

# DAILY PEOPLE

VOL. 11, NO. 7.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 7, 1910.

ONE CENT.

EDITORIAL

## CONGRESSIONAL GLEANINGS— “LEAVE TO EXTEND.”

By DANIEL DE LEON

**A** DISGRACEFUL scene, enacted in the Federal House of Representatives on June 4th between the Democratic Representative Henry T. Rainey of Illinois and the Cannonite or Stalwart Representative Duncan E. McKinlay of California, should go far towards the abolition of a practice that tends materially to lessen the value of the Congressional Reports as a truthful reflex of the country's parliament—the practice of “leave to extend.”

When the transactions of the Congress are finally bound up, speeches will be found, inserted in the course of a debate, that never were delivered; or, that were delivered only in part. In such instances the speaker took the floor; said a few words, sometimes very few, other times very many; and, before resuming his seat, asked for “leave to extend.” “Leave to extend” means that his speech shall be omitted from the current issue of the *Record*, and shall not be published until the “extended” speech subsequently written by the speaker, is handed to the corresponding clerk. The “extended” speech then appears in some later issue of the *Record*—as much later as it took the alleged speaker to cook it up. In the *Congressional Record*, that being a daily publication, the imposition does not impose upon the reader. Not so with the final and bound up reports of Congress. When “leave to extend” is asked “Congressional courtesy” forbids refusal, with the consequence that a decided discourtesy is practiced upon later readers. What this sort of thing leads to and invites transpired on the occasion in question.

On April 14 Representative Rainey delivered a speech on the Sugar Trust frauds, connecting the Attorney-General with the same. The speaker obtained “leave to extend” and the “speech,” which is valuable as an article, appeared two days later in its “extended” form, greatly extended, with proofs of the charges made

by the speaker. Subsequently, on May 21, Representative McKinlay delivered a speech in the interest of the Sugar Trust and also obtained "leave to extend"; but, not days only, nearly two weeks passed before the "extended" article appeared in the *Record*. When finally it did appear, June 3rd, Representative Rainey discovered that the "extension" consisted in a truly extensive argument intended to exonerate the Attorney-General. Against such "extension" the Illinois Democrat objected as "an attempt on the part of the Attorney-General himself to print in the *Record* his answer to the charges made against him," and to do so "when time to answer{"}) had apparently expired "under leave to print" obtained by the California Republican. In the process of the debate the lie was exchanged, and parliamentary practice otherwise violated.

The practice of "leave to print," or "extend" is fundamentally wrong. A record should be accurate. The evil practice invites abuses such as the one just described. The abuses thus invited are of frequent recurrence. That which was perpetrated on June 4 is the most glaring. As Representative Rainey indicated, the *Record*, which should contain the utterances of the Representatives, can be turned into a vehicle for members of the Executive Department to deliver speeches as if they were Congressmen.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official website of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded July 2011

[slpns@slp.org](mailto:slpns@slp.org)