

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 158, transferring the management of the Senate restaurants to the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes. This resolution transfers the management of the Senate restaurants to the Architect of the Capitol and does other things. I presume it is something that should be done, and I ask for its immediate consideration. The joint resolution is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc. That effective September 15, 1942, the management of the Senate Restaurants and all matters connected therewith heretofore under the direction of the Senate Committee on Rules shall be under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol under such rules and regulations as the Architect may prescribe for the operation and the employment of necessary assistance for the conduct of said restaurants by such business methods as may produce the best results consistent with economical and modern management, subject to the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules as to matters of general policy: *Provided*, That the management of the Senate Restaurants by the Architect of the Capitol shall cease and the restaurants revert from the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol to the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Rules upon adoption by that committee of a resolution ordering such transfer of jurisdiction at any time hereafter.

Sec. 2. The Committee on Rules after the close of business September 15, 1942, is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol all accounts, records, supplies, equipment, and assets of the Senate Restaurants that may be in the possession or under the control of the said committee in order that all such items may be available to the Architect of the Capitol toward the maintenance and operation of the Senate Restaurants.

Sec. 3. The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to carry into effect for the United States Senate the provisions of this Act and to exercise the authorities contained herein, and any resolution of the Senate amendatory hereof or supplementary hereto hereafter adopted. Such authority and direction shall continue until the United States Senate shall by resolution otherwise order, or until the Senate Committee on Rules shall by resolution order the restaurants to be returned to the committee's jurisdiction.

Sec. 4. There is hereby established with the Treasurer of the United States a special deposit account in the name of the Architect of the Capitol for the United States Senate Restaurants, into which shall be deposited all sums received pursuant to this act or any amendatory or supplementary resolutions hereafter adopted and from the operations thereunder and from which shall be disbursed the sums necessary in connection with the exercise of the duties required under this act or any amendatory or supplementary resolutions and the operations thereunder. Any amounts hereafter appropriated from the Treasury of the United States for such restaurants shall be a part of the appropriation "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" for the particular fiscal year involved, and each such part shall be paid to the Architect of the Capitol by the Secre-

tary of the Senate in such sum as such appropriation or appropriations shall hereafter specify and shall be deposited by such Architect in full under such special deposit account.

Sec. 5. Deposits and disbursements under such special deposit account (1) shall be made by the Architect, or, when directed by him, by such employees of the Architect as he may designate, and (2) shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may direct: *Provided*, That payments made by or under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol from such special deposit account shall be conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

Sec. 6. The Architect, Assistant Architect, and any employees of the Architect designated by the Architect under section 5 hereof shall each give bond in the sum of \$5,000 with such surety as the Secretary of the Treasury may approve for the handling of the financial transactions under such special deposit account.

Sec. 7. This act shall supersede any other acts or resolutions heretofore approved for the maintenance and operation of the Senate Restaurants: *Provided, however*, That any acts or resolutions now in effect shall again become effective, should the restaurants at any future time revert to the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Rules.

Passed the Senate August 27, 1942.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter I wrote to the editor of my local paper stating my views on current issues.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the assurances given by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia that the soldiers' voting bill will be handled with all possible expedition is gratifying to those who have been anxious to see this legislation enacted.

Self-government can survive only by safeguarding the right to vote. That right is guaranteed to all citizens under the Constitution. Today we are at war—a war which will determine not only the right of our own people to govern themselves but which will also decide the fate of free institutions throughout the world. The war in which we are engaged is not a war of 48 separate States. It is a war of one nation—a war of a united people—a war which has fused sectional interests into a common purpose, the defeat of dictators, the triumph of freemen.

We have established a far-flung battlefront. Our ships hold lifelines on the seven seas. Our pilots navigate their planes in the frozen Arctic wastes and in

the torrid Tropics. Our soldiers endure hardships in a world-wide war. The manhood of America, untrammelled by intolerance and unsullied by bigotry, stands guard on this far-flung front to protect freemen and the way of a free life.

Every segment of our social structure supplies a part of the strength of our forces. It must be so if the might of our ideal is to master the torture of tyranny. A courage which is inspired by a broad tolerance that rejects all thought of class or creed or race, a tolerance peculiarly our own, has challenged the defy of dictatorships. A united nation, not a sectional nation, should sustain that courage.

We have the opportunity today to stimulate that courage. We can bury differences which have divided the Nation in the past. We can tear down barriers founded on age-old prejudices and propped up by hostility and hate. We can put bullets and ballots on a par. Dare we do less? Shall we transmit to an American soldiery that accepts a common duty and shares a common danger a message that breathes an hostility and that embraces a prejudice? Shall we make that soldiery a soldiery of separate States? Shall we say to a son of Pennsylvania at the battle front, you may cast a ballot and deny that right to another because he happens to come from Virginia? Shall we permit poll taxes to be a wedge of separation? Shall we threaten the right of every soldier to vote by attempting to impose restrictions on a comparatively small number?

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, our duty is clear—to safeguard the survival of self-government. We can bring no better contribution to this cause than a spirit of tolerance and a determination to give to every citizen who is a soldier a badge which all can share in common—the right to cast a ballot in the free election of a free people.

(Mr. DITTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is recognized for 20 minutes.

HOW LONG?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, a Chicago grand jury has found that the Chicago Tribune did not violate the Espionage Act when it published confidential naval information about the Midway battle.

I will have more to say about that later on.

But in the proceedings, the Chicago Tribune convicted itself of practicing a journalistic confidence game, along with its fellow partners of the vermin press, the Washington Times-Herald and the New York Daily News.

Robert McCormick blandly pleaded, in defense of his newspaper stories, that they were not culled from naval-intelligence documents. Although the story stated that it was based on information received from naval intelligence and was printed under a Washington date line, the Chicago Tribune said that was just done to deceive its readers.

The Pattersons and the McCormicks are very quick with the word "liar."

They even use it to describe themselves.

McCormick went even further. He said that the fakery practiced by the Chicago Tribune was "common practice and newspapermen all over the United States follow it."

McCormick has his countries mixed up. He is thinking of the land of the Nazis where Dr. Goebbels cooks up the news to suit the needs of Nazi propaganda without any regard for the truth whatsoever.

It is just another case illustrating the close parallel between the Nazi mind and the inner workings of McCormick and his cousins the Pattersons.

The American press has rightfully resented this assault on its integrity. Honest editors everywhere have protested against being tarred with the brush of Patterson-McCormick journalism. Real newspapers do not fake stories.

Mr. Speaker, the McCormick-Patterson papers screamed bloody murder that they were being persecuted when the Government began its investigation of the Midway battle story. They were being framed, they squealed, that dictator—Roosevelt—was sending them to a concentration camp any minute. Democracy was dead; freedom of the press was dead; tyranny was enthroned—and justice had become a mockery.

That was the wall of the Chicago Tribune, the Washington Times-Herald, and the New York Daily News.

I can just picture their friend, Hitler, with whom they so love to compare our President, to the latter's disadvantage, taking a case to the grand jury and letting the potential defendants testify before that grand jury.

Any German who, however innocently, gave military information to his country's enemies in this war, would not live to see the next sunrise.

But, this case went to the grand jury, and the grand jury found that the Tribune had violated no law—and no bill of indictment was returned.

But, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the military branches of the Government wanted a true bill returned?

We are fighting this war for democracy in a democratic way, Mr. Speaker. We are preserving our ancient liberties at home while we fight to safeguard them against our enemies.

A bill of indictment means a public trial, Mr. Speaker. A public trial means public testimony. And public testimony in a court of law, with skilled counsel representing the defendants, means that military secrets, however vital, must be revealed if they are relevant to the defense of those accused.

It is public knowledge that the Tribune story, published also in the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald, tipped off the Japanese high command that somehow our Navy had secured and broken the secret code of the Japanese Navy.

That is a priceless advantage in war—to know your enemy's plans through your knowledge of his code.

Three days after the Tribune story was published, the Japs changed their code.

Through the unthinking and wicked misuse of freedom of the press, by the Tribune, our side had been deprived of a military advantage of enormous utility.

American boys will die, Mr. Speaker, because of the help furnished our enemies by Joe Patterson, Robert McCormick, and Eleanor Patterson through the Chicago Tribune, the New York Daily News, and the Washington Times-Herald.

I have this thought, Mr. Speaker: Is it not possible that when our naval officers and our legal officers sat down to work out their case against the Tribune, it became plain to them that the trial of the case would reveal, of necessity, how that code came into our possession and other secrets of naval intelligence—not already revealed by the traitorous triumvirate, the New York Daily News, the Washington Times-Herald, and the Chicago Tribune—which the Japs would gladly sacrifice a battleship to learn.

If that was the reasoning of the Government departments, I do not blame them for failing to use all the facts in connection with the Chicago Tribune and its publisher's treasonable conduct so that a true bill might be voted.

The governmental departments made the right choice. It is better to let Robert McCormick and his associates escape than to cost us a chance for further victories in our war against the treacherous scoundrels who attacked us without cause or warning.

But somewhere there is a weakness in our wartime structure if we lack protection against the repeated disclosure of military information by the vermin press of the Pattersons and McCormicks.

Three days before Pearl Harbor these jackals of journalism secured and published our master plan of war, delivered to the President under the signature of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff of the Army.

Secretary Stimson then told the country what he thought of the journalistic ethics of McCormick and the Pattersons. He said:

While their publication will doubtless be of gratification to our potential enemies—

In 2 days' time our enemies in war—and a possible source of impairment and embarrassment to our national defense, the chief evil of their publication is the revelation that there should be among us any group of persons so lacking in appreciation of the danger that confronts the country and so wanting in loyalty and patriotism to their Government that they should be willing to take and publish such papers.

Secretary Stimson said that on December 5, 1941.

On December 5, 1941, Robert McCormick and his associates were indicted by the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson.

Nine months have passed and they have been 9 months of war.

We have been attacked and we are beginning to strike back.

How long are we going to be stabbed in the back at home while our brave soldiers, sailors, and marines fight for our lives abroad?

Today, August 31, 1942, the Chicago Tribune, the Washington Times-Herald, and the New York Daily News, their publishers and those who follow their un-

American leadership, stand indicted before the bar of public opinion, and history will record that the publication of information of advantage to the enemies of America by the Chicago Tribune, the New York Daily News, and the Washington Times-Herald has immeasurably helped the enemies of our country.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman have any concrete suggestion to make? I was impressed by the fact that the gentleman has criticized as un-American certain great American newspapers. Does he have any concrete suggestion to offer wherein these newspapers have specifically given aid and comfort to Hitler, and particularly why does he say that these newspapers are friends of Hitler? I do not know Colonel McCormick and I hold no brief for him. He may be all that the gentleman says. But has the gentleman any proof that Colonel McCormick is a friend of Hitler's?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. All you have to do is read the editorials of the Chicago Tribune and compare them with the editorials—and I will be glad to show them to the gentleman from Pennsylvania—appearing in the French papers and the Austrian papers before Hitler conquered those countries. I have no interest in Colonel McCormick. I do not even know the gentleman. I do not know the Pattersons. All I ask them to do is to be Americans, to preach patriotism in the country in order to unite the country to stand behind our great Commander in Chief in this great peril, and to protect our boys who are on our battle fronts fighting for the rights you and I have today on the floor of this House.

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman has that proof, the proper service to the American people would be to waive his congressional immunity and submit that proof to a court of law, so that it can be properly established, because if Colonel McCormick is a friend of Hitler I want to know about it, I am sure the gentleman wants to know about it, and I am sure the country wants to know about it, but I think the proper place and the proper forum to decide such matters is the forum where the defendant has an opportunity to be heard and to answer.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and after that I will not yield any more. I have stated in one of my talks and read the editorials appearing in the McCormick-Patterson papers; they show them consciously or unconsciously to be a friend of Hitler. When a man's hate becomes so great that he hates a certain individual and loses all reasoning power, which I believe the Pattersons and Colonel McCormick have, they strike at our President, thereby aiding Hitler.

In using the floor of this House to expose to public light issues endangering our war effort, I am only doing what I was elected to do. The McCormick-Patterson papers do not give the administration side in any of the attacks they make.

Their paper is their medium. Congress, by the right given me by the people, is mine.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today under a reservation of the right to object and at that point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Young). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobbs]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Sabath]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of all other special orders today, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Patrick]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, last week in the course of an interview I was asked what I thought of the induction of young men between 18 and 19 years of age. I stated that it was my opinion, if and when a request for such legislation was submitted, that Congress would approve the induction of young men of 19 years of age. Some newspapers quoted me as favoring legislation to provide for the induction of young men 18 years of age, and they were in error in this respect. I did state that from all indications it might become necessary to induct young men 19 years of age and that I felt if such legislation was considered it would be enacted. I further stated in my interview at that time that I would rather see boys of 19 taken into service than married men with wives and children dependent upon them for support or men who are skilled technical workers engaged in the production of war materials which are so vitally needed by our armed forces. It has come to my attention that many men, with years of experience and technical ability, serving in key positions in war manufacturing plants, have been inducted, thereby slowing up production. Therefore, it is my contention that married men with dependents and men skilled in war production work should be deferred and younger men between the ages of 19, 20, and 21, who have demonstrated beyond any doubt that they are superior to older men, should be inducted. We have it from the very highest officers in every branch of our armed forces that the younger man is more easily trained and develop into better fighters, and it is my opinion that the young man of 20 excels the man of 25 years of age, and especially those of 25,

20, 25, or 30. We find in all athletic fields, college or professional, in baseball, football, boxing, and other athletic games that there is greater efficiency among the younger men. Men nearing 30 years of age cannot cope athletically with the young man of 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the mothers and fathers of boys of 18 and 19, although I do not favor reducing the age limit to 18 years, that it will take 6 months or more for registration and induction and a further period of 1 year to train them, and consequently they will be nearer 21 when they are ready for actual service. Further, the legislation will not be enacted for some time and, in view of the favorable reports which we are receiving, I hope that before these boys see service those men now fighting so valiantly in our armed forces will have eliminated Mr. Hitler, the Nazi, and the Japs and the war will be concluded.

Mr. Speaker, this country is entitled to the services of every able and capable man at this time. I hope no one will be so unpatriotic as to try to excuse himself from service. In that connection may I say that in some instances draft evaders are imprisoned for a year or more. I feel that they should be dealt with more severely and confined to jail for a longer period because, should the war be over within a year or two, they will then have been taken care of by the Government while the other boys have been serving.

I hold no brief and am not in favor of excusing a man from service who has recently married for the purpose of evading service. Such cases, I am satisfied, are receiving the real scrutiny of the draft boards, and when it is established that a marriage has been consummated with the object of draft deferment the boards make a proper classification.

I have observed that many service organizations composed of men of experience and seasoned veterans favor the induction of boys of 18 and 19. Just today I noticed the statement of Max Singer, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who has gone on record to that effect. In that connection, I desire to insert an article by Robertson, which I feel is enlightening on this subject. It reads:

CONGRESS WOULD VOTE "YES" IF F. D. R. INSISTED

Public sentiment for taking the 18- and 19-year-olds is rising as the draft reaches further into the ranks of married men. By next winter, Congress may be taking the initiative without waiting for the President. Except for political reasons, Congress would pass the law today. Military authorities seem agreed that 18- and 19-year-olds make excellent soldiers, and for some assignments are better than older men. It seems pretty silly to argue about upsetting their education. Most American boys are through school by 18. Only a minority goes on to college, and even for that minority the draft is not as upsetting as it is for married men who have begun to get themselves established in the world. Certainly it will be easier for these boys to return to school after the war than it will be for many men to get reestablished in their businesses and trades.

I also insert excerpts from an article by Wright which is one of many that has come to my attention which I feel gives

interesting facts on the subject at this time. I quote:

"I hear talk about 'taking babes from their mothers' arms.' Let me describe a few of these babes. The marines, all volunteers, that were the first upon the battle line; that went over the trenches with cheers upon their lips; that the officers could not hold back; that wrote a page of deathless glory in the latest battle of the Marne—the marines are 70 percent composed of these babes. Splendid, gallant babes they have proved themselves . . ."

Eighteen and nineteen year olds were drafted at the end of August 1918, but they'd scarcely begun their basic training before the war was over. None of them saw service overseas.

Military spokesmen today make no bones about the fact that they need—and want—18- and 19-year-olds. They give only one reason—18- and 19-year-olds make the best soldiers.

"We have never had a war in which it was not necessary to draft boys of 18 and 19." Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Director of Selective Service, said recently. "I expect we'll have to take them in this one."

"They are quick to learn," one military authority explains, "have all the energy in the world, and their actions are almost instinctive. Their reflexes are at their peak. And most important of all, they have remarkable recuperative powers. A boy of 18 can fight all day, sleep 2 hours, and be almost as good as new again. A man in his late twenties and early thirties can't do that. Another thing: 18- and 19-year-olds act immediately on orders; older men are slower and inclined to think twice."

To those who contend, as some Senators did in 1918 and as others undoubtedly will in 1942, that youths of 18 and 19 are not mature and therefore do not make as good soldiers as men over 21, the medical information bureau of the New York Academy of Medicine has this to say:

"There can be no doubt that boys from 18 to 20 make the best soldiers for modern warfare. This is unfortunate, perhaps, but true. Their physical stamina is at its peak. They have, in general, a high, almost reckless, type of courage. They lack premeditation and haven't developed the conservatism and sense of responsibility that a boy of 25 usually has. By peacetime rules, the boy of 25 is the better man; but the very things a boy of 18 to 20 lacks are, again perhaps unfortunately, the things that undoubtedly make him the better soldier."

Col. Arthur V. McDermott, director of selective service in New York, says: "From my own experience in the last war, these young men under 21 make good soldiers. For instance, under my command there were several corporals and sergeants 18 or 19 years of age. One of my best sergeants was only 17."

As one military man sums it up, from a qualitative point of view, the Army wants 18- and 19-year-olds because "the best way to win a war is to have a crack army and a crack army depends on having crack soldiers. The best potential soldiers in the country are the 18- and 19- and up to 21-year-old boys."

The Army's need of 18- and 19-year-olds quantitatively is not so clear-cut. The Army will not say, because there is nothing the Germans and Japs would rather know, whether there are enough men in the country to build the size Army it needs without drafting the 2,500,000 boys between 18 and 20.

WE MAY HAVE TO

Several times military men have said we will need between eight and ten million men to beat the Axis. On July 28 President Roosevelt reported there were 4,000,000 in our armed forces.

As one military man says of the eight-to-ten-million force: "If we're going to have an army that big, it's a cinch we'll have to draft