

whose parents are so situated. But statistics show that four out of every five persons are unable to provide for themselves in old age, so I feel certain many of my colleagues will understand me when I say that even among the Members of this body there are those who will reach old age without sufficient income to provide for themselves.

I happen to know of a specific case in which my colleagues may be interested. The widow of a former well-known attaché of the House from Ohio, who now lives in Washington, is on the verge of going to the public welfare to seek old-age assistance. If she goes there, she will receive not more than \$30 a month, and she has been a woman in splendid circumstances. Her husband, connected with an important committee of the House, took her traveling the world over. They owned a fine home in Washington. They had excellent furniture. They had a good automobile. They enjoyed life and had all that anyone could wish for. Old age might have been a pleasant sunset for them.

However—and, Mr. Speaker, this can happen to any of us, and does happen to many industrious, patriotic Americans—the husband, whom many of the older Members knew, died. Financial reverses came for his widow with the depression, and only a few weeks ago she saw many of her cherished possessions placed on the auction block to satisfy a storage charge. She is now making an effort to find a rooming house so that she can support herself until her death.

Gentlemen, this thing called old-age poverty stretches out its grasping claw toward you and every American—little or big. Yet it is all so unnecessary, and you and I have the power, working together as we should as the Representatives of the greatest nation on earth, to enact a law which will provide true security in old age for every American.

There are those who doubtless will say that this is not the time to provide security for the American people. We are at war.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are at war—and we wage war to give to the world the freedoms which God in His heaven meant that everyone should have. We have the great words of a great and noble President that we fight to establish "four freedoms" on earth—and one of these is the freedom from want.

If we cannot do this now in America, how can we hope to give such a heritage to the world? Our aims will be empty, hollow words of mockery if we cannot establish here in America that cardinal and basic freedom—freedom from want.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge this House to concern itself with the enactment of a new Magna Carta—a law to establish a sound old-age insurance system. It concerns us all personally—it concerns our own families and it concerns our neighbors back home who are looking to this body to give them real security.

There is before the House a bill to give us this security. It has been before the Ways and Means Committee for over a year, and a petition now bearing 172 signatures is on the Speaker's desk which

seeks the discharge of the committee and consideration of this measure by the House as a Committee of the Whole. The bill is H. R. 1036 and the petition is No. 7.

Let me urge my colleagues to sign this discharge petition so that we may have the opportunity to give consideration to this very important piece of legislation. All of us—and this matter is not a partisan issue—have the right to pass this bill and to give to the American people a law of such great value that we will be blessed by every citizen in the country for passing it. In America can this great freedom from want be established. I ask my colleagues to sign discharge petition No. 7 today.

### Be Not Deceived

SPEECH  
OF

**HON. HAROLD KNUTSON**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1942

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a terrific drive was recently opened by a group of eastern radicals to purge Congress of those Senators and Representatives who openly opposed President Roosevelt's foreign policy prior to Pearl Harbor and who are opposed to communism and fascism in America. The movement is well financed, and if we may believe the press, nothing will be left undone to bring about retirement to private life those who have placed America first and oppose subversive activities in the United States. As I understand it, the movement has the blessings of high administration officials and also the international banking crowd in New York, who are the same kind of folks that backed Hitler and Stalin when they were laying their plans to seize control.

Judging by reports from back home, these superpatriots are not making much headway in their program to make over America along the lines of communism, nazi-ism, and fascism. As a matter of fact, the movement has already stalled so the internationalists will be looking for another issue before long. Just why did the program to purge noninterventionist and America-first Senators and Representatives peter out? There are several reasons: First, the American people are not as dumb as the internationalists thought; second, the noninterventionist Senators and Representatives were but reflecting the sentiments of their people when they repeatedly voted against the President's foreign policy. They saw that it was slowly but surely dragging America into the war. The folks back home remember how they had repeatedly been assured that repeal of the Neutrality Act would keep us out of the war, and they have not forgotten how they had been assured again, and again, and again, that passage of the lend-lease bill was also necessary to keep America out of the war. They feel that

someone slipped something over on them and are resentful as a result. Now that we are in the war they are most alert to the necessity for winning the war as quickly as possible, and they are putting every effort and every resource into the task. Letters they write me indicate that they feel very strongly the need for winning a decisive victory, but they are resentful over the efforts of the internationalists to divide us into fors and againsts now that we need unity. They view with suspicion many of those who are shouting the loudest because they remember how before the German invasion of Russia these same superpatriots were for keeping out of the war because Stalin was a friend of Hitler. When those precious friends of humanity fell out they swung completely about. Of course, they did not fool anyone but themselves. We know them for what they were and are. The leopard cannot change his spots.

But let me get back to the political angle of the movement. The superpatriots are in reality gunning for those who have fought subversive activities in this country rather than for noninterventionists. Now, why do I say that, and upon what evidence is that statement made? If you will go over the purge list recently published, you will see such names as Congressmen E. E. Cox, of Georgia; MARTIN DIES, of Texas; and JOE STARNES, of Alabama, all loyal Americans and Democrats who supported 100 percent the President's foreign policy, but, on the other hand, have been most active in fighting communism, nazi-ism, and fascism in America—see reports of Dies committee. On the other hand, they have omitted from the purge list Representative MARCANTONIO, who voted against everything until Russia got on the other side. There you have the entire plot, stripped of all falsehood and deceit; all who are against communism must be defeated.

I think it may be said without successful contradiction that the rural press—small dailies and weekly papers—more nearly reflect the hopes and aspirations of the American people than do the large metropolitan dailies, because their editors daily rub elbows with the man on the street and he better knows how Mr. Average Citizen thinks and feels than can the editorial writers on the larger newspapers, who must of necessity get their information indirectly. I have here three editorials from three leading Minnesota weekly newspapers that I wish to have inserted as a part of my remarks. My reason for doing so is that they express the majority views of the folks back home much better than I can hope to do:

[From the Long Prairie Leader]

LET US HAVE THE WHOLE RECORD

The State League of Women Voters announces that it will circularize the State, giving the record votes of Minnesota Congressmen on war measures as part of a campaign it is to conduct to defeat all the present Congressmen from the State.

No Member of Congress will object, we are sure, to a statement of his votes in Congress, provided the record is complete. The voters are imposed upon, however, if only a few of

the votes are given, and the fairness of any such campaign effort is open to question.

The Leader, for instance, was critical of some of the votes cast by Minnesota Congressmen and Senators on war measures, but the record of the State's delegation the past 10 or 12 years on the issues of domestic policy, opposition to bureaucracy, opposition to extravagance, opposition to centralization of government, and consistent support of progressive policies of efficiency and economy, is so 100-percent good and represents what we think has been so completely the sentiment and wishes of the large majority of their constituents that when a balance is struck we are most decidedly for the State's congressional delegation.

This attempt which the league is going to make to capitalize the war spirit in an effort to defeat all of our Congressmen, is not only unfair but short-sighted. This war is not going to last forever and when it is over our domestic problems are coming right back again for consideration. We think the present congressional delegation, tried and proved as it is, will represent State sentiment and represent it better than any new delegation, particularly if the new delegation is elected on an appeal that will be forgotten as the country returns, where it left off, to the problems of our domestic economy.

For 10 or a dozen years, the record of Minnesota Congressmen on the important issues of the day has been constructive and distinctly in line with Minnesota sentiment. Expressions of pride in the record have been common and votes of approval at elections have been continuous. This, we think, is what the people of the State will take into account in selecting Congressmen this fall—not the unfortunate appeal to prejudice which the ladies of the league, it seems, are about to make.

And by the way and wholly apart from the congressional elections, isn't this the wrong time to try and start a political campaign on the issue of the war? Will it promote unity and good spirit? How many bonds will it sell? The ladies would be the last, we are sure, to impugn the loyalty of any of the State's Congressmen. Then why start a campaign that is certain to provoke bitterness, hard feeling, and ugly cleavage when the only basis for the campaign is one that boils down to an honest difference of opinion—a difference of opinion shared by hundreds of thousands of Minnesota citizens?

The Leader cannot help but think the good ladies of the league have been badly advised.

[From the Wadena Pioneer Journal]

#### DON'T BE HOODWINKED

Recently the Minneapolis press published data recording how the Minnesota congressional delegation voted on certain issues set up as a yardstick for measuring the stature of representatives. It is all well and good to compare, and by so doing strike a comparative idea on the fitness of a certain object or individual. But when it comes to comparing the patriotic qualities of a person when in the free course of his deliberations he chooses to use his constitutional right in free representation of his constituents even though he may cross the whims of the powers that be, it is going too far.

An editorial appearing in the Brainerd Journal-Press last week diagnosed the issues at hand in excellent manner, and we publish it verbatim:

"It is all very well for the metropolitan press to publish data showing how the Minnesota delegation voted on certain pre-war measures, but it is not dealing fairly with these men when it uses such data to imply that they were remiss in their patriotic duty or blind to the best interests of their country. It is no more fair to accuse them of political sins of commission or omission than it would be to accuse the President and the rest of

Congress of disloyalty for not putting a prompt stop to the shipment of high-octane gasoline and scrap iron to Japan. God knows that was the worst crime committed in this present war.

"A far more fair check on the loyalty and patriotism of the Minnesota Congressmen would be their voting records after the Pearl Harbor incident.

Why all this quibbling over the issues of isolation and intervention? Let the very, very dead past bury its dead. The future hangs too heavily with grave possibilities to warrant the waging of a congressional campaign based on reprisals and on intolerance of any political ideas at variance with those emanating from official Washington.

The conduct of this war would not be improved one iota by any change in the Minnesota congressional delegation. These men—every one of them—are giving wholehearted and intelligent support to the country's war program. They are just as anxious as President Roosevelt to see that this terrible conflict be brought to a successful conclusion.

The real issue in this campaign should be the status of this country after the war. We should be asking: Are the liberties we have forfeited to help carry on this war to be forfeited forever? Are the extraordinary powers vested in the executive branch of our Government to remain permanently or is this country again going to become one of checks and balances? Are the communistic influences, made brazen since Russia became our ally, going to continue swaying our governmental affairs? Are we going to give free reign to all international trends that threaten the integrity and prosperity of our Nation?

Now, as never before, do we need men of independence and positive convictions—men who are not afraid to express themselves emphatically regardless of which way the political tide is turning. Don't be misled by dead issues. The Minnesota congressional delegation is tried, true, and patriotic.

[From the Montevideo News]

#### WILL THERE BE TWO LISTS?

Publicity is being given to a list of alleged mistakes by Members of Congress—how they voted in 1939, 1940, and 1941, before December 7. This is part of a move to put them out of office in 1942. The list gives votes on questions put before the legislature on war matters mostly.

Will there be a similar list giving alleged mistakes by members of the administrative side of the Government? This, too, could be a long record.

Is there much point now in hashing over old stuff? Critics of Congressmen and Senators believe there is. If so, there is just as much point in having critics of Presidents, Cabinet members, generals, and admirals dig up and publish the record of things said and methods used by them in the years before Pearl Harbor.

No matter how many mistakes Congressmen may have made, they are not alone. As for now, progress in winning the war is not made by looking backward.

### Flag Day Address by Hon. Alf M. Landon

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 15, 1942

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD the address delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon at the Elks Lodge Flag Day meeting at Marshalltown, Iowa, on June 14, 1942.

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

#### KEEPING OUR HEADS

Tonight our flag is flying on battlefields from Greenland's icy mountains to India's coral strands.

But over Corregidor the flag no longer flies. There its guns are silent. Its brave warriors are gone. Their heroic fighting is done.

Our fight is just beginning. We must all pull together in order to raise the flag once more over that island fortress.

If the flag is to continue as the emblem of our national sovereignty, it must be the emblem of national unity and tolerance, as well as the emblem of our strength, courage, patience, and common sense.

Willingness to defy fate and fortune is one of our national characteristics. We can stand the long pull. With God's help we must learn to pull together now as never before. It is an idle dream for us to think we can bring harmony in the world if we cannot adjust, among ourselves, our own frictions and animosities.

I am astounded and discouraged by the narrow, bigoted views taken toward labor unions by many people and by the equally narrow bigoted views taken by some labor leaders toward the problems of labor security. I mean security for organized labor and the public against racketeers as well as labor-baiting industrialists.

Another stupendous problem ahead is racial relations. The war has removed many racial limitations on the Negro, which will never be replaced. Failure to adjust ourselves to the economic as well as the citizen rights of the Negro, along with labor problems, suspicion by the New Deal of business and by business of the New Deal may well rack our country to pieces.

Our approach to these changing conditions could make or break the Republic. There will always be an America. But the great question is, Can we maintain the Republic or shall we pave the way for the man on horseback? Whatever else comes out of this war, man will have a wider outlook and broader scope for his activities only if we preserve the ideals of our Republic.

The battle is passing from the production front to the line of fire on sea and land. The fight is growing in intensity each week. However cheering the production rate, and the current reports from the front, expectations of final victory, soon, must not again delude us into underestimating our enemy's strength. We are fighting a war for our very existence. We have been scored on in every inning. We must rely only on our own efforts to produce victory, and not on any possible weakness of our enemies.

When I called on the President last February to pay my respects, I asked him if there was anything I could say that would be helpful. The President said: "The great problem is ships." It still is ships, despite the great increase in American ship construction. That is because the total world sinkings of the United Nations' ships have been greater for nearly 3 years than construction of ships. We are millions of tons of shipping behind September 1939.

Without the necessary quantity of shipping we cannot adequately strengthen our many expeditionary forces, scattered from the Arctic Ocean to south of the Equator. Without still more shipping we cannot furnish the wealth of material we are producing to our brave, hard-fighting allies. Our supplies are needed on every front, and only ships can take them there.