Fortunately, this newspaper had available the excellent stories of Tom Horgan of the Associated Press. Horgan, who lives in Boston and is a well-known yachtsman, is regarded as one of the greatest experts on affairs of the sea among American newspaper men.

#### NO JOBS PAY \$75,000—HAS STOCK CONTROL OF DAILY NEWS

There are spots where it is difficult to tell where the Secretary of the Navy Knox's paper ends and the Navy begins, or vice versa.

Although he is supposed to be directing naval warfare on the seven seas and trying to stem the tidal wave of submarines along the eastern coast, the Secretary of the Navy still drawing down handsome emolument from an advisory capacity with his Chicago paper.

Before he jumped into the Cabinet, Knox was getting \$75,000 a year from his Chicago paper. Percentage-wise, the \$15,000 cut would mean he is now only 80 percent as useful to the paper as he was before being elevated to the Cabinet. But the job of Secretary of the Navy pays \$15,000, so Knox is no loser at the end.

In other words, Knox is drawing fifteen-twentieths of his pay from the Navy and the rest from his Chicago newspaper property. How much time he puts in on each is probably a military secret.

"It is only because of your energy and skill," wrote Knox in an open letter to employees of his paper in a house organ at the end of 1940, "each in his own field of responsibility, that I have been able to contribute my personal services to our country and want you to feel that by your efforts you are personally making a major contribution to the national defense."

Since Knox owns the controlling interest in the stock of the holding corporation which

is the parent of his paper and the building which houses it, it is fairly easy for him to vote a salary for himself.

#### OTHER OWNERS NOT HAPPY

But some of the minority stockholders have set to grumbling, especially since the directors omitted the dividend normally payable on the common stock on July 1. When Knox took over control of the paper, the stock was quoted at 12¼ bid and 12¾ asked. It is now down to \$4 bid and \$5 asked.

Last September when Knox appeared at the American Legion Convention, he was greeted with a half page newspaper advertisement carrying one of his pre-Cabinet quotations about the President. Knox had said:

"President Roosevelt is without doubt the greatest autocrat in the history of the country. He has callously repudiated not only his pre-election promises (1936 when Knox was defeated as Republican candidate for Vice President) but the solemn pledges of his party. 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."

This is only one of many of Knox's sentiments along this line.

Knox also prints another pro-administration organ, a morning newspaper, on his presses, for which his company receives \$400,000 a year.

Employees of Knox's paper have also been shuttling back and forth between their newspaper jobs and fat posts in the Navy. In the van of the parade was the local Knox paper's managing editor. He was given a commission as lieutenant commander and ruled over the Navy's press section.

Not the least of the duties of the managing editor after he had been transferred to the Navy pay roll was to sell Frank Knox to the Nation. It is reported in Washington there were few takers for his commodity.

#### COLUMNIST GETS NAVY JOB

More recently Ed Lahey, a columnist for Knox's paper, received an appointment as a special naval assistant and adviser on labor relations. One of the reports from Washington is that some of the more conservative of the paper's stockholders choked on Lahey's labor columns and he was "drafted" into the Navy.

Another reason for the Lahey move was voiced in Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round column. According to Pearson, Lahey, who is a warm personal friend of Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, was moved into the picture to put a "curb" on Ralph A. Bard, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Pearson described Bard as "a banker" whose record was not to the liking of labor interests.

Bard, incidentally, has been closely associated with the Chicago financial interests behind Knox's paper.

Several foreign journalists on Knox's paper were given jobs in Government propaganda bureaus after the progress of German conquest on the European Continent cut their assignments out from under them.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### OIL FOR NEW ENGLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have in New England an actual and an acute shortage of oil. I realize that the Interior Department and Mr. Eastman, War Transportation Coordinator, are making efforts to have more tank cars diverted to New England in order to bring oil to us. I pointed out in the Congress over a year ago that when our tankers were sent to England under the Lend-Lease Act there were tank cars that could be used for the bringing of oil to New England. I would like to ask the sections of the country that have plenty of oil and plenty of gasoline, Mr. Speaker, to assist in seeing that New Englanders keep warm during the winter months. Action must be taken at once as winter comes to us very early. A great hardship will be worked upon all of New England if this is not done.

I asked the President if he would appoint a well-coordinated oil department under one head, in order to expedite the sending of oil and gas into New England, so that we might have a fair distribution.

This war should be fought and sacrificed in by the entire country. No one section should be made to bear the heaviest burden. The rationing of sugar is Nation-wide. Rationing of oil and gas should be Nation-wide. Perhaps we could secure legislation to that effect, but, as you know, it requires hearings and the bill must pass both the House and the Senate. If the President would act, under his powers, we could have an almost immediate adjustment.

I know the members from other sections of the country do not feel that New England should bear by far the greatest burden of the war. She is doing so today. Many New Englanders already have lost their sons. I know in my own city of Lowell there is a very heavy toll of deaths.

I would like to point out also, Mr. Speaker, that other sections of the country, where there is plenty of oil and gas, allow their salesmen to have all the gasoline they need in order to sell their goods. Many of those goods are wares for the conduct of the war, materials for war production. It seems unfair that New England salesmen today must not only curtail their sales, but absolutely stop their sales so far as transportation by automobile is concerned. It will mean a very heavy loss in dollars and cents, and in my opinion will mean a loss in war production.

I need not point out the large amount that New England will pay out in taxes for the conduct of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I do not need to make a more urgent appeal to my colleagues from all over the country. Many of them have been very much interested in helping other nations, our Allies, in this World War, with the feeling that by so doing they were helping us. Surely they will want to help a section of their own country. I am very sure that my appeal will not fall upon deaf ears. If the members of the oil States will join in cooperation, asking that New England be given the necessary relief, I feel positive that the united effort would secure the necessary results.

I urgently ask that all of you from other sections of the country help us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

#### WINNING THE WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILSON was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I humbly plead with every American to get out his Bible and study the principles on which the great Apostle Paul made his straight tracks through this world.

Hitler's method is and has always been first, to divide the people, create hate, one group for another, and then to conquer. It is now happening here. It took Pearl Harbor to unite us and even though it started us on our way there are powerful, greedy, political forces now attempting to disunite us; yes, to divide, conquer, and destroy us. Far too much space in intervention papers and nonintervention papers is now being given to the discussion of pre-Pearl Harbor issues. Far too much time is now being given on the radio to the discussion of the same thing. Only a negative contribution to our war effort can possibly come from these activities. It is purely politics, and in my opinion, politics of the lowest, dirtiest, filthiest type. Neither side has made a point without having contradicted itself many times, all of which tends to confuse the people.

Mr. Speaker, it would not become me to make this criticism unless I offered a suggestion. This I do at this time; which suggestion I feel will be an easy and long step toward creating and maintaining national unity and toward the winning of this war. Before my suggestion, however, I wish to compliment the Senate majority leader for his admirable statement on the floor of the Senate, Monday, August 10. Senator BARKLEY said:

By and large and in the main, I had confidence in the patriotism of the men and women who took a position on either side of the dramatic questions which faced the American people with respect to the World War, which was precipitated in September 1939.

Think how comforting it would be to millions of mothers and fathers if this statesmanlike attitude was taken by all of our politicians, by the press, and by the radio. Think of the blow it would be to Hitler. It would be equal to a major victory for the Allies and it would not cost us a single life, an ounce of critical material, or a red copper.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, let us take our eyes off the ballot box and show a small fraction of the courage now being shown by our boys on a score of fighting fronts. Let us show enough courage and bravery to forget selfishness, even though it may mean defeat at the polls next November, all in the interest of national unity and winning the war.

My suggestion is that all politicians, newspapers, and radio commentators re-

view the principles of the great Apostle Paul, who said:

One thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark.

Analyzing his words, I believe Paul would have us do one thing and concentrate all our efforts on that single purpose—the winning of this war. That job is of sufficient magnitude as to challenge the best in each and every one of us. Today, with many battle fronts all over the earth, even though our production is becoming great, it is of necessity being spread so thinly that our striking power is terribly inadequate on all fronts. We are barely properly prepared to fight a defensive battle at this time on all these fronts, much less launch a world offensive. We will not and cannot win this war by winning defensive battles. So I say, in the words of the Apostle Paul, "One thing I do"—we must bend our efforts on every front, for unity at home, for production in the factory, for production on the farm, and for the delivery of the goods that we may win this war.

Paul's second point was: "Forgetting those things which are behind"; and at this time I think it is one of the most important of all to civilians on the home front. Now is no time to waste hours and energy going back, the result of which would only be helpful to our enemies in dividing and conquering. Those differences of opinion went down at Pearl Harbor, and rightly so. Let us keep them down. Concessions must be made by all, and the subject must be dropped if we are to remain a united people and exert our best to win this damnable war, in the shortest possible time and with the least sacrifice of lives, money, and suffering. Napoleon's great achievements were accredited in part to the fact that he lost no time brooding over mistakes already made, and therefore about which he could do nothing. He was said to have analyzed the situation to be sure he would never make that mistake again, and then to have discarded the whole matter forever.

The third part of Paul's statement was: "Reaching forth unto those things which are before." This would be of great help in expediting our victory, if we could look straight to the mark and never take our eye off it. Every worker has a production goal ahead of him, whether he be a farm worker, factory worker, or legislator. The farmer and the factory worker have accepted their challenge and your Congress has accepted its responsibility for seeing that proper legislation is passed in order to win this war and preserve our democracy at home. We all have our separate parts to play, and even though your part may seem insignificant, it is an integral part of the whole war effort, and must be played by someone. You cannot play two positions at the same time and play them well, so when you have selected your job, put everything you have into it to be sure it is not your part that is holding up our victory parade.

The last of Paul's statement is: "I press toward the mark"; and herein is a challenge to all of us. Let us press on with

our very best efforts that this war will be brought to the earliest possible conclusion, at which time we can settle down to the problem of rebuilding a better world and a lasting peace.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the views of the War and Navy Departments as expressed in letters addressed to the Speaker of the House with reference to the bill passed today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 7211. An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, August 17, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of August 10, 1942.]

1846. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting in compliance with the provisions of section 3 of an act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government, approved August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1219-1221), herewith list of papers, consisting of 199 items; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

[Submitted August 13, 1942.]

1852. A letter from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Charles B. Henders chairman, transmitting reports for the months of October 1941 to June 1942, inclusive, which are submitted as provided by law to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1853. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report covering operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the fourth quarter of 1941 and for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to December 31, 1941, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 830); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1854. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report covering operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the third quarter of 1941, and for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to September 30, 1941, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 831); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1855. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I.; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1856. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain