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 immediately on 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, 1943, the management of the Senate Restaurants and all matters connected therewith under the direction of the Senate Committee on Rules shall be under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol under such regulations as to the Architect may prescribe for the operation and the employment of necessary assistance for the conduct of said restaurants by such bodies as the Architect determines to be necessary in order to cause the 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 restoration to the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol to the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Rules upon approval by the Senate 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, 1943, is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to 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 accounts shall 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 amending heretofore adopted as 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 said restaurants to be returned to the committee's jurisdiction.

Sec. 4. There is hereby established with the revenues 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 receipts from said restaurants and from any resolution of the Senate amending heretofore adopted as supplementary hereto hereafter adopted and from any resolution thereon which shall be disburbed the same necessary in connection with the exercise of the duties required under this Act or any amendment or supplementary resolutions and the operation hereunder. Any amounts hereafter appropriated from the Treasury of the United States shall be paid into this account as part of the appropriation "Contingent Expenses of the Senate," for the particular fiscal year involved, and such such part shall be paid into the Architect of the Capitol by the Secretary 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 of the Capitol or by such employee or employees of the Architect as he may designate, and (2) shall be subject to the direction and control of the Architect 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 sign 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 hereafter approved for the Senate Restaurants: Provided, however, That any acts or resolutions now in effect shall remain in effect until such time as the Senate Committees on Rules shall again become effective, and that the Architect of the Capitol shall cease and any future time revert to the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Rules.

Passed the Senate August 27, 1943.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and the question of adoption thereon to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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 of a people driven into a common purpose, the defeat of dictators, the triumph of freedom.

We have established a far-flung battlefield. Our ships hold lifelines on the seven seas. Our pilots navigate their way to the torrid Tropics. Our soldiers endure hardships in a world-wide war. The manhood of America, untrammeled 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 dictators. Is our 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. As we do so, shall we transmit to an American soldier that accepts a common duty and shares a common danger a message that breathes an hostility and that embraces a prejudice? 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 we do so, 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 purposes.

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.

But in the proceedings, the Chicago Tribune convicted itself of practicing a journalistic confidence game, along with its unwholesome fellow, the vermin press, as the "Chicago Tribune" of 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 sources but from other publications, and that the newspaper stories were not based on information received from naval intelligence and was printed under a Washington date line, the Chicago Tribune said that it 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.

I do not blame the noble gentleman from Pennsylvania, and after that I will not yield any more. I have stated in one of my talks and read the newspapers that appeared in the 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 the Nazi propaganda with which they so love to compare our military information by the vermin press.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Youmans). 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. Garam)?

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.

Mr. 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. Garam) 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 I thought 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 they are 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 a hardship to the Army. When 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 Sneider, Director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who has gone on record to that effect. In that connection, I desire to insert an article by Robert McDermott, director of Selective Service, which I feel is enlightening on this subject:

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 younger men. By next winter, Congress may be taking the initiative without waiting for the President. Exceptions 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. They are old enough to go to college, and even for that minority the draft is not as upsetting as it is for married men. It is not so upsetting when they 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 have come to my attention which I feel gives interesting facts on the subject at this time. I quote:

"I hear talk about 'taking babies from their mothers' arms.' Let me describe a few of the babies. They are the 18- and 19-year-olds that were the first on the battle line; that went over the trenches with cheers upon them; that the Government could not hold back; that wrote a page of history that will forever beyll. The latest battle of the Marine—the marines are 70 percent composed of these babies. Gallipoli, Gallipoli. They have proved themselves * * * * ."

EIGHTEEN AND NINETEEN YEAR OLDS WERE OF THE INGLORY AT THE END AND THE ONLY VICTORY in the latest battle 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."—Gen. Lewis.

They lack girth. They lack recuperative powers. A boy of 18 can fight day, sleep 2 hours, and be as good as new the next day. A man of 20 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 1916 and as others undoubtedly will in 1942, youths of 18-20 are needed 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 self-control and haven't developed the conservatism and sense of responsibility that a boy of 20 usually has. They are, however, not quick or good enough soldiers; 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, the young men under 21 make good soldiers. For instance, under my command there were several cases where older men and younger men of 18 and 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 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 is not new.

The Army will not say, because there is nothing to suggest it, that the 18-20-year-old has not the energy, the will to win, and has never had a war in which that was the case. The men I am describing were the first on the battle line; that went over the trenches with cheers upon them; that the Government could not hold back; that wrote a page of history that will forever be.