

tribute to the redwoods of California by Irving S. Cobb.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### THE 35-MILE LIMIT

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, a great newspaper in New Jersey, the Newark Evening News, designed these little cards that I have in my hand for use in their own delivery trucks. They are now making them available to anybody who wants them. To preserve rubber we are asked to drive not over 35 miles an hour. When you place this little card over your speedometer, the needle will disappear if you exceed the 35-mile Victory speed limit. I suggest to the O. P. A. that they get some such gadget and deliver it into the hands of everyone who applies for a gas-rationing card.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. John C. Page.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial and also sundry telegrams of protest on the recent order closing the gold mines of this country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[The matters referred to appear in the Appendix.]

#### ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE SURRENDER AT YORKTOWN, VA.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute is preliminary to a request that I shall make at the end of that minute.

October 19, next, will be the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of the surrender at Yorktown, Va., and the establishment of American independence. To the tune of *The World Turned Upside Down*, the British marched out about 1 or 2 o'clock on that afternoon and surrendered. I really think we ought not to let the day pass without at least bringing it to the attention of the House.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday, preferably before the other business of the day. If that should violate

the rules of the House, then I ask that permission after the business of the day is disposed of. I ask unanimous consent now, in commemoration of the surrender at Yorktown 161 years ago, that I shall be permitted to speak for 10 minutes immediately after approval of the Journal on Monday.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.

#### NONWAR EXPENDITURES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO 870)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed with illustrations:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

In recent months you have demonstrated, through the activities of regular and special committees, a keen interest in reducing nonwar expenditures of the Federal Government. Undoubtedly reports by the special committees have helped to stimulate the large volume of letters which I have received from citizens in all walks of life. Some of the letters protest against recent cuts in various appropriations. Other letters urge a reduction of Federal expenditure to the amount expended in the fiscal year 1932 and characterize such a reduction as a "Federal contribution toward helping to win the war."

I, therefore, recently requested that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget prepare a report on just what has happened in the field of nonwar expenditures since I assumed the Presidency. The report is attached.

Inasmuch as total war enlists all our resources, you will recognize the very great difficulties of segregating "war" from "nonwar" expenditures. Moreover, the text in many places can only hint at the extent to which so-called nonwar expenditures are now integrated with the war program.

Nevertheless, it does show the important reductions which have been made without sacrificing humanitarian considerations. In addition, the report should be especially useful in further legislative and administrative consideration of budget policy.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 16, 1942.

#### PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds upon which he desires recognition.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been published and put on sale to the public a

booklet edited by one Rex Stout, called *The Illustrious Dunderheads*. It purports to set forth the record of various Members of Congress.

On page 28, under my voting record, appears what purports to be a record of my speeches and writings. On a following page, among various quotations attributed to me, on page 30 of this booklet, is a statement purporting to be taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 12, 1941, page 7197, which reads as follows:

If the Germans get into Africa, they will be twice as far away from the United States as they are in Germany. They would be going backward; and even if they seized Dakar and got over to Brazil, that is twice as far away from America, and yet we are told we must go to war for Dakar and for Africa, and somebody the other day in debate said we must go to war against Japan for rubber, tin, quinine, and nux vomica.

"Mr. Speaker, I did not make that statement. As a matter of fact, that statement is found on page 7197, but was uttered in the course of debate by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I produce the Record to substantiate that statement.

I might say further, Mr. Speaker, that he also lists in my voting record that I voted for the ship-seizure bill. It is true I was incorrectly recorded as voting for it, but I changed the permanent Record by unanimous consent 2 days later on May 9, 1941.

The SPEAKER. While it is a close question, the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago one Sunday night, having nothing better to do, I turned on the radio to listen to that outstanding smear artist on the record of Members of Congress, namely, one Walter Winchell. In the course of his discussion that evening he advised the public to read a new and illuminating document that had just appeared on the bookstands of the country entitled "*The Illustrious Dunderheads*," written or edited by one Rex Stout.

Let me say at the outset that I have no particular interest in anything that Mr. Rex Stout says. Nor shall I receive any royalties from his writings. His record has been well known to the members of the Dies committee for some time, but at the same time I do not propose to let him circulate in the country statements attributed to me which I did not make.

Such has been done in this booklet, and that is the reason for being on my feet at the present time.

In explaining the purpose of this book and the reason for setting forth records of the various Members as to how they voted and some of their presumed-to-be writings and sayings in the debates, Mr. Stout has a foreword in the front of this booklet which I want to quote as follows:

The sad-funny record of what the illustrious figures on Capitol Hill were doing and saying before Pearl Harbor is here to speak for itself. It will bring a kind of laughter to your lips—but not always the laughter of amusement. Frank Sullivan's marvelous introduction sets the pace, a pace

which is maintained not only by the illustrations of William Gropper, one of two or three great cartoonists of our time, but also by the antics of the honorable gentlemen themselves.

The men whose speeches and voting records are cited here guessed wrong. Most of them are up for reelection.

I had presumed all of us are up for reelection.

The question is whether three strikes are out—or whether a man can stay at bat indefinitely no matter how many times he fans.

Every one of these Congressmen is a patriot; and everyone of them is a dunderhead. Ordinarily we can treat the dunderheads to "Bundles for Congress"; but these are not ordinary times. Today these men legislate for the United States.

Now get this statement—

When total victory is ours they will be legislating for the world.

Apparently he has us embarked on a program of world conquest—

And yet as their remarks show, their gaze does not reach beyond their own back yards. The folly of these men is not just their wrong guessing about the war, it is a narrow, parochial, selfish folly that puts local and private interests above the national interest. The favorite appeal of these men is "international," but their shame is that they themselves aren't able to think even nationally. From such men spout the dunderheadisms of which this book is made up.

We find further the above-referred-to introduction that one Frank Sullivan, whoever he is, proceeds to attribute all these dunderheadisms to a carefully laid Nazi plan for dividing and then conquering the United States, and he intimates rather clearly in here that those of us who have made the various statements recorded in the book are in effect and with deliberation tools of the Nazi Government in this country. I have always thought in the few years I have been here that we Members of Congress were sent down here to be the official spokesmen for the people of our districts. Our constituents have the right to remove us at the polls every 2 years if they do not agree with our utterances as reflecting their opinions and desires; but I believe the people of my district and in many parts of this country are getting sick and tired of attempts to smear the people's representatives down here in Congress and attribute to them false or unpatriotic motives whenever they make statements they consider to reflect the true wishes of the majority of the people back home, because when they smear us they in effect smear the judgment of our constituents.

It is bad enough to have some of these smear attempts being made to purge the Members of Congress and so on, but at least the man who purports to put out a book like this and a man who plugs it over the radio, as Mr. Winchell did, should at least be careful that his words are accurate. It is to show their inaccuracy in my case—and doubtless others—that I have risen to this question of personal privilege. He has me incorrectly recorded as voting for the ship seizure bill. As a matter of fact, I fought that bill and felt fully justified in fighting that bill based on evidence sub-

mitted before the Merchant Marine Committee of which I happen to be a member. I fought it on the floor, and spoke against it. I spoke against it on May 5, 1941. I voted for the motion to recommit on May 7. I was incorrectly recorded as having voted for the bill despite the fact I voted for the motion to recommit. Two days later, on May 9, I received permission to have the permanent RECORD corrected.

As I have already said, there are two mistakes in quotations he attributes to me. In the first place, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A3851, he makes a very minor mistake, but in spite of that, it changes the whole meaning of the words:

Were you told then that within a year the United States Army Air Corps would be ferrying American-made bombers to England in a steady service routine? In fact, was it then even so much as intimated to you that within 2 months after election America would become the arsenal for democracy, which not only—

That is where he misquoted. I said: which now means that we give all aid possible to bloodthirsty, atheistic Russia?

There is—there can be—no question that you were deceived by Candidate Roosevelt last fall.

I want to say this with respect to Russia: I have the highest regard, as has everybody in this House, for the magnificent defense the Russians are putting up for their homeland and for the courageous help they are giving us in winning this war. Certainly in view of these things I want to see them get every possible aid we can ever give them; but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Russia are entitled to have whatever form of government they decide they want to have. We are entitled to continue in our form of government here which has made us ever greater since that day at Yorktown to which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] just referred. We have prospered very well under our form of government. But still if somebody chooses to advocate a communistic form of government for this country, as long as they stay within the law they are perfectly entitled to advocate it if they want to. Yet I want none of it here.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. How can a person advocate communism and stay within the law when the cardinal principle of the Communists is to overthrow this Government? They are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. When they advocate the overthrow of this Government by force and violence I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is exactly what their program is. These American Communists led by Earl Browder are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government by force of arms or in any other way they can. Surely a man cannot stay within the law and advocate that stuff.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I understand how the gentleman feels about being misquoted; I likewise understand how the gentleman might feel about being an intended victim of the smear campaign; but when you consider the authors of this book, the long communistic affiliation of both the author Rex Stout and this Gropper who has been connected with the Daily Worker for a period of years, I think a lot of the sting is taken away from it. This Rex Stout at one time was either the owner or publisher, or both, of the Communist paper, New Masses. He was a contributor to New Masses for many years.

You can hardly pick up a Daily Worker, the official Communist organ, without seeing one of Gropper's cartoons in there. I think the most interesting thing about this author, this Stout, today is his present job. Unfortunately, I am not able to say definitely, right at this moment, what his job is, except that I have heard on very good authority that Rex Stout now is ghost writer No. 1 in Washington—I repeat, ghost writer No. 1—for one of the highest Government officials in America today. I hope before very long we will be able to verify that absolutely and name this official, although it is not very hard to guess who it is.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I appreciate that contribution from the gentleman from New Jersey, who is a member of the Dies committee.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. In support of what the gentleman from New Jersey has said, Rex Stout comes either from my district or a few miles out of it, near Brewster, N. Y. He is recognized throughout the whole country as being one of the leading writers for the Communist front in the United States. It seems to me, and I think from the point of view of most Americans who have no use for communism or Communists in our own country, that any attack upon any Member of Congress, Republican or Democrat, or upon his or her record in Congress, by Rex Stout, this Communist fellow traveler, is a commendation worth having, and you ought to be proud to be attacked by a man holding such views. To my way of thinking condemnation from such a source is the highest possible commendation.

Furthermore, in support of what the gentleman from New Jersey has said, Rex Stout was one of the owners, likewise editors and contributing editors, to the New Masses, one of the two leading Communist magazines in America and I am also informed a writer for the Daily Worker. Anyhow, this man together with his colleague, Mr. Gropper, whose cartoons appear regularly in the Daily Worker, are two of the outstanding agitators for communism in America. What can you expect other than to be attacked by men of that type? I think the gentleman is making too much of

it. If Rex Stout writes about you or attacks you and other Members of Congress, what do you expect from the fountain head of communistic propaganda in America. Naturally he is going to attack you and all other Members of Congress who are fighting communism. We propose to continue to fight communism in the United States no matter what happens to communism in the rest of the world. We have taken an oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution which guarantees our freedoms and a Republican form of government. There can be no compromise between communism and Americanism in our own country.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think it would be very satisfactory to all of us when we are criticized to prove that the one who says this or that is a skunk. That is quite satisfactory. But when there are a lot of people who like these skunks, it is not so satisfactory.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I think there is a situation here that we can easily run into and make an unintended mistake in discussing these things. Even the people of Russia are not all Communists. We condemn anyone who will try to foment communism and foster it in our Government. We condemn that as a body and every man in here condemns any group that will undertake to overthrow this Government by force or by any other violent means. But in a discussion like this, as it goes out over the ocean to other countries, the impression is liable to be sent out that a discussion of this kind is aimed at Russia. Russia may be red but she is not yellow, and the people of Russia are fighting for their homeland, they are fighting a battle that challenges the admiration of everybody in America, and I think we should clearly and carefully delineate in a discussion of this kind any possible criticism of Russia, and make it clear that anything we say on this floor shall not be construed so as to engender a feeling between any of the Allied Nations that are fighting together. You know how easily and how quickly anything is taken hold of and employed across the ocean.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Now, if the gentleman will yield to me I would like to conclude. I agree with what he has said. As I stated a moment ago, I have the highest regard in the world for the magnificent fight the Russians are putting up. However, we are fighting for the freedom of peoples all over the world to govern themselves as they see fit. If the people of Russia want to be governed by Communists, that is all right with me, but the point I wish to leave with you is that we in this country do not want to come out of this war under a Nazi government, a Fascist government, or a Communist government. We want the American form of government forever in this country, and I am opposed to any-

body who advocates anything else. I am proud of the fact that I am one of those Members of Congress who has been singled out in here by this man Rex Stout who to all appearances is far more interested in preserving America for Communists than he is in preserving America for Americans.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, our Government, and rightly so, has called attention to the extreme shortage of manpower, especially in certain essential industries. It is especially acute in the farm regions. The entire problem is a serious one.

It just seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the Government could set the example and lead the way in this direction by applying that very principle in our own departments of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am in accord with the resolution adopted yesterday giving the Civil Service Committee of the House authority to investigate the whole problem of civil employment in government.

Mr. Speaker, there are now approximately two and one-half million persons on the pay roll of the executive branch of our Government. About half of them are connected with the Departments of the Army and the Navy. The Army and the Navy and all other necessary agencies should have all the assistance they really need.

Mr. Speaker, I want to insist again there are a number of activities that are not necessary in view of the dire need of manpower for the prosecution of the war. I am advised there has been little effort to reduce personnel in any of the departments of government whether they relate to the prosecution of the war or not. It seems that those in charge of the various departments do not seem to want to reduce the number under them for the reason, in many cases, they have a higher standing or more money if more people are employed under them. We might reverse that and put a premium on doing the work with less employees; this by less duplication and less red tape and more efficiency on the part of the employees. I see no reason why the hours of all white-collared workers should not be extended to 48 hours a week, except in a few cases where it may not be practical. Pay them what they are worth but work longer hours. I realize that we have thousands of patriotic employees in Government who are anxious to do their share. There must, on the other hand, be numbers whose services could be dispensed with without injury to the departments where they are employed. Then there are activities that are all right in ordinary times but not absolutely needed in view of the critical situation as it exists today. In a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] I mentioned only two comparative items as examples

of items that I did not think were necessary right now, it being my notion the manpower and money could be better used in more critical places.

Mr. Speaker, I think Government employees would be glad to have their hours extended from 44 to 48 hours per week. I feel, too, they would be willing to cooperate by transferring to more important jobs. I think, too, the departments should be willing to cooperate in cutting duplication and red tape in many of our departments. Let me say again, I feel the Government should set the pace.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to divert the discussion a little to clear up a sort of colloquy between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and myself. I made no charges or attack against the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Certainly not. The gentleman from Texas is one of the able Members of this House. Furthermore, I have always refrained from making any charges of any kind against any Member of this body, no matter how much our opinions may differ. I regret that he seems to take it in that light.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] had the floor. The gentleman from Indiana yielded to me to point out two specific items that I did not think were necessary expenditures for the prosecution of the war. I was simply expressing my own opinion. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] rose. I explained in these words:

I am not asking the gentleman from Texas. I am addressing the question to the gentleman who has the floor.

The gentleman from Texas then replied by stating he did not question any specific item the gentleman from Kansas mentioned, but presumed he, the gentleman from Kansas, was on the floor at that time to point them out, and that he wondered if a concerted effort was made to defeat the appropriation that the gentleman from Kansas said was unnecessary and harmful. And he further said he did not know whether or not it was.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas then proceeded to say that he did offer amendments to strike these items from the bill. Upon recollection, the gentleman from Kansas says he offered the amendment to strike the item of \$50,000 to the Committee on Appropriations handling the bill, but that the same or identical amendment was offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] on the floor of the House. The gentleman from Kansas supported the amendment and spoke for it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas did say he objected to the item of \$50,000 and the item for the continuance of a travel bureau in our Government, not because they had no value but because they were not needed in the prosecution of the war. It should be understood, too, that the item of \$50,000 was a small part of a total of \$6,871,775 that was under consideration for Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. Speaker, there was no intention to seem to criticize the gentleman as to