

September  
1939

# National Issues

A SURVEY OF POLITICS AND LEGISLATION

Review of the 76th Congress

The U.S.S.R. and Non-Aggression

BY EARL BROWDER

How Your Congressman Voted

COMPLETE TABULATION ON ALL MAJOR ROLL CALLS

Young  
Democracy

AN EDITORIAL

Mr. Dies  
Rubs Elbows

BY PEGGY DUANE

15 CENTS A COPY

\$1.25 A YEAR

## EDITORIALS:

The Soviet Peace Move . . . . .	3
Young Democracy . . . . .	5
LESSONS FROM THE 76th CONGRESS . . . . . <i>Adam Lapin</i>	8
AMERICA AND THE NON-AGGRESSION PACT . . . . . <i>Earl Browder</i>	11
MR. DIES RUBS ELBOWS . . . . . <i>Peggy Duane</i>	15
SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATION BEFORE THE 76th CONGRESS . . . . .	17
HOW YOUR CONGRESSMAN VOTED . . . . .	22

## OCTOBER NUMBER

WHAT NEXT IN EUROPE? • THE FIFTH COLUMN IN THE NEW DEAL •  
 GARNER AND THE WHITE HOUSE • THE FEDERAL DEBT • TREASON  
 AND THE DIES COMMITTEE • 150th ANNIVERSARY OF THE BILL OF  
 RIGHTS • THE STATE CONVENTIONS OF THE A. F. of L.

NATIONAL ISSUES: *A Survey of Politics and Legislation*

*Editor:* GENE DENNIS. Published monthly by the National Committee, Communist Party, U. S. A. Single copies, fifteen cents; yearly subscription \$1.25. Editorial Offices, 35 East 12th Street, New York City. Address all business communications to: P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class matter February 27, 1939, at the Post Office at New York N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

# The Soviet Peace Move — An Editorial

It goes without saying that the non-aggression pact between the Soviet Union and Germany profoundly affects and aids not only the peace of the world but the specific national interests of the United States as well.

The voluminous chorus of dismay which has arisen in certain quarters as a result of the Soviet-German pact is a confession that this peace move has struck hard and sure at certain far-reaching Munich plans of the Chamberlain-Daladier forces in Europe and their eager collaborators among the pro-Axis cliques in the United States, and has disrupted and weakened the fascist axis, especially in the Far East.

As for the simulated disillusion, the well-acted hysterics, the calculated propaganda of anti-Soviet hate, we may well be sure that the authors of this torrent of distorted press reports know full well what the real facts of the pact are. The true facts of the situation are also rapidly becoming known to the people. By the time this issue has reached the hands of the reader the remarkable contribution which the Soviet pact makes to the safety of the world will have been even more fully grasped.

It goes without saying that the pact is no "reversal of policy." The pact is no "betrayal." The pact is not a pledge of joint aggression, or ideological collaboration, or any expression of merger in political thought, or any sort of such blatant nonsense as is now being shoveled into the ears of American public opinion.

The pact is simple. It is a non-aggression pact. It represents the culmination of the past and present efforts of the Soviet Union to maintain peaceful relations with any and all countries. It forces Hitler to retreat and compels him to pledge not to attack the Soviet Union. *In a single stroke, the pact drives a formidable spike into the scheme which had been the basis of Chamberlain's "appeasement" policy—to foment war between Germany and the Soviet Union.*

Hitler has been continuously urged to drive ahead with his military *Drang nach Osten*. It had been the deepest hope and aim of Chamberlain's betrayal of Czechoslovakia, Austria and Spain that Hitler would repay the British Tories for these victims by launching an assault against the Soviet Union from the West while the Axis partner in the Pacific, Japan, would strike simultaneously from the East. With his eyes staringly fixed on this bloody dream of conquest, Chamberlain had brushed aside every objection to his fatal "appeasement" which he had hoped would give strength to the Hitler war machine.

Despite every new appeasement, and particularly with an aroused world hostility to the proposed betrayal of Poland, the Hitler war machine found itself in a deeper crisis from which it could not extricate itself. Fascism was growing weaker. The Soviet Government sought to impress this fact on the deaf ears of the Chamberlain-Daladier governments and their delegations which deliberately dallied away the months in Moscow, stalling and obstructing the conclusion of a genuine anti-aggression pact with the Soviet Union on the basis of mutual aid and collective responsibilities.

It is a matter of indisputable record that the Soviet Government alone has proposed with uninterrupted insistence that economic sanctions and military actions, if necessary, be agreed upon by Britain, France, the U.S.S.R. and smaller nations against any and all aggression against independent states. This is why it proposed and sought to conclude a peace pact for curbing aggression with France and England.

But Mr. Chamberlain stalled, because he believed that he could execute a double-faced policy against the Soviet Union and world peace. He planned on carrying on "negotiations" with Moscow in order to placate an aroused public opinion which demanded collective security, while, at the same time, he attempted to press secretly for a new "appeasement" at the expense of Poland, with the aim of

driving toward that blessed goal of his policy—a German-Soviet war. At the same time this policy also found adherents even among certain Polish ruling circles which were ready to betray the national interest of Poland to advancing Axis conquest in the hope that they would share in the booty of a subjugated Soviet Ukraine later. This, at least, was what Chamberlain was whispering into their ears.

The extremely significant interview given out by the Commander of the Red Armies, Voroshilov (August 27), reveals that the Anglo-Soviet negotiations for a collective defense of peace were deliberately wrecked by Chamberlain and his satellites in Poland who, among other things, refused to permit military passage of the Soviet armies in the event of a Nazi attack on Poland. *The pro-Chamberlain circles in Poland were frightened at a too-adequate defense of the Polish nation. They broke off negotiations because they wanted a feeble defense of Poland, not a firm one.*

But, as Earl Browder put it in his radio interview on August 26 which is printed in this issue, Chamberlain did not have the "Soviet Union in his pocket," as he believed.

The Soviet Government had made it clear to Hitler that it was impregnable. Hitler goes where he expects the least, not the most, resistance. The growing inner crisis in Nazi Germany compelled him to act. Hitler believed that he could salvage his position at the expense of Poland, the Balkan countries, England and France, especially when he knew that Chamberlain was only too willing, if not always equally capable, of giving him new victims. Hitler bowed to the firm position of the Soviet Union. He was compelled to sign the non-aggression pact. Instead of the heralded march to the East, it is the West which now as before remains unprotected thanks to the Chamberlain-Daladier policy of surrender to aggression.

Stalin had warned the British Tories that the U.S.S.R. "did not intend to pull anybody's chestnuts out of the fire." They had refused to heed the warning. They know better now. And so do the British people who see more clearly now than before Chamberlain's treacherous game.

It is also a singular fact that the hue and cry in the press intended to create the impression that the future of Poland has been adversely affected by the pact is drastically refuted by the sentiments of the Polish people themselves. Poland is in a stronger position to defend its independence today simply because Hitler is weaker as a result of the pact, and because it is more difficult for the Chamberlain forces outside and within Poland to betray it. The Soviet Union has given an example to the Polish people of its strength and the unwavering firmness of its determination to curb aggression and to maintain peace. And despite every canard to the contrary, the Soviet Union's policy for collective security remains in full force. In fact, the non-aggression pact with Germany is an expression of this policy under conditions of Chamberlain sabotage and aimed at overcoming this sabotage.

Of course the danger to Poland's independence and the danger of a new World War still exists. But this is due to the hovering menace of new Munichs, new betrayals of Poland, new efforts to block united action against aggression. For the Munichmen are still appeasers of fascism and the fascist aggressors still remain aggressors. And as we go to press (August 28) the danger of a new, gigantic Munich sell-out by the Munichmen is clearly in preparation, with Chamberlain planning to effect a general "appeasement" plan at the expense of the British and French people, Poland, Lithuania, the Balkan states and *the United States and the U.S.S.R.*

But in England and France, the power of the Soviet Union's latest blow for peace will unquestionably give new strength to the forces which have questioned Chamberlain's fatal collaboration with fascist aggression. Chamberlain and Daladier have left their countries more nakedly exposed to war than ever before. This realization will grow; the Soviet pact speeds its development and makes for renewed struggle to halt the Chamberlain-Daladier treachery.

How about America?

No honest American can escape the conclusion that both Japan and Hitler have been weakened. The Axis has been seriously cracked at its vital point. Japan has been further isolated, and its ability to enslave the Chinese people and threaten American national interests in the Pacific and the Far East vastly reduced. Only willful blindness can ignore this fact.

Because of this, the American Tories, the pro-fascist "isolationist" clique, are starting a new campaign for American help to Japan's tottering military and economic structure. They are attempting to facilitate Chamberlain's plans to appease the aggressors at the expense of the United States as well as other nations. Mr. David Lawrence and the Scripps-Howard press typically represent this new political strategy of the reactionary forces which fear the emergence of an independent, democratic China and which are willing for America to pay the "appeasement" price to keep China and the Far East subjugated to imperialist exploitation. Mr. Lawrence wants a "peaceful understanding" with Japan on the basis of a recognition of Japan's demand for control of China, and a bargain giving Wall Street a share in the booty. These are at once confessions of the immense anti-war effect of the Soviet pact and a preparation for new treacheries to overcome these peaceful effects, and drive toward war. These are sinister signs which compel the greatest alertness.

The national interest of the United States now stands more than ever boldly and directly in line with an active policy of collaboration with the peace policy of the Soviet Union, particularly, at this moment, to block a new Munich betrayal and the spread of aggression. The recent peace appeals of President Roosevelt undoubtedly mirror American majority sentiment. But their effectiveness is ham-

pered because of the actions of the tory coalition of Garnercrats and Hoover Republicans who blocked neutrality revision and the repeal of the arms embargo in the 76th session of Congress, and who are now feverishly trying to drum up support in America for Chamberlain's latest intrigues.

It cannot be urged too strongly that American leadership demands that America give concrete expression to the President's peace appeals by a policy which embargoes the aggressor and aids its victim through a complete rejection of all "isolationist" sabotage, and through specific actions aimed at blocking the Chamberlain-Daladier "appeasement" policy in the world arena. The Soviet-German non-aggression pact opens an unprecedented opportunity to

defend the democratic national interests of the United States, strengthen its peace policy, and make it a leading force for the defense of the peaceful, democratic relations between nations.

America cannot afford to wait. It must itself take actions that will give unmistakable evidence that it will embargo the shipment of war supplies to aggressors, that it will aid the victims of aggression in order to preserve the independence of states, that it will assert its leadership in the fight to preserve world peace. This is the road to peace and the most effective protection of American national interests. Toward this end the American people, especially labor, must speak out and unitedly demand that Congress adopts and follows a consistent anti-fascist peace policy.

## Young Democracy

The recent national convention of the Young Democrats was a highly important political barometer. It registered which way the political winds of America are blowing. It forecast some of the main issues and developments in the next stage of the struggle of progress versus reaction, of the crucial battle of 1940.

Coming right after the close of Congress, the convention inevitably became a sounding board for public opinion on the results of the first session of the 76th Congress. And there can be no mistake as to where the majority of Democrats, young and old, stand.

The Young Democrats condemned the anti-Roosevelt, bi-partisan coalition in Congress which wrecked New Deal recovery measures and blocked the enactment of a positive peace policy. They vigorously castigated the traitors in their own ranks, the Garnercrats. They decisively repudiated the unholy alliance of these anti-New Dealers with the Hoover Republicans. They branded the reactionary policy of this tory coalition as treachery to the nation, as well as to the President and the party. They made clear that the tories in Congress have a rendezvous with the people, and indicated the people's answer.

From beginning to end the convention proved to be a spontaneous popular demonstration for Roosevelt and the New Deal. Even the Garner delegates were compelled to jump on the bandwagon and pay lip service to the progressive action of the convention. It was not healthy at this convention to be identified with that "labor-baiting, evil old man" who poses as a Democrat but acts like a Hoover Republican.

The convention not only reaffirmed its support of the Administration's domestic and foreign policy but voiced the determination of the youth of the country to *extend* the New Deal, to march forward, to strengthen the fight

for recovery, democracy and peace. In this they expressed the sentiments of the majority of the people.

The will of the overwhelming majority of the delegates was definitely for a third term for the President. And the action of the convention in approving a continuation of Roosevelt's leadership and policies, in approving "a third term for Roosevelt's ideals," will undoubtedly give the draft-Roosevelt movement, which is sweeping the country, greater impetus and strength.

\* \* \*

Mention must be made, too, of the role at the convention of the Administration spokesmen: Senators Pepper, Lee and Guffey, Mayor Kelly, Solicitor-General Jackson and Aubrey Williams. These leaders, as well as the President in his significant message of greetings, gave every indication that the progressive New Dealers want to and intend to accept the challenge of the reactionaries. They took a militant stand, squarely placed the responsibility for what happened in Congress upon the tory coalition, and gave the convention a fighting leadership—leadership which is so sorely needed in Congress and to carry the issues to the country.

In fact, on the question of the Garnercrats and the tory coalition in Congress the New Dealers did some plain speaking. They showed that the Garnercrats are renegade Democrats seeking to destroy the Democratic Party from within and to scuttle the New Deal. They likewise emphasized that the Garnerites, in alliance with the reactionary Republicans, are trying to steer the Ship of State along the channels of reaction and ruin.

But the New Deal spokesmen did more than this. They signaled more effectively than in the past whom the tory

coalition represents, what class interests it serves, and in what direction it is heading.

Senator Pepper drove home the fact that the tory coalition of Garner Democrats and Hoover Republicans are the Congressional representatives of Big Business. Moreover, in his keynote address, Pepper bluntly stated that the dictatorship of the monarchs of Wall Street made "it possible for one to say with much evidence of truth that ninety men actually, through their vast power, controlled the United States of America," and that the "King-makers of Wall Street" are the power behind the throne of the Garner-Vandenberg "economy bloc."

Senator Guffey, in his address, developed the indictment of the tory coalition further and warned of the growing danger of fascism in the United States. Guffey said, in part, in reference to the pro-fascist orientation of the Hoover Republicans: "the Republican organization next year will campaign on a program of camouflaged fascism, which it has been tending to ever since 1933. . . ."

These efforts to identify the main enemy, to expose the pro-fascist orientation of the tory coalition and to analyze the real source of the fascist danger—the reactionary sections of monopoly capital—is a valuable contribution to American political life. It reflects the growing political understanding and anti-fascist trend of important sections of the democratic movement.

In this connection the observations of the progressive New Dealers and recent political developments tend to further confirm the foresight and timeliness of the analysis made by the Communist Party at its Tenth National Convention in May, 1938, when we stated:

"As part of the world offensive of fascism, which is already extending to the Americas, the most reactionary section of finance capital in the United States is utilizing the developing economic crisis, which it has itself hastened and aggravated, as the basis for a major attack against the rising labor and democratic movements.

"This reactionary section of American finance capital continues on a 'sitdown strike' to defeat Roosevelt's progressive measures and for the purpose of forcing America onto the path of reaction, the path towards fascism and war. . . .

"Finance capital, which is organizing its forces around the bloc of reactionary Republicans and Democrats in Congress, representing the Morgan-du Pont-Hearst interests, is attempting to limit the powers of Congress . . . is concentrating on blocking and nullifying all progressive legislation. . . ."

Subsequent events, particularly the strengthening of the pro-fascist tendencies and groups of the most imperialistic sections of American monopoly capital and the reactionary role of their tory coalition in the 76th Congress, add even greater force to the correctness of this prognosis.

Moreover, these developments substantiate a hundred-fold the contention of the Communists, which we particularly stress today on the eve of our twentieth anniversary: *in the present situation in the United States to fight the*

*fascist danger means to struggle against the reactionary measures and policies of the tory coalition, means to prevent this pro-fascist combination from coming to power in 1940. It means to establish working class unity of action and a people's democratic front to combat the offensive of the big monopolists and the spread of fascist aggression and war, to ensure greater democracy, economic security and peace.*

\* \* \*

In many respects the Young Democrats' convention marked the opening gun of the New Dealers' campaign for 1940. And here too the position of the New Deal spokesmen at the convention was unmistakably clear. A progressive New Deal victory in 1940 can only be achieved if, among others, the progressives nominate a liberal New Deal candidate, rally and unite the people around a democratic front program for the preservation of New Deal social achievements, and, above all, *for extending and developing the New Deal* so as more effectively to curb the monopolies, promote jobs and recovery, advance the cause of peace and democracy.

On this point the convention expressed its full accord with the position set forth in President Roosevelt's message:

"From the beginning, democracy has meant progress, and its battle ever since Jefferson's time has been a steady conflict with the forces of reaction and special favors. Every time the policies involving greater opportunities for the common man have triumphed, our political enemies have sought to minimize those policies and to neutralize the decisions of the people. Today is no exception to that classical course of events. . . .

"The Democratic Party will fail if it goes conservative next year, or if it is led by people who can offer naught but fine phrases. . . .

"If we nominate conservative candidates, or lip-service candidates, on a straddle-bug platform, I personally, for my own self-respect and because of my long service to, and belief in, liberal democracy, will find it impossible to have any active part in such an unfortunate suicide of the old Democratic Party. . . ."

Moreover, the Young Democrats have very definite opinions not only as to the kind of liberal candidate they wish, but specifically as to whom the candidate shall be. This is why they expressed themselves not merely for a continuation of Roosevelt's policies, but for the extension of the New Deal under the leadership of the President.

The policy outlined in the resolution of the convention, pledging the Young Democrats to work for the election of delegates to the national convention of the Democratic Party who will support a progressive program and candidate, can do much to realize the sentiments and decisions of the convention, can do much to contribute to a progressive victory in 1940.

But, clearly, to ensure success the other sections of the progressive movement, especially labor, bear even greater

responsibility for establishing the guarantees that the tory coalition will not come to power in 1940. And here it would be well to indicate, on the basis of the lessons of the Young Democrats' convention, some of the vital immediate tasks confronting the camp of democracy.

First of all, greater organization is needed. Systematic organizational activity is necessary to organize and rally the first voters, the unorganized workers, unemployed, farmers, and city middle classes, for progress and democracy, especially in the small towns and rural areas.

Secondly, the greatest vigilance would seem to be required to unmask and isolate all those who pay lip-service to the New Deal but in practice sabotage and betray its objectives. The convention itself seemed to dramatize this problem. The unanimity of the convention's action on its resolutions should deceive no one, especially when one bears in mind that even Garner's representatives voted for them. Also the position of Mr. McNutt raises some pertinent questions. Mr. McNutt delivered an eloquent speech on liberalism. But there are still some unanswered questions regarding his recent "conversion" to New Deal progressivism. Be this as it may, the experiences of the 76th Congress and the role of the Garner turncoats should be sufficient warning. Only today with the spread of the third term movement and with the firm adherence of the majority of the people to the social objectives of the New Deal, this danger is bound to multiply.

Thirdly, to achieve a progressive victory in the national convention of the Democratic Party and, above all, in the elections, it will be necessary for the New Dealers to establish closer ties with organized labor, the working farmers, the Negro people, the small businessmen and the old-age pension movement.

And what is needed here is not only the recognition of the need of such collaboration, *but practical steps to bring it about*. For instance, to secure the most active and enthusiastic support of labor, both C.I.O. and A. F. of L., it will be necessary that labor receive adequate representation, voice and an influential role in the selection of delegates and candidates, in the formulation of the platform and legislative measures and policies, and in the execution of these policies. This means, among other things, that labor and the progressives jointly should work out a common legislative program and activity for the next session of Congress and for cooperative action in the state legislatures and municipal councils. This likewise means that labor and the progressives should already consult on ways and means of preparing now in a practical way for the primary elections in the spring and autumn of 1940.

Such labor-progressive collaboration is, of course, a mutual process and responsibility. Labor itself should speak more determinedly. It should display greater *political initiative in its political activity and in rallying the camp of progress*. Above all, the movement for united labor

*action on the legislative and electoral front should be pushed forward in the localities and states more vigorously and systematically*. For this is vital for the defense of labor's class interests and for establishing more firmly that foundation upon which the democratic front of labor, the farmers, small business people and all progressives can be forged and made invincible.

Finally, more consideration needs to be given to hammering out and popularizing, in consultation with all sections of the labor and progressive movement, a more rounded-out program of action for promoting jobs and economic security and for safeguarding democracy and peace. And here it is imperative to focus attention to how to consolidate and *extend* the New Deal and on how to meet the pressing economic and political demands of those sections of the population which have benefited least from the New Deal, especially the small farmers and tenants, the small businessmen, and the old people. The starting point and heart of such a program, a democratic front program, should be effective measures to really curb the economic and political power of the big monopolists, to make the economic royalists shoulder the full burden of the crisis, and to halt the fascist aggressors.

GENE DENNIS

IN THE OCTOBER ISSUE

GARNER

AND THE WHITE HOUSE

THE FIFTH COLUMN  
IN THE NEW DEAL

TREASON

AND THE DIES COMMITTEE

The important international events which are dealt with in this issue have necessitated the omission of other articles announced for publication. They will appear in later issues.—THE EDITORS.

# Lessons from the 76th Congress

BY ADAM LAPIN

The first session of the 76th Congress was a painful and bitter political school. But if the American people learn the lessons of the last few months before it is too late, the coalition of Hoover Republicans and Garner Democrats may find that it has won a pyrrhic victory.

In the first place, the people of the nation were given a pretty good insight as to what the election of a reactionary, a pro-fascist, would mean in 1940. They are now in a position to check the demagogic promises the reactionaries will make in the presidential political campaign against the nightmare of what really happened at the last session.

The facts are well known by now. The heart was cut out of W.P.A., and hundreds of thousands of people were fired from the rolls. Hitler was told to go ahead with his war plans by a Congress which refused to repeal the infamous arms embargo. The President's lending and housing bills designed to put unemployed men and women to work and to aid recovery were scuttled. Sweeping attacks against the Wagner Act and the wages and hours act, which are expected to reach their climax early in the next session, were launched.

If there is any thread of consistency that runs through this record, it is the determination of the pro-fascist sections of American finance capital and their tory coalition of Garnerocrats and Hoover Republicans to throw the country into economic chaos and to promote fascist aggression. There is no other explanation for the narrow, bigoted partisanship that replaced even the most obvious national interests with a drive against every attempt by the President to bring recovery and prevent world war. Out of the disaster which they hope to bring to the country, the tories plan to seize the reins of power and elect a tory Republican president.

Statements by a number of reactionary Representatives and Senators and letters which they have sent to their constituents illuminate the tory strategy. Diehard reactionaries ranging from that old battle-axe of the Republican Party, Representative John Taber of New York, to more polished Senator Millard Tydings of Maryland have disclaimed responsibility for the havoc caused by the Woodrum relief bill. Sanctimoniously, they say that they voted for the full amount asked by the President—and ignore the arbitrary wage slashes and discharges of workers who had been on the rolls eighteen months which they imposed, as well as the relief slashes for which they voted earlier in the session.

The point of all this elaborate evasion is transparent. Not only did the tories deliberately throw a monkeywrench into the economic machinery of the country, but they propose at the same time to blame the New Deal administration

for the damage which they caused. They propose to take the meager earnings out of the pockets of the men on relief and then point at the President and shout thief.

Undoubtedly, it was against this kind of chicanery that the President was aiming when he repeatedly said at his press conferences that the people would know where to place responsibility for killing his program and retarding recovery and peace.

To know the names of the tory bloc, to know what they did, and to inscribe these facts in our minds and in the minds of the people becomes one of the most important phases of the battle in the months ahead and in the showdown that will take place during the 1940 election campaign.

\* \* \*

Second, the American people could see in the arena of action, in the halls of Congress, the tremendous and overshadowing importance of unity to the forces of progress—and the advantage which disunity gives to the tory bloc.

Practically every gain of the reactionaries was put over as a result of some split in the ranks of the people. Of most importance was the continued division in the ranks of labor. Again and again during the session, the tory coalition was able to claim the support of the reactionary leaders of the A. F. of L. executive council.

The treachery of the A. F. of L. leaders was at least in part responsible for the wrecking of W.P.A. During the critical days when the C.I.O., the Workers Alliance and scores of A. F. of L. unions were fighting to prevent passage of the Woodrum bill, there was a thundering silence from William Green and his associates. Only after A. F. of L. unions all over the country went on strike against the elimination of the prevailing wage did Green and Matthew Woll and John Frey speak up against the provisions of the Woodrum bill—and only then in an effort to turn the indignation of the workers against the New Deal and away from the tory bloc which was to blame.

Green was in the forefront of the tory drive to emasculate the Wagner Act. Despite repeated resolutions by A. F. of L. conventions against fascist aggression, Green went on record in an isolationist statement against the President's attempt to repeal the arms embargo. On every vital issue, the A. F. of L. chiefs aided the tory bloc.

Refusal of the A. F. of L. leaders to join with the C.I.O. and the New Deal against the reactionary coalition permitted the tories to drive additional wedges into the forces of the people. Not only were the tories active in attempting to keep the labor movement itself separated, but they tried

to create antagonisms between the workers and the middle class, and particularly between the workers and the farmers. As a matter of fact, Representative Woodrum went so far as to whip up hysteria against big cities in general and especially against the New Deal during the drive to destroy W.P.A.

At every point when labor was able to unite, it succeeded in stopping the reactionary offensive. For example, the alliance of the majority of the A. F. of L. workers with the C.I.O. proved a vital factor in saving the Wagner Act. The united stand of labor against crippling the wages and hours act also proved successful.

\* \* \*

Third, it can hardly be disputed now that the only way for the New Deal to triumph at the next session and in 1940 is to follow a bold and uncompromising policy. Appeasement does not work in national politics any more than it does in international affairs. The gains made by the profascists, by the big monopolies at the last session have simply encouraged more sweeping demands for the next session.

Many of the set-backs of the session can be traced to the fact that the Administration was willing on too many issues to compromise with the reactionaries in their own party and with the tory bloc as a whole. Every time the President yielded, the result was disaster.

For example, one of the most tragic blunders made by the Administration was to ask for only \$1,477,000,000 for W.P.A. This permitted the reactionaries to divert the fight from the real issue of adequate relief and jobs for the unemployed and to concentrate on proposals to cripple the W.P.A. program. It gave them an opening for their demagogic drive to place on the President the blame for their wrecking work. It permitted them to argue that they had granted every penny the President has asked. Excess timidity proved just as costly in the fight on neutrality revision. On the issues of the prevailing wage and of maintenance of the Southern differential in the textile industry, certain New Deal circles also yielded to reaction.

A bolder stand and an open, direct appeal to the people would have resulted in victory on both the relief and the neutrality issues. Too frequently the administration seemed to rely on clever deals and maneuvers rather than on the support of the masses of the people.

\* \* \*

Fourth, the events of the last session point to the need for increased vigilance and for a bolder fight against the members of the tory camp who hold vital positions in the Democratic Party, in the Administration itself and in the ranks of labor. Treachery played its part in the defeat of many New Deal measures. In the United States, too, reaction has its fifth column.

On the whole, the tory Democrats came out in the open

more than ever before at the last session. The people know their names now. But much of their work was accomplished by stealth and deception. It is a significant fact that John Garner can still attend Cabinet meetings—and report back to the tory bloc the plans of the New Deal.

Garner did his work in the Senate. In the House, the majority leader was one of his stooges. Sam Rayburn came out in the open for Garner as President shortly after the session adjourned. Rayburn's "leadership" was the cause of more than one New Deal defeat. At least, it is possible now for the people to know just where Rayburn stands.

Within the Administration itself there are men like Under-Secretary of the Treasury Hanes and James Dunn in the State Department who sabotage New Deal policies. In the labor movement the Greens, the Wolls and the Homer Martins were active. And on both the political and labor fields, those experienced fifth columnists, the followers of Trotsky and Lovestone, were active spreading confusion and disunity.

Much of the tory program was put over as a result of pleas for "party harmony" from men like Rayburn and Jimmy Byrnes in the Senate. When the New Dealers in the House pressed for a stand by the Democratic caucus in support of the President's policies, Rayburn and Speaker Bankhead, another extremely lukewarm supporter of the New Deal, threatened that it would mean a party split. Party "harmony" was maintained—but on the terms of the minority group of reactionary Democrats.

It should be said that, considering the circumstances, the New Dealers in both Houses fought gamely and well. Many of them developed and hardened in the course of the session. Men like Senator Pepper and Representatives McKeough, Marcantonio and Casey emerged with new stature as vigorous and able fighters. Closer cooperation between these New Dealers and the White House and the Administration, and above all with the people, especially labor, can at the next session strengthen and encourage the camp of democracy and peace.

The need for energetic and uncompromising and steadfast leadership in Congress takes its place together with the necessity for a bold policy to consolidate and extend the New Deal as one of the essentials for victory. To permit people like Rayburn to continue ostensibly to lead, and actually to betray, would be fatal.

\* \* \*

Fifth, the necessity for exposing red-baiting looms as one of the major lessons of the last session, and one of the most important to be mastered if victory is to be achieved in the months ahead.

Red-baiting was used by the reactionaries and fascists as one of the most strategic weapons in their arsenal. It was used in the drive against W.P.A. and against the arts projects with considerable success. In preparation for fresh

attacks against the New Deal when Congress convenes, the Dies Committee proposes to continue with its red-baiting smear campaign during the summer and fall.

The most frequently repeated charge in the red-baiting drive is that the Communists want to bring chaos and anarchy. It is an interesting and significant thing to consider that this charge comes from the reactionary coalition which has now clearly emerged as the real party of chaos, reaction and war.

The Communists, on the contrary, showed during the session that they were the most constructive political force in the country. The Communists consistently pointed to the need for a far-reaching program to promote national security and to save the country from the economic chaos which is the goal of the Tories and economic royalists.

We advocated government ownership of railroads, nationalization of the Morgan, Rockefeller and Kuhn-Loeb banks, and a vast five-year housing program as the road toward economic recovery. We proposed and fought for a positive peace policy to curb the fascist warmakers, to strengthen the role of the United States as a leading force for ensuring American and world peace. It was the Communists who again and again took the lead in working for unity of the people against reaction and fascism.

During the 1940 campaign, red-baiting will be more widely used than ever before in an effort to divide the people. Every liberal organization, every progressive candidate will be called Communist. To retreat before this drive will play into the hands of the Tories. To expose it as a camouflage and a fraud will turn the red-baiting tactic into a boomerang.

\* \* \*

If the reactionaries expected despair and resentment against the New Deal to become the dominant mood of the nation after the adjournment of Congress, they must be badly disappointed. There has been no despair. As a matter of fact, the outstanding progressive leaders have launched a new and vastly encouraging offensive which has already succeeded in rallying wide public support. The enthusiastic support given the President and the New Deal at the convention of the Young Democrats is a symptom of what is going on throughout the country.

John L. Lewis played a unique role in fostering the fighting spirit which is now coming to the fore, especially in the labor movement. This was one of the most significant aspects of his devastating blast against Garner. He substituted for the pussy-footing that had been too frequent during the session plain, hard-hitting words, and that was what the people wanted to hear. It is no coincidence that his was the first of a series of highly significant statements. He made possible Senator Pepper's magnificent attack against the tory alliance just before Congress went on vacation.

Towards the end of the session and in the weeks following adjournment, President Roosevelt has been taking a firm stand that has been dismaying the reactionaries and is a most hopeful sign for 1940. Not only has the President been pinning responsibility on the tory bloc, but he has defied the reactionaries in the Democratic Party and warned that he will not support either a conservative or "straddle-bug" candidate in 1940.

What is needed now is for these fighting statements to be followed up with definite and immediate steps. The indications are that the President will bring his program to the people before Congress meets again. Should he do this, it will prove one of the most effective ways of rallying support for the New Deal, for economic security, democracy and peace. It will enable the people to contrast the program of the New Deal with the program of chaos and starvation offered by the Tories.

Of equal importance is the need for unity of the people in preparation for the next session. Of course, a united labor movement is the most pressing need in this connection. But even short of a merger of the two movements, it is possible for the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. to agree on an immediate legislative program and to develop wider unity of action in the localities and states. The most practical step to unite labor as well as the progressive forces generally would be a national legislative conference to map a program of action which will be pressed at the next session.

The lessons of the last session have to be studied, and they have to be applied. If that is done the entire situation may be changed by the time the next session opens. Vigorous action now may force the pro-fascist Tories into ignominious retreat, and make possible a real labor-progressive offensive for 1940.

IN THE OCTOBER ISSUE

•

WHAT NEXT IN EUROPE?

•

THE FEDERAL DEBT

•

THE STATE CONVENTIONS  
OF THE A. F. OF L.

NATIONAL ISSUES

# America and the Non-Aggression Pact\*

BY EARL BROWDER

Into a world full of war and threats of war came the announcement that two great powers had agreed not to attack one another. This has been greeted with anger and dismay by many, including people who claim to be for peace above everything. And while such persons are doubtless in a minority, they seem to control most of our newspapers, and influence most of our radio news commentators. So that those who take their opinions ready-made over the air or in editorial columns are already convinced that the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany have made an alliance against the rest of the world. That is a gigantic lie designed to hide the work of the most dangerous and malicious war-makers.

Let us approach the whole question as Americans, from the viewpoint of American national interests, which include a deep interest in maintaining world peace. When the newspapers cry "betrayal" at the Soviet Union because it signed a Non-Aggression Pact with Germany, because it will not go to war at the orders of Mr. Chamberlain, we should ask ourselves—"Do we want Mr. Chamberlain to have also the power to order America to war?" If we agree that the Soviet Union is under moral obligation—everyone knows it has accepted no legal obligations—to go to war when Chamberlain decides, then we are also admitting that the U.S.A. is under the same or similar obligations.

But I think that most Americans, the overwhelming majority, will say that the United States does not want to go to war, least of all under the orders of Chamberlain and to enforce his policies. If the U.S. should find it necessary to go to war, it would only be after much more serious efforts to organize the world for peace, and under conditions decided by the U.S. itself, and to enforce policies decided by the U.S. and agreed upon with other powers through negotiations. If the U.S. could not obtain agreement with others powers, then it would keep by itself. Under no conditions would it surrender its decisions into the hands of Mr. Chamberlain.

Apply these simple rules of conduct which the U.S. would under all conditions observe for itself, and you will understand the action of the Soviet Union in reaching a Non-Aggression Pact with Germany. The Soviet Union, despite its sad experiences with Chamberlain and Bonnet, offered a mutual defense pact to Britain and France, if the terms could be agreed upon, which would include military support to any nation in Europe threatened by aggression. But Poland declared flatly she did not need and would not accept Soviet military help; Chamberlain and Bon-

net supported this point of view. The smaller Baltic States declared they did not need and would not accept Soviet military help; Chamberlain and Bonnet supported them. The issue boiled down to this: Chamberlain wanted the Soviet Union to agree that any time Hitler attacks, then the Soviet Union will be automatically at war with Germany—but with its hands tied, and unable to move in any way except when and in the manner Chamberlain and his advisers might decide. Chamberlain was even willing to drift into war without even this agreement, provided he could keep the long and dilatory conversations going on in Moscow, and falsely assure the British and French people that thereby he had ensured their safety. Chamberlain's policy became the greatest danger for Poland, the greatest danger for the Soviet Union, for the U.S. and for the British and French people themselves. It had to be exposed and smashed at all costs.

In declaring that it would not attack Germany, the Soviet Union was merely repeating what it had always declared as its basic policy. But in obtaining from Hitler a similar guarantee, the Soviet Union won a victory not only for itself but for the peace of the whole world. It smashed the fascist axis, the combination of powers whose joint action had upset the equilibrium of the whole world. It smashed the whole fascist ideology, and released the German people from its hypnosis. It broke the deadlock in which the world had been drifting into war without any serious initiative being taken to stop it. And it built a great barrier against a repetition of the shameful Munich agreement of a year ago which destroyed Czechoslovakia without a blow being struck in her behalf.

Some light-hearted and shallow-thinking liberals have joined the outcry against the Soviet Union by the Chamberlainites, and characterized the Non-Aggression Pact as "another Munich." But we should know every tree by the fruits it brings forth. Americans should first of all judge any event by its effects upon American national interests. The Pact of Munich was a heavy blow against America, admitted now by all, although at the time only the Communists had the courage and insight to denounce it for what it was. The Soviet-German Pact, on the contrary, has greatly improved the position of the United States; it has already brought a grovelling protestation of undying affection for America from Japan, broadcast last night directly to America from Tokyo by the same officials who a few weeks ago were bombing American missions, slapping American women, and generally trampling on American rights and sentiments. It has lifted a heavy cloud from America's position which, less than two weeks ago, was

\* Radio Speech of Earl Browder over Station WINS, New York, at 9 p.m., August 29, 1939.

described by a very conservative columnist, Dorothy Thompson, as a threat that: "There will be no Open Door in the Far East, no Monroe Doctrine, and no Europe. . . . We shall have isolation confined to North America." At one blow, the Soviet-German Pact has begun to restore the Open Door in the Far East, to dissolve the threat to the Monroe Doctrine, and has given the first ray of hope that Europe may survive. That "isolation confined to North America" has been dissolved almost overnight, and the voice of the United States is heard with respect once more in the councils of the world, despite all the wrecking and sabotage of the tory coalition in the late Congress, which tried to tie President Roosevelt's hands.

Alfred Duff Cooper, former First Lord of the Admiralty in Britain, a few days ago, in a newspaper article, complained against Mr. Chamberlain that he is a poor fisherman because he had allowed Russia to escape from his hook. Yes, the Soviet Union escaped from Mr. Chamberlain's hook, but they had publicly warned him and the whole world many times that they saw the hook, that they would not bite, and if Mr. Chamberlain wanted to do business he should drop his role of fisherman, put away his hook and line, and sit down in serious conference quickly to arrive at an agreement *between equals* that would meet adequately the world emergency. Let those who complain that the Soviet Union "betrayed" any people or cause by refusing to bite on Chamberlain's hook openly answer the question: "Do you advise the United States to bite that hook? Do you want America impaled at the end of Mr. Chamberlain's fishing line?" If the answer to that question is no, then cease forever your slanders against the Soviet Union!

There is nothing in the Soviet-German Pact of Non-Aggression that hinders Poland from receiving all the help she has agreed to receive from the Soviet Union. Since she rejected all military help, there is nothing left but materials, which are purely a commercial matter and need no special pact to secure, merely commercial negotiations.

There is nothing in the Pact to hinder the Soviet Union from reaching an agreement with Britain and France, or with the United States for that matter, on ways and means to halt aggression against other states, no matter where it may come from. But certainly, there is much in Soviet experience that will make them very cautious in reaching agreements with any other power, which it cannot itself enforce by its own might, as it can enforce its agreement on non-aggression with Germany; the Soviet Union will need serious guarantees before it engages its fate with that of governments controlled by the Gentlemen of Munich!

It is very enlightening to witness how quickly those who slander the Soviet Union with the charge of "joining Hitler" themselves immediately propose that the U.S. and Britain should answer by forming an *active partnership* with the other members of the axis. The Scripps-

Howard newspapers have already begun to talk of "that old and really beautiful chivalry and culture" of Japan, and assure the Mikado that "her best friends all along have been Britain and America." And David Lawrence, a writer very close to Hoover and the Republican Party high command, openly proclaims that "Hitler's surrender to Moscow paves way for U.S.-Tokyo alliance," and to explain that "British and American capital can furnish the sinews [he means money!] of such partnership while Japan can furnish the administrative aid that is needed to industrialize and develop Chinese resources." Such are the thoughts brazenly printed in the public press by those who organize an unprecedented campaign of vilification and slander against the most peaceful and non-aggressive power in the world.

The truth is mighty, and facts are stubborn things. The great campaign of incitement being carried on by the apologists of Mr. Chamberlain in America, with the aim to discredit the Soviet Union, comes to a catastrophic shipwreck upon the rocks of American common-sense. All Americans need to do, in order to arrive at a reasonably correct understanding of the Soviet Union and its Pact of Non-Aggression with Germany, is to ask themselves the question: "How would I want my own government of the U.S. to act in this world situation? Would I want Washington to deliver over to Chamberlain the power to put us into war with Germany under conditions and at a time dictated by him, and with his control of American armed forces? Or would I prefer that Washington to declare, since America is not immediately threatened and is able to defend herself, that we will fight only when the cause is clearly the cause of peace, and not the sustaining of Mr. Chamberlain's empire, only when our government has secured guarantees that we are not fighting merely to impose a new and more horrible Versailles upon the world."

The answer to those questions will be agreed upon by the overwhelming majority of the American people. And the verdict thus rendered will at the same time be one of emphatic approval of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, and of its Non-Aggression Pact with Germany.

\* \* \*

*(We publish below the radio interview with Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., over the National Broadcasting Company Network, August 26, 1939, at 10 P.M. Due to certain unexplainable actions of the interviewer, the printed text of the broadcast differs slightly from the broadcast itself, though the substance is essentially the same.)*

\* \* \*

Q. How does the Communist Party in America reconcile the Soviet Government's new friendship for the Nazi German Reich when it is opposed to fascism in all forms?

A. The Soviet-German Pact is an agreement between

NATIONAL ISSUES

two powers not to attack each other; this is quite independent of opinions about the governmental or economic system in each country. It has been the basis of Soviet foreign policy since the existence of that government to maintain peaceful relations with all powers, to abstain from all aggression, and, wherever possible, to express this in mutually-agreed pacts with other powers.

American Communists, as well as the Soviet Union, have consistently advocated organized collective security among all governments wanting to maintain peace, so as to present aggressors with the certainty of a solid front against them. But it became clear, after months of protracted negotiations in Moscow, that Mr. Chamberlain would never agree to a system of organized collective security, that after destroying the League of Nations he was by no means ready to establish a substitute for it, that he was merely trying to inveigle the Soviet Union into war without a single guarantee that Mr. Chamberlain would not repeat, at a moment chosen by him, his exploit of 1938 at Munich. Mr. Chamberlain, despite the sharpest warnings, evidently considered that he had the Soviet Union in his pocket and could dispose of its forces at his own sweet pleasure.

The Soviet Union was finally forced to proceed to organize peace in its own way. That this way is effective is proved by the admitted smashing of the Axis world alignment, which was the chief danger to American interests, the immediate lessening of international tensions, and the improved position in world affairs of the two greatest and most peaceful powers, the Soviet Union and the United States. This is disappointing to those who wanted to entrap the Soviet Union, and the United States finally, into a war policy. As long ago as May 4, 1938, I denounced such a policy, in a debate at Madison Square Garden, when I said: "Anyone who advocates world peace in this practical way will be charged with being in favor, in reality, of a preventive war against the fascist powers. . . . But what do we actually propose? We propose to make peace profitable and war unprofitable. We do not propose war or any steps that would lead to war." The Soviet-German Pact is a big step in the application of such a policy, failing its general application which had been refused. If President Roosevelt's admirable appeals for peaceful settlements obtain any results, it can only be along the line of similar agreements by other nations.

The Soviet-German agreement is thus the best current example of the way to peace. Duff Cooper, British imperialist, complained in this morning's papers, that Chamberlain "has allowed Russia to slip off the hook." It is in the interests of world peace that not only Russia, but the U.S. as well, shall never be impaled on Chamberlain's hook. Jules Sauerwein, French nationalist and surely no Communist, wrote this morning to prove that even the position of France has been greatly improved by the Pact and its consequences. Japan is crying with rage, along with Cham-

berlain, but that should not cause Americans to lose any sleep.

Q. Is it true that while there are vast differences between the Communist, Nazi and Socialist forms of government, they are essentially the same totalitarian systems of government or state capitalism and naturally there is sympathy between them?

A. No, this line of propaganda is completely false, and has the great disadvantage of causing people who believe it completely to misunderstand what is going on in the world. The Soviet Union represents the common ownership of the national economy by the whole people; the Nazi and fascist systems represent the complete domination by a few monopoly capitalists. The Soviet Union represents greatest cultural and economic progress; the Nazi and fascist systems represent retrogression in culture and economics. And so on. No, there is no point of sympathetic contact between the Communist and Nazi systems, *although it should be emphasized that there is deep sympathy and common interests between the Russian and German peoples.*

Q. How would you, Mr. Browder, as a Communist, view the Russian economic support of Hitler and his Axis allies in a war against the so-called Democratic or Peace Front?

A. I cannot conceive of any such support, especially since the present pact has cracked the Axis, and I propose that the United States Government should take the lead in working out an international agreement, whereby our country, the Soviet Union, and every other that could be induced to join, would concertedly withhold our economic resources from all warmakers. That would mean, of course, that the U. S. would finally have to halt its shameful war-trade with Japan, which has been sustaining the criminal war against the Chinese people.

Q. I took care to say "so-called" Democratic Front because in Communist terminology I have seen France called the bourgeois republic and Britain a caste-ruled commonwealth, but they do champion representative government as Stalin professes to do. Then in a showdown, which would seem ultimately inescapable, which side would the Communists take?

A. We Communists support the preservation and extension of democracy, without idealizing the forms in which it has developed in France or Britain, or even in the United States. We will always be found in support of democracy against any anti-democratic and reactionary attack. If the so-called "democratic powers" will make it possible, on conditions of equality, for the Soviet Union to join such a front internationally, that would improve the situation very much. But today the press, and many public commentators, seem to be happy at what they consider an opportunity violently to push the Soviet Union out of any alignment with the democratic powers, although they hope-

fully speak of their ambitions to draw Mussolini onto their side. That is a very peculiar conception of a democratic front, to speak mildly.

Q. Do you think it would be to Stalin's advantage to view complacently or even to facilitate war between the Axis and the democratic powers and so gain ultimately by their mutual exhaustion?

A. No, I think that the Soviet Union, which of course includes Stalin, wishes to do everything possible to limit and extinguish the wars that are going on, and to prevent the outbreak of any general war. The concept contained in your question was taken not from any Soviet thought or action, but directly copied from Chamberlain's expressed plan to embroil Germany and the Soviet Union. However, the Soviet Union does not copy Chamberlain in any way.

Q. Is it true that there is a common bond between the totalitarians, Nazis, fascists, and Bolsheviks, as to their common persecution and detestation of religion?

A. No, it is not true. The very conception of religious freedom was first introduced into Russian life by the Soviet Revolution of 1917, while in Germany it was the Nazi regime which wiped out centuries of progress toward religious freedom. The very form of this question, despite its wide prevalence, displays a complete lack of knowledge of the history of religion in the various countries.

Q. In 1917, the Brest-Litovsk Treaty by which Russia deserted the Allies in the World War, when Germany supported Lenin and Trotsky in the Bolshevik Revolution, was there not a curious parallel made in this new so-called Non-Aggression Pact between Nazi Germany and Communist Russia? Both these covenants were decidedly not open covenants openly arrived at, but secret agreements suddenly revealed. How does this thought of diplomatic dealing square with Communistic professions of fellow-going with democratic processes in international relations?

A. First, I must straighten out the facts of history. Brest-Litovsk was the result of the Allies deserting Russia, not the other way round. Next, Germany did not support the Bolshevik Revolution, but made deadly war against it, invading and seizing great territories. Further, there is little value in any analogy between those days and the present, because Brest-Litovsk was forced upon a weak Russia, because of her weakness, while the Pact under present discussion arises from the great strength of Russia, and her emergence, as the Soviet Union, as the most decisive force in world politics. There is such a world of difference, that all attempts at analogy will fail, even when we get our historical facts straightened out.

Q. The Communists of France have decided unanimously to go along with their government. Then, as in the last world war, is it not patriotism against hegemony, based on the Communist claim that all governments should be one in accord, a popular front, or, to put it briefly, Mr. Browder, doesn't communism go out the window when

patriotism comes in the door?

A. I think I get the general drift of your question, and the answer is no, that communism and patriotism do not exclude one another. The Communists of France, of course, have not decided to go along with their government; they have decided unanimously to fight for the interests of their country, but that means they must try to force their government to change its course, and finally come to an agreement with the Soviet Union instead of playing the Chamberlain game. American Communists fight for American national interests, without in any way weakening their Communist principles, and that is one of the reasons we are happy at the Soviet-German Pact, because it has improved the position of our own country also. If patriotism means, not idle boasting and arrogant assumptions of superiority over other people, but the defense of the interests of the great majority of the working people of the nation, then the Communists of this and every other land are among the best patriots.

Q. How do you think Stalin's treaty with the Reich changes the Communists' attitude toward Japan, for in one case Stalin makes friends with Hitler, the god of one system, while making war on the Japanese Emperor, the sungod of another system, both truly totalitarian?

A. Again I think we must straighten out the facts. The Soviet Union is neither making war against nor friends with either Hitler nor the Japanese Emperor; just as our own President's peace policy, despite reactionary slanders, is neither making war nor adopting favored friends. It is striving to maintain peaceful and friendly relations with both the German and the Japanese peoples. Long ago it offered a pact of non-aggression to Japan, but the Japanese government rejected it, and has indulged in a long series of provocations which have strained the relations between the two countries. The Soviet Union has given, and continues to give, assistance to nations which have been attacked by Japan and Germany, and which fought for their national independence. The Soviet Union is itself not afraid of any attack, from any quarter, for it is fully prepared to deliver two blows for any one that it receives, and such preparedness is the surest guarantee of peace in the present-day world. As for the American Communists, as distinct from the Soviet Union—after all we are Americans, and cannot speak for but only about the Soviet Union—we think that the United States could well afford to develop its own particular application of the consistent peace policy shown by the Soviet Union. We would also have our difficulties with Mr. Chamberlain, as well as with Japan and Germany, but I cannot agree with those who think that Americans are too stupid to hold their own in the great puzzle of international relations. I think that our country too, following our President's admirable initiative, can help organize peace in the world, instead of helplessly drifting into war.

# Mr. Dies Rubs Elbows

BY PEGGY DUANE

Congressman Dickstein, in a press statement on August 16 regarding the Dies Committee's recent "investigation" of fascist activity, hit the nail on the head when he said:

"They are just rubbing elbows with Kuhn. They are learning nothing. If they wanted to really investigate that man they could really learn something."

This is a polite way of saying that the Dies Committee is avoiding a real investigation of fascist groups and activities. But more than this, the Dies Committee is deliberately masking the scope, nature and objectives of the fascist movement and activities in the United States which is organized and instigated by the most reactionary sections of American monopoly capital.

In the burlesque examination of Fritz Kuhn, the Committee confined itself to trite facts which are a matter of common knowledge. But Mr. Dies and his committeemen failed to lift the lid even a thousandth of an inch on the nationwide network of Nazi espionage of which the Bund is an integral part. It failed to follow up the already apparent threads that lead from Mr. Kuhn and his Bund district leaders to the Nazi Embassy, consulates and commercial agents. The Dies Committee ignored the admitted links which exist between Kuhn's Bund and Coughlin's Christian Front and Mobilizers, as well as their joint actions in assaulting Jews, Negroes, Catholics, trade unionists and other anti-fascists.

The Dies Committee made no move to investigate the real source of financial and political support of the fascist movement. It failed to disclose the intimate ties between the Bund, the Christian Front, the Associated Farmers and the fascist-minded open shop industrialists—the Fords, Girdlers and du Ponts.

Similarly it steered clear from unmasking the connection between the Nazi and other fascist groups and the policies of the fascist mouthpieces in Congress, of such people as the Garnerocrat Senator Reynolds and Republican Congressmen Thorkelson and Schafer.

Yes, the Dies Committee worked hard to avoid finding what Congress authorized it to investigate. The reasons for this is not so difficult to understand. After all, it would be expecting the impossible to expect Dr. Jekyll to investigate Mr. Hyde. It would be expecting too much to expect the Dies Committee honestly and frankly to investigate Messrs. Dies, Thomas, Parnell and Starnes. But if the Dies Committee were really concerned with subversive activity, it might well probe, among other things, the following:

Why was Martin Dies the guest of honor, a few months ago, at a luncheon given by the pro-fascist New York State Economic Council?

Why were Fritz Kuhn, James Wheeler-Hill, and other leaders of the German-American Bund present at this luncheon and why did they enthusiastically applaud the high praise given Mr. Dies by the after-dinner speakers?

Why did *Liberation*, the official organ of the Silver Shirts, find occasion to laud Mr. Dies in its editorial pages time and again as it did in a number of issues less than a year ago?

Why did Mr. Dies propose to swell the ranks of the growing fascist groups by organizing the short-lived pro-fascist League of a Million? Who were the individuals who, according to Mr. Dies himself, offered \$500,000 to have the Committee's last year's red smear of the New Deal continued?

Why did Mr. Dies place upon the Committee's payroll such "investigators" as Edward Sullivan—exposed by the La Follette Committee as a professional labor spy and strikebreaker and J. B. Matthews, scab employer?

Obviously Mr. Dies, as well as most of his fellow committeemen, as an active member of the Garner branch of the tory Democrat-Hoover Republican coalition, and as a fellow-traveler of fascism, knows the answers and knows how to play reaction's game.

For any real investigation of subversive activities would, among other by-paths, take Mr. Dies and the nation upon the trail of his own colleagues in Congress. For it is they, the tory coalition, who seek to undermine the Bill of Rights by legislating the pro-fascist, un-American alien and sedition bills. It is they who act to block the security and peace measures vital to the welfare of the country. It is they who subversively act to undermine and violate the laws of the land such as the Wagner Act, the wages and hours law, the tax and anti-trust laws.

Congressman Dickstein, who cannot be accused of being tainted with communism, came somewhat near the truth when he also stated in his August 16 press interview:

"... Unfortunately the Dies Committee has chosen to investigate red activities in this country in preference to looking for Fascism and Nazism in the United States."

If by "red activities" Mr. Dickstein refers to the noxious red-baiting, anti-New Deal, and anti-labor rampage which Mr. Dies and his cohorts have embarked upon, then indeed he has scored a bull's eye.

For Mr. Dies, in accordance with the desires and interests of big business whom he serves, is gunning for the New Deal and its progressive legislative achievements under the guise of "investigating Communism." He is out to smear the anti-fascist peace movement by attempting to label it as propaganda designed "to involve the United States into war." He is after the organized labor movement which has strengthened its position and political influence, particularly the C.I.O., by branding it "Communistic." He is after every progressive measure, movement and person which acts as a brake upon the pro-fascist drive of the big monopolists, charging these with being "Communistically" inspired or duped.

In order to facilitate this treacherous task, Mr. Dies seeks to hide his role by peddling the fascist bait regarding the need of combatting both "fascism and communism." He knows that the American people ardently hate fascism. Therefore he is trying to divert this anti-fascist hatred into hostility against the Communists who are the staunchest fighters against fascism, and for democracy and peace. In this, he is trying to imitate Hitler who in his beer-garden putsch days also shouted loudly against "capitalism and communism alike." For Hitler helped prepare his ride to power on the basis of the strong anti-capitalist feeling of the German people and tried demagogically to divert it into an anti-Communist one. But after his advent to power, the drive against the Communists became a drive against Communist, Socialist, democrat and liberal alike.

In the coming days and months the Dies Committee is scheduled to unearth some new "red plots" and is planning, among other things, to level more slanderous attacks against the Communist Party directly. This is being projected as a double-barreled offensive to prepare the ground for curbing the constitutional rights of the Communists, as well as to foment "red hunts" and red-baiting throughout the progressive and labor movement.

The Dies Committee is reported to be grooming as its star witnesses Messrs. Mathews and Krivitsky, as well as a series of lesser fry of the same ilk. Mathews needs no introduction to informed public opinion. Mr. Mathews has already earned his spurs as an informer and an open shopper. "General" Krivitsky, an international spy and provocateur, comes to the United States fresh from the White Guardist scum of Paris where he participated in the anti-People's Front, anti-Communist, and anti-Soviet slanders and intrigues of the fifth column cabal.

Verily, by their friends, ye shall know them. And by the general run of the "witnesses" and activities of the Dies Committee America knows that treason never dies.

As for the projected "investigations" of the Communist Party, in addition to springing some new fantastic "red conspiracies," the Dies Committee will undoubtedly reveal "startling" headline facts which are common knowledge to everyone. Yes, the Communists will be found in the organ-

ized labor movement, both C.I.O. and A. F. of L. They will also be found within the organized peace movement. They will be found in every progressive, economic, social and civic movement. Wherever the will and voice of the people is being expressed in the interest of American democracy, security and peace there the Communists will be found. For the Communists are an integral part of the American people. They are the organized vanguard of the working class. They are the champions of security, peace and democracy, including its highest form: socialism.

But we repeat that Mr. Dies is not concerned so much with the Communists alone. For we, as yet, are a small minority party in the political life of the nation. We alone cannot decide the fate of the nation in 1940. But by a frontal attack upon us—and Mr. Dies is definitely preparing such an attack, the Committee, the pro-fascist sections of big business, and the tory coalition in Congress are preparing for flank attacks against the progressive New Deal and labor alliance which is vital for progressive victory in '40.

Clearly, the Dies Committee will not and cannot really probe the fascist threat to America, the fountain-head of subversive activities. But an investigation of the spokesmen, organizations and activities of incipient American fascism, as well as the official and unofficial agents of the Axis powers, is vital to the welfare of the nation. There are scores of individuals, anti-fascist groups, leaders of the trade unions, of the Jewish and Catholic movements, progressive Congressmen, men of letters, who can and are willing to give accurate testimony concerning the menace of reaction and fascism. They can give names and addresses and dates.

These people have the right and the duty to be heard. They have the right and the duty to expose what the Committee is trying to shield. While making a public demand to be heard before the Dies Committee, these people could perform a service to democracy by making their evidence available to the Civil Liberties Division of the Department of Justice for federal prosecution. In addition, labor, progressive, and civic groups in each community should take the initiative to organize public investigations and hearings by labor and citizens committees regarding fascist activities and penetration in their own localities and democratic institutions.

The fascist threat to American democracy is growing. But so is the anti-fascist movement. The forces of American democracy and peace are becoming more vigilant and determined to resist and halt the advance of fascism. The people will not allow Mr. Dies, the fascists and the reactionaries to make the political capital out of their pro-fascist "red hunts" and red-baiting in the crucial 1940 elections as the tories did in the 1938 Congressional campaign.

# Summary of Major Legislation Before the 76th Congress

## FIRST SESSION—76TH CONGRESS

We summarize below the major legislation affecting jobs, security, democracy and peace which came before the first session of the 76th Congress. In every instance where Administration measures were emasculated or defeated or where reactionary legislation passed—the responsibility rests upon the tory coalition of Hoover Republicans and Garner Democrats who gave it a voting majority in Congress.

A part of the present tactic of reaction is to obscure the issues and try and shunt the blame onto the New Deal and its Congressional supporters. Therefore, wherever possible, we call attention to the decisive vote on each issue (see the voting record in this issue) and recommend that you use this summary as a guide to action in your Congressional District.

## I. RECOVERY—SECURITY

### RELIEF

Relief and work relief for the unemployed must be a major factor in a recovery program so long as private industry fails to provide jobs and purchasing power to eleven million workers and their families. In the first session of Congress there were three engagements between the New Dealers and the tory coalition over relief and work relief appropriations.

1. *The \$725,000,000 Relief Deficiency Act* (Approved February 4, 1939)

When Congress convened, the President made an emergency request for \$875,000,000 to meet W.P.A. needs up to June 30, 1939. The House Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of chief hatchet-man Woodrum of Virginia (a Garner Democrat) pared the amount to \$725,000,000. *This prevented a record vote in the House on the amendment to restore the sum asked for by the President. Ask your Congressman how he voted on the \$875,000,000. Your Senator's vote is recorded.*

2. *The \$100,000,000 Relief Deficiency Act* (Approved April 13, 1939)

Repeated and vigorous demands on Congress to appropriate the full sum of \$875,000,000 were the President's answer to the tory "economy" bloc. After weeks of dangerous delay, labor, the progressives and New Dealers in Congress wrung an additional \$100,000,000 out of Congress. Here again the Woodrum-Taber coalition prevented a record vote on the full amount of \$150,000,000. *Your Congressman's vote for the second relief deficiency appropriation doesn't tell the story of where he stands on relief. Ask him how he voted on the amendment to increase the amount. Your Senator's vote is recorded.*

3. *The Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939* (Approved June 30, 1939)

This is the vicious Woodrum starvation bill, the most boasted "achievement" of the "economy" bloc. According to the President's estimates, this bill will curtail the purchasing power of some twenty million persons and adversely affect all business, big and little, as well as farmers and the unemployed themselves.

The way for its passage was cleared by the Woodrum "in-

vestigating" Committee and its smear campaign against the jobless and the W.P.A.

The Woodrum bill has four main purposes:

1. To intensify the attack on the living standards of the unemployed, putting upon them the main burden of the depression.
2. To discredit the whole W.P.A. program by making it unworkable, and so prepare for abandoning it altogether.
3. To lower the wages of workers in private industry, through further lowering the W.P.A. wage and creating a surplus of labor.
4. To try and place the blame for the resultant misery on the New Deal and the Roosevelt Administration, thus sowing confusion and division in the progressive camp and facilitating a return of reaction to political power.

While the Woodrum bill appropriates the full sum of \$1,755,600,000 asked for by the President, it places the most serious restrictions on the New Deal's relief program. Some of these are:

1. Thirty-day lay-offs for all workers who have been on the rolls eighteen months or more; 650,000 workers who will lose their W.P.A. jobs by September 1 have little chance of reinstatement because of drastically reduced quotas.
2. Substitution of the "security" wage for the prevailing wage—a blow at construction workers and at wage standards in private industry.
3. Fifty thousand dollar limitation on the cost of construction projects.
4. A monthly "earning schedule" for W.P.A. workers which "shall not be varied for workers of the same type in different geographical areas to any greater extent than may be justified by differences in the cost of living." This is a scheme to bring wage levels in the North and West down to the coolie rate current in the South.
5. Abandonment of the Federal Theatre Project and curtailment of all cultural projects—a typically fascist attack on the cultural life of the people.
6. Attacks on the political rights of W.P.A. workers as the "loyalty" oath and the denial of relief to "any who advocates, or who is a member of an organization which advocates the overthrow of the United States government by force or violence." This is a criminal provision, subject to unscrupulous distortion in connection with labor disputes.

Insufficient activity on the part of labor and progressives, as well as the secret connivance of W.P.A. leaders, helped the tory coalition put over the Woodrum bill.

When the people awoke to its full implications of misery and starvation, they were able to win at least the Murray amendments, in the form of a rider to the lending-spending bill. This victory resulted in Administrator Roosevelt temporarily rescinding his order for the thirty-day lay-offs. The Murray amendments were lost when the House passed the lending-spending bill. Last minute efforts to attach them, and

the McCarran amendments restoring the prevailing wage rates to the third deficiency bill were defeated by the tory coalition.

*Test your representatives by these votes:*

*In the House:* the Casey bill to provide jobs for 3,000,000 workers (no record vote). A vote against the rule to consider the lending-spending bill was also a vote against the prevailing wage and for the thirty-day lay-offs.

*In the Senate:* The Murray bill, companion to the Casey bill in the House. The McCarran and Murray amendments to the lending-spending bill. The McCarran and Murray amendments to the third deficiency bill.

## LENDING-SPENDING PROGRAM

President Roosevelt's request for \$1,755,600,000 for relief, while in our opinion wholly inadequate to meet existing need, was based on the conviction that his job-lend program would be passed and provide employment for at least 500,000 additional workers.

This was a program for stimulating recovery in private industry through authorizing self-liquidating government loans, not to exceed three and a half billion dollars. It included loans to municipalities for hospitals, water works, schools and similar projects; loans for construction of toll roads and bridges, loans to railroads for the purchase of new equipment, half a billion dollars for rural electrification and rehabilitation of farm tenants; \$100,000,000 to the Export-Import Bank for loans to foreign countries (primarily for stimulating trade with Latin America); other public works projects.

Sabotaged in Committee hearings by Jesse Jones, and viciously misrepresented by the "economy" bloc, this measure was drastically curtailed in the Senate. Ask your Senator how he voted on various proposals to extend or cut the lend-spend program, as well as how he voted on final passage.

The House refused to grant a rule for consideration of this bill. The record vote on the rule tells the story. *A vote against the rule is a vote against this important recovery measure.*

## HOUSING

The Wagner Housing Bill (S. 591) had already passed the Senate when the President's job-lend program was proposed. Appropriating an additional \$800,000,000 for the U.S. Housing Authority, S. 591, is an integral part of the recovery program. It would have provided jobs for an estimated 500,000 workers annually, and made possible a considerable expansion of the slum clearance program.

The House refused to consider this bill. Your Congressman may say that he didn't vote against housing, but only against a rule to consider S. 591. *A vote against the rule was a vote against housing, against slum clearance, against recovery, against jobs.*

*The Steagall National Housing Act (Approved June 3, 1939)*

Amends Title I of the National Housing Act by continuing until July 1, 1941, the authority of the Administrator to insure modernization loans, which otherwise would have expired July 1, 1939. An Administration measure, helpful to small house owners, but no substitute for a large-scale housing program.

## AGRICULTURE

Recovery for the farmers is indispensable to general economic recovery.

*The Agricultural Appropriation Act (Approved June 30, 1939)*

The first session of Congress appropriated \$1,194,173,633 for the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940. In the main this

bill continues the old farm program, making no new contribution to the solution of the agricultural problem, especially to meeting the basic needs of the small and middle farmers. It includes \$499,560,000 for Soil Conservation and the A.A.A.; \$225,000,000 for parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn, rice and tobacco; \$113,000,000 for the Surplus Commodities Corporation; \$40,000,000 to continue the Farm Tenant program; \$28,150,000 for the Farm Credit Administration, and other smaller sums for agricultural agencies.

Failure of Congress to act on the Lee Tenancy bill (S. 1826) was a tragedy for small and tenant farmers and a blow to general recovery. The Housing bill (S. 591) which was rejected by the House contained substantial provisions for rural housing. The job-lend bill carried more than half a billion dollars for aid to small farmers and funds for extending rural electrification. *Farmers must consider votes against housing and the job-lend bill as votes against farmers.* In the House the funds for continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation program were stricken from the third deficiency bill, though they were later restored by the Senate. *This is a key vote for farmers.* No roll call in the House. Ask your Congressman how he voted.

## TAXATION

A progressive tax system, to finance social expenditures out of the swollen profits of the giant monopolies and the hoarded wealth of America's "sixty families" must be an integral part of a real recovery program.

Even the minimum tax reforms instituted by the New Deal were largely wiped out by the tory coalition in this session of Congress.

*The Revenue Act of 1939 (Approved June 29, 1939):*

Continues the nuisance and excise taxes whose burden falls heaviest on those least able to pay.

Permits corporations to carry over losses of one year as offsets against the profits of the next two years. This feature reduces tax revenues by probably more than \$100,000,000 per year, widens the avenues of tax avoidance, and tells Big Business that losses it may incur in the present sabotage of recovery will be compensated for by tax reductions after the 1940 elections.

Eliminates what was left of the undistributed profits tax and in effect repeals the excess profits tax by permitting corporations to revalue their capital wealth. Thus takes away the outstanding contribution of the New Deal to a progressive tax structure.

Permits corporations to make full deductions of capital losses. A big boon to tax evaders and speculators.

Garner, Harrison and Vandenberg were the chief Senate architects of this Wall Street tax program.

## TAX EXEMPT BONDS

No action was taken on the President's proposal to remove present exemptions from government and other tax-exempt bonds, held mainly by corporations and wealthy individuals. This becomes a "must" measure for next session.

## MONOPOLY

There can be no serious approach to the recovery problem without stringent measures to curb the power of monopoly capital.

No adequate anti-monopoly legislation was proposed in the first session, though the O'Mahoney bill, on which no action was taken, represented a very timid step in this direction.

*The Monopoly Appropriation Act (Approved April 26, 1939)*

The investigation of monopoly abuses by the Temporary National Economic Committee at least served to bring the monopoly

problem before the people. The Monopoly Appropriation Act increases the T.N.E.C.'s funds from \$500,000 to \$1,100,000 for continuing its work.

## SMALL BUSINESS

Aid to the small business man is bound up with the issue of monopoly control, monopoly price-fixing and credit monopolies.

### *The Mead Bill (S. 1482)*

Even the very timid approach to the problem of credit for the small business man, represented by the Mead bill, was smothered in committee this session. This measure, providing for the government insurance of bank loans to small business, should be revived and strengthened next year. Now is the time for labor, the farmers, and all progressives to join with local merchants in building the campaign for support of the principles of the Mead Bill.

### *Wheeler-Lea Railroad Bill (S. 2009)*

Passed both Houses of Congress, died in Conference Committee. Provides for railroad consolidations without adequate protection of jobs. Would throw thousands of railroad workers into idleness.

A program of railroad rehabilitation to increase employment is in order next session, with government ownership as the only satisfactory solution. Railroad workers note that a vote against the job-lend bill was a vote against *you*.

## RIGHTS AND LIVING STANDARDS OF LABOR

Government protection of wages and working standards, and of the rights of workers to organize in their own defense, are fundamental to recovery. Organized labor and its allies among progressives generally served the interests of economic recovery by holding the fort against the tory drive to amend the Wagner Act and the Wage-and-Hour law.

### *Wagner Act Amendments*

Crippling amendment or outright repeal of the Wagner Act is the program of the Republican Party and of the National Association of Manufacturers and Chamber of Commerce. This program was brought forward by Wall Street's stooges in the Democratic Party and masked by the treachery of William Green and the A. F. of L. Council of Capitulation.

Most dangerous of the many amendments proposed were those of Senator Walsh of Massachusetts (S. 1000) because they claimed the "official" endorsement of the A. F. of L.

Vigorous opposition by the C.I.O., many A. F. of L. locals and international unions, and the main body of the A. F. of L. rank and file as well as of labor's friends among consumers and the middle class, prevented action on any amendments to the Wagner Act in this session.

Both the Senate and House Labor Committees, after long weeks of hearings on proposed changes in the Act, recessed without making any report. Senate hearings will be continued next session, long enough to hear the testimony of John L. Lewis and Phillip Murray of the C.I.O.

Amendments to the Wagner Act will again become a major issue for all progressives when Congress reconvenes. The key to a successful defense of the Act is *labor unity*. *A. F. of L. workers in particular should visit their Representatives during the recess and hammer home the truth that the overwhelming majority of organized labor, craft or industrial, repudiates the Walsh-Green amendments as well as those of Senator Burke and other spokesmen for the open-shoppers.*

## SMITH INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Checked in its drive to emasculate the Wagner Act, the tory coalition succeeded in setting up an "investigating" committee of the House to smear and harass the National Labor Relations Board.

Chairman of the Committee is Howard Smith of Virginia, arch foe of labor, who voted against both the Wagner Act and the Wages-Hours Law. Two Republicans, Halleck of Indiana and Routzohn of Ohio, give the reactionaries a majority on the Committee. However, strong Administration pressure and the protests of labor and New Dealers forced Speaker Bankhead to appoint two progressives, Healey of Massachusetts and Murdock of Utah.

*The record vote in the House on the Smith investigation is one of the key tests for labor. Test your Congressman by this vote—if he voted for the Smith resolution he voted against labor.*

## FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT AMENDMENTS

Dozens of bills to "amend" the Fair Labor Standards Act by excluding millions of low-paid workers from its protection were introduced in this session. Most vicious were the Barden amendments, aimed primarily at workers in the food processing and similar industries. They would deny minimum wage and maximum hour protection to over two and a half million workers.

Vigorous action by the C.I.O., Railroad Brotherhoods and consumer groups—which the A. F. of L. Executive Council was finally forced to support—saved the Fair Labor Standards Act at the eleventh hour. John L. Lewis' attack on the Barden amendments, during which he placed the blame for this and other anti-labor legislation on the "evil old man" Garner, was a vital factor in postponing Congressional action.

But action on the Barden amendments was *only postponed*. They remain a live issue for the coming session, when they can again be called up, either for hearings or for a vote. While the Fair Labor Standards Act needs strengthening and should be extended to classes of workers not now covered, in view of the tory strength in this Congress, the slogan must continue to be: *No amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act!*

There was no vote on this issue in the first session. *Get your Congressman and Senator to pledge that they will vote against all amendments to the wage-hour law next session.*

## SOCIAL SECURITY

Security of all the people, in good times or bad, against the vicissitudes of life—illness, old age, unemployment—is the only sound basis for an enduring society. Social security has been one of the progressive objectives of the New Deal. Measures for partially achieving this objective were recommended to Congress by the President in his opening message.

*The Social Security Act of 1939 (Approved August 5, 1939).*

Amendments to the Social Security Act, proposed by the Social Security Board and in their main essentials enacted by Congress, represent a slight advance over the original law. Their adoption indicates the extent to which the principles of social security are supported by the people. Only two years ago these principles were viciously attacked by the Republicans in the 1936 Presidential election campaign. Today the tory coalition, not daring to take the offensive against the Social Security Act, succeeded only in holding liberalizing amendments to a minimum.

Main features of the amended law are:

1. Increases the maximum monthly Federal contribution from \$15 to \$20 for old-age assistance, and from \$6 to \$9 for aid to the blind.

2. Liberalizes old-age insurance benefits, provides benefits for aged wives, for widows, children and aged dependent parents (what President Roosevelt called the principle of "family insurance") and provides that old-age benefits shall start January 1, 1940, instead of January 1, 1942.

"Freezes" the old-age insurance tax at 1 per cent on the workers and 1 per cent on the employer for the three calendar years 1940, 1941 and 1942, against the 1½ per cent rates on each under the previously existing law.

4. Extends the benefits of the Act slightly, to include seamen and some agricultural workers not previously covered.

#### *Townsend Plan*

Defeat of the Townsend plan in the House, immediately preceding consideration of the Social Security amendments, exposed the demagoguery of Republican promises to the old people and the Townsendites. But, although the Townsend movement received a serious set-back, the popular demand for an adequate old-age pension system continues to increase and gain strength.

#### *\$60 After 60*

At the close of the first session this movement found its main expression in the slogan "\$60 after 60." A major task in preparation for the next session is to unite labor, progressive and pension groups around one practical measure to make this slogan a reality.

#### HEALTH

An adequate program to protect the nation's health was projected by the President in his opening message to Congress, as an integral part of the Administration's social security objective.

*The Wagner National Health Bill* (S. 1620), based on the recommendations of the Interdepartmental Committee on Health and Welfare, and carrying the support of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O., never got beyond the committee stage. A sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor endorsed its broad outlines, but withheld specific recommendations until next year.

To secure passage of a National Health bill next session, the broadest activity on the part of labor, women's organizations, social welfare and medical groups, and all progressives will be needed. The time to start campaigning for the health bill is now.

### II. DEMOCRACY

The reactionaries in the first session of Congress inaugurated an almost unprecedented offensive against the democratic rights of the people. Two main instruments of reaction of the anti-New Deal coalition were "investigating" committees and various alien and sedition acts.

#### INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

The un-American Dies Committee obtained an additional appropriation of \$100,000 to continue its subversive and anti-New Deal activities. In an effort to repair his badly damaged reputation and curry popular favor, Chairman Dies staged a five-day phony "exposure" of anti-Semitic and Nazi groups. This attempted whitewash of Deatherage, Moseley, and their collaborators in the Republican high command revealed, however, unwillingly, the main sources of present-day danger to democracy. Through the rest of the session the Dies Committee remained eagerly silent, waiting for adjournment and a clear field.

There is every reason to believe that its present performance, like its previous ones, will star the most unsavory witnesses in a fantasy where the "villains" are the New Deal, the labor and

progressive movement and the Communist Party.

There was a record vote on the Dies request for added funds. If your Congressman voted "yes"—convince him of his error and urge him to support the growing demand that the Dies Committee itself be investigated and retired.

The Woodrum and Smith Committees are referred to under "Relief" and "Labor" respectively. Like the Dies Committee, they constitute the preparation for an attack on democracy, as well as serving the immediate purposes of slashing relief and emasculating the Wagner Act.

#### ALIEN AND SEDITION LAWS

More than sixty bills closely paralleling the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 were introduced in this session. Under the guise of protecting the United States government from forceful overthrow and the menace of "undesirable" aliens, these bills strike at the fundamental American rights of citizens. The National Emergency Conference, held in Washington during May and followed by numerous regional conferences, began the organization of progressive opposition to these measures. Growing popular vigilance checked Senate action on the alien and sedition bills which passed the House. But these infamous measures are live issues for next session, when Senate action alone will be needed to enact them into law. Furthermore, what the tory coalition could not do directly it did by trickery, slipping a number of sedition acts through as "riders" to unobjectionable bills or routine appropriation acts.

#### *The Dempsey Bill* (H.R. 4860)

Provides for the exclusion and deportation of any alien who believes in or belongs to an organization which advocates any change in the U.S. government. Passed the House by unanimous consent, during the absence of progressives.

#### *The Hobbs Concentration Camp Bill* (H.R. 5643)

Provides for the permanent detention of certain classes of deportable aliens, in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, without trial. Passed the House. *Progressives secured a record vote. Ask your Congressman how he voted on the Hobbs bill.*

#### *The Smith Omnibus Alien and Sedition Bill* (H.R. 5138)

Provides for fingerprinting of all aliens, makes membership in "anarchist and similar classes" at any time and, however briefly, a deportable offense, writes a new catch-all definition of "anarchist class" designed to trap any progressive or anti-fascist, provides for search and seizure and other infringements on the civil rights of citizens. A thoroughly vicious and dangerous bill. Passed the House. *Record vote—speak to your Congressman.*

#### *The Walter Bill* (H.R. 6075)

To increase the punishment for espionage. In the form in which it appeared on the House Consent Calendar and originally passed was unobjectionable. *But the McCormack sedition amendment which passed the House as Section 2 of this bill is a vicious criminal syndicalism act. Could be used to curtail labor organization and strike activity. No record vote on bill. Record vote on McCormack amendment in House.*

#### *The Reynolds Bills* (S. 407, 408, 409, etc.)

Provide for every kind of repressive measure against aliens and citizens, including fingerprinting, registration, total shut-down on immigration for five years, etc. Favorably reported by Senate Immigration Committee. Could be passed as companion to the Smith bill and reconciled in conference. *A serious threat next session. Warn your Senator and Congressman.*

### NATIONAL ISSUES

### *Walter Amendment to the Relief Bill*

Discussed under "Relief." Passed both Houses, signed by the President. Watch for abuses in your community. Protest to your Representatives.

### *Reynolds Amendment to the Social Security Act*

Provided for the exclusion of all aliens from the benefits of the Social Security Act. Passed the Senate—no record vote. Widespread indignation resulted in eliminating this shameful proposal in conference. *But its passage by the Senate is a danger signal that cannot be ignored.*

### *Hatch Bill* (Approved August 2, 1939)

This Garner-conceived and sponsored measure claims to prevent "pernicious political activities." Prevents Federal officeholders, with the exception of Cabinet members and policy-making officials, from participating in national election campaigns. May prove a boomerang for the Garnercrats, since in many states patronage has been in the control of reactionary Senators.

In signing the Hatch Bill, President Roosevelt warned against interpretations that infringe upon the constitutional liberties of citizens. Also recommended its extension next session to include state and local officeholders.

A criminal syndicalism amendment to the Hatch bill forbids Federal officeholders to hold membership "in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government." Be on guard against distortions in interpreting this vague language and undemocratic provision. Record vote in House.

### WALSH-HEALEY

S. 1032, the amendments to the Walsh-Healey Act requiring that firms under contract with the Federal government comply with the Wagner Act, passed the Senate but failed to come up in the House. Should have the support not only of labor, but of all who are concerned with taking the profits out of war. Firms getting fat war contracts from the government should at least pay union wages and bargain collectively with their workers.

### *Oppressive Labor Practices Act* (S. 1970)

Based on investigations completed by the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee. Designed to curb use of industrial spies and strikebreakers. *Not one witness dared to testify against this bill in Committee hearings.* Reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. No action taken in either House. *A must bill for next session.*

### POLL TAX

An important bill to strengthen democracy by removing the limitations on suffrage now prevailing in eight Southern states was introduced in the closing hours of the session by Congressman Lee E. Geyer of California. It would amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to make it unlawful "for any person whether or not acting under the authority of the laws of a state or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax, as a prerequisite for voting, or registering to vote, at any election for Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States."

In view of the part played by reactionary Representatives from poll-tax states in sabotaging and obstructing progressive legislation, and particularly in view of the political urgency of enforcing the 14th and 15th Amendments, this bill should have the support of the people in Northern and Western States, as well as of all progressive Southerners.

### *The Wagner Refugee Bill* (S. J. Res. 64)

To provide refuge in this country for 10,000 child victims of Nazi terror each year for the next two years.

The Senate Immigration Committee, after hearing the broadest support for this humanitarian measure, reported it out in a form that completely distorted its purpose. Senator Reynolds used his own bills to help kill the Wagner Child Refugee Bill. In the committee print, the bill provides that *children shall be admitted as substitutes for adult anti-fascist refugees already accepted on the quota.*

To restore the Wagner Refugee bill to its original form and secure its passage; to prevent enactment of new alien and sedition acts in the next session—these are major tasks for labor, farmers, professional people, and all progressives during the coming months. *A vigorous educational campaign in your community, and strong pressure on both Congressmen and Senator are needed.*

### ANTI-LYNCHING

In the closing weeks of the session the necessary 218 signatures to bring up the Wagner-Gavagan anti-lynching bill were obtained in the House. House action can be obtained at the opening of the next session, without further Committee consideration of the bill. Did your Congressman sign the discharge petition on the Gavagan bill? Urge him to work for immediate passage of this fundamental democratic measure when Congress reconvenes.

### LaFOLLETTE CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE

Joint A. F. of L. and C.I.O. pressure, together with persistent demands from all progressive groups, succeeded in getting an additional \$50,000 from the Senate for continuing the work of the LaFollette Committee. The committee's immediate plans are for exposing the Associated Farmers, a West Coast vigilante group. The 50 per cent cut in the amount asked for leaves the committee with insufficient funds for doing a thorough job on even this limited phase of its work. Record vote. Other violations of civil rights make it imperative that more money be appropriated next session. Line up your Senator now.

## III. PEACE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

### NEUTRALITY AND FOREIGN POLICY

#### *The Bloom Peace Bill*

First line of American defense is a positive peace policy, throwing the economic and moral weight of the United States against the fascist war-axis.

The Administration-sponsored Bloom bill, while only a timid step in the right direction, was converted into an instrument of encouragement to aggressors by the isolationist-tory coalition in the House. As it passed the House, the Bloom bill is no improvement on the present un-neutral "neutrality" act. Repeal of the mandatory arms embargo, most important of Secretary Hull's six-point program for neutrality legislation, was rejected. The Republican Vorys amendment, restoring the arms embargo, was jubilantly received in Rome, Berlin and Tokio. *The record vote on the Vorys amendment shows where your Congressman stood on the vital issue of peace.*

Senate consideration of the Bloom bill was prevented by the tory coalition in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 12-11.

Congressional action to drastically amend or repeal the neutrality act will be the first order of business next session. Make sure that both your Senator and Congressman pledge support to repeal of the arms embargo and the principle of distinguishing between aggressor nations and their victims.

### *The Schwellenbach Resolution*

Senator Schwellenbach's resolution (S.J. Res. 143) to embargo trade with Japan will also come up for early action. Denunciation of the 1911 trade treaty with Japan has removed the last possible obstacle to its prompt passage in January. Start working now for the Schwellenbach resolution.

### DEFENSE

In the face of the fascist war menace in Europe and Asia, even the isolationists did not dare to deny the President's requests for funds to strengthen the armed forces. Congress appropriated nearly \$2,000,000,000 to expand the army, navy and air forces. *At least a part of this record peace-time bill for defense expenditures must be charged up to those who increased the war danger by refusing to enact a positive peace policy.*

### *Strategic War Materials Act* (Approved June 7, 1939)

Provides for the acquisition and storing of strategic war materials necessary to the national defense.

### HEMISPHERE DEFENSE

Senator Pittman's bill (S.J. Res. 89) authorizing the Secretaries of War and Navy to "assist the governments of American republics to increase their military and naval establishments" was lost in the adjournment stampede. This bill, an important part of the President's peace policy, should be speedily enacted in the next session.

### *Stabilization Fund Monetary Act* (Approved July 6, 1939)

A shameful Senate filibuster allowed the monetary powers of the President and the stabilization fund to expire with midnight on June 30. However, they were finally restored and the Monetary Act passed. Extends the stabilization fund of two billion dollars for two years. Extends the President's power to devalue the dollar. Continues the silver purchase program. This is primarily a peace bill, giving the United States power to act on the side of peace in the world's money markets.

*Check the records in both House and Senate on the Monetary Act and the Conference report of June 30.*

### MISCELLANEOUS

### *The Government Reorganization Act* (Approved April 3, 1939)

In somewhat altered form, Congress passed the Reorganization bill, defeated by a tory coalition in the last Congress. Empowers the President to regroup Federal agencies in the interest of efficiency and economy.

### ISOLATIONIST BILLS

Various tory-isolationist measures, like the Ludlow-LaFollette "war referendum bill" and "tax the profits out of war" bills were killed in committees. However, these may crop up again next session, largely in order to divert attention from the real source of the war danger—fascist aggression. Your Congressman and Senator should be warned against them.

# How Your Congressman Voted\*

An examination of the voting record of all Congressmen in the first session of the 76th Congress throws considerable light on the pro-fascist, reactionary policies and activities of the tory coalition of Hoover Republicans and Garnercrats which operates in both the House and the Senate.

The Hoover Republicans and Garner Democrats voted together *against* those bills that would enact a positive peace policy for the United States; they voted together *for* those bills which strike at the very heart of American democracy and sabotage economic recovery.

The reactionary character of the position of the anti-Roosevelt, anti-New Deal coalition is especially shown by the voting record of the House of Representatives. In the House, 150 Republicans in alliance with 61 tory-isolationist Democrats voted to include the pro-fascist Vorys arms embargo amendment to the Bloom Peace bill. Subsequently the tory-isolationist bloc of Republicans and Garnercrats in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted to postpone Senate action on revising the unneutral Neutrality Act until the January session of Congress. Those Senators who voted to prevent democratic consideration and adoption of a positive American peace policy were: Clark, George, Gillette, Reynolds, Van Nuys, Borah, Capper, Johnson, Vandenberg, White, La Follette and Shipstead.

The following Senators voted in support of the Administration's proposal to bring neutrality action before the Senate: Barkley, Connally, Green, Guffey, Harrison, Murray, Pepper, Pittman, Schwellenbach, Wagner and Thomas of Utah.

Sixty-four Democrats joined with 138 Republicans in the House

in encouraging the Japanese aggressors by defeating the Administration's proposal to construct a naval base at Guam.

In a cold-blooded design to sabotage jobs and economic recovery 146 Republican Congressmen together with 47 anti-New Deal Democrats voted to defeat consideration of the President's lending-recovery bill and 54 Democrats joined with 137 Republicans to defeat consideration of the Wagner Housing bill.

In a sharp attack upon the democratic rights of the American people 82 Democrats joined with 157 Republicans to pass the anti-labor Smith bill calling for an investigation of the National Labor Relations Board. One hundred and fifty-one Democrats joined with 120 Republicans in refusing to shelve the undemocratic and un-American Smith omnibus alien-sedition bill.

In the vote on the Townsend old-age pension bill the demagoguery of the Republican promises to the old people and the Townsendites was partially exposed. The Republicans voted two to one against the Townsend bill (107-55).

On W.P.A. and relief legislation, the Garnercrats and the majority of the Republicans put across the infamous Woodrum-Taber starvation W.P.A. Act. We do not record the roll call votes on the Woodrum bill which passed the House by a vote of 373 to 21, because the final vote on this bill does not give a clear indication of the position of the individual Congressmen. For the New Dealers concentrated upon a series of progressive amendments and substitute bills, such as the Thomas-Casey bill sponsored by the C.I.O. and the Workers Alliance. But the vote on these amendments was taken by voice or teller count and was prevented from coming to a roll call by the undemocratic rules established by the majority of the House Rules Committee. Therefore in the final action on the Woodrum bill which came at the close of the 1939 fiscal year, the majority of the progressives

\* Prepared and compiled by the National Issues Research Bureau which assumes sole responsibility for the data and factual material submitted in the following tables and records.—*The Editors.*

were practically compelled to vote for the bill in order to secure an appropriation for continuing W.P.A. after July 1, the beginning of the 1940 fiscal year.

We have compiled the following data with the firm belief that the people and their organizations are vitally interested and concerned with the records and activities of their elected representatives; that these records and activities when given wide publicity will speak louder and more effectively for or against the Congress-

men than any election promises or belated platform explanations. The record shows to a certain extent how and through what individuals the anti-New Deal Garner-Republican coalition worked. It is in the interests of the national and social security of the country that the spotlight of public opinion shall be focused upon the records and actions of your Congressmen. The next move is yours.

RESEARCH BUREAU, NATIONAL ISSUES

## MAJOR ROLL CALLS IN THE SENATE

### NOTES ON THE SENATE VOTES

1. Jan. 27—W.P.A. and RELIEF: McKellar amendment to increase the deficiency appropriation from \$725,000,000 to \$875,000,000 in line with the President's request. Defeated 47-46. A "yes" vote is progressive.

2. Mar. 6—NATIONAL DEFENSE: Amendment to increase appropriation to War Department to permit construction of 6,000 instead of 5,500 planes. Carried 54-28. A "yes" vote is progressive.

3. Mar. 22—REORGANIZATION BILL: Passed 63-23. A "yes" vote is progressive.

4. Mar. 31—STRATEGIC WAR MATERIALS ACT: Passed 56-13. Provides for acquiring stocks of strategic and critical materials in which the natural resources of the U. S. are insufficiently developed or deficient in order to supply the industrial, military and naval needs of the country for national defense. A "yes" vote is progressive.

5. April 11—W.P.A. and RELIEF: Pepper amendment to increase deficiency appropriation by \$150,000,000. This would make up the original amount requested in January. Defeated 49-28. A "yes" vote is progressive.

6. May 12—AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION ACT: Appropriated \$1,194,173,633 for the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Credit Administration. Passed 61-14. A "yes" vote is progressive.

7. May 18—NAVAL APPROPRIATION ACT: Appropriated \$773,049,151 for the Navy Department and the Navy Service. \$149,000,000 more than last year. Passed 61-14. A "yes" vote is progressive.

8. June 1—T.V.A.: Norris amendment authorizing T.V.A. to issue \$100,000,000 bonds for the purpose of enabling T.V.A. to purchase properties of Commonwealth & Southern and Tennessee Valley Power Corp. and other properties in Northern Alabama and Northern Mississippi. Carried 45-23. A "yes" vote is progressive.

9. June 8—WAGNER HOUSING BILL: \$800,000,000 appropriation for U.S.H.A. carried 48-16 but was subsequently killed by the House. A "yes" vote is progressive. Prior to this vote, Senator Taft introduced an amendment to reduce the appropriation from \$800,000,000 to \$400,000,000. This was defeated 39-26.

10. June 26—DOLLAR CONTROL: Adams amendment depriving President of power to devalue gold dollar on foreign market. Carried 47-31. This amendment was carried due to the political horse trading between the reactionary anti-New Dealers and the Silver Bloc. The reactionaries voted for an increase in the price of domestic silver and the Silver Bloc voted for this measure. This was subsequently repealed. A "no" vote is progressive.

11. June 28—P.W.A.: Mead's amendment to add \$400,000,000 to P.W.A. Defeated 43-32. A "yes" vote is progressive.

12. June 28—FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION: Bankhead amendment to increase appropriation to Farm Security Administration from \$123,000,000 to \$153,000,000. Carried 49-20. A "yes" vote is progressive.

13. July 5—STABILIZATION FUND: Conference Report. Extends power of President with respect to fund for two years until June 30, 1941. Passed 43-39. A "yes" vote is progressive.

14. July 11—SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS: Liberalizes eligibility. Carried 58-16. A "yes" vote is progressive.

15. July 28—W.P.A.: McCarran amendment to restore differentials on W.P.A. Defeated 40-38.

16. July 28—W.P.A.: Murray amendment to ease provision dismissing W.P.A. workers after eighteen months. Carried 43-32. A "yes" vote is progressive. This was an amendment to the Lending Bill which was defeated in the House. The amendment was therefore lost.

17. July 28—FOREIGN SILVER PURCHASES: Townsend amendment to deprive President of the power to purchase foreign silver. Defeated 41-38. A "no" vote is progressive.

18. July 31—LENDING-RECOVERY BILL: Passed 52-28. Killed in the House. A "yes" vote is progressive.

19. Aug. 4—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION: Appropriation of \$119,599,918 to restore capital impairment. Passed 61-7. A "yes" vote is progressive.

20. Aug. 4—PREVAILING WAGES ON WORK RELIEF: McCarran motion to suspend rules and add this "rider" to the Third Deficiency Bill. 40 Yeas to 31 Nays. Defeated because two-thirds vote is required. A "yes" vote is progressive.

21. Aug. 4—FARM MORTGAGE AID: LaFollette motion to suspend rules and attach "rider" to Social Security Act to authorize the Farm Mortgage Corporation to grant aid to farmers in refinancing mortgages where it is shown that normal farm income did not yield sufficient for debt service. 39 Yeas to 30 Nays. Defeated because two-thirds vote is required. A "yes" vote is progressive.

22. Aug. 4—FEDERAL THEATRE PROJECT: Pepper motion to suspend rules and attach this to Social Security Act so as to restore the theatre projects in W.P.A. Two-thirds vote is required. Defeated 18 yeas to 42 nays. A "yes" vote is progressive.

23. Aug. 4—LAFOLLETTE CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE: Resolution granting \$50,000 to LaFollette Committee investigating violations of civil liberties. Adopted 36-17. A "yes" vote is progressive.

24. Aug. 5—SOCIAL SECURITY ACT: Passed 59-4. A "yes" vote is progressive.

Date of Roll Call	1-27	3-6	3-2	3-31	4-11	5-12	5-18	6-1	6-8	6-26	6-28	6-28	7-5	7-11	7-28	7-28	7-28	7-31	8-4	8-4	8-4	8-4	8-4	8-5
Y—Yea																								
N—Nay																								
PF—Paired For																								
PA—Paired Against																								
AF—Announced For																								
AA—Announced Against																								
NV—Not Voting																								
GP—General Pair																								
Index Number to Notes on Votes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
NEW ENGLAND																								
Maine																								
Hale (R) .....	N	PF	PA	PA	PA	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	
White (R) .....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	GP	N	NV	Y	N	NV	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
New Hampshire																								
Bridges (R) .....	PA	NV	N	Y	PA	N	GP	GP	GP	Y	N	GP	PA	NV	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	NV	GP	NV
Tobey (R) .....	N	N	N	GP	PA	N	GP	GP	N	Y	N	N	N	GP	N	N	Y	GP	PA	PA	N	PA	GP	NV

Index Number to Notes on Voter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
<b>Vermont</b>																								
Austin (R) .....	N	Y	N	Y	N	PF	Y	N	PA	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gibson (F) .....	N	Y	N	AF	N	N	Y	N	Y	PF	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	GP	GP	Y
<b>Massachusetts</b>																								
Walsh (D) .....	Y	AF	AF	GP	Y	N	Y	GP	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NV	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lodge (R) .....	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	PF	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
<b>Rhode Island</b>																								
Gerry (D) .....	N	Y	N	AF	N	PA	Y	PA	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Green (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	AF	AF	PF	GP	GP	GP	AF
<b>Connecticut</b>																								
Maloney (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	AF	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	NV	Y	Y	Y	NV	PF	GP	PF
Danaher (R) .....	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	PF	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	NV	Y	Y
<b>MIDDLE ATLANTIC</b>																								
<b>New York</b>																								
Wagner (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	NV	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mead (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PF	Y	AF	Y	NV	Y	Y	Y	Y	PF	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>New Jersey</b>																								
Snodders (D) .....	Y	Y	AF	Y	Y	AF	Y	AF	AF	N	Y	Y	Y	NV	GP	GP	GP	Y	AF	PF	GP	GP	NV	PF
Barbour (R) .....	N	Y	PA	GP	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	PA	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	PA	GP	PF	GP	GP	GP	AF
<b>Pennsylvania</b>																								
Davis (R) .....	N	N	N	N	N	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	AF	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	GP	PF	Y
Guffey (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	AF	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	PF	PF	PF	Y	Y	Y
<b>EAST NORTH CENTRAL</b>																								
<b>Ohio</b>																								
Donahay (D) .....	Y	N	Y	NV	PF	Y	NV	Y	NV	NV	Y	NV	Y	Y	NV	NV	NV	AA	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV
Taft (R) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	PA	Y	N	Y	PF	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	NV	Y
<b>Indiana</b>																								
Van Nuys (D) .....	N	N	Y	NV	PA	NV	GP	NV	PF	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y
Minton (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	AF	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
<b>Illinois</b>																								
Lewis (D)* .....	Y	Y	Y	PF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Slattery (D) .....	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	AF	PF	PF	NV	NV	AF
Lucas (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NV	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	NV	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
<b>Michigan</b>																								
Vandenberg (R) .....	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NV	N	NV	Y
Brown (D) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	NV	Y	Y	PF	NV	NV	NV	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NV	PF	GP	AF
<b>Wisconsin</b>																								
La Follette (Prog.) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wiley (R) .....	N	N	N	N	PA	Y	N	GP	NV	Y	NV	Y	N	N	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	NV
<b>WEST NORTH CENTRAL</b>																								
<b>Minnesota</b>																								
Shipstead (FL) .....	N	AA	Y	Y	N	Y	PA	PF	GP	Y	PF	PF	N	NV	PF	GP	Y	PF	Y	Y	PF	N	Y	Y
Lundeen (FL) .....	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NV	AF	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>Iowa</b>																								
Gillette (D) .....	N	AA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NV	N	NV	N	Y	Y	N	NV	Y	N	Y	AF	PF	NV	NV	NV	AF
Herring (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	AF	Y	NV	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	NV	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
<b>Missouri</b>																								
Clark (D) .....	N	N	Y	Y	N	AF	N	GP	AF	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Truman (D) .....	N	Y	Y	PF	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	GP	Y	PF	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
<b>No. Dakota</b>																								
Frazier (R) .....	Y	N	N	N	PF	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PA	Y	Y	Y	N	AF	NV	PF	NV	PF	NV
Nye (R) .....	N	N	N	PA	N	Y	N	Y	NV	PF	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
<b>So. Dakota</b>																								
Bulow (D) .....	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Gurney (R) .....	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
<b>Nebraska</b>																								
Norris (Ind.) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	AF	N	Y	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV
Burke (D) .....	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	NV	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
<b>Kansas</b>																								
Quinn (R) .....	N	PA	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Reed (R) .....	N	N	Y	GP	N	AF	AA	N	N	Y	N	Y	PA	NV	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	NV	NV
<b>SOUTH ATLANTIC</b>																								
<b>Delaware</b>																								
Townsend (R) .....	N	N	N	N	N	N	GP	N	N	Y	N	N	N	NV	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	PA	GP
Hughes (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	AF	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	NV	N	Y	N	Y	AF	GP	GP	NV	GP	AF
<b>Maryland</b>																								
Tydings (D) .....	N	NV	N	GP	PA	AF	Y	N	N	Y	PA	NV	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	NV	PA	NV	NV	AF
Radcliffe (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	AF	AF	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
<b>Virginia</b>																								
Glass (D) .....	N	NV	NV	Y	AA	Y	PF	PA	AA	Y	PA	PA	N	NV	PA	GP	PF	PA	GP	PA	PA	AA	GP	AF
Byrd (D) .....	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	NV	N	N	N	N	AF
<b>West Virginia</b>																								
Neely (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PF	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	PF	Y	Y	Y	AF
Holt (D) .....	N	AA	NV	NV	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	N	NV	Y	N	Y	N	NV	AF	NV	N	N	N

\* Lewis died April 9, 1939; replaced by Slattery.



# MAJOR ROLL CALLS IN THE HOUSE

## NOTES ON THE HOUSE VOTES

1. Feb. 2—DIFFERENTIALS ON W.P.A.: Preferential motion on Senate amendment abolishing differential wages on W.P.A. Carried 252-140. A "yes" vote is progressive.
2. Feb. 3—DIES COMMITTEE RESOLUTION: Adopted 344-35. A "no" vote is progressive.
3. Feb. 15—NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT: Passed 367-15. A "yes" vote is progressive.
4. Feb. 21—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK EXTENSION ACT: Passed 150-82. A "yes" vote is progressive.
5. Feb. 23—FORTIFICATION OF GUAM: Amendment omitting Guam from bill proposing improvements of the island for naval purposes. Amendment carried 205-168. A "no" vote is progressive.
6. March 8—REORGANIZATION BILL: Passed 246-143. A "yes" vote is progressive.
7. March 27—INVESTIGATE W.P.A.: Smith Resolution to investigate W.P.A. This helped pave the way for the reactionary Woodrum Bill. Carried 351-57. A "no" vote is progressive.
8. March 31—W.P.A. and RELIEF: Taber motion to recommit \$100,000,000 deficiency appropriation and reduce same to \$55,000,000. Defeated 276-130. A "no" vote is progressive.
9. March 31—W.P.A. and RELIEF: Deficiency appropriation of \$100,000,000. Passed 290-110. A "yes" vote is progressive.
10. May 5—HOBBS BILL: Anti-alien, concentration camp bill. Passed 288-61. A "no" vote is progressive.
11. May 8—NAVAL APPROPRIATION ACT: Passed 296-58. A "yes" vote is progressive.
12. June 1—TOWNSEND PLAN: Defeated 302-97. After the Republicans had promised the followers of the Townsend Plan support in order to defeat New

- Dealers for office in 1938, the majority turned renegade on the Townsend supporters and defeated this bill.
13. June 5—SEDITION BILL: McCormack amendment. Carried 357-17. A "no" vote is progressive.
  14. June 10—SOCIAL SECURITY ACT OF 1939: Carried 361-2. A "yes" vote is progressive.
  15. June 22—AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION ACT: Passed 180-175. A "yes" vote is progressive.
  16. June 30—STABILIZATION FUND: Passed 209-162. A "yes" vote is progressive.
  17. June 30—NEUTRALITY BILL: Vorys amendment to the Bloom Peace Bill restoring the automatic arms embargo. Carried 214-173. A "no" vote is progressive.
  18. July 14—T.V.A.: Enables T.V.A. to acquire properties of Commonwealth & Southern and other private power companies. Passed 208-145. A "yes" vote is progressive.
  19. July 20—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD: Resolution to investigate Board. Adopted 254-134. A "no" vote is progressive.
  20. July 20—HATCH POLITICAL ACTIVITY ACT: Passed 242-133. A "no" vote is progressive.
  21. July 29—ALIEN AND SEDITION BILL: Motion to recommit the reactionary Smith Omnibus Anti-Alien Bill. Motion defeated 272-48. A "yes" vote is progressive.
  22. Aug. 1—LENDING-RECOVERY BILL: Defeated 193-167. A "yes" vote is progressive.
  23. Aug. 1—NATIONAL DEFENSE: Construction of additional facilities in the Panama Canal. Motion to recommit defeated 166-144. A "no" vote is progressive.
  24. Aug. 3—WAGNER HOUSING BILL: Defeated 191-169. A "yes" vote is progressive.

Date of Roll Call	2-2	2-3	2-15	2-21	2-23	3-8	3-27	3-31	3-31	5-5	5-8	6-1	6-5	6-16	6-22	6-30	6-30	7-14	7-20	7-20	7-29	8-1	8-1	8-3
Y—Yea N—Nay PF—Paired For PA—Paired Against AF—Announced For AA—Announced Against NR—Not Recorded P—Present GP—General Pair	Abolition of W.P.A. Wage Differentials	Dies Committee Resolution	National Defense Act	Export-Import Bank Extension Act	Against Fortification of Guam	Reorganization Act	Investigation of W.P.A.	Recommit W.P.A. Deficiency Appropriation	100 Millions W.P.A. Deficiency Appropriation	Hobbs Anti-Alien Bill	Naval Appropriation Act	Townsend Plan	McCormack Sedition Amendment	Social Security Act	Agricultural Appropriation Act	Stabilization Fund	Vorys Arms Embargo Amendment	T.V.A. Bond Issue	Investigation of N.L.R.B.	Hatch Political Activities Act	Recommit Smith Alien and Sedition Bill	Lending-Recovery Bill	National Defense in the Panama Canal	Wagner Housing Bill
Index Number to Notes on Votes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
<b>NEW ENGLAND</b>																								
<b>Maine</b>																								
Oliver (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	N	N
Smith (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	PF	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Brewster (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	PA	PF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	GP	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
<b>New Hampshire</b>																								
Jenks (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	GP	PF	PA	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	GP	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N
Stearns (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	PA	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	PA	N	N	N	Y	Y	GP	PA	GP	GP
<b>Vermont</b>																								
Plumley (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	PA	PF	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
<b>Massachusetts</b>																								
Treadway (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N
Clason (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N
Casey (D) .....	Y	N	Y	GP	GP	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	AF	NR	GP	GP	GP	GP	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Holmes (R) .....	Y	Y	AF	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	PA	GP	GP	GP
Rogers (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Bates (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N
Connery (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	AF	NR	GP	GP	GP	GP	PA	GP	GP	Y	N	Y
Healey (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Luce (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	PA	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Tinkham (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	PF	N	GP	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Flaherty (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	GP	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
McCormack (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Wigglesworth (R) .....	GP	AF	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N
Martin (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	GP	Y	N	N	N	PF	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Gifford (R) .....	Y	Y	AF	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	GP	GP	N	GP	AF	PA	PA	PF	N	PF	PF	N	N	Y	N
<b>Rhode Island</b>																								
Risk (R) .....	GP	AF	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Sandager (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
<b>Connecticut</b>																								
Monkiewicz (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	PF	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Miller (R) .....	GP	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	PF	PA	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	PA	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Ball (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	PA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	PA	Y	Y	GP	N	PF
Shanley (D) .....	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	GP	Y	Y	NR	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Austin (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	PF	PA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Smith (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	PF	Y	N	Y

Index Number  
to Notes on Votes

# MIDDLE ATLANTIC

## New York

Merritt (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	N	PF	N	N	PF	Y	N	Y	Y
O'Day (D) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Hall (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	Y
Barry (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Pfeiffer (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PF	N	PA	PF	PF	GP	Y	Y
Cullen (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	PF	Y	N	Y	Y
Evans (D) .....	GP	Y	Y	Y	N	PF	GP	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PA	GP	N	PF	Y	Y	Y
Somers (D) .....	GP	GP	Y	GP	GP	Y	GP	N	Y	N	GP	N	Y	Y	NR	Y	N	PF	N	N	PF	PF	GP	Y	Y
Delaney (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	AF	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
O'Toole (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	GP	Y	NR	Y	Y	PF	N	N	N	Y	Y	GP	Y
Keogh (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Celler (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	N	GP	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	PF	Y	N	Y	Y
O'Leary (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Dickstein (D) .....	Y	GP	Y	GP	PA	Y	Y	N	Y	N	GP	N	Y	Y	GP	NR	Y	N	NR	N	N	PF	Y	N	Y
Sullivan (D) .....	GP	NV	GP	PF	GP	Y	GP	N	Y	GP	GP	N	Y	Y	GP	NR	Y	N	PF	PA	PA	PF	PF	GP	Y
Sirovich (D) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	GP	GP	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	PF	PF	GP	Y	Y
Kennedy, Michael J. (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Fay (D) .....	Y	Y	GP	GP	N	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	GP	GP	N	GP	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	PF	Y	N	Y
Barton (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	GP	Y	N	GP	GP	AA	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Kennedy, Martin J. (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	PA	Y	GP	N	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	PF	GP	GP	AF
Bloom (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y
Marcantonio (ALP) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Gavagan (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	N	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Curley (D) .....	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	PF	GP	AA	AF	GP	GP	AA	GP	GP	NR	GP	GP	PF	PA	GP	PF	GP	GP	AF	AF
Buckley (D) .....	GP	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	GP	AA	AF	GP	GP	N	Y	GP	Y	NR	Y	N	PF	PA	GP	PF	GP	GP	Y
Fitzpatrick (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	Y	GP	GP	GP	PF	GP	GP	PF	PA	GP	PF	GP	GP	AF	AF
Gamble (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Fish (R) .....	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	N	Y	AF	NR	N	Y	GP	Y	Y	PA	PA	GP	GP	GP
Rockefeller (R) .....	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	GP	GP	N	Y	Y	PA	N	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	GP	PA	GP	PA
Byrne (D) .....	Y	GP	Y	Y	PA	Y	N	N	Y	GP	NR	N	Y	Y	GP	NR	Y	N	PF	PF	GP	N	Y	N	Y
Cluett (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	PA	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	PA	N	Y	PA	Y	Y	PF	GP	PA	GP	PA
Crowther (R) .....	GP	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	GP	PA	N
Pierce (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	PF	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N
Culkin (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	PF	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Douglas (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	GP	Y	N	Y	GP	AF	PA	N	Y	PA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NR
Lord (R)* .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	GP	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hancock (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	PA	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Taber (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N
Cole (R) .....	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N
O'Brien (R) .....	Y	Y	GP	GP	PF	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Wadsworth (R) .....	N	Y	Y	GP	PF	Y	Y	Y	N	GP	Y	N	Y	GP	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	GP	N
Andrews (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	PF	PA	GP	N	N	Y	AF	N	PA	PF	PF	PF	PF	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Harter (R) .....	Y	AF	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Schwert (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	AA	AF	N	Y	Y	Y	NR	Y	NR	Y	Y	PF	PA	GP	N	PF	GP	AF
Reed (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	PF	PF	PA	PA	GP	AF

## New Jersey

Wolverton (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	GP	PF	PF
Jeffries (R) .....	GP	AF	Y	GP	N	PA	GP	N	Y	GP	GP	Y	GP	Y	N	N	Y	PA	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Sutphin (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	GP	Y	Y
Powers (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	PA	GP	NR	NR
Eaton (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	PA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	PA	Y	Y	Y	PA	GP	GP	GP
McLean (R) .....	GP	AF	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	GP	Y	N	N	Y	PA	Y	Y	Y	PA	N	GP	N
Thomas (R) .....	Y	Y	N	GP	PF	N	Y	GP	GP	Y	Y	N	Y	AF	N	N	Y	PA	Y	Y	Y	PA	N	Y	N
Seger (R) .....	GP	AF	GP	GP	PA	GP	GP	GP	Y	GP	PA	GP	AF	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PA	N	Y	Y
Osmer (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	PA	GP	GP	GP	N	GP	N	GP	Y	N	N	Y	PA	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	GP	N
Hartley (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	GP	PA	PA	GP	Y	N	PA	GP	N	Y	GP	PA	N	Y	PA	Y	Y	Y	PA	N	GP	N
Vreeland (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Kean (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Norton (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	NR	GP	GP	GP	GP	Y	Y	Y	GP	GP	Y	Y
Hart (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	PA	Y	Y	N	Y	PA	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

## Pennsylvania

Sacks (D) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	NR	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
McGranery (D) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	AF	NR	Y	NR	N	N	Y	PF	PF	GP	GP
Fenton (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Faddis (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	N	GP	Y	NR	Y	N	PA	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Graham (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Moser (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
Bradley (D) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	N	GP	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Rutherford (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Tibbott (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Daly (D) ** .....	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	PF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Rich (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	GP	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	N	GP	N
Allen (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Gartner (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Ditter (R) .....	Y	Y	AF	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	GP	Y	N	NR	AF	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	PA	N	Y	N
Rodgers (R) .....	Y	AF	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Myers (D) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	NR	Y	GP	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y



State	Rep.	Dem.	Ind.	Lab.	Pro.	Cons.	Unaff.	Other	Abst.	Blank	Invalid	Total	Rep.	Dem.	Ind.	Lab.	Pro.	Cons.	Unaff.	Other	Abst.	Blank	Invalid	Total
Alabama	(L)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alaska	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arizona	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arkansas	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
California	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colorado	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Connecticut	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Delaware	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Florida	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Georgia	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Idaho	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Illinois	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Indiana	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Iowa	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kansas	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kentucky	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Louisiana	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maine	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maryland	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Massachusetts	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Michigan	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mississippi	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Missouri	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Montana	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nebraska	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nevada	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Hampshire	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Jersey	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Mexico	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New York	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Carolina	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Dakota	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ohio	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oklahoma	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oregon	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pennsylvania	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rhode Island	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Carolina	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Dakota	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tennessee	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vermont	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Virginia	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Virginia	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wisconsin	(D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wyoming	(R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Index Number to Notes on Votes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
<b>South Dakota</b>																								
Mundt (R) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	PF	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	GP	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Case (R) .....	N	Y	Y	GP	Y																			
<b>Nebraska</b>																								
Heinke (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
McLaughlin (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	PF	GP	GP
Stefan (R) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Curtis (R) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	PA
Coffee (D) .....																								
<b>Kansas</b>																								
Lambertson (R) .....	GP	Y	N	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Guyer (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	NR	Y	N	N	Y	N
Winter (R) .....	N	Y	GP	PF	PF	GP	N	Y	Y	GP	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Rees (R) .....	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Houston (D) .....	N	Y	N	GP	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Carlson (R) .....	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	PA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Hope (R) .....	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
<b>SOUTH ATLANTIC</b>																								
<b>Delaware</b>																								
Williams (R) .....	Y	AF	GP	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
<b>Maryland</b>																								
Goldsbrough (D)* .....	Y	Y	Y	GP	GP	GP	NR	N	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Cole (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
D'Alessandro (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kennedy (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sasscer (D) ** .....	-	-	-	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	AF	AF	GP	GP	Y	PF	PA	NR	Y
Byron (D) .....	Y	N	Y	Y	PA	Y	GP	PA	PF	GP	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>Virginia</b>																								
Bland (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Darden (D) .....	N	Y	Y	GP	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Satterfield (D) .....	N	AF	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Drewry (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Burch (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Woodrum (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Robertson (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Smith (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Flanagan (D) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>West Virginia</b>																								
Schiffler (R) .....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Randolph (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Edmiston (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Johnson (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kee (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Smith (D) .....	N	GP	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	NR	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	NR	PF	GP	N	NR	NR	N	N	N
<b>North Carolina</b>																								
Warren (D) .....	N	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kerr (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	GP	PF	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Barden (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cooley (D) .....	N	Y	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Folger (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Durham (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Clark (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Burgin (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Doughton (D) .....	Y	Y	GP	GP	PA	PF	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bulwinkle (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Weaver (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>South Carolina</b>																								
McMillan, Thomas S. (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	Y	PA	GP	GP	Y	Y	GP	GP	Y	N	GP	PA	GP	PA
Fulmer (D) .....	N	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hare (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bryson (D) .....	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	Y	N	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Richards (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
McMillan, John L. (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>Georgia</b>																								
Peterson (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cox (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pace (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Owen (D)*** .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ramspeck (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vinson (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tarver (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gibbs (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Whelchel (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Brown (D) .....	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

\* Resigned April 5, 1939; replaced by Ward, David J. (D), June 13, 1939. Ward's votes begin with Bill No. 16 of this table.

\*\* Sworn in February 16, 1939.

\*\*\* Died on June 24, 1939.



Index Number to Notes on Votes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Dies (D)		Y	GP		GP	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	GP	AA	GP	GP	NR	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP
Beckworth (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Rayburn (D)	GP	GP	Y	GP	NR	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	Y	GP	GP	GP	NR	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP
Sumners (D)		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Johnson, Luther (D)		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Patton (D)		Y	Y	GP		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Thomas (D)		Y	Y	Y	N	PF	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	PF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mansfield (D)	GP	GP	AF	Y	GP	PF	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP	GP
Johnson, Lyman B. (D)		Y	Y	Y	N	PF	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Poage (I)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Larman (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gossett (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kleberg (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Thomason (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Garrett (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Jones (D)	GP	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mason (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kilgus (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

# MOUNTAIN

## Montana

Thorkelson (R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	PA	N	N	Y	N
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---

## Idaho

White (D)	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	NR	GP	GP	GP	GP
-----------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----

## Wyoming

Horton (R)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	GP	GP	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

## Colorado

Levi (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Cummings (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Martin (D)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Taylor (D)	GP	GP	Y	N	GP	GP	N	Y	Y	Y	N	GP	GP	Y	Y	GP	Y	GP	GP	N	Y	GP	GP

## New Mexico

Dempsey (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	GP	Y
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---

## Arizona

Murdock (D)	N	GP	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	N	NR	N	Y	N	Y
-------------	---	----	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	---

## Utah

Murdock (D)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	GP	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

## Nevada

Binson (D)	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	PA	Y	N	N	PA	Y	N	Y
------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	----	---	---	---

## PACIFIC

### Washington

Magnuson (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

### Oregon

Mott (R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pierce (D)	GP	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Angell (R)	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

### California

Glenn (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Glennbright (R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wenne (D)	Y	N	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	GP	AF	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (R)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (R)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	Y	N	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	Y	Y	Y	Y	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (R)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	N	GP	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wick (D)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y







