

to one of the belligerents. The only justification urged in its behalf is that there is no risk to us involved in such a statute and in the action authorized.

Mr. President, the absence of risk to a nation in its course of action is not the touchstone of neutrality. If we enact the proposed legislation as now written, we make cause with a single belligerent. We justify the charge that we have become a participant in the conflict. I should have greater respect for our position if we frankly declared that to be our purpose. I cannot, however, believe that to be respect for neutrality or the path to a more assured peace.

Mr. President, the pending joint resolution professes to repeal an existing embargo law. It does so in the letter, but in its substance it imposes more onerous restrictions upon our ancient rights of free shipment, and militates directly against belligerents wholly dependent upon sea transportation, those belligerents to whom America's sympathy goes out. It makes pretense of respect for our neutral obligations, but it is unneutral in that it gives aid to one belligerent and denies like aid to all other belligerents. It makes no contribution to our peace that is not overbalanced by this provocation of partiality and participation in behalf of a single belligerent. It speaks in terms of cowardly abandonment of rights, a surrender without precedent in our national life.

Mr. President, for all these reasons I am constrained to vote against the proposed legislation in its present form. My final action will depend upon the final form of the joint resolution.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 12, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, as Thy children, we supplicate a Father's blessing. Like streams of water in a dry and thirsty land, so have been Thy benedictions. To Thee we lift our grateful hearts, for Thou art not far from us at any time; may we set them before Thee to be chastened. Enable us, dear Lord, to apply our days unto wisdom, for we know how the fortunes of life change. Melody of song becomes the voice of lamentation; falling tears take the place of happy laughter; the strong become ill; and the joy of life is turned to aching grief. O Divine One, help us not to be cast down, for as our day is so shall our strength be. Oh, may the vision never fade nor the inner light fail. Spread Thy covering wings around till all our hardships cease. In the blessed name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, on last evening a speech was delivered in New York City before the Foreign Trade Convention by my fellow townsman and distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, which is so typical, in its wisdom and in its unswerving devotion to a sincere conviction, of that eminent southern gentleman, who has no peer in statesmanship in the world today, that I ask leave to extend my remarks and to include it therein.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Hull's speech is as follows:

#### NEW PROBLEMS IN OUR COMMERCIAL AND FINANCIAL RELATIONS WITH OTHER NATIONS

Less than a year ago, when I had the pleasure of addressing the last National Foreign Trade Convention, the minds of all of us were preoccupied with the ominous increase of tension among nations in several parts of the earth, which was fast darkening the world horizon. We were all acutely conscious of the imperative need of doing everything possible to decrease international tension and to strengthen the forces of peace.

Unfortunately, these efforts failed. For nearly 6 weeks now, the red flames of war have been raging in the heart of the European Continent. No one can tell how much of what mankind holds most precious will be destroyed before the conflagration subsides, nor what remnants of foundations upon which to rebuild civilization and progress will remain.

In this new situation our first and most sacred task is to keep our country secure and at peace. Toward the accomplishment of that task, our Government is devoting every ounce of energy and vigilance. We are happy that the other American republics are equally determined, together with us, to ward off war from the shores of the Western Hemisphere.

It is my firm belief that we will succeed in this endeavor, and that our nations will not be engulfed in the catastrophe of war. Yet, even though we remain at peace, we cannot escape the far-reaching consequences of a widespread major war.

Within the lifetime of most of us a great war was fought. Its fearful effects and repercussions are indelibly impressed upon our memories. Its disastrous aftermath is still before us in sharp relief.

We have witnessed the stupendous difficulties involved in restoring the order of peace out of the chaos of war, and the price which mankind must pay for failure to give proper direction to efforts of reconstruction after a period of protracted hostilities. The most striking feature of the two decades which elapsed between the outbreak of the present war in Europe and the termination of the last, was the widespread and appalling disregard of those fundamentals in the relations among nations upon which alone the work of reconstruction could successfully be carried out.

In no phase of life was this failure to recognize fundamental conditions and requirements more pronounced than in the field of international economic relations. Only through vigorous and healthy trade was it possible for the nations of the world to utilize to the utmost the natural resources of our globe and the unceasing progress of modern science and technology for the purpose of making good the destruction wrought by the war and of laying the foundations for the future advancement of the human race. Instead, by entering upon the road of narrow nationalism, by building up a constantly extending network of trade restrictions, by forcing trade away from the channels of natural advantage, the nations of the world not only failed to correct the profound maladjustments bequeathed by the war, but created new and even more profound dislocations.

These maladjustments and dislocations were in large measure responsible for the unprecedented economic crisis which struck the world with the impact of a hurricane at the end of the 1920's. And even then, instead of reversing the direction of their policies, most nations merely intensified their suicidal movement toward narrow economic nationalism.

The inevitable consequence was that world production was held back, purchasing power within and among nations was impaired, and the human race was forced to subsist on a level of material welfare far below that which was practicable and feasible on the basis of an intelligent organization of international economic relations. Narrow economic nationalism contributed greatly, in recent years, to a weakening of social stability within nations, and to a growing deterioration of morality in international relations. Out of these conditions sprang the roots of the present armed conflict.

As we now enter upon a new period of widespread war, to be followed, sooner or later, by a new period of reconstruction, we should constantly keep before us the lessons of the sad experience of the past quarter of a century. In the economic field, two sets of problems confront us today. The first involves the conduct of our commercial and general economic relations with other nations during the war itself. The second relates to the task of preparation for the reconstruction effort after the termination of hostilities.

In dealing with the first of these two sets of problems, it is necessary to distinguish between three areas: The belligerent nations, the neutral nations outside the Western Hemisphere, and the American nations. In each case, there are certain consequences which we have no choice but to accept, and certain considerations which should guide our policy and action.

Our trade and general economic relations with the belligerents must, of necessity, be governed by two primary factors: The vital requirements of our position as a neutral, and the exigencies of the war situation. The first of these factors imposes upon us, as our wisest and safest course, nonparticipation in the conflict, and an impartial attitude toward the two groups of antagonists. Such a course of true neutrality leaves us entirely free to trade in all commodities with both sides, within such limitations as may be legitimately introduced by the belligerents under the rules of war, and within the further limitations of whatever measures we may wisely choose to adopt for the purpose of eliminating or reducing the risk of danger to our nationals, goods, and ships. The second factor has already caused, and will cause increasingly in the future, substantial changes in the direction and composition of our trade with the nations at war.

From the very outset of the present war, the belligerents have begun to subject their foreign trade to rigorous government controls, which have already far surpassed in comprehensiveness and thoroughness the regulations put into force during the earlier period of the last war. The drastic restriction by the belligerents of imports unessential to the prosecution of hostilities, and their concentration on imports needed for war will place before our exporting industries serious problems of adjustment. Whether the net result of these factors will be an increase or a decrease of our total exports to Europe, no one can tell at this moment. Whatever the result, it will be determined by conditions over which we have little or no control.

Additional limitations on our export trade will, no doubt, arise if we decide to adopt, as a prudent national policy, a course of action under which our ships will be kept out of the zones of danger; under which no loans for belligerent governments will be permitted; and under which, no commodities purchased by the belligerents will be permitted to be exported before title to them shall have been transferred to the foreign buyers. Here the decision is within our power. We can, if we so wish, abstain from these self-imposed restrictions, but if we do so, it must be with a clear realization that we shall thus expose ourselves to the risk of dangerous incidents which will increase the possibility of our being drawn into the European conflict. The executive branch of the government is convinced that such inconveniences or losses as may result from this voluntary curtailment of our freedom of action in trade relations constitute, from the viewpoint of the national interest, a worthwhile sacrifice for the enhanced security of our Nation, and for the greater certainty of our remaining at peace.

On the side of imports which we normally receive from what are now belligerent nations, the war will also impose upon us a certain amount of difficulty, resulting from wartime controls of trade. In this respect, our Government is prepared to do its utmost to remove or reduce unnecessary hardships for our business interests, whether growing out of measures of policing trade or out of undue price exactions.

As regards our trade with other neutral nations outside the Western Hemisphere, our endeavor will be to maintain it as nearly as possible on a normal basis. Here our greatest difficulties will arise out of various measures of control adopted by the belligerents as they affect certain neutral countries of Europe. And here again, it will be our policy to steer a balanced course between the greatest practicable protection of our commercial interests and the avoidance of imprudent risks.

In the Western Hemisphere, we are bound to our sister republics by close ties of inter-American friendship and solidarity. Not only are we all partners in the vital enterprise of keeping our 21 nations secure, but we share equally in a common determination to place our economic interrelations upon the soundest possible basis of mutual benefit.

The other 20 American republics are confronted, in varying degrees, with much the same problems of adjustment to the war in Europe as those with which our country is faced. In order to enable all of us, by concerted and cooperative action, to cushion, as much as possible, the impact of the extraordinary conditions imposed upon us by the European war, our nations took an important step, at the Panama conference, toward creating necessary machinery for this purpose. The Inter-American, Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, which is to begin its functioning in Washington within a few weeks, is designed to furnish a means of discussion and action with respect to problems of trade, finance, and other phases of economic relations and activity which press for solution within and among our nations. The first meeting of representatives of the national treasuries, scheduled to meet in Guatemala next month in pursuance of an important decision adopted by the Lima conference of last year, is another step in the same direction.

Some of the American countries face difficulties arising out of loss of European markets for some of their staple exports. Some are confronted with inability to receive normal imports from accustomed sources of supply. Some are face to face with financial or monetary problems of a pressing emergency character. We shall all benefit in proportion as our nations succeed, by cooperative effort, in easing or solving these problems and difficulties.

So far I have dealt with questions of Government policy and action. That, of course, is only a part of the story. It is true that under conditions of increased Government control of trade and of economic life in general, which are characteristic of wartime periods, the significance of Government action increases in proportion. But even so, in a country such as ours, private enterprise, represented by groups like the one here assembled, continues to be the mainspring of economic activity. In the difficult days which lie ahead, just as in more normal times, your initiative, your energy, your ingenuity, your understanding of the broad problems comprising the national interest, and your willingness to act on that understanding will be among the decisive factors in determining the degree to which we shall be able to maintain our national well-being in a world harassed by war.

So much for our immediate problems. We all know how difficult and how pressing they are. But in our search for their most effective solutions let us not forget for one moment those broader and more far-reaching objectives which we must keep constantly before us if the human race is not again to doom itself, all too soon, to reaping a whirlwind of its own sowing.

Wars come to an end, and with their ending begins the even more difficult work of reconstruction. If the sad story of the last two decades is not to repeat itself at the conclusion of the present war, there must be kept alive somewhere in the world a clear understanding of the failures of the recent past and of the dangers for the future if these failures are reenacted.

I have already indicated that one of the most disastrous shortcomings of the period following the World War was the nature of the commercial policies pursued by the nations of the world. Fortunately, side by side with the forces which were pushing nations in the direction of increasing trade restriction and trade diversion, there were also operative in the world forces which were working in the opposite direction.

During the past 5 years our country has taken a position of leadership in an effort to promote the material well-being of our Nation and of every nation through the establishment and strengthening of sound and healthy international economic relations. By inaugurating and vigorously implementing our reciprocal trade agreements program we have sought to bring about an abandonment throughout the world of trade policies which had resulted in excessive restriction of commerce, in an artificial diversion of trade, and thus in acute economic distress. We have sought to place our commerce with the rest of the world upon a basis of reasonable regulation and nondiscriminatory treatment, in order to give business enterprise the greatest possible scope for profitable operation in foreign trade—to the advantage of business and to the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

Today, as a result of the war in Europe, some of the tendencies in the methods of trade regulation which we and other nations have sought to combat in recent years have become greatly intensified. That is an inescapable consequence of the war situation. But it does not mean that these disruptive tendencies must necessarily become permanently established in international commercial relations after the end of the war.

To believe that this would be likely to happen would be to abandon ourselves to hasty counsels of despair. The experience of the period immediately following the last war and, even more, the experience of recent years have demonstrated the destructive nature of such practices as embargoes, quotas, exchange controls, unreasonably high tariffs, and various other means of regimenting and forcing trade. These practices may have their place in time of war, when the central objective is the creation of the instrumentalities of armed force at no matter what sacrifice of human welfare. There is no place for them in time of peace, when the desired objective is the promotion of the well-being of individuals and of nations, for which a healthy functioning and expansion of international commerce is an indispensable prerequisite.

If, after the termination of this war, commercial policies characteristic of extreme economic nationalism should become dominant, then mankind would enter upon an indefinite period of alternating economic conflicts and armed warfare—until the best attainments of civilization and progress will have been destroyed. I cannot believe that this is the fate in store for the world. I, for one, hold fast to the conviction that, however grave have been the errors of the recent decades, however much suffering and destruction may lie ahead in the immediate future, there is, in all nations, sufficient strength of will and sufficient clarity of vision to enable mankind to profit by the costly lessons of the past and to build upon a sounder foundation than heretofore.

There is much that our country can do toward that end. We must retain unimpaired our firm belief that only through enduring peace, based on international law and morality, and founded upon sound international economic relations, can the human race continue to advance. We must cooperate to the greatest possible extent with our sister republics of the Americas and with all other nations to keep this conviction alive and to maintain the basic principles of international good faith, world order under law, and constructive economic effort.



In the economic field the guiding lines of the policies which we should pursue are clear. Nothing that has happened has weakened in any way the validity of the basic ideals which have underlain our commercial policy in recent years. The type of international economic relations which we have sought to establish through our reciprocal-trade agreements has been amply proven by experience to be the only effective means of enabling the process of international trade to perform fully its function as a powerful instrument for the promotion of economic welfare and for the strengthening of the foundations of enduring peace.

For the immediate future we must continue our efforts to maintain and expand our trade program within such temporary limitations as may be dictated by the exigencies of wartime conditions. We are, in fact, engaged today in important trade-agreement negotiations, notably with the American nations. We shall neglect no opportunity, wherever it may present itself, to expand the area of our negotiations. We must not be diverted from this essential purpose by the acts or utterances of those who, intentionally or unintentionally, seek to mislead the public mind into the belief that our efforts have been rendered powerless by the unhappy circumstances of today.

When the war is over, we must stand ready to redouble our efforts in the direction of economic progress. As the process of post-war reconstruction begins, the task of restoring international trade relations on a sound basis will be even more difficult than it has been heretofore. But it will be even more imperatively necessary if, after the setbacks and prostrations of recent decades, mankind is to resume its upward climb.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from General Pershing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt has proclaimed today as General Casimir Pulaski Day to honor the memory of that great hero and patriot of Poland. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Col. E. M. House to Hon. David Lloyd George.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a broadcast made by myself last evening.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on Count Casimir Pulaski, the Polish patriot.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an open letter written by me to the Gallup poll.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter and list I received from the secretary of the Southern Council on International Relations in regard to neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] for 10 minutes under the special order of the House heretofore made.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I come not to bury Caesar but to praise him.

On Monday, Mr. Speaker, a great Member of this House, great in his influence and admired by every new Member here, particularly on the Republican side, passed from the Chamber with shock and sorrow registered by all those new Members.

White-plumed Henry of Navarre had tripped in his own stirrup and been unhorsed.

When I came here to take a seat in Congress I had an idea that no matter what party had elected a Member, he was equal in every way, so far as rights, privileges, and standing were concerned, with all others. I have never blindly followed partisanship here or elsewhere.

I pay tribute here to the kind consideration given to new Members by the Speaker of this House. I think the old tradition that a new Member should be seen and not heard has been broken down by this attitude of the Speaker, and in the name of these new Members I thank him.

But to return to my mutton. I say here that I was shocked Monday when the gentleman from Virginia, whom we have loved and supported, went out of character. I would like to ask that gentleman a question. Who wrote that speech? Did he write it or was it handed to him from the pen of the smear professor of the dirt-spreaders cult of the Raskob committee? It smelled like that. If that is so, if that speech was a hand-out, used under political pressure, I can forgive it. If it was his own, I can only think of those lines:

To crook the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift may follow fawning.

Mr. Speaker, I think also of the double character in Ingoldsby Legends where:

The prince-bishop uttered a curse and a prayer,  
Which his double capacity hit to a nicety.  
His lay-brother half induced him to swear,  
While his Episcopal motley said "Benedicite."

Mr. Speaker, I have some things here I would like to have put in the RECORD in their entirety.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES]?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is it the gentleman wants to put in the RECORD?

Mr. BOLLES. This entire thing.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman wants to put all of that in the RECORD?

Mr. BOLLES. Yes; sure.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I think under the circumstances we will have to object.

Mr. BOLLES. I knew it would storm you down. What are you going to do about it?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I have before me, and it ought to go in the RECORD, the documentary evidence of the work of 442 paid servants of the United States Government who are on the pay roll at anywhere from \$3,000 to \$6,000 a year. One of them gets \$7,200 a year. That is all right. They are just newspapermen, friends of mine, and belong to the same Masonic order of newspapermen that I do. They all write this stuff. They want a job. They want the pay check and everything else.

This is yesterday's bunch of junk right here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. About how many pounds?

Mr. BOLLES. I did not weigh this. The only scale I have is the scale of justice, and it does not weigh this kind of junk. Now, then, I have for a number of days collected this outburst of political effluvia, born in the pornographic mind of political prostitutes, which seeks to tell the cock-eyed public of the United States of America.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Are not most of those Hoover hold-overs?

Mr. BOLLES. Oh, no. These are brand new new dealers. I will show you this. There is not one single man here who is a Hoover hold-over.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. How about Chairman Fahey, of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation?

Mr. BOLLES. He has not a single word in here. They are too busy foreclosing mortgages on home owners' loans.

Mr. HOOK. He happens to be a Hoover hold-over.

Mr. BOLLES. That is all right. He has not anything in here.

Mr. HOOK. Probably the gentleman left out the Hoover hold-overs.

Mr. BOLLES. No. The gentleman is probably wrong, as usual.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It may be that Mr. Fahey is a Hoover hold-over, but he must have turned New Deal or else the New Deal control of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would not have selected him as Chairman.

Mr. BOLLES. He is too busy foreclosing home owners' loan mortgages.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I refuse to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The administration must have some competent men to help them, must it not? That is probably why they keep Fahey.

Mr. BOLLES. I should suppose that occasionally they might pick out somebody who had both mental attitude and working capacity as well as ones who may be appointed from purely political considerations.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is to help get the work done. After all, there is some work down there.

Mr. BOLLES. They tell me that in my home district I will have the appointment of census enumerators, because the people I appoint will have a sufficient amount of capacity to make such enumerations. They could not find anybody else in the district who would.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I want to recall to the gentleman's attention that it was under Chairman Fahey that the attorney was appointed who sent out those franked letters all over the United States that he did not have any business doing.

Mr. BOLLES. He did not put pressure on the whole of the United States of America to raise millions for a birthday ball, though.

Mr. HOOK. But the money that was raised for the birthday ball went for a good purpose.

Mr. BOLLES. Oh, sit down. I am sorry to libel Michigan.

These publications are paid for by the United States Government. There is absolutely no way by which anybody can get anything out of this National Capital in the mail for any purpose to help him unless he pays for it out of his own pocket outside of the rules and regulations that dominate our privileges here.

It is perfectly proper. The only thing I regret is that I am not on that committee which the gentleman from New York, HAMILTON FISH, heads. They did not think I amounted to enough to invite me to be on it, so I am not on it, but I wish I were.

The whole people of America stand here right now at home desiring only one thing, that the United States of America do not enter a war. Every time I hear about this war proposition I can see marching up and down in the trenches the face of my dead son, who was one of the victims of the last war.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. No. I can see that face. What do you have to say?

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. The gentleman has a lot of sympathy for the men that march in war. Did the gentleman march in the Spanish war, or the last war, or the Civil War?

Mr. BOLLES. No. I would have liked to have been in the Civil War.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. What about the World War?

Mr. BOLLES. I will put my record up against that of the gentleman from Missouri.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. Just a minute. I have this boy from Missouri on my neck.

There was a shavetail lieutenant examining me, and he said that I had a bum eye and I could not go to war. Well, I can see farther than the gentleman from Missouri.

I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. With reference to legislation that will keep us out of war, may I say that the American people are more interested in the fact that we are kept out of war rather than in what legislation we may pass in order to meet that end?

Mr. BOLLES. Yes.

Now, to return to my mutton, I wish to say here definitely that I deprecate the attitude of any Member of this House who would stand here and disparage the character or question the motives of any Member of this House, particularly when he is so vulnerable in the matters of which he was speaking. I do not like it. I hope it will never occur again. I hope this House will remember that. I am going to forget. I love this gentleman from Virginia. I have worked with him and fought with him and helped him in the investigation he is making, but when he comes here and talks about a man raising a few dollars to send out literature concerning peace, whether it be from his own office or from some other office, what does it matter, when the Government of the United States, with an army of 442 servants, paying them about \$240,000, can write and print and send out this kind of stuff, which every newspaper editor of the United States gives a three-way play—desk to open to wastebasket. The wastebaskets of every newspaper office of the United States have had to be enlarged and have additions built on them. I know; I sit there myself and handle this stuff. Nobody prints this; it is junk. But it does get into the hands of a few people who believe it because it is a Government document.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RICH. Are not the taxpayers of the country paying for the various agencies that are set up in every department of the Government for the purpose of sending out this literature?

Mr. BOLLES. Oh, of course; but there is no such animal as the taxpayer any more. He is just the "forgotten man," except on the 15th day of March.

Mr. RICH. Did not the Congress at its last session make appropriations of hundreds of thousands of dollars compelling the taxpayers, whether they wanted to or not, to pay to put out all that junk?

Mr. BOLLES. Yes. Does the gentleman know how much that amounts to? I want to bring out these figures here. It will amount to \$240,000 or more each year.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Do I understand that all of this material, piled 2 or 3 feet high on the table beside the gentleman, is material that has been sent to the newspapers as propaganda?

Mr. BOLLES. Here is a bunch right here; here is another bunch right here. This is the bunch that came over yesterday. These are the bunches over a period of a week. I wanted to put them all in the RECORD, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. That might break the Government, although the people should have the facts. I would have to object to that because the volume is so enormous it would cost too much. But what I want to inquire about is, has the gentleman offered a resolution that the Congress investigate this mass of propaganda that is going out from the departments as Government literature?

Mr. BOLLES. No; I have not, but I thought I would.



Mr. MICHENER. Does not the gentleman think it would be a pretty good thing to do, because if what the gentleman says is true and this vast amount of material is being sent out by these four hundred and how many—

Mr. BOLLES. Four hundred and thirty-two.

Mr. MICHENER. Four hundred and thirty-two propagandists.

Mr. BOLLES. Paid servants.

Mr. MICHENER. No; they are paid propagandists in the several departments. I use these words advisedly because that is their purpose, to propagandize their several departments, to sell this New Deal philosophy to the people. They are paid by the taxpayers. Why does not the gentleman introduce a resolution and let us have an investigation that is worth while? If the Government is employing 432 expert propagandists or ghost writers to load up the newspapers and, in a subtle way, influence the uninformed, the truth should be made available. If these activities are good, we ought to know about them and the country ought to know about them. What protection has the people if no opportunity is given to explain or expose propaganda put out by agencies of the administration?

Mr. BOLLES. I intended to prepare a resolution, I may say to the gentleman, to bring in with this pile of junk, and I shall do so when it is in order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I believe the gentleman will find that when the appropriations bills and the bills authorizing appropriations come before the House there is in them language to the effect that a certain amount of money may be used for this specific purpose.

Mr. BOLLES. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If this is true, I do not see any object in asking for an investigation. We can eliminate items of that kind from the appropriation bills if we are willing to do so, and I am willing to do so.

Mr. BOLLES. Oh, no. A lot of this stuff is buried under a brush heap where the smell of the skunk is not noticeable.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Perhaps I am in error in saying we could eliminate all of it, but we could eliminate a large amount of it.

Mr. BOLLES. Yes; we could, but you do not do it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct, we do not do it.

Mr. BOLLES. No. You sit here and vote for it day after day.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, I do not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; if it is not taken out of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for a few moments permit me to call to the attention of the few who are here in the House today the manner in which our national-defense program is being menaced by the C. I. O. and the Communists.

While the President reports hostile submarines off our shores; while Germany warns us that the *Iroquois* is to be destroyed; while Great Britain denies our right to establish a neutral zone as advocated by the Americas; while Stalin joins hands with Hitler and apparently prepares to turn loose the "red" menace upon all civilization, we here in America sleep on, blind to the very real danger of the "reds," who, day after day, strike at the very foundation of our Government, at our national defense.

We are all familiar with the fact that in most industries—industries which are essential to a successful national defense,

to say nothing of the carrying on of a foreign war into which only the most earnest, patriotic efforts of this Congress can prevent us becoming involved; industries such as coal, steel, motors, and oil, John L. Lewis—his C. I. O. has obtained a strangle hold—is in a position where, if war comes, and under the present plans for a selective draft, men in essential industries such as those enumerated will be left at home while other loyal citizens are sent to foreign lands, this Government can be successfully destroyed.

Right here at home there is plenty of trouble if we want to look for it or if we want to see it when it appears on the front pages of the newspapers.

Here is a situation to which your attention is called and to which we may all give serious thought and then act. The last Congress appropriated millions of dollars for national defense. We authorized the construction not only of additional battleships and the purchase of munitions of war of all kinds, but we gave instructions and we appropriated the money for the building of millions of dollars' worth of airplanes. We did this on the theory that these airplanes are necessary immediately to our national defense. We did not authorize those airplanes, we did not appropriate the money to build them to send across the water so they might be used in a war over in the other hemisphere.

The War Department and the Navy Department entered into contracts for the construction of those planes. Among the contracts entered into by the War Department was one with the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, of Detroit, which has several plants. This contract was for the making of bearings which are to be used in motors.

On the 29th day of August an affiliate of the C. I. O. called a strike at the Bohn plant. This strike was not called for the purpose of getting shorter hours or higher wages. It was called to force every man who worked in the plants of this corporation to pay dues to this particular union.

The bargaining agent for the employees for this company was a C. I. O. affiliate. That organization made a demand upon the company for a closed or preferential shop; that is, that all employees be required to pay dues in order to work. Look at this proposition as it is. Here is a great factory, employing thousands of men, engaging in manufacturing bearings which are absolutely necessary if this Nation is to be prepared to defend itself on land and sea. Here is a union organization which on the 29th day of August 1939 closed that great factory engaged on Government work and demanded that no one work therein until he agreed to pay tribute to it.

Follow them and see where we get if we permit that kind of thing to continue. Under the plan of the President, announced not so very long ago through the public press, when the draft law is put into force one of the last groups to be taken will be those engaged in essential industries, and those essential industries are coal, steel, motors, and oil. So, if the C. I. O. can get control over all the men, as it proposes to do or as it proposed to do in this particular strike, who enter those industries, then they are the last to be called in case of war; and who goes to fight the war? Those who do not belong to these organizations will be called first.

Here is what the C. I. O. did in this particular strike, which began on the 29th of August and continued until day before yesterday—Monday, the 9th day of October. They tied up those factories engaged in the manufacture of bearings which went into motors which the Army and Navy needed for national defense. There is no question about it. Stalin himself could have taken no course to more effectively hamper, to have obtained control over the production of articles which are necessary for American defense, than did this union. Here is a labor organization which demands that in order to aid our country in preparing for its defense all men must acknowledge allegiance to it.

Here you have in America an organization which reaches out its hand and stops the wheels in the factories which are producing those things that are essential to our national defense, and we sit here and do nothing about it, and the administration does nothing about it.

Turn now to the situation as it applied to the Navy. The Navy had a contract for the construction of a bearing which went into a motor which was necessary for the production of a special type of airplane which the Navy deemed essential for our national defense. The bearing could not be obtained from any other company. The Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation had on hand a large number of these bearings. It had in its possession the plans and specifications which belonged to the Navy and the possession of which was necessary if the bearings were to be manufactured; and then the C. I. O. affiliate—and there is no doubt but that the C. I. O. is shot through and through with communistic ideas and that it employs communistic methods—threw a picket line around this plant and for 41 calendar days held up the production and delivery of bearings which the United States Army and Navy needed, and by force prevented the delivery to the Navy of parts which are absolutely necessary to make the planes that protect our country. What do you think of that kind of a situation? I go one step further, and I am making these statements on my responsibility as a Member of this House. When the Navy of the United States demanded of this union that it withdraw its pickets, and that these parts be delivered so they could be put into the Navy planes, the union refused. How do you like that? It is not treason, because we are not engaged in war, but it is a criminal conspiracy to overthrow or to prevent the activities of this Government, and to do it by force. In the words of Chief Justice Marshall, it was "a conspiracy to subvert by force the Government of our country." And the man at the head of that strike was Frankenstein. This strike and its results were called to the attention of the Labor Department, and the officials of the company were called down here and they were told by the War Department that the production and delivery of these parts was necessary, and that the strike must be ended. But did the Government call down the representative of the union? If it did the union representative did not come. Oh, no. Frankenstein, sitting in Detroit, called up the Labor Department and told them what the union wanted. And the strike was settled. How do you like that? Who is running this Government, and what is the sense of sitting here and voting millions of dollars to produce planes and to manufacture munitions of war when all the time overhanging us is this red hand controlled by Russia, which says, on occasion, as it did one day not in the distant past, and as it will some day not in the distant future, but as it did from the 29th day of August to the 9th day of October—41 calendar days—"you may not fill that order"; holding in its grasp the manufacture and production and delivery of parts essential to our national defense. What happens to Frankenstein? Is he prosecuted? Oh, no. Frankenstein was the man appointed by Governor Murphy to distribute relief in the State of Michigan, and today Attorney General Murphy does not see Frankenstein, or his hand in this criminal conspiracy. Now, I ask you, Where is our manhood, where is our courage, where is our patriotism, our loyalty to our system of government, when we submit to such a situation as this? How much longer are we going to let John L. Lewis and his C. I. O., the Communists within its ranks, tell us and the President of the United States who can and who cannot work and when and where this Government of ours is to obtain delivery of articles upon which our national defense depends? Take that question home with you and come back tomorrow or later in the week or next week, if you cannot before find the answer, and then declare that no longer will we submit to these Communists who get their orders from Moscow, to the C. I. O. which conceives itself to be above the law, to be more powerful than the Government itself. How long are we going to sit here and stand for this sort of a proposition? I will drop into the basket tomorrow a bill to make it a criminal offense to prevent or interfere with the manufacture of necessary Government implements or munitions of war; and I shall drop into the basket also a resolution, privileged, calling on the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to tell us the facts; and you gentlemen then can read the official record

and see how much of my statement is true. Then, if you want, you can sit here day after day and let this red menace that comes from across the sea interfere with our national defense if you desire, but you will never be able to say that you were not advised of the danger. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a brief editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] he may address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

#### NUMBER OF STRIKES SINCE 1928

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] tell us what has happened in the way of strikes in this country, and especially at a time when it is very imperative if this country wants to be put on a proper defense basis, in order that it may protect its shores and its people in case of any eventuality. I do not believe that the Congress or the American people want this country to be put in a position where it cannot have adequate defense. On the other hand, I do not believe that citizens of the country want to have any larger Army nor any larger Navy nor any larger air force than is necessary for that particular purpose—adequate national defense. So that when we are trying to get our country on a footing where we may have adequate defense it seems that it is the wrong thing for anyone in the country, if they are good, sound, honest American citizens, to strike in order that we may not accomplish that end. I think it perfectly right for labor organizations to use the strike method to secure justice for the worker insofar as they do not interfere with the normal operation of our Government; but I call attention at this time to the great number of strikes that have occurred in this country since 1928, and I think this information is of sufficient value to make Members realize what is going on because of the war that we are now having between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. Certainly one of those organizations must be wrong. There is something that is wrong that will permit labor that is striking for the benefit of the individual workman to do things that are not only contrary to the welfare of the workers of the country but are contrary to the principles involved in trying to take care of our Nation and our national defense.

In 1928 we had 604 strikes. In 1929, 921 strikes. In 1930, 637 strikes. In 1931, 810 strikes. In 1932, 841 strikes. There is an average of about 760 strikes per year during the years 1929 to 1932.

But let us see what happened beginning in 1933. Since the New Deal has operated our Government, in 1933 we had 1,695 strikes—more than double what we had on the average in the 5 preceding years. In 1934 we had 1,856 strikes in this country. In 1935 we had 2,014. Just note how they are increasing yearly from 1933. In 1936 we had 2,172 strikes in this country. In 1937 it jumped to 4,740 strikes. Think of it—6 times as many as we had in the previous 5 years before



this administration came into power. Are strikes a symbol of success? If so, then this administration is successful in that respect.

In 1938 we had 2,772 strikes. From 1928 to 1932 there was a total of 3,812 strikes in this country. From 1933 to 1939 we had 15,247 strikes in this country—over 450 percent increase in the number of strikes over the last 5 years preceding this administration's coming into power.

Does it not seem as if there was something wrong? Is it possible that labor is being benefited by this great number of strikes, when there are the number of workers involved in these various lay-offs? Labor loses, manufacturers lose, capital loses, and the country loses.

I want to insert in the RECORD the number of man-days that were lost during those strikes and the workers involved. It certainly will convince the Members of Congress, and certainly ought to convince labor, that the method the labor unions are pursuing at the present time must be wrong.

*Strikes in United States, 1928-38*

Year	Number of strikes	Number of workers involved	Number of man-days idle
1928	604	314,210	12,631,863
1929	921	285,572	5,351,540
1930	637	182,975	3,316,808
1931	810	341,817	6,893,244
1932	841	324,210	10,502,033
1933	1,695	1,168,272	16,872,128
1934	1,856	1,466,695	19,872,128
1935	2,014	1,117,213	15,456,337
1936	2,172	788,648	13,901,956
1937	4,740	1,890,621	28,424,857
1938	2,772	688,376	9,148,273

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Apr. 10, 1939.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. GEYER of California. Would not the gentleman like to discuss for a few moments the decrease in the number of strikes after the time when the Supreme Court passed upon a certain bill? Do you not think it would give a different bearing if the gentleman would give us those figures?

Mr. RICH. If I had those figures I assure you I would be glad to give them to you. I, however, do not have them. But I want to say to the gentleman that there is something wrong in Denmark. There is something wrong in America when there are the number of strikes which we have now. If you pick up the morning Post or the morning Times-Herald, you will see listed a number of strikes in the city of Washington. Look at the New York Times of this morning and see the number of strikes going on there. Pick up any paper you want to in this Nation and see what is happening. Strikes, strikes, strikes all over. You will see that notwithstanding a decision of the Supreme Court, this country is being overburdened with strikes. This country is being over-influenced by radicals—men who come here from Russia; men who have come here from foreign countries, who have "isms" in their souls. It is time we took the "isms" out of all those fellows except Americanism, or else let us send them back over the ocean where they belong. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the study which the gentleman has given to this presentation he is now making, what, in his opinion, is the primary cause of that tremendous increase in the number of strikes in the latter period as compared with the prior period?

Mr. RICH. My own personal opinion is the fact that we have so many radicals in this country who do not care a rap for the men they are trying to work for in the labor unions. They do not care a tinker's hoot for the manufacturers of this country. They do not care a rap for this country of ours. All they want to do is pull down ten, fifteen, or twenty-five thousand dollars a year salaries, and they want to do everything that the Russian Government would like to have them do. They are the fellows who are responsible, in my judgment, for these strikes. The sooner

the Dies Committee lines them up and we load them on a boat and send them overseas, the better we will be off. I hope I have the privilege of going down there to help load them on.

That is one reason I would like to see American boats used now for transporting radical aliens, because I would not want to contaminate any foreign vessels taking them across the ocean. But I think we have enough red-blooded Americans in this country who will load them on and man the ships and take them over the ocean to some place and dump them on some island perhaps. I think perhaps the best place would be to take them down to the South Sea Islands where there are no inhabitants and leave them there. We might send them a little food to keep them from starving to death, but there they could have any kind of government they wanted. They could do anything they chose, so long as they did not kill each other. If they happened to want to take that method of eradicating themselves, that would be all right with me. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. RICH. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is an experienced manufacturer. I have made a pretty close study of the wage structure in my own district. Is it not true in the gentleman's district—and I will say it is true in my district—that during this latter period which has been described wages have materially increased?

Mr. RICH. That is a fact.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the wage increases have occurred without being forced into operation by any law which the Congress has passed. In the gentleman's opinion, have the strikes been the result of the workers being dissatisfied, primarily, with the wages they received, or are they primarily the result of these agitators, non-Americans, to whom the gentleman has referred?

Mr. RICH. It is primarily the result of those agitators. American labor today is desirous and anxious to work. The American manufacturer today is doing everything he can to try to help his employees. The American manufacturer realizes that the most valuable asset he has in his business is the work that is produced by American workmen. It is more vital to the businessman than buildings and machinery. It is more vital to business than capital. Capital and labor are indispensable to business.

It would be impossible to get along without them. This is the first consideration. Manufacturers want happy, contented employees, for a manufacturer knows when they are in that frame of mind he is able to produce products such as he could not otherwise produce.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a few brief questions?

Mr. RICH. Certainly. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is not this alien-directed wave of strike terrorism unfair to more than 12,000,000 of our people who are unemployed, who want jobs and cannot find them?

Mr. RICH. Absolutely. If the gentleman would investigate the real causes of the strikes, he would agree with me that it is imperative that we change some of the laws that have been put on the statute books—the Wagner Act and the set-up of the N. L. R. B. The fact is that American laborers are compelled by these radical labor leaders to quit their jobs when they do not want to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROBERTSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that most of these strikes the gentleman mentions, strikes that have been destroying jobs, were instigated by professional agitators and

racketeers, perhaps many of whom never had on a pair of overalls in their lives, and who take a position that a working man or woman shall not earn their bread in the sweat of their brow unless their labor is sold by said professionals?

Mr. RICH. The great majority of these strikes have been brought about by radical communistic labor agitators.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And when the gentleman makes arrangements to load these alien professional racketeer labor-union agitators on that boat I hope he will reserve first-class passage on the first boat for that alien Communist British subject, Harry Bridges, who has been trying to destroy our American merchant marine, which is an essential arm of our national defense. Bridges is a subject of Great Britain who came to America from Australia. Since the country of his allegiance is now engaged in war, Bridges, an experienced guerrilla warfare leader, would render exceptional service to his King.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this boat should be big enough to put all men on who do not believe in the American form of government, the American Constitution, and the American way of living. I think it ought to be big enough to put them all on, because we have no place in America for anybody who does not believe in these principles. Put all on that boat who cannot look up to the American flag and say: "That is my flag; that is the flag that flies over my country; I want to protect that flag." If he will not get on the boat voluntarily, I want to see the proper authorities take hold of him and put him on. And you and I will be glad to help them—with force, power, bayonets, guns, or fists, if necessary.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. HAWKS. Is it not a fact that the principle of collective bargaining is absolutely all right, but that the difficulty and danger comes from the leadership of the unions under collective bargaining? Is not that destroying the whole labor program in this country?

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is absolutely right. The principle of collective bargaining is the proper mode of procedure in labor-employer relations. Labor should be allowed to get together to try to settle their differences with their employers. They should be allowed to sit down and talk to their employers, but under the National Labor Relations Act if an employee goes to his employer and tries to talk to him in reference to his employment and his difficulties, right away the National Labor Relations Board steps up and says to the employer: "Because you have talked to that individual, this case will be thrown out." That is un-American in principle.

If ever we needed a law changed, it is the National Labor Relations Act and the Wagner Act. President Roosevelt said the Neutrality Act was wrong but that he signed it. He wants it changed. Let the President remember also that he signed the order setting up the National Labor Relations Board and the Wagner Act, and they are just as bad as the Neutrality Act. Why does he not recommend a change? I shall be pleased to help him and support him in trying to change all of them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 1 minute. I wish to ask him a question.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we have plenty of time I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for a minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTINGER. My question may not be exactly in point, but I should like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that while the House is marking time and the Senate debating a bill it would be well for Congress to take up uncompleted legislation? By this I mean legislative matters that were not reached in the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are a number of important bills that were not reached in the last session of Congress prior to its adjournment on

August 5; for instance, the amendment to the W. P. A. Relief Act of 1940 and a lot of other bills.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is absolutely right. We have been here now for 3 weeks but we have not done a thing.

The House of Representatives has passed only one bill, giving us our mileage, paying the Members of Congress for coming here, sitting around, and doing nothing. We could be changing some of these laws that have been enacted during the last 5 or 6 years that are wrong, laws that are doing more damage and more to hinder the orderly pursuit of government than anything else possibly could. I think the gentleman is right. We should be here considering this legislation and changing these laws so that we can make this country what we would all like to have it—a better America; a better place to live; a happy and contented people. I hope we will preserve our form of government, our Constitution, and our flag.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VREELAND. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two radio speeches on the dedication of Seton Hall College.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND]? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELOSON] for 30 minutes.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, in my discourse of yesterday I deviated from my subject a little. I referred to Great Britain and the propaganda that has been carried on by that Government for a number of years, and the propaganda that is now going on in the daily papers, as well as in many magazines. I have a magazine here in which there is an article entitled "Military Alliance with England," by Lord Beaverbrook.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article in connection with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELOSON]? There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long is the article?

Mr. THORKELOSON. Eight columns in this magazine.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that the Lord Beaverbrook, the British publisher, who had dinner at the White House the other day?

Mr. THORKELOSON. I believe it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELOSON]? There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

[From the American Mercury of August 1939]

#### A MILITARY ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND

(By Lord Beaverbrook)

The United States and Great Britain will, I believe, enter into a military and naval alliance in the course of time. They will make such an alliance because they must do so. There is no alternative for these two nations but to find security for the future in the companionship of one another.

In some quarters in Britain it is believed that the United States will not have the alliance. And there is, accordingly, a reluctant tendency to put this ideal of closer relations in the category of admirable but unattainable objects. This regretful conviction is, in my view, profoundly mistaken. Perhaps the people of the United States take the view that Britain's liabilities are too big and her assets not big enough. If this were an accurate estimate of the situation of Britain, then, of course, it would be a reasonable attitude to adopt. No one could quarrel with it. The matter would be at an end. But it is not accurate. Indeed, it is totally wrong. Britain would bring very substantial assets to any joint account that the two nations might enter on. And, if we are to have a true picture of the situation between the two countries, we must not leave the liabilities of the United States out of the reckoning. Make no mistake; those liabilities are great indeed, and you do not escape from them by withdrawing from the Philippines. On balance, I believe the surplus of assets is to be found on the side of the British Empire.

There is, to begin with, the very great burden you have incurred under the Monroe Doctrine, to defend all the independent states of the American Continent against the aggression of a foreign power. This is a heavy responsibility. It may seem that an at-



tack on any South American country by a foreign state is a very remote contingency. But are you so sure that it is? For instance, we have seen Italians in the Argentine determining the policy of that republic to the League of Nations. Will the Italians go further? We live in an age of hungry and ambitious powers whose governments are not subject to the same democratic checks upon reckless adventure as exist in the United States and in Britain.

But another liability is, of course, much more immediate and obvious, the peril in the Pacific. The threat of the Japanese Fleet, with, behind it, the threat of the Japanese Army. There is no need to indulge in scaremongering on this subject. It would be as foolish as it would be wicked. But the simple fact is that in the Japanese Empire we have a proud and ambitious race, fanatically devoted to a national ideal, courageous in battle, and highly equipped for war. This oriental race of splendid qualities has shown itself in recent years swift and ruthless in action, patient and resolute in carrying out a program of expansion. For the moment, its activities are directed to the continent of Asia. But there are necessities which cannot be fulfilled in China. The Japanese seek an outlet for their population. They cannot find it in China, already overcrowded, or in Manchuria, where the climate is unsuitable to their people. Where will they find it? They must look out, across the Pacific Ocean. And what do they see as they look toward the rising sun, the symbol of their national flag? The beautiful seaboard of California.

It may be said that the Japanese will look rather to Australia. But an invasion of Australia would be a military enterprise fraught with immense perils. The tropical archipelago which separates Japan from Australia would be infested with mines, with submarines, and with other destructive craft. Japanese communications would be intolerably harassed. And besides, the British naval base at Singapore, with the Indian Ocean behind it, would provide Britain with the necessary authority, so long as we did not abandon our naval domination.

An attack by the Japanese on the Pacific coast of the United States would certainly have to deal with a serious obstacle in Hawaii, although an attack on Pearl Harbor would not compare in danger with an assault on Singapore. And whereas a landing on the north coast of Australia would be a landing on an undeveloped tropical territory with a small population and separated by deserts from the centers of Australian life, a landing in California would not present such problems. California, moreover, has something which the Japanese want very badly and which they would not find in Australia—oil.

So far as the Pacific is concerned, then, it seems that the United States carries heavier liabilities than the British Empire. But there are other things to be borne in mind. Britain has assets of a positive character. She has the biggest merchant fleet in the world, valuable in itself and with an additional potential value as a source of splendid seamen in time of war. Her navy—on paper equal to the Navy of the United States—is in all probability more powerful in fact. Her air force is reported to be of the highest efficiency and is expanding swiftly at the present time—some say at the rate of more than a squadron a week. There are in the British Empire immense resources of raw materials and of industrial power, sufficient to equip for a war of modern character her millions of white people who, though peaceful, are not without courage.

If there were closer relations between the two nations, if there were an understanding, Britain would not come empty-handed into the association. Indeed, it is obvious that she could contribute something of the highest value to the security of the United States, an undertaking to protect the Atlantic seaboard of your country with her fleet. If America could concentrate her whole Navy in the Pacific with the knowledge that her front door was barred and bolted by battleships flying the British flag, that would be a matter of great comfort to the American people in a moment of stress. And Britain has the resources, the ships, and the naval stations to confer this benefit.

## II

It is quite true that there are liabilities as well as assets on the British balance sheet. One of these is of a serious character. As an island lying off the coast of the European Continent, Britain has for centuries taken an interest in the affairs of the European peoples. We have fought in their wars, believing that our own safety was involved in the fortunes of one side or another in the conflict. It has for long been a basic doctrine of British policy that the mouth of the River Scheldt must not be in the hands of a great power. And so slow are statesmen in awakening to changed circumstances that some of them still fail to realize that the policy which was suitable for an island kingdom is quite out of place for an empire which spans the globe and contains vast dominions populated by vigorous and growing peoples.

Americans may argue that closer relations with Britain involve the danger of entanglement in European wars. It is well understood that this would be too high a price to pay for the British association. For this reason those who desire most earnestly to advance toward an understanding with America are most determined and persistent in urging a policy of isolation upon Britain, a policy of detachment from European quarrels.

It is remarkable how slow a nation is to learn by bitter experience, how readily it forgets painful lessons. The Crimean War, so painful in its memories for the British people, sprang out of a situation similar to that with which we recently have had to deal in the war between Italy and Ethiopia. In that case the British Government egged on the Turks to defy the power of Russia. Left to their own devices, the Turks would have submitted to the Russians in the trifling dispute which arose over the possession of the holy places

in Palestine. But with the might of Britain behind them, they chose to resist. In the end there came war, not only upon Turkey but upon Britain also—a long, weary, bloody war on which the nation looked with gloomy horror.

Yet there is no doubt about it; the Crimean War was, in the beginning, a popular war. The people favored it. A section of the newspapers demanded it. The mood of the people was expressed at a dinner held in the Reform Club when Admiral Sir Charles Napier, commander of a British fleet about to leave for the Baltic, said in public that he expected he would be able to declare war against Russia when he reached there. The audience greeted this with cheers and shouts of "Good old Charlie!" And when John Bright opposed the war he was looked upon as a base man guilty of unpatriotic actions.

We have not got so far as that on this occasion. But we have had an English archbishop telling us that it may be necessary to have another great and horrible war to establish the efficacy of the League of Nations. "This generation or the next will probably have to be sacrificed," said the distinguished ecclesiastic.

But there is good reason to suppose that this is a passing mood of the people, not a fixed attitude. It has sprung up swiftly during days of excitement, and generous, although misguided, emotion. The cause of "Little Abyssinia" appealed very much as the cause of the Cuban rebels did to the people of the United States 40 years ago. And these storms of passion rarely, if ever, have an influence in shaping permanent policy. The mood changes too swiftly. Certainly the change in viewpoint is very marked compared with the situation we had in 1922. At that time I was able to take part in a movement which brought down the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, and destroyed his government. And what was the charge against him? What was the crime he had committed in the eyes of the public? Simply that he had threatened to use military sanctions against the Turks for an offense against a peace treaty, and therefore against the League, every bit as glaring as the Italian invasion of Ethiopia.

The growing strength of the isolation sentiment in the country will be sufficient to defeat any attempt to saddle Britain with a fixed commitment to take part in war on the continent of Europe. And, if there is any movement in the direction of the United States—a movement for which the American people can give the signal—it would inevitably be accompanied by a decision to turn away from Europe.

## III

I have tried to establish my belief that in such close relations of the two peoples the balance of advantage would not be all on the one side. It would be an equal association of risks and benefits. By uniting our resources we both gain a measure of security such as we can hardly hope to attain by any other means. Indeed, if we cannot work together, if we must conduct separately our preparations for defense in this troubled world, then, of course, there will be an expenditure on arms, a concentration on military affairs, which our peoples would find irksome and maybe intolerable. We are peaceable-minded folk; we wish to be left to mind our own business and contribute to the welfare of ourselves and our fellows. We hate war. We detest the compulsion and regimentation which is a characteristic of militarist societies. These things are alien to both of us.

Yet we face this situation. The dictator-ruled states are powerful and warlike, openly ambitious and predatory; they use a monopoly of information and the press in order to shape the minds of their populations and prepare the war spirit. And therefore the democracies, standing alone, may have to choose between imitating the methods and emulating the armaments of the dictatorships or, on the other hand, going down to defeat.

Is there any way out of this dilemma which faces us? Indeed there is. The way out of the dilemma is an association of the two great democracies, children respectively of the Puritan revolution and the American Revolution, which would offer us the prospect of security without the loss of the civilian freedom which we cherish, and which would enable us to look on the threatening ambitions of other nations without weighting ourselves down with a load of armaments.

And certainly this conception of closer relations does not rest on self-interest alone. It is based on the belief that there are bonds between the two peoples closer and stronger than those between any two free nations on earth. It is the presence of these bonds which argue most persuasively for the association and which would be the surest guarantee of its success. We spring from the same racial stock. We speak the same language. We cherish the same religious ideas. If there are differences between the creeds and rites found in one country, these differences are repeated in the other. And, having inherited a common stock of traditions, we pursue the same ideals in politics, morals, and social life. Our life, as peoples, consists in the protection, the strengthening, and the spreading of those ideals. And the fact that we hold them in common offers us a reasonable confidence that a real basis of cooperation exists between us. Already it can be said the relations between us are not conceived on the usual pattern of mutual distrust and envy which exists between two foreign nations. We are agreed at least in declaring that war between us is impossible. And this is not a mere commonplace. There are 3,000 miles of undefended common frontier to give it reality.

I do not deny that there have been in the past misunderstandings between our two peoples, sometimes of a serious character; but on no occasion for many generations have these misunderstandings given rise, in the most pressing circumstances, to the

fear of war between our nations. It is true that President Cleveland, in 1896, made use of the old, time-honored expedient of twisting the lion's tail over a boundary dispute in Venezuela. But what was the result? His political opponents at once charged him with attempting to make political capital at the expense of the national interests. Most of his supporters refused to follow him in such expedients. The New York and other newspapers condemned him out of hand. Ministers of the gospel over the length and breadth of the land advised the President to pursue the paths of peace. But if fight he must, the preachers took the view, that the cause of Armenia might be of more interest to the American people than boundary disputes in Venezuela. And, while jingoes sang the words of the national anthem, a cartoon which had given the public in an earlier campaign a representation of Mr. Cleveland joining in the demonstration with a variation of the sentiment by singing "My Country, 'Tis of Me!" was widely reproduced.

Only a few years had passed when Admiral Dewey, moving to the attack on Manila and pursued by German naval forces, was protected by British warships under the command of Captain Chichester. These British ships, ready for action, deliberately sailed into the path of the oncoming Germans, thus forming a rear guard for the advancing American squadron.

Those pages in history are, I regret to say, not well known nor widely read on either side of the Atlantic. Nor is it realized in Britain or the United States that at the time of the War of Independence, the American cause was more popular in the city of London than in the city of New York, and that the American insurgents got support of more value in the House of Commons at Westminster than in the Congress sitting in Philadelphia.

IV

That is the story of the past. What of the days to come?

The issues are graver now than they used to be. War brings with it not the danger of defeat, indemnity, loss of territory, but the possibility of complete devastation, destruction—it may be, the wiping out of whole populations. That is what we have to face. If science has made war so much more deadly and damaging, we should adjust our policies to the new situation. We should, if possible, double our insurance. And what better guaranty of the safety of ourselves and our children could we have than a broad understanding between our two nations, a resolve to walk in companionship?

In that association we should be unassailable, for no possible coalition of hostile nations could equal our strength. We should be free from external quarrels, since we do not harbor aggressive designs in any quarter of the globe. We should follow the rightful purposes of our peoples, free from the obsession of war and able to devote ourselves to beneficial projects. We should be an example to the whole world of the advantages of a determined policy of peace. And in this we should realize, as we can do in no other way, the highest ideals of those Christian peoples, the United States and the British Empire.

These are some of the benefits which will flow from closer relations between the two Nations, sundered for more than a hundred years, and now, I believe, destined to be reunited in a community of interest and of purpose.

MR. THORKE. Mr. Speaker, the reason I propose this request is because the claims in this article are falsehoods. What is set forth in the article did not in reality happen.

I wish to take you back 41 years, when the American Fleet was anchored in Hong Kong Bay, just before declaration of the Spanish-American War. Just before that there were certain of our ships in the harbor of Hong Kong, which I shall name.

Let the record show that for several weeks prior to the breaking out of the Spanish-American War in 1898 the Asiatic squadron of the United States Navy, consisting of the cruisers *Olympia*, *Raleigh*, *Boston*, *Charleston*, and *Baltimore*, and the gunboats *Concord*, *Monocacy*, and *Petrel*, the supply vessel *Zafiro*, the colliers *Brutus*, *Nashan*, and *Nero*, the monitors *Monadnock* and *Monterey*, the transports *City of Pekin* and *Sidney*, and the revenue cutter *McCulloch*, had been lying in the harbor of Hong Kong, China, then under the colonial control of the British. Commodore George Dewey was in command of this squadron. Almost immediately after the declaration of war by the Congress a colonial proclamation of neutrality was issued and Dewey was given 24 hours' notice to put to sea by the British. Dewey repaired with his fleet to Mirs Bay, near Hong Kong, took on coal and supplies from his tenders, and proceeded to Manila. What he accomplished there is a matter of history. This fairy tale of the British admiral sailing in to protect Dewey against attack by the German naval vessels at Manila is just another example of the intensive British propaganda now being used in this country to get us into a military alliance with Great Britain and into the next World War when it really gets under way.

I recall that because I marched with the boys to the Army when we volunteered for that war. The German Fleet was in Manila Bay when Dewey arrived. The English squadron did not intercept the German squadron. When Lord Beaverbrook makes that statement he lies, and I do not like to use that word. I do not care whether he is British or not; that is immaterial; it is the statements that he makes to which I object. Great Britain "funks" on most her promises, yet today this country is filled and overloaded with British propaganda. The headquarters for this propaganda is in London. It is propaganda of the "invisible government." Some day I may have to name those boys so that you will know them, but I am not going to do it now. At any rate, let me say that it is very foolish for the American people to pay any attention to the propaganda that constantly appears in the press, because it has no other purpose in view except to raise our feeling against Central European Powers. The power behind this propaganda machine—the "invisible government"—is particularly desirous of our forming an alliance with England.

In London there is an organization called the British Israel Organization, founded upon the legend of the 10 lost tribes of Israel. There is a paper published by the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America, called *Destiny*, which is purely a propaganda publication, under the auspices of those who propose a world government. Its purpose is to fool the American people. So do not believe all that you read in this magazine.

Several days ago I addressed a letter to the State Department, asking questions with regard to the rights of neutrals and the rights of nations at war. I shall now read these questions into the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In line with my telephone conversation today and the kind invitation of Mr. Savage to propose in writing such questions as were not clear to me, I am acting upon that suggestion and request the State Department's reply to the following questions:

1. When Germany, England, and France, or other nations have declared war, does not such declaration include all colonies, territories, or landed surface flying the flag of such nations at war?

The following answers are all my own:

The answer is, "Yes."

2. Who determines the right of blockade?

Nations at war.

3. Who determines the extent of the blockade?

Nations at war.

4. Is it within the right of nations at war to lay down a blockade on the colonies and territories of its enemy?

The answer is, "Yes."

5. Who names the contraband, nations at war, or neutrals?

The answer is, "Nations at war."

6. Is a neutral ship carrying contraband cargo to nations at war or to their colonies considered as a blockade runner?

Yes.

7. Are neutral ships with contraband cargo to nations at war subject to seizure?

Yes.

8a. Isn't a neutral ship with contraband cargo to nations at war subject to seizure after leaving the 3-mile limit of the neutral port until she reaches her destination?

The answer is again "Yes."

b. Are not all neutral ships, with or without cargo (except Red Cross), when bound to nations at war, subject to seizure by the enemy?

The answer is, "Yes."

9. Isn't a neutral ship with a contraband cargo continually in a zone of attack throughout the whole route and subject to interception until she reaches her destination, providing such ports are located in nations and territories engaged in war?

The answer to that question is, "Yes."

10. Assuming that four ships leave the port of New York, each of them with a contraband cargo, one bound to England, one bound to Germany, one bound to an English possession in the Pacific, and one bound to a German possession in the Pacific; assuming further that each of these ships is overhauled by an enemy patrol, isn't it true that each of them will be considered a prize of war, and disposed of accordingly?



The answer is, "Yes."

11. Isn't it true that war zones and patrolled zones are equally dangerous to neutral shipping carrying contraband cargo to the power at war? And that the danger to property and life is exactly the same when intercepted by enemy patrol?

The answer is, "Yes."

12. Isn't it true that the rights of all neutrals outside their own ocean limits, whether it be 3 or 12 miles, are exactly the same, and that one power has no greater right than another neutral power to establish potential safety zones for their own ships by declaring war zones?

The answer to that question is, "Yes."

The next question in this letter is this:

13. When a neutral nation has proclaimed a war zone, to what extent may such nation employ its own navy for the protection of such shipping to territories or possessions of nations at war?

None; it cannot use its own navy to protect such a zone without getting into trouble.

14. If neutral ships are cleared with contraband cargo to the possessions and territories of nations at war, and are captured by an enemy patrol, is such act *causus belli* for the neutral nation that owns the ship?

No, indeed, it is not, because a neutral nation which undertakes to clear its ships with a contraband cargo to nations at war, it follows when such ship is overtaken by an enemy patrol it may be commandeered and the ship seized or else it may be sunk if it cannot be convoyed to port.

15. (a) Isn't it short of an act of war for a neutral to proclaim war zones, and, by indirection, suggest neutral zones and clear its own shipping with contraband cargo to enemy possessions located in assumed safety zones?

It is practically an act of war if you attempt to enforce such a provision.

(b) If a neutral, having declared such war zones, and, by indirection, neutral zones, decides to back up such declaration, isn't the ultimate result going to be war with such powers as refuse to be regimented and ordered about by a neutral nation?

The answer is "Yes."

I propounded these questions because they are intimately concerned with the act we are now considering.

We have no right, of course, to pass any legislation in this House that operates beyond the 3-mile limit of the United States, and that principle holds good for all the other nations in the world, because the 3-mile limit is conceded and accepted among nations throughout the world. There has been some discussion of a 12-mile limit, and there was a discussion of a hundred-mile limit during prohibition time, but that is no longer important.

Here is another thing we must bear in mind: Much has been said in the past 2 days about submarines being off our coast somewhere. Any submarine has a perfect right to be outside of the 3-mile limit. You cannot stop them. They may even come into a harbor, but they must leave the harbor within 24 hours or be interned for the remainder of the war.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. I shall be very pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Under the plan which Under Secretary Welles proposed to the South American dictatorship countries, a 300-mile neutral zone is to be established off the coast of the Americas, and our American Navy is to patrol said zone. Would not the establishment of such a 300-mile zone prohibit cash-and-carry or credit-and-carry shipments of all kinds because the belligerent nations have armed the ships of their merchant marines, and if they come within the 300-mile Welles neutral zone they are subject to extermination by our American Navy, if the 300-mile zone of neutrality means what Welles has said it means?

Mr. THORKELSON. Well, I may tell the gentleman from Wisconsin that the question is rather complicated—

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I will make it somewhat simpler—

Mr. THORKELSON. Let me answer the question first, please, because I would rather do that.

LXXXV—20

The British have a perfect right to arm their merchantmen, and a neutral has no right to say whether or not she should arm them. The British nation may arm its own merchant ships, but when they do arm such a vessel it becomes a war vessel. So when a British merchant ship that is armed comes into an American port, it can only remain in that port for 24 hours, or else it will be treated exactly the same as any other war vessel.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. That is the point; and if America adopts the Welles program of a 300-mile neutral zone, then no ship of any belligerent or peaceful nation could come within that zone and carry arms, munitions, implements of war, or war supplies.

Mr. THORKELSON. I am just wondering how it would work out. Of course, Great Britain has expressed an opinion on that, and she has said that if the United States Navy attempted to enforce any provision of that sort, or any such declaration, it would mean war for the United States and nothing else.

I now want to call your attention to another point in this connection. Suppose they set aside a 300-mile zone for merchant ships. These ships make about 8 knots an hour, and it would take them quite a long while to travel through that zone. It would be tantamount to operating within the 3-mile limit. It would take them several days to reach port in a 300-mile zone. Assuming that the 300-mile zone is equal to the 3-mile zone and the distance traveled is under 300 miles in 24 hours, such ship would be theoretically interned before it reached port. The conferences which draft such legislation take too much for granted. Our Federal Government should learn to run the United States first before trying to dictate to the world, and then we will get along much better.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask three or four questions in sequence. First, does the gentleman understand that the 21-nation agreement which was agreed upon at Panama is now in operation?

Mr. THORKELSON. I did not know that it is in operation, but if it is, it is very unfortunate for us, because if this agreement is now in operation, it will not be recognized by other nations; and we are in quite a dilemma if we attempt to enforce it. What does it mean? There is not one South American Republic that has a navy worth anything, and it means that the United States would have to protect all of South America and all of the Central American Republics because they do not have an adequate navy for such enforcement or protection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Let me add this to the gentleman's statement. Is it not true that in these zones 16 of the possessions are British?

Mr. THORKELSON. I could not say as to that, I could not give the exact number. Of course there is quite a number in the Caribbean Sea, and British Honduras, and a lot of other British possessions.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. There are 16 different British possessions and I can give the gentleman the names if he desires.

Mr. THORKELSON. I shall ask the gentleman to place them in the RECORD.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. And does the gentleman not know that there are grave potentialities in this guardianship over these 16 British possessions?

Mr. THORKELSON. In reply to the gentleman I say that there is grave potentiality in such guardianship. If we attempt to enforce it, it will mean war for the United States. It is also going to mean war if we pass this neutrality law which gives the President power he should not have. He cannot enforce it, nor can the Navy. It is all right to agree on an

embargo. That is legal. Nothing can prevent us from doing that, but we cannot without inviting danger enact any legislation that will compel other powers to accept our opinion, because we have no jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit. If we attempt to enforce such legislation it means war for the United States and that is all there is to it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman misunderstood me a while ago. I did not mean to say that this agreement is in effect. What I ask is this: Has the gentleman's research work in connection with this subject brought him to the conclusion that this agreement in respect to the 300-mile zone proposition is now in operation? I am seeking information. Does the gentleman understand that it is now in operation?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. All I know is what I see in the newspapers, that a tentative agreement had been reached by those nations represented at the Panama conference. It was a proposition to set aside a 300-mile zone up and down the east and west coasts of North and South America, to be termed a "safety band."

Mr. CRAWFORD. And if, according to your understanding, it is not now in operation, what step must be taken, in the gentleman's opinion, to make the agreement effective insofar as the United States is concerned?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The agreement naturally will have to come up before the Senate and before the Congress. It cannot be negotiated by the President of the United States without any consultation with Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the agreement is confirmed by the Senate or otherwise and put into operation, will that, in the gentleman's opinion, constitute a precedent in international law?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Yes; it will; because it will be a declaration of war if the Senate should agree to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If this agreement is consummated and put into operation, will that, in the gentleman's opinion, be an arbitrary extension of international law?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. It will be; certainly; but it will not be agreed to by other nations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And if these things occur, in the gentleman's opinion, would that type of procedure conflict with the debates which are now being carried on in the Senate, by those who propose to repeal the embargo provisions, to the extent that it conflicts with international law?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. It does not conform to international law at all. It is an arbitrary attitude on the part of the administration to attempt to enact such legislation and suicidal to attempt to enforce. The Senate is now debating upon the repeal of the embargo clause. Why? Because the embargo clause ties the hands of the President and acts as a brake upon the power that is given to him by the Congress. If the embargo is repealed, then he will be at liberty to do what the act declares, and he can proceed on his own authority to declare these war zones, and, indirectly, if you please, safety zones, which is similar to the "safety bands" to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] made reference. When the President proclaims safety zones by indirectly declaring war zones it does not differ from the "safety bands" or safety zones discussed at the Pan American Conference.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to refer to the question I raised yesterday and to the article which has been inserted in the RECORD. If it is true that our Navy Department has, within the last few weeks, sent certain naval officials to England to sit down around the table with the English naval authorities and discuss and work out the details of the procedure that is to be followed by the British Navy and the American Navy during the next 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 months, depending upon developments, and if those plans call for the shifting to Asiatic waters of a large portion of the American Navy, so that we may proceed as best we can under those adverse circumstances to protect British interests and American interests and French interests in Asiatic waters, including the Malay

Straits, the Dutch possessions, and all that territory, then what position will we be in, with the Neutrality Act on the books setting forth that the President shall not permit our merchant ships to enter war zones, in the event a war zone is declared in Asiatic waters by Japan or otherwise?

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Excuse me just a moment. I submitted this question in much less detail yesterday and the gentleman's time expired and he did not have a chance to answer my question. If he will, I will appreciate very much his giving his opinion on that situation which is now in the making.

Mr. GEYER of California. Will the gentleman yield before he answers that question on this very point?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Will the gentleman mind waiting just a moment?

Mr. GEYER of California. I would like to ask one question in regard to the question which the gentleman from Michigan asked.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Very well.

Mr. GEYER of California. I am wondering if the gentleman from Michigan is fair when he says what he himself knows to be supposition—that certain things are being done by our Navy Department. I am wondering if that thing in itself is not doing the thing which we all deplore, perhaps stirring up distrust in our Nation, which at the present time certainly needs something besides that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Insofar as my questions on this floor are concerned, I will take care of those myself. If the gentleman who has just spoken will refer to the President's speech of September 3, he will find where the President said that "we have the news," and if the gentleman will yield to me for the purpose, I will read an excerpt from the President's statement.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There will be more to follow on this, I may advise the gentleman.

The President said:

It is, of course, impossible to predict the future. I have my constant stream of information from American representatives and other sources throughout the world, as you, the people of this country, are receiving news through your radios and your newspapers at every hour of the day. You are subject to no censorship of news, and I want to add that your Government has no information which it has any thought of withholding from you. I myself cannot and do not prophesy the course of events abroad, and the reason is that because I have, of necessity, such a complete picture of what is going on in every part of the world I do not dare to do so, and the other reason is that I think it is honest for me to be honest with the people of the United States. I hope the United States will keep out of this war. I believe that it will, and I give you assurances that every effort of your Government will be directed toward that end.

Now, I have the "news" the President refers to. I have rumors. I have propaganda. Sometimes I get a little of the "news behind the news." My question is based on some of the news behind the news, and I have a distinct right to put it in here. I think the gentleman is entirely out of order in making the insinuation which he did, and I will take future time to take care of it if he wants to proceed with it further.

Now, will the gentleman please go back to the question to which I referred?

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. No; I will not yield at this time.

Mr. GEYER of California. You will not yield for me to answer him?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. No. You can answer him in your own time. I want to say that the United States Government has no right to send our officers to Great Britain to arrange plans for aid or help to Great Britain, particularly at this time, because Great Britain is now at war. In doing that, it is equal to a declaration of war. It is *causus belli* as far as the German Government is concerned. The President or an



administration performing an act of that sort is liable, if Congress so decides, to meet a charge of treason, because any administration that deliberately enters into negotiations with a nation at war and arranges to assist that particular nation, without the authority of Congress, is committing an enemy act, and he adheres to the enemy.

Article III, section 3, of the Constitution reads:

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THORKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, for the present I shall have to object. I may not object later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma object?

Mr. MASSINGALE. For the present; yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 12, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7580. A bill for the relief of Mary Savage; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 7581. A bill to admit Henry Hans Jacob Gummasson permanently to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5673. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of sundry citizens of Birmingham, Mich., asking that our Neutrality Act be preserved as it now stands, and urging that it be not repealed or modified; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5674. Also, resolution of the Detroit Postal Employees' Legislative Council, of Detroit, Mich., asking that proper action be taken to regulate and stabilize the price of food during the present war crisis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5675. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. E. A. Tarbox and 16 other citizens of Rock Island City, Ill., protesting against selling to warring nations and loaning to belligerents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5676. Also, petition of C. J. Klingeviel and 23 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., opposing any change or repeal of present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5677. Also, petition of Iris Newland and 23 other citizens of Colchester, Ill., to keep the neutrality law intact and to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5678. Also, petition of Dr. T. H. Marsh, minister, and 150 women members of First Baptist Church of Moline, Ill., to keep America out of war and opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5679. Also, petition of 500 members of Parent Teachers Association Council, of East Moline, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5680. Also, petition of Mrs. J. F. Strombeck and 26 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of

war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5681. Also, petition of Mrs. Eric Sten and 32 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5682. Also, petition of Mrs. W. R. Mullinix and 22 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5683. Also, petition of Mrs. W. H. Exline and 12 signers of a petition, to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5684. Also, petition of Elizabeth Ridenour and 18 signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5685. Also, petition of Mrs. Raymond B. Johnson and 13 signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5686. Also, petition of Mrs. N. W. Johnson and 23 signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5687. Also, petition of Letty M. Henry and six signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5688. Also, petition of Mrs. Sigurd Johansen and 13 signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5689. Also, petition of Pastor C. G. Engdahl and 25 signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5690. Also, petition of Alice Swanson and 38 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5691. Also, petition of Mrs. H. M. Park and 20 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5692. Also, petition of Frances Wehman and 53 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and against selling anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5693. Also, petition of Mrs. L. B. Neighbour and 34 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5694. Also, petition of Mrs. H. L. Pressel and 23 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5695. Also, petition of Mrs. Luther McChesney and one other citizen of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5696. Also, petition of Mrs. E. O. Reynolds and seven other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5697. Also, petition of Mrs. A. H. Beitel and seven other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5698. Also, petition of Ruth Lowe and 13 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5699. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Sandberg and 30 other signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5700. Also, petition of Mrs. Emil Slahey and 29 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5701. Also, petition of Mrs. Earl Seabee and 11 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5702. Also, petition of Mrs. Howard W. Gordon and 10 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war, and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5703. Also, petition of Florence Hankins and nine other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war, and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5704. Also, petition of Mrs. James C. Valley and 14 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., protesting against revising the Neutrality Act; to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5705. Also, petition of Ethel Heister and 2,700 members of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, urging Congress to keep our country at peace, and vote against arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5706. Also, petition of S. M. Merrill and 14 other citizens of Carthage, Ill., protesting against repeal of the Neutrality Act as a whole or in part; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5707. Also, petition of E. M. McDaniel and 24 other citizens of Plymouth, Ill., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5708. Also, petition of R. B. Lourie and 104 employees of John Deere Plow Co., of Moline, Ill., opposing our entry into any foreign war under any pretext, also suggesting that our Government take delivery of military supplies now under order of United States firms and should not be delivered to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5709. Also, petition of Albert A. Teske and 45 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., urging the retaining of the arms embargo and to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5710. Also, petition of Elizabeth Holmes and 25 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5711. Also, petition of Ralph De Porter and 51 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5712. Also, petition of Bess Gill and six other citizens of Macomb, Ill., to keep America out of war and to retain the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5713. Also, petition of R. Evans and 55 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5714. Also, petition of C. B. Parmelee and 31 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5715. Also, petition of Louis P. Reddig and six other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5716. Also, petition of Cleone Wadman and 12 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5717. Also, petition of G. E. Rigg and 82 other citizens of Macomb, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5718. Also, petition of Frank Haws and 120 employees of the Western Stoneware Co., of Monmouth, Ill., urging retaining of present Neutrality Act as written, without amendments or repeal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5719. Also, petition of Mrs. Franklin Johnson and 19 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of

war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5720. Also, petition of D. P. Nolan and nine other citizens of Galesburg, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5721. Also, petition of Mrs. R. J. McKee and 18 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5722. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of 200 citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5723. By Mr. LESINSKI: Petition of the Wyandotte Council of Clubs, representing over 5,000 members, favoring the repeal of the arms embargo to permit sales on a cash-and-carry basis in accordance with the President's plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5724. Also, petition of Telesfor Sokolowski and other citizens of Wyandotte, Mich., urging the lifting of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5725. Also, petition of Dr. F. A. Pawlowski and other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District, Detroit, Mich., urging the repeal of the embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5726. Also, petition of the Polish-American Citizens Club, requesting support of President Roosevelt's plan to lifting the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5727. By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Petition of residents of Bradford County, Pa., protesting against the repeal or revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5728. Also, petition of sundry residents of Wayne County, Pa., protesting against the repeal or revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5729. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Gertrude K. Kirsch, secretary, and Mrs. Paul Gregory, grand regent, Catholic Daughters of America, Court Carroll, No. 299, Wheeling, W. Va., urging no change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5730. Also, petition of Mrs. John Besso and other citizens of Triadelphia, W. Va., urging no change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5731. Also, petition of Verne Monroe, chairman, committee of the Cameron First Methodist Church, of Cameron, W. Va., urging no change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5732. Also, petition of Donato Dittarelli, of Follansbee, W. Va., and 110 other citizens, urging that we keep the arms embargo, oppose the cash-and-carry, and keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5733. Also, Petition of Donald Habig and 50 citizens of Wheeling, W. V., urging that we use our influence and employ all means at our disposal to keep America out of war and free from foreign entanglements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Very Reverend Noble Cilley Powell, dean of the Cathedral of Saints Peter and Paul, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Father Almighty, of whose righteous will all things are and were created: Thou hast gathered the peoples of this land into a great nation and set before them a noble heritage. Do Thou deepen and strengthen the roots of our life in everlasting righteousness. Make us equal to the solemn trusts committed to our hands, reverent and grateful in the enjoyment and exercise of our freedom, just in the use of our power, wise and generous in our every relation one with another.