

do these people defend H
he is not one of them?

I have noted, as have ^{many} others, that the Attorney General has set out upon a large program of prosecuting newspapers, periodicals, and so forth, for sedition. Included in this program are many individuals. Of course, I do not know all the facts in connection with these cases, but will say this, that wherever any sedition or treason exists, I will always commend and congratulate the Attorney General for protecting this country's interests. All the facts should be brought out in connection with these matters and handled upon their merit, without any political consideration whatsoever.

My stand is definitely known to Members of this House. I have fought the Nazis just as hard as I have fought the Communists, as well as the Fascists and all the teachers of the philosophy of Karl Marx, and the encroachment of any of them upon our American form of government as I have known it. The record will show this. It was I who signed the affidavit for the cancelation of Fritz Kuhn's citizenship, protested his release from prison, and made the statement that the bund had no place in this country with its pledge of allegiance first to Hitler, as against allegiance to this country. With that purpose in mind, I want to publicly ask some questions in regard to this whole program.

The first question is, Why is it that certain people seem to have immunity against prosecution, no matter how seditious their expressions and their actions may have been and continue to be? How is it that certain of these people appear to have protection from high official sources? In this connection, I am going to ask these questions specifically, with reference to Harry Bridges, and wish to place a few facts in the Record.

Why has Harry Bridges not been prosecuted for perjury, in view of the fact that he executed three affidavits in connection with his citizenship, with reference to his marriage date, none of which agree? The Attorney General has these facts in his possession, and at least two out of three must be lies, because they are presumed to answer the same question. Now, the Attorney General has in his possession evidence in Harry Bridges' own handwriting that should convict him, but still no prosecution on this account has ever been forthcoming.

I agree thoroughly with the Attorney General of the United States prosecuting every individual, every newspaper, every periodical, or any or every thing in fact, that is seditious or treasonable, and I do not think we should split hairs in so doing, and I do not believe anyone should be favored in any manner whatsoever, and that the laws should be enforced with equal justice to everyone and everything. Now, in this connection, why does not the Attorney General go back and review and take action on Harry Bridges' whole record? Does he see fit to forget that Harry Bridges actually destroyed the shipping industry on the Pacific coast, and has crippled it in many other places?

Does not the Attorney General realize that shipping and the merchant marine

are most important factors in our war effort today? Why, then, this lack of action against this man, who has struck right at the heart of our war effort?

Why does the Attorney General refuse to take cognizance of Bridges' statement that any sabotage occurring in the shipping industry or the merchant marine should be reported to Bridges, and not to duly authorized officers of the land? This in itself is sedition, and violates a very specific law covering this matter. Does the Attorney General believe that airplane production is an important factor in our war effort? If he does, why does he choose to forget that Harry Bridges supported Freytag, the self-confessed Communist, in his abortive effort to destroy production at the North American plant in my district? Why does the Attorney General seek to forget, or not inform himself, that Bridges supported this abortive strike, even after the troops of the United States took this plant over, and was willing to fight the Government itself?

Why does the Attorney General refuse to take cognizance of the statements placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, about Harry Bridges and the conspiracy to commit murder, placed there by Arthur Anderson, former district attorney in St. Louis, who was well qualified by his position to know that which constituted conspiracy to murder?

These are only a few, and a very few, of the highlights of the seditious statements and actions of Harry Bridges. My people on the Pacific coast and many throughout the United States know that Harry Bridges has been thousands of times more seditious, and committed more treasonable acts, than many of the people whom the Attorney General is now prosecuting, and right here I want to state that I have no brief to make nor defense for any of these who have been prosecuted who have been guilty.

Why have Madam Perkins and all in her Department defended this man?

Why has not the F. B. I. been supported through the courts? Many of us greeted the transfer of this Bureau from the jurisdiction of Madam Perkins to the Attorney General with much hope. Were these false hopes, Mr. Attorney General?

Action was asked against this man while he still could be deported, and perhaps he still can, to Australia, and we do not propose to be fooled now by the statement that there is no place to send him. As a matter of fact, in answer to this question there are many Federal prisons and concentration camps where he can be placed. Mr. Attorney General, why this favoritism? During this crisis of war the President of the United States has asked for a nonpartisan, nonpolitical consideration in every single one of our actions, and I ask you, therefore, that any political pressure that may have been present in the past should now be waived and this man should be placed where he belongs.

The people of this country are not children and are not going to be fooled with any weak-kneed, mealy-mouthed excuses as to why this man is still being protected. His reputation is generally

known and his acts are known. Neither can he now come out and fool the American people by his offer to cooperate, when we know that his fundamental philosophy is to get as close as he can to the picture, and occupy a position as high as he can, all the better to destroy us and to bore from within. Our whole Nation and particularly the people in California are not going to be fooled by his statements and professions of help, because they know him only too well and feel that he is much worse than the Japanese peace group, who sat here in Washington and made the same kind of professions only to attack us in their treacherous manner without warning. The people of this country cannot look with complacent confidence upon you and your office as long as this discrimination and favor are shown to this man Bridges. The fact are too well known and they cannot be covered up.

Mr. Attorney General, the eyes of this whole country are upon you and are going to be kept there, particularly in California, to see whether you have enough red American blood in your body and the intestinal fortitude to do your duty in this matter, as, by tradition, we have been taught to expect a Federal official to do his duty. This is up to you and don't you ever believe that we are going to let you forget this situation for 1 minute.

Now I want to direct some remarks to the chairman of the Rules Committee.

I have written you, phoned you, and pleaded with you for a hearing before your committee on my resolution calling for a congressional investigation of this whole matter. I have gone to the individual members of the committee, and no less than 10 of these members have stated that this matter ought to be brought up but it was in the hands of the chairman. Mr. Chairman, you have stated from time to time that you would give me a hearing, but you never have.

I draw to your attention that when the Allen bill for the deportation of Bridges was brought up, the fight on the rule was carried some 363 to 20; that the bill was passed some 343 to 40. I believe this indicates the desire and temper of this House. I hesitate to think that a chairman of this committee, you are going to continue to deny a hearing that every Congressman in this House is entitled to have held. I have been patient but, after all, there is a limit to which that patience will extend. What are you going to do?

The article referred to from the Peoples' World of April 28, 1942, is as follows:

LELAND FORD FROTHS—BUT NOT AGAINST HITLER

Congressmen who should be changed this year include California's JOHN ANDERSON and LELAND M. FORD.

ANDERSON, from San Juan Bautista, has been an energetic Associated Farmers spokesman in the old days from the Associated Farmers was prominent as the leader of all reactionary forces in the State. His latest is a demand that there shall be no more cut in overtime for machinists, coupled with a lot of slander about unions delaying work during their 40 hours' straight time in order to do it on overtime rates.

...this year recently with a revival of the case on Harry Bridges and a demand that Attorney General Francis Biddle prosecute him for "seditious utterances and treason." Since it did not seem that Foss could possibly mean Bridges' challenge to employers in his recent Commonwealth Club speech to a "friendly rivalry to see whether capital or labor can do most to win the war," Congressmen listened patiently and finally found out what Foss had in mind was that Bridges be prosecuted for whatever the Marine Workers Industrial Union did to aid the 1934 waterfront strike.

(Neither the union nor anybody in it has ever been tried for treason, and it dissolved 8 years ago.)

V. S.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. HOUSTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be considered as read, but that this do not preclude the offering of amendments or points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments which relate to the same item, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HOUSTON:

On page 55, line 10, strike out "\$138,600" and insert "\$149,640."

On page 55, line 13, strike out "\$140,600" and insert "\$151,640."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, this morning the committee was notified that the W. P. A. workers at the home for the aged and infirm have been withdrawn. In order to supplement the deficiency appropriation for personnel, we are asking for a change in this amount to add 12 additional attendants there, which would make a total of 22, the number there before the W. P. A. workers were withdrawn. This amount covers payment to these workers at the rate of \$1,080 each, less \$160 subsistence for each.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 7, line 17, strike out "\$71,120" and insert "\$41,120."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman I am asking that this appropriation for the Public Utilities Commission be cut \$30,000.

I understand the committee has already cut this appropriation over \$17,000. I do not think you have cut him enough. I trust you will adopt this amendment.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has made a good case for the record, but I think

this is the wrong way to approach this subject. I think it should go through the House legislative committee on the District of Columbia.

We have already eliminated from this item \$17,395. We cut the total request of \$88,000 by over \$17,000. We did allow one chauffeur. I think as far as curtailing the appropriation is concerned we have done all that we are justified in doing at this time.

The scope of the duties and activities of the Commission is enormous. There are many things they have to do. If the gentleman from Ohio will take time to look at the justifications on page 74, he will see what this Commission does have to do.

I think the amendment should be defeated and that the matter should be taken up with the House Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia. I ask for a vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I simply want to state to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] that the committee is in favor of all these investigations in order to protect the public.

Mr. VOORHIS of California: I appreciate that.

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly the gentleman from California does not infer that the committee was opposing any investigation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not at all. I do not think I said anything that gave that impression. I understood the gentleman to say that the committee had favored the investigations; had taken the position that it was possible for them to go ahead, and everything else. All my remarks were to indicate was that I appreciated the gentleman's service in these hearings as well as that of other members of the committee and that I hoped the investigation will be a thorough one, because it seems to me that the facts brought out by the committee are indicative of the fact that we do need such an investigation.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. I merely want the record to show the committee wants always to protect the interests of the public.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is there anything in this investigation that would apply to the holding companies running taxicabs in the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEFAN. I assume when Mr. Hankin and Mr. Flannagan get together they will make an investigation of all of the public utilities wherever investigations are necessary. The public is entitled to know all facts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

...what I wish to say is not in criticism of the committee, but more in explanation.

I know it is contended that we have cheap electric light and power rates in the District of Columbia. That is true for the higher brackets. That is true for the first 50 or 100 kilowatt-hours per month. When you get beyond that, however, you are going to find that the rates are exorbitant. You will find the commercial consumers, the merchants, the hotel operators, the cafe and cafeteria operators, the filling station people and others who pay commercial rates, are greatly overcharged for their electricity.

The company is making about 60 or 65 percent a year on its common stock. The reason it is able to do that is that we have not permitted them to pile up vast useless holding companies on top of the Potomac Electric Power Co. Let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] that a large portion of this power comes from the Susquehanna River. If you will search the record you will find that power is laid down wholesale in the District of Columbia at something like 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. I live 75 or 100 miles from the Tennessee River, the way the line runs. In my town we buy power at 5 mills per kilowatt-hour wholesale. If the rates over the country, if the people in the State of Pennsylvania, for instance, received their electricity at the same retail rates that we do in Tupelo, Miss., they would save about \$80,000,000 a year on their light and power bills alone.

If you will strip all these holding companies off of the private power companies of the Nation and see that electricity is delivered to the people at rates that provide only reasonable returns on legitimate investments, you will save the American people at least a billion dollars a year on their light and power bills on the present load.

We are just in the edge of the electric age. From this day forward our domestic, our commercial, and our industrial life will be geared to a power economy. The importance, the prosperity and the progress of every city, town, and community will be governed largely by the availability of its electric power and the rates that people have to pay for it.

When I came to Congress we were using 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year throughout the country. That is how much was sold to the electric consumers annually. Last year there were sold 160,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. This year it will be above 200,000,000,000. By the turn of the century, by the dawn of the year 2000, I predict that the American people will be using a trillion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

We are just in the beginning, lagging far behind other nations in rural electrification, in the electrification of the farm homes of the Nation, as well as in rate reduction.

Here is the place where we should set an example in holding down light and power rates, here in the Nation's Capital.

I hope the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia will see to it

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD].

WHY "BIDDLE" WHILE THE COUNTRY BURNS?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I shall, later, in the House, ask unanimous consent to revise and extend these remarks and include an article from the People's World, resenting the attack that I made upon Harry Bridges. I am advised, after checking with the Dies committee, that this is the official Communist organ on the Pacific coast.

I particularly call this to the attention of Attorney General Biddle. This is only one more proof of Bridges' Communist connection, not that any more should be needed, but here is just another. Why