

7-15-39

[July 15, 1939]

THE CONGRESSIONAL FRONT.  
By Congressman Everett M. Dirksen  
16th District.

ONE TERM, TWO TERMS, THREE TERMS.

The suggestion of Senator Vandenberg that those who aspire to the nomination for President in 1940 pre-pledge themselves to one term started, oddly enough with a Democrat. At the time the Constitution was being framed, Jefferson first made the suggestion of a single seven-year term. President Jackson in his first message to Congress suggested a single term and later on in his term as President, suggested a constitutional amendment to that effect. However, Jackson did not follow this idea. Presidents Hayes and Buchanan were the only two who made a one-term pledge and kept it. Cleveland favored the principle but took terms, altho' they were not consecutive. In 1912, the Democratic platform contained a pledge which favored a constitutional amendment limiting the Presidency to a single term. Wilson regarded the pledge as Bryan's work and did not feel disposed to stand by it. As early as 1828 and for many years thereafter, the matter of a third term was roundly debated in Congress without much effect. In 1876, Congress did pass a resolution condemning a third term. Grant sought to overcome the tradition against a third term and failed. Theodore Roosevelt made a similar attempt and failed. If Republicans should endorse the one-term proposal they will be doing precisely what the Democratic platform of 1912 endorsed. Such are the vagaries and vicissitudes of politics.

THE SHADOW OF 1940.

The shadow of 1940 already falls athwart the country. Consider the bills now pending in Congress which take cognizance of the fact that next year is election year. A bill by Representative Walter of Pa., makes it unlawful and punishable for an employer or any Federal officer to influence the votes of employees thru' fear or intimidation in a Federal election. A resolution by Rep. Thorkelson of Montana would provide for a constitutional amendment to repeal the present 17th amendment to the Constitution which provides for the direct election of Senators. A bill by Rep. Pierce of Oregon would make it an offense punishable by a fine or imprisonment or both to use the mails in taking a straw vote in any Federal political election. A resolution introduced by Senator Holman of Oregon would set up a joint committee of 10 members of the House and Senate to investigate the use of public opinion polls in a Federal election and file a report of its investigation on or before January 15th 1940. Somebody is always taking the joy out of life. We get ourselves all set for a thrill as the open season on straw votes begins and now somebody wants to investigate the straw vote takers. Ho, Hum!

ATTENTION! VETERANS.

Many veterans are interred in new memorial cemeteries which prohibit the use of the regular upright marker or headstone which the Secretary of War is authorized to furnish for the marking of veteran's graves.

Consequently, many of the graves of veterans are now unmarked. To meet this difficulty, the House of Representatives has passed a measure which authorizes the Secretary of War to provide, at the option of any relative or representative of a deceased world war veteran, a flat stone marker, a standard bronze marker or an upright headstone or marker. The bronze marker is 12 x 24, cast of bronze from three sixteenths to one quarter of an inch in thickness and weighs about 20 pounds. The flat stone markers are of white marble. About 30,000 markers are provided annually by the War Department to mark the graves of veterans.

#### AN ANTI-STREAM-POLLUTION BILL WHICH NEEDS DENTAL WORK.

We have examined what we believe to be the "recommendingest" bill that ever struck the floor of Congress. It recommends everything and does nothing. It is the bill which creates a DIVISION OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL in the United States Public Health Service. For 10 pages, the bill provides for surveys, recommendations, comprehensive plans, programs, compacts, agreements, cooperation, information, investigations, tests, studies, experiments, grants-in-aid, classifications, summaries, reports, authorizations and more recommendations, but it does precisely nothing about the stream pollution problem. It does not make anybody do anything. In so many words, it says to the Executive branch of the government, to the states, counties, cities and sanitary districts, "If you want to do something about stream pollution, we shall be glad to help you with studies, surveys, reports, recommendations, financial aid in the form of loans and grants etc., but if you don't want to do anything about it, that's your business and we shall not attempt to compel you." All of which means that if anything is to be done about preventing the pollution of the creeks, lakes, and rivers of this country, the anti-pollution bill needs some fancy dental work in the form of a whole new set of teeth.

#### WAGE HOUR OPINION MENANCES COUNTRY NEWSPAPERS.

When the Wage Hour Act was passed by Congress, it contained a clear and unequivocal provision that the minimum wage and maximum hour standards should not apply to small weekly and semi-weekly newspapers with circulations of 3000 or less and where the major part of such circulation remains within the county. Recently, the Wage Hour Division issued a ruling or opinion to the effect that if such a small newspaper did job work any part of which entered into interstate commerce, the exemption would not apply. Everybody knows that country newspapers are possible only because these plants can take on job printing and thus provide revenue and also enough work to keep the printers busy. Thus, the effect of this ruling would be to make it difficult for country newspapers to operate and possibly crush many of them out of business. When the ruling was announced, Congress immediately took cognizance of it as an effort to nullify the clear intent of Congress as written into the Wage Hour Act and it is most likely that the Wage Hour Division will back down as gracefully as it can. To avert any possibility that the WHA by future administrative rulings might destroy the clear intent of the Act on this point an amendment has already been offered to clarify this situation.