Law
J
11
.R5

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1939

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Our father in heaven, we bless Thee that there is no love like Thine, and all human love is divine when it has its source in Thee. When in the flood of great waters, when storms climb the sky and unjust criticism rides out against us, then let Thy love break up the clouds and make them beautiful. Forgive us if we have been unmindful of Thy marvelous providence; forgive us if we have longed for easy tasks; forgive us if we have refused to do our utmost in hard and narrow ways: Oh, forgive us all our faults and may we ever learn wisdom from our failures. Illumine our souls that we may know clearly Thy will and have power to fulfill it. We bear at the altar of prayer our most honorable Speaker and all Members of the Congress. In the plentitude of Thy care watch over them each day and give peace. In the Saviour's name. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD by including therein the encyclical of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief table on employment, issued by the United States Civil Service Commission.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address made by me last night over a local radio station.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by George Rothwell Brown, in the Los Angeles Examiner.

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

There was no objection.

WE NEED A SECRETARY OF THE NAVY—THE NAVY TAKES ITS ORDERS FROM THE PICKET LINE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a short editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution declares that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States."

But until recent months the Navy Department had a Secretary, as did the War Department. For many months, due to the illness of Secretary Swanson and since his death because of the failure of the President to make an appointment, the Navy Department has been without an active head.

Does the President think that Cabinet Members are no longer useful or does he prefer to himself perform the duties of the Secretary of the Navy? Or has he delegated that authority to Mme. Perkins, the Secretary of Labor?

This query is prompted by the fact that within a month a picket line in Detroit defied a representative of the Acting Secretary of the Navy and refused to deliver to that representative property of the Navy which was needed in the Government aircraft factory at the navy yard at Philadelphia.

Day before yesterday I wrote the Acting Secretary of the Navy inquiring as to the reason why a picket line successfully resisted the Navy's demand for the return of its own materials. The answer, if one is received, will be spread upon the RECORD.

In the meantime, it might be well for Members of the House to know that some of the people are making inquiries along the same line. To that end I quote an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of October 31:

DON'T TELL THIS TO THE MARINES

The report of Acting Secretary Edison of the Navy Department to the House Naval Affairs Committee on the stoppage of work on navy airplane engines by the C. I. O. strike in Detroit makes strange reading. The Acting Secretary gave the information in response to a resolution of Representative HOFFMAN, of Michigan, inquiring concerning stories that the Navy's defense program had been hampered by the C. I. O. strike against the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation.

Edison replied that the Navy Department had called the attention of the regional director of the C. I. O. to the seriousness of the delay in the delivery of material for which the Department had contracts and the urgent need of the shipment of patterns.

Says Mr. Edison: "The inspector requested that the C. I. O. director instruct his representative in charge of the picket line at the corporation's plant No. 2 to allow a representative to pass through the picket line to pick up Government-owned patterns and ship them on a Government bill of lading. The regional director of the C. I. O. sent three representatives of union local No. 208 to discuss the removal of the patterns with the inspector of naval material. The union representatives were given full access to the files of the Navy contracts. At the end of the discussion the union

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

representatives stated that as the strike situation stood their answer was emphatically 'no' and that they would not let patterns or inspected castings be removed. No further action was taken by the Navy Department to remove the patterns and castings."

The strike was settled October 8, but during its duration of 41 days the picket line kept the Navy from getting its own patterns out of the plant. The Department bowed to a superior force which the Government itself had nourished into strength. Mr. Lewis already had victories over the Post Office, the Department of Justice, and the Governors of several States. He can now hang up a naval flag in his trophy room. The Navy won't go through a picket line.

When did Mme. Perkins become its secretary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the Most Reverend F. J. Beckman, archbishop of Dubuque, on Sunday, October 29, 1939.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial from the Detroit News.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein three short letters, my answers thereto, and one brief editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on neutrality from the Washington Post of this day.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Citizen-Press, of Jackson, Mich.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts from the 1939 mobilization plan.

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

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the motion to instruct the conferees. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] desire to yield time?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, in a city block there sits a madman with a sawed-off shotgun, holding down the fort of his own back porch. As soon as some of his neighbors emerge, he proceeds to pick them off. In another large city we have a mob of gangsters. They proceed to arm themselves with sawed-off shotguns and machine guns and prey on the peace-loving citizens and any groups who would oppose them in their endeavor to gain unjustly what belongs to their neighbors.

Six years ago a gentleman named Adolf Hitler presumed to do that very thing in one of the great nations of the world. You may say that that did not affect us. Ah, but it did, and I shall show you how it did. Six million men were put to work building arms and munitions. Billions of dollars were spent, so that man's nation should be more powerful than any of his neighbors, and inside of 4 years it began to dawn on the neighbors that there must be some ulterior motive behind that activity. Like the gangster, Hitler began to pick off one after another of the peaceful nations. Of course, we had been sending the things that he had to have, raw materials, with which to build up his arms and ammunition plants. We sold them the scrap iron and the oil and the copper and the cotton, and in a very short space of time he was so far ahead of any other nation that those selfsame peace-loving nations decided they had to change their economy. My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] said yesterday the result was an armed camp. It would be an armed camp for the world. Do you not see the significance of a thing of that kind? Under our present Neutrality Act we provide the arms and munitions before war is declared, and the man who is bent on bringing war and destruction to his neighbors arms himself with our tools, and then declares war, at which time no more arms may be sent by us. It gives him the full advantage. Hitler has taken full advantage of this and when he saw England and France catching up, as they have been during the past 2 years, although he had a lead of 4 years and is far ahead to this very day, then he declared war, so now we cannot ship to anyone else—even to its victims. But it is said we must not take sides because there are 16,000,000 people of German extraction in this country. I am feeling for the German people themselves being led to the slaughter by a madman who happens to be in command at the present time; but if you do not think of that, if you do not worry about the German people or about other nations, then think about our own.

We have always believed in a certain type of national defense—not a large standing army, not great armament. No; we will take it easy; we will give perhaps 10 to 20 percent of the revenue of the Government to the building of national defense. That seems sufficient. In time of trouble, of course, we would build up rapidly, because we have the facilities so to do. But with this new philosophy of force in the minds of the leaders throughout the world there can be but one answer. We likewise must accept that philosophy and arm and build in time of peace. It is likely to be a budget of 50 to 75 percent of the revenue of the Federal Government going for national defense in times of peace just to keep up with that madman who is bringing that kind of conditions on the whole world. That is what I object to. I do not care, if you insist, what he is doing to his own people, or to the people surrounding him, but I am thinking of America. We have to change. Last year, when they denounced the treaty that limited naval armament, what was the result? It meant that we had to spend one billion and a quarter dollars to bring our armaments up to those of other nations—naval armaments alone. Every time someone takes the lead and goes ahead in an armament race we, in self-defense, have to do the same. If we do not, what will the American people say to us? We must represent them and keep abreast of what any one nation can bring against us. Our people expect it of us, and there has been hardly a word against our building up our national defense.

Let us take the moral side of this thing. A few years ago some States denied the right to sell cigarettes within their borders. No cigarettes were to be sold in those States, and what happened? They got out a little machine with a handle on the end, with wheels inside. You would take a cigarette paper, slide it in the machine, pour in some of Duke's Mixture, or some other kind of tobacco, make a few turns of the wheels, and out came a finished cigarette. That is exactly what you are doing today with your arms embargo. You are providing them with all of the ingredients with which they make their own, and still you say that is not immoral but that it is immoral if you put that fuse on the end of the shell and send it to them that way. If that is not asinine reasoning, I do not know what it is. If it is immoral to send implements of war and munitions and guns in time of war, then it is in time of peace.

Our dear friend Mr. Molotov, the right-hand man of Stalin, is sore at us, if you please, because we are not doing things the way Communist Russia would like to have them done. He does not want the arms embargo repealed. But, just the

same, they have been getting the things they need to build up their munitions, and we have been supplying them, and not their neighbors who knew of no designs upon their sovereignty.

When the time comes Russia will declare war, and because of our present law we will not be able to send their victims any help. Russia will not need any then, because they will have built their own factories. All they will want is the raw material.

Take Japan. The same thing is going on there. They can get anything they want from us. Nearly $200,000,000 of imports from us in a year, and still less than 1 percent of that was finished munitions.

My friends, it is so ridiculous to talk about the immorality of sending munitions and at the same time sending them the things out of which they make their munitions—cotton, copper, scrap iron, oil, and the requisite machinery.

I am sorry that we have on both sides of this question men who served in the World War and still view it from opposite poles. It seems to me that we learned certain lessons from the World War, but not all of us interpret those lessons in the same way. However, I believe we are all agreed in one thing, that an army must never again be sent across the seas to iron out the difficulties or to heal the wounds, if you prefer, of the peoples of Europe. Our boys must never again be sent across the seas to show them how to conduct their affairs. We are all agreed on that. But I dislike to hear some of my good friends say, "If you vote to lift the embargo, you are voting to send boys to France." You know as well as I do that no neutrality bill we enact can keep us out of war. That is the function of the mind and the heart of the American people—not of any law we pass. Furthermore, regardless of the law we pass, neither you nor I can say that that will get us into war or will keep us out of war. However, there is one thing that we have been overlooking, and I was glad to hear the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN] mention it yesterday. Who are we doing these things for? Molotov, or Chamberlain, or Daladier, or Hitler? No. We are doing these things for the American people. We are trying to give them the law that they want, that will keep them out of war, and at the same time treat all people alike—treat all foreign nations alike. I believe by repealing the arms embargo we will be treating them all alike; and if, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] said yesterday, even the Germans can come here and get planes, I have no objection to that. Surely, that is being neutral, is it not, if they can all get planes?

Do not forget this, and our Army and Navy officers constantly remind us of it, unless we build up our manufactures—not just the munitions industry—what does that amount to? Probably 1 or 2 percent of what we need in time of war—but unless we build up our industries to the point where they can take the blueprints and the jigs and the dies and patterns that we give them and make our munitions in time of war, we will not be able properly to defend this country. That was the case in the World War. Ninety percent was done outside of the so-called munitions industry. Practically all the guns that we got came from independents all over the country. You say, "Oh, well, this is to make the munition makers rich." Who are the munition makers? Du Pont made a lot of money and so did Colt and Winchester and the rest of them, but I will tell you there were other people who made a lot of money. The farmers made a lot of money by selling wheat at twice the normal price. Was anything said about our changing economy due to that? As a result, you have the Dust Bowl today. They turned everything into wheatland. They plowed everything—pastures and forest lands—to make more money. We were all profiteering. Do not blame just a handful of munition makers. Now, we need our industries in this country to be in as good position for the turning out of munitions as those of any other country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. IZAC. In just a moment. If we cannot turn out those things for ourselves, we had better be doing it for other nations, because we are learning all the time. It is our duty to see that this country is adequately prepared in case of another conflict.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing I want to mention. That is this matter of letting the foreign nations build their finished munitions and accept from us only oil, scrap iron, copper, and other things that they need. I will tell you one reason why you and I do not want that to happen, because every time a W. P. A. bill comes on this floor you say, "It is terrible that we have so much relief; that relief costs so much in this country."

The reason men are walking the streets is because the raw product can go to those countries but the finished product, that is made in our factories by our workingmen, can no longer be made here under this law of ours. If it is not a sufficient reason to repeal the arms embargo that our men might be given employment that otherwise would go elsewhere, that we may reduce our relief rolls, give our people this work, I can think of no better reason. Yes; they say it is immoral. I cannot see how it is more immoral to let our people walk the streets begging for a crust of bread and taking W. P. A. employment at starvation wages than it is to send munitions that those countries need or of sending the unassembled and nonprocessed ingredients rather than the same products after subjection to a few hours' finishing in a factory.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman arguing seriously to this House that we should repeal the embargo for the purpose of bringing prosperity to this Nation and furnishing jobs for our men? Is this the purpose of the gentleman's observation?

Mr. IZAC. I am sorry the gentleman construes it in such manner, but I am merely mentioning this as one of the reasons why it is no more immoral to send finished products than it is the ingredients that go into the making of either cigarettes or finished munitions.

Mr. COOLEY. I quite agree with that observation, but I do not agree that we would be justified in lifting the embargo if the only reason that actuated us were that of bringing prosperity to idle people in America.

Mr. IZAC. I do not believe the gentleman is correct in supposing that it would bring prosperity. It would not at all, because there is not enough business to do that; but I say that is one of the things that is a bad result of this embargo. It permits us to send the raw materials—the wheat, the cotton, the things that are produced in the gentleman's district out of the ground, let us say—but it does not permit us to do anything to it in our factories. We cannot cut that cotton up and saturate it with acid and make an explosive out of it; we cannot do any of those things to it. We may send the raw materials there, but that will not give employment to our men. It goes over there, and their people get the employment.

Mr. COOLEY. I quite agree with that part of the gentleman's observation, but I was impressed with the fact that the gentleman was emphasizing the possibility of profits which might inure to the benefit of farmers and idle men in America as well as to munitions makers.

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

Mr. IZAC. Let me answer first the question of the gentleman from North Carolina and then I will yield.

I should say that we are, unfortunately, able to profit by the misfortunes of other people, because immediately they need goods up go our prices. There is no way under the sun of preventing that. It is a fact that business is better because of the needs of foreign nations for our goods, but we should not differentiate between the manufactured article and the wheat and the cotton as they come from the ground. The demands of belligerents for raw materials will, in itself, cause a war boom, without sending a pound of munitions.

I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman believes it would be absolute folly for us to try to clothe ourselves with such a position

that we entirely remove ourselves from our social and economic welfare in consideration of a general matter, because the first law of nature is self-preservation. We expect that from all that lives. Let me ask the gentleman, however, following that line of reasoning if thinking of ourselves, as we must if we are intelligent people—if by pursuing this course we cause the makings, the ingredients, as the gentleman calls them, to be assembled at another place, will not that go further than first anticipated and result in factories springing up in Canada and across the ocean that would otherwise naturally be here, factories that will continue to operate after the war is over?

Mr. IZAC. That is the first corollary. Already Canada is erecting plants to the extent of $3,000,000,000, and they are proceeding to assemble the things they can get from this country right now. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time has been consumed on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used 2 hours 8½ minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has used 2 hours 7½ minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] such time as he may desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] is recognized.

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

Mr. BARTON. I yield.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] left the impression that Germany had bought up large supplies of war material, ammunition, and arms from the United States in the last 4 years. I hold in my hand a letter from the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, who gives these figures for the last 8 or 9 months. These months, of course, were those in which they were most intent on building up supplies. Leaving out some of the letter for the sake of brevity, I quote the following:

This information you requested is set forth in the following table of war supplies bought of us by these different countries:

France, $17,258,681.74; Germany, $78,044.52; Great Britain, $27,496,336.07; Italy, $45,613; Russia, $1,552,521.29.

According to these figures of the Secretary of State himself, Germany in the last 8 months has bought only $78,000 worth of war material in America, as opposed to $17,000,000 for France and $27,000,000 for England.

I submit, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, that I doubt if Germany needs a great deal of our war supplies, arms, or munitions of war.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. BARTON. I shall be pleased to yield if I may be yielded further time.

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] such time as the gentleman from California consumes.

Mr. IZAC. Here is the answer to my friend from New York. The gentleman has mentioned only the last 8 months. It is true that Germany during the past few months has gotten very little from us and is going to get less; but over a period of 6 years she has received tremendous quantities of oil and scrap iron as well as other things which she needed, not war supplies or so-called arms, ammunition, and implements of war, but ingredients that go into the building up of war supplies. She is now making her own in factories erected all over her country.

Mr. FISH. That is what we are arguing about. We do not make any exception in this bill and we are not concerned with oil and scrap iron, but with arms and ammunition.

Mr. IZAC. I am trying to show the difference, or lack of any, between the ingredients and the finished product. One other thing I failed to mention was the fact that Hitler also by conquest took over about one-half of the munition plants of the world by taking the famous Skoda works in Czechoslovakia and other plants in Austria and Poland. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, though I have the honor of membership on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I plan to speak only a very few minutes. The House granted me the privilege of printing in the RECORD yesterday a radio speech delivered Sunday night in which I tried to present my thinking on the arms embargo in some detail. If there is anything more that I would like to have included in that statement, it was furnished by the argument of the distinguished authority on international law, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY], who spoke yesterday.

I started reading the Senate debate and I read every speech delivered. I started with as much of an open mind as it is possible for me to have. I started with the assumption that I should vote this fall the way I voted last summer—to lift the embargo. As that debate went on, whether my judgment is good or bad, I was driven to the conviction that the logic and the authorities on international law and the best interests of the American people were all on the side of keeping this embargo, and that only the emotions are on the other side. It seemed to me what the other side is asking is a neutrality law which will allow us to be unneutral, and the chance to help England and France, but only at their own risk and expense.

The gentleman from California has just presented a dramatic picture of a highwayman loose in a city, but I think he should have finished his picture. If I am awakened at night by a disturbance next door and I make up my mind it is only my English neighbor, Mr. Adams, and my German neighbor, Mr. Schultz, fighting over their boundary line, as they have been doing for a great many years, I close the window and go to bed. [Applause.] If, however, I find Mr. Adams being attacked by Mr. Schultz or by a highwayman, who thereafter intends to attack me, then, acting in the spirit of this bill, I call out to Mr. Adams, "If you have $25 and will send your boy over here I will sell you my shotgun." That does not seem to me a noble way of fighting this war, if it is our war. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen in my life an issue that developed such a cleavage between men and women of equal patriotism and intelligence on both sides. I have never seen an issue that created such strange bedfellows. I had lunch a couple of months ago with one of the great munition makers in this country, one who would be called upon to become a great munition maker if the United States should be drawn into war. He said to me, "Mr. BARTON, I hope Congress is not going to lift that embargo. That is the surest way to get us into war." I asked, "How do you figure that?" He said, "Of course, when we begin supplying arms Germany will retaliate in every possible way by sinking our ships and by the destruction of our plants. It was incidents of that kind that got us into war before."

On Monday there appeared in the newspapers a statement prepared by my friend William Allen White, and signed by 30 spiritual leaders, stating that this is a holy war and the only chance to preserve the teachings of the Prince of Peace is for the United States to make and ship arms and munitions of war. A great munition maker, an international devil, who, if we get into war will be charged with starting the war in the congressional investigations of the future—he is all for keeping the embargo and keeping out of the war; and these spiritual leaders argue that it is a holy crusade and we ought to be in it.

I believe I come from a district in which there is more sentiment for lifting this embargo than probably in any district in the country. I have many splendid citizens who believe with all their hearts that the only security of the United States is to underwrite the victory of England and France; to do it without delay and at any cost.

I have tens of thousands of constituents of foreign birth or heritage, whose roots run back into Europe and who are so outraged by the murderous cruelty of Hitler that they believe we ought to go over there and wipe him off the face of the earth. I sympathize with those emotions. I believe the sentiment for repeal may very probably represent the majority sentiment in my district. I have been down here only a little while and my wife likes it, so it is not pleasant

for me to have to cast a vote which will probably separate me from the public pay roll. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I have come to the deep conviction that this is not the time for us to make a move in what certainly up to date is the most stupid, the most crazy, the most cockeyed war in human history. [Applause.] This is a war in Europe that is not a war. I wrote a book years ago in my youth called The Book Nobody Knows, This is a war nobody wants. I read in the newspapers that France has already sent 100,000 men back from the western lines. I read that the English people are already grumbling against bureaucracy, which they have nicknamed "controlitis."

We know that when there was a false report of an armistice in Germany the German people went wild with rejoicing until the report was denied. I have said before, and I say now, that the war gives every appearance of a lot of countries that are in something they are desperately anxious to get out of if they only could find a way to get out. When my constituents call me up on the long-distance phone and abuse me for my position and talk to me about this being another World War and lasting for years, I think they are utterly unconscious of the significance of what has happened in the world in the last 10 years.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I will be very glad to yield if I may finish this statement first.

Some of you may have read a book written by a Spaniard, Ortega y Gasset, called The Revolt of the Masses, which I believe you will agree with me is one of the most significant books published in our generation. It was published in 1926. It does not mention Hitler or Stalin. It was published before they came on the stage. Yet it explains them. Hitler is the creature of the masses and Stalin is the creature of the masses. Every government in Europe today exists by the consent and support of the masses, and when the masses withdraw their support those governments will fall. Every one of those governments is afraid today of its own people. Every one of those governments knows that it is absurd to think that any people are going to stand again for a long war.

I say that the longer we postpone our action here the more the people of Europe will be asking, What is the purpose of this war? What are its objectives? Why cannot our statesmen make as good a peace for us right now as they can make after our cities are crumbled into ruins and millions of our sons are dead?" I say the more they question, the better is the chance for peace, and that in an early peace lies the only hope of civilization in Europe. The only winner of a long war in Europe will not be England and France and it will not be Germany; the only winner will be communism.

My plea is to keep both the embargo and cash and carry. At least, I plead that we do not touch the embargo now at this special session. Let us give the forces of peace over there one more chance to work.

A young American was in my office today, a student of music, who was in Germany when the war started and enlisted in the International Red Cross and worked in both Germany and France. He just came back this morning. He said to me, "If America would quit meddling in this war and advertising this war the people over there would begin to talk peace within 30 days."

I say if there is any chance of that, if there is any chance of their folding up the stupid, bloody business, let us not stand on our shore of the Atlantic and shout to them, "Keep it going just a little longer and we will send over some guns." I say this is the wrong time to give a signal of that sort to Europe.

It is a very solemn thought that a vote now to lift the embargo may possibly be the signal to start the real war. We simply have not facts enough to justify that decision. No lawyer in this House will advise a client to sign a contract with one party to a controversy until the client knows what the objectives of that party are and what, if any, are the secret agreements. I say we ought to ask the Allies now for a clear statement of their terms of peace. I am for the overthrow of Hitler. No man in this House detests him more than I. But when the Allies have overthrown him, whether with the help of our arms or without those arms, on what terms do they propose to dictate peace? Will it be a peace founded on justice, a peace that will endure, or will it be a peace that will last only until another Germany is strong enough to produce another Hitler and start another war?

We have a right to ask these questions and to demand an answer, and we ought to have an answer before we take an action which most of the authorities on international law believe is an unneutral action, an action which, in my opinion, will tend to drive the German people closer to Hitler and closer to Stalin out of a spirit of desperation, an action which, no matter what we say about it on this side, will be regarded by the English and French, as an implied promise, a promise which we have no moral right to imply, because we have no intention of fulfilling it. I wish that this thing could wait. I believe, if it does wait, we will have made the best contribution we can make to the Allies, because we will be in a position to be a friend of all the peoples in Europe who have hated each other through these generations and centuries, a friend who can help them make an honest, a just, and a lasting peace. [Applause.]

I yield now to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman during the hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, when his colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] was testifying as a witness favoring repeal of the arms embargo, asked him this question:

> Suppose that we should adjourn here on June 1 with section 1 still on the statute books. Suppose that, on the 2d of June, over the 30,000,000 radios in this country we should hear a broadcast of the bombing of London and the fall of Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral, and the screams of women and children, as we would hear them. Do you not suppose the President would call us back here in 24 hours and ask us to repeal section 1?
>
> Mr. WADSWORTH. The pressure on him to do so, I suppose, would be almost irresistible.

Is not that statement true, that if such things should happen the public sentiment would demand the repeal of the arms embargo, and is it not safer to do it now before the war reaches that critical stage?

Mr. BARTON. I think that is a matter of soothsaying and astrology, and not of statesmanship. [Applause.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The question the gentleman asked dealt with soothsaying, then. Why would it not be statesmanship now?

Mr. BARTON. Yesterday another gentleman on this floor, for whom I have almost as much affection as I have for the gentleman from Texas, came to me and quoted that same testimony and said, "Bruce, I believe that testimony was cabled to Europe, and that is one reason the Germans have not bombed the cities over there, because they know it may bring this country in."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to quote my warm and able friend from Texas, a statement made just a few months ago on this very proposition, and here is what he said——

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Whom is the gentleman quoting now?

Mr. DONDERO. I am quoting the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]. [Laughter and applause.]

With reference to the arms embargo, he said:

> It discourages war between other countries by our Government refusing to furnish arms, ammunition, or implements of war, and also credit. No war can be successfully carried on without these.

[Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia). The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] has consumed 16 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to call attention to the speech which I made and to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] referred and from which he quoted a sentence that I uttered at that time,

which was in 1936, when we were considering neutrality legislation. I also stated that such legislation, we hoped, would discourage war between countries, and I will read my exact statement in that regard:

It—

Referring to the arms embargo feature—

sets an example in pioneering in the passage of neutrality legislation which it is hoped that other governments may emulate—

And thereby prevent war, but in view of developments that have happened since then, it is my deliberate judgment, instead of discouraging nations, it has encouraged aggressor nations, and instead of preventing war it has been an incitement to war. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I know just as well as you do that not a single vote is going to be changed by anything which I may say or by a prolongation of this discussion. Those, if any, who might be inclined to yield to pressure or to be politically expedient, as well as those who are sometimes opportunists, are confronted by an issue which permits them neither to be opportunists nor to resort to political expediency.

The reaction to the debate which has been indulged in with respect to the issue which now confronts us has once more forcefully corroborated the statement that—

A great nation cannot make up its mind in a moment. What first appeals to its fancy is not likely to appeal to its final judgment, and the severest test of the disinterestedness of the statesman under our system is his readiness to risk unpopularity and defeat in order to protect the people from their first impulse and give them an opportunity to form a real opinion.

Former Speaker Reed's faith was in what he called the deliberate judgment of the people, but he declared that—

The sudden and unreflecting judgment of the noisy who are first heard is quite as often a voice from the underworld.

This distinction is vital, since the cause of democracy has nothing to hope from the statesman who weakly yields to the temptation always to be popular and who panders to the noisy passions of the moment rather than consults the real interests of the people.

THE "UNNEUTRALITY BOGEY"

The attempts to befog the issue by dragging across the trail the suggestion that an act of unneutrality is involved in our exercise of our own sovereignty, according to what we adjudge to be necessary in order to correct a situation and to establish a nonexisting neutrality, will get nowhere. It is hoist by its own petard. Those who are looking for a reason not to support the pending measure may find it as easily in one man's contention as in another's.

As for me, I will not subscribe to any doctrine which involves the surrender of our sovereign rights by submitting to be told by anybody or any government that to legislate as my conscience and my judgment dictate, and, as I see it, for the best interests of my country and its people, is an unneutral act. [Applause.] Who says so? The cold-blooded truth is that the suggestion made by some people to the effect that a sovereign state has no right to determine what constitutes its perfect neutrality by amending, repealing, or revising an existing law, and that in so doing it becomes ipso facto unneutral, is to me ridiculous. Such a suggestion denies to the United States its incontestable attribute and rights of sovereignty. Such attributes and rights I have been taught and have learned to know exist by very reason of the existence of the United States, and as such, and by virtue thereof, may at all times be invoked at any time if and when the United States may be pleased to undertake to so regulate its relations with foreign states as to make them accord with its own view of its own national interests. [Applause.]

THE RIGHT TO BE NEUTRAL

I understand that every sovereign state has a right to be perfectly neutral, and at any time has a right to take such action as in its judgment will accomplish that result. To suggest that it cannot so legislate is to say that it has no right to protect its own interests and may not take such action as in its judgment will keep it out of war. That is absurd. We may differ as to policy and program, but as to our right to determine our own policy and program—as to our right to change our laws to suit our own purposes, I firmly believe that no one who is informed can contend otherwise. Every sovereign state has a right to be perfectly neutral and to determine what in its judgment constitutes neutrality; such right is an essential attribute of its sovereignty and national independence, howsoever such status may be reached by it. To say it is unneutral to exercise our soverign rights, or that we cannot do it without violating neutrality—ipso facto—is to suggest our incompetence. It is to say we are unable to and cannot determine what constitutes neutrality; it is to suggest that we are barred from the exercise of our incontestable rights because heretofore we have acted, such previous action having been had and taken by us by virtue of the very sovereignty, the national independence which once depended upon it, but which it is now suggested we cannot now invoke, exercise, or improve.

As I recall it, a change in an existing statute or status in an undertaking to establish a perfect neutrality has never been held to be and is in itself ipso facto not unneutral. Such a change is a recognized concomitant of sovereignty. It cannot be and never has been rightly construed as unneutral. To so hold is to undertake to deprive the legislating state of all its soverign right to undertake to protect itself and its interest as a neutral. So the argument of those who contend that no change can now be made reduces itself to an absurdity, without argument, if only one will think it through to its logical conclusion.

Now, then, it is very generally contended that the President is right in asserting that the embargo provisions of the existing so-called neutrality law are "most vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace." To say we cannot change it in order to make ourselves neutral is the height of folly. Perfect neutrality requires that we be the ally of none of the contesting powers. Under the existing law Germany is placed in a decidedly advantageous position. As to this statement, there can be no argument. But be it Germany or Ethiopia matters not when we reduce the proposition to the lowest common denominator and forget friends and foes while we seek to be neutral in law, which we cannot be under the existing law, as everybody knows, or should know.

The question of establishing our strict neutral status should be discussed and arrived at with the sole determination to establish that status. We should not play friend or foe against or for ourselves. As Secretary Hull said in his speech of the 25th:

I think that you will find from a careful analysis of the underlying principles of the law of neutrality that this Nation, or any neutral nation, has a right during a war to change its national policies whenever experience shows the necessity for such change for the protection of its interests and safety. I do not mean to be understood as saying that such action may be taken at the behest or in the interest of one of the contending belligerents, it being understood, of course, that any measures taken shall apply impartially to all belligerents.

AN EXERCISE OF SOVEREIGNTY

That status must be determined, as such, by the sovereign legislative power of the United States, and then maintained. To do this will be an exercise of sovereignty. If and when the situation changes, as it may, and further revision, alteration, or amendment of the act may be necessary in order to guarantee our neutrality in law, acting as a sovereign state, we should make such changes as our interests shall require and may then demand.

It is alleged that such a change as is proposed by the act, that is, the establishment of our neutrality under law, benefits certain nations whose position seems to us to be nearest right and most nearly in accord with our ideals and, as a result, contributes to our safety. Well, that is fine if true; and I assume it is true. That the act in itself is preferable to the existing law, "merely as an insulation against war," is accepted as true by a preponderant majority of the

American people; and, if evidence were needed, it is to be found in the incident involving the *City of Flint*. An editorial writer in the Christian Science Monitor covers the situation pretty well when he says:

AMERICA WILL NOT BE DRAWN INTO WAR

Americans intend not to be drawn into the war in Europe. They do not wish to lengthen that war. They do, however, sympathize with the position of nations which are standing against evils which Americans themselves abhor. They do recognize the seriousness of the position of small nations in a Europe in which violence may become dominant unless it is checked by force equal in power. Their determination to stay out of war can be reconciled with their hope for a victory of those nations nearest right only by offering such aid to those nations as will not involve the United States in war.

A GRATUITOUS INSULT

So, for anyone to suggest that for the Congress of the United States of America to so act as to protect the United States and to prevent our involvement in the war, as in our own judgment we may see best to do, is an unneutral act on our part, just does not make sense.

THE "DEADLY PARALLEL" GOBLIN

Then there is another thing, Mr. Speaker, which irks me; and that is all this talk about the "deadly parallel" between the present situation and the situation in 1917. That is pure propaganda and "bunkum."

The bill before us, in its terms and by its very language, refutes such a proposition. The bill makes a comparison as between the situation now obtaining, or which will obtain when the bill becomes a law, and the status quo of 1917 absolutely noncomparable.

The reasons alleged for our being induced to enter the war in 1917 will not and could not exist today under the proposed law as written. Anyone who will take time to analyze and to check up on this statement must, if not emotionally unable to make a fair judgment, agree that it is correct. There is and there can be no intellectually honest statement made to the effect that there exists a deadly parallel, for such is not the truth.

By the very terms of the act, in order to protect the people of the United States and to keep us out of war and to reduce the risk of our involvement in the war, we sacrifice some of those national and neutral rights which we entered the World War and fought for in order to establish and to maintain. You know as well as I do that the proponents of this law have been most severely criticized for the restrictions imposed on American shipping on the basis that such restrictions are unreasonably and unnecessarily drastic. Not so if they keep us out of war.

There are those who contend that a greater Executive discretion in the definition of combat areas would be desirable. Maybe so, but I do not agree. However, these are details. The policy has been defined and, in general, I agree with it.

It was contended in 1917 that we had a right to engage in legitimate commerce. Read the bill and admit, as you will have to do, that scrupulous attempts to avoid the pitfalls of 1917, in an effort to avoid the causes that led us into the World War, have made it impossible under the proposed law for any of those things to happen which then occurred. It follows, therefore, that the proposed law is not, as has been said, a step toward war but a step away from the probability of our being involved in war. I say to you again, there is no deadly parallel.

Under the existing law it would be, as is evidenced by the *City of Flint* incident, as easy for us to become involved in war as it was in 1917. Why, even the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] admitted, in answer to a question propounded to him in the Senate, that the pending measure goes much further in keeping our ships and our people and our cargoes out of war zones than the present law. The myth that there is a deadly parallel is exploded. There can be but one choice made by those who are governed and controlled by reason rather than by emotion or partisan bias. This is a neutral bill, for under it commerce with belligerent nations is permitted and established on a basis of equality as between the belligerents and withheld altogether so far as shipments in any of our vessels are involved or concerned. The bill as drawn is evidence of the fact that we do not intend to be involved in this war or any foreign war for that matter. Insofar as it is possible for us to see or forecast the future the bill undertakes to prevent anyone else dragging us in.

WE WILL MAKE NECESSARY CHANGES

If events should so associate themselves as to necessitate a change in the law in order to further insure our keeping out of war, we will make such change. We shall send no men to Europe. Congress proposes to protect the United States against involvement in the conflict. Congress is going to pass this law as the one chance of avoiding involvement and in order to relieve ourselves of the just charge of being, under the existing law, an active participant in this war on the side of nazi-ism and communism.

No, Mr. Speaker, there is no deadly parallel and there is nothing unneutral.

The war which we were induced to fight in order to "make the world safe for democracy," taught us an unforgettable lesson, a lesson learned at an awful price, paid therefor in blood and treasure.

It may be that "the war to end wars" was worth all it cost provided the lessons we learned therefrom shall keep the American people out of this and all foreign wars.

NOT FOOLED BY PROPAGANDA

Today the American people are fooled by no foreign propaganda. "That sounds like propaganda," they say. They know they cannot be neutral in thought though neutral in law. They are disillusionized as to their Messianic responsibility to save the world, and more particularly Europe from itself and its never-ending intrigue and power politics. They are saturated with and by the froth and foam and the superficiality of the "window dressing" offered by those who oppose the pending measure. They are neither greatly disturbed nor seriously perturbed by oratorical bombast, emotionalism, and pseudo-patriotic appeals. They know it is not true that America went to war at the behest of the munition makers, and the fathers and mothers and sisters and wives and brothers of the dead who lie in Flanders Field resent that statement as they would the desecration of a grave and the dishonoring of the memory of the dead who gave their all for a cause. [Applause.]

The American people, Mr. Speaker, know they were fooled. They know who fooled them. They can name their debtors, repudiators as they are of their contracts legally entered into by them. They remember and they commend to the careful and thoughtful consideration of those who fooled them once, the statement, significant as of this day, most apropos and applicable to the situation that obtains, that Abraham Lincoln made when he said:

> If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time, you can even fool some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all of the people all the time.

By inserting the word "American" before the word "people" wherever it occurs in the above quotation you get a better picture of the status quo.

Charged with the duty of representing and protecting our own people insofar as it lies within my power, I have no right to be swayed by any motive except the preservation of the integrity and welfare of our own Nation as I see it in the light that God has given me in the attempt to perform that duty and that service. I want no war. And because I want no war, I am supporting and propose to vote for a measure which involves the greatest sacrifice ever made in any nation in the history of mankind in order to avoid war. That is a statement which will live long after that which most of us may say with respect to this proposed measure has long been forgotten. It is found in substance in the peroration of a speech made by Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky. It voices my sentiments. [Applause.]

In my judgment and for reasons too numerous to be recapitulated but which have been stated over and over again, as between the existing law and the proposed law, the passage of the proposed law minimizes the chances and offers less

danger of our going into, or being dragged into, this or any foreign war than does the existing statute.

I cannot see it any other way. I shall vote for the proposed law in order, as I see it, to promote the security and preserve the peace of this country and to protect the lives of the citizens of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, if ever in the history of our republic the American people needed to exercise cool, calm, and deliberate judgment, that time is now. Because of inherent or inherited sympathies or prejudices, it is exceedingly difficult to keep emotion under control or reason. Unfortunately, the American people are prone to take sides in any conflict. I care not whether it be a dog fight, a boxing bout, a divorce suit, an election, or a war. [Laughter.] It is bad enough when citizens of our country are divided among themselves on domestic issues, but it is much worse when they are divided on foreign policy.

There is no question about which the American people are more concerned at the present time than the way to keep this Nation out of war. We all want peace, but good and intelligent men will honestly differ as to the method by which it can be maintained. Certainly I believe that every Member of this House possesses some character and a little intelligence else he would not be here. All of us are striving for the same goal, namely, to keep this Nation out of war. For that reason I am reluctant to criticize anyone holding opposite views from my own, regardless of how violently I may differ with him. We all may be amateurs, but I do not think anyone should be branded a "faker."

Of course, the question of neutrality is so big, complicated, and intricate that it is difficult to discuss it satisfactorily in the limited time at my disposal. I regret that after 96 Senators have had 4 weeks in which to discuss this measure 435 Representatives are granted only 8 hours, or 480 minutes, to consider it. Because of my limited time I shall appreciate it if I am not interrupted until I have closed my remarks.

May I say at the outset that when the neutrality bill was first presented to the Congress in 1935 I questioned seriously whether or not it was wise for Congress ever to attempt to legislate about this matter. It is just as impossible to legislate neutrality as it is to legislate morality or prosperity, but the undeniable fact is that Congress has legislated; and though I have been a consistent and at times a bitter and uncompromising critic of the New Deal, I voted for the Neutrality Act of 1935, for the amendments to it in 1936 and 1937; and the present law has been in existence for the past 2 years. The bill at the time was debated thoroughly after long and exhaustive hearings and passed overwhelmingly in both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, and was signed by the President. It had the wholehearted support of the Department of State and met with the almost universal approval of the American people. Certainly there was no politics when we passed the bills, because many of the most violent critics of the administration, including myself, voted for it. We passed it at a time when the United States was at peace and when there was no general war in Europe. It became the law of the land when we could think cooly and objectively without passion or prejudice before the outbreak of the present war in Europe. Our neutrality law was enacted not to prevent war in Europe or anywhere else in the world, as some of the proponents of repeal now claim, therefore, how could this law have failed to date? It was enacted, indeed, because we feared a war would break out in Europe, and we wanted to keep America out of any future conflict. Not the prevention of war, but the prevention of our involvement in it was the the sole argument for the passage of the Neutrality Act [applause], and where were all these critics of the act today back in 1935, 1936, and 1937? They were standing in the Well of this very Chamber advocating its passage and voting for it when the roll was called. What has happened since then for them to change their minds? If the act was a good law in peacetime, it should be even a better law now and should not be changed because of the hysteria created by the present conflict in Europe. It is always dangerous to change the rules in the middle of the game, but the mecurial mind of some men in high authority makes it exceedingly easy for them to change the rules at every inning of the game as regards both our domestic and foreign affairs. Why change the rules now? What nation or people have injured us or even insulted or threatened us? Certainly the repeal of the embargo on arms, munitions, and the implements of war at this particular time would be considered an unneutral act. America, as has been well said, "would become the arsenal of one belligerent and the target of another." While aiding and abetting one side we would make ourselves the object of attack by the other side. This would certainly be interference or intervention and not neutrality. If I furnish the bandit the tools with which to crack the safe, I am equally guilty with him of the robbery he commits. I have aided and abetted in the perpetration of the crime.

It was stated on the floor of this House yesterday that one of the belligerents in Europe had several years to buy weapons from us, while its enemies have had only 1 year in which to purchase weapons. Nothing could be more inaccurate. All the belligerents alike before the outbreak of the present conflict in Europe had free access to our ports and our markets, and the truth of the matter is that we sold more of the materials of war to England and France during the past few years than we have to Germany since Hitler took control.

It is not our fault that some nations went to sleep while others were arming. Even Prime Minister Baldwin in 1936 said that Britain was aware that Germany was rearming, but he did not want to make an issue of that in the elections of the campaign of that year lest the Conservative Party would be defeated. All the world has known since we passed the present neutrality law in 1935, and as amended in 1936 and 1937, that in case of war we would not sell arms, munitions, and implements of war to any belligerent. They were warned sufficiently in advance and knew that all were to be treated alike. If the present law is so bad, why in the world did the President ask for it and why did we as representatives of a great and free people pass it?

Certain events have transpired in the past 1 or 2 years to which we cannot blind ourselves. Over a year ago President Roosevelt, dedicating a bridge in Chicago, spoke of economic sanctions and of quarantining aggressor nations. About the same time Anthony Eden made a special mission to the United States, where he was royally received and cordially entertained. Last January the President called his ambassadors to Britain and France, respectively, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Bullitt, from their vacations in Florida back to Washington to appear before the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House in a joint executive session behind closed doors, picturing to us the great peril in which both Britain and France found themselves. Be it said to their credit, they are good salesmen. Later on last spring the President, bidding his friends in Georgia farewell, told them he would be back to see them this fall if we were not in war. Then came the crash of the airplane in California, in which a French pilot was seriously injured and the revelation of secret sales of airplanes to Britain and France was made known to both Congress and the people. Finally came the King and Queen of England themselves, and were wined and dined in our National Capital. No one knows what was secretly discussed between the representatives of the British and American Commonwealths, but there are many "amateurs" in this country who fought in the last war and who deserve something better than the ignominious title of "faker," who naturally wonder what promises, if any, were secretly made. In addition to all these incidents, there were certain notes sent to Europe, and when put together they make a completed picture like a jigsaw puzzle that spells anything but a neutral attitude.

For the life of me, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how we can now change the rules in the middle of the game for the express purpose of helping one belligerent against another without being branded by any reasonable and just man as taking sides. On its face it is the most unneutral thing we could do. We are not staying out, we are getting in, and it is obvious from the

speeches and communications from all people who now want to repeal the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war that they are not neutral but are taking sides, and many of them are honest enough to admit it. They want to employ methods just short of war but such a thing is ridiculous and utterly impossible. [Applause.] We cannot be half in this war and half out. If we cannot deal honestly with other nations, we certainly should not attempt to kid ourselves by calling this a neutrality act. The advocates of repeal do not want to fight Germany; they merely want to slap her face or hand her enemies the weapons with which to destroy her, and this obviously is an act of war, and if we lift the embargo now, we will bring the war to our very shores. Is there any Member of this body so inexperienced, so gullible, so naive, or so "amateurish" as to believe for one moment Germany will not do her best to prevent arms, munitions, and implements of war reaching her enemies from any source whatever? German submarines will not wait until the cargoes approach England and France, but they will lurk outside our own harbors and our own coast lines.

Mr. Speaker, they will not wait until the munitions leave our own shores. Have we not learned from our sad experience in the last war that we shall have more Black Tom cases? Sabotage will be widely practiced, and violence will threaten us in every corner of our land. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that America is a heterogeneous nation, and we are a polyglot people. There are many foreign elements that comprise our citizenry, and if we take sides in the present dispute we must expect buildings to be bombed, subways dynamited, bridges blown up, trains wrecked, ships sunk, water supplies polluted, and the activities of secret agents will be all the more easy because we have 10,000,000 hungry men out of work. I am no alarmist; but who for one moment, in the light of past experience, thinks that this is not likely to happen?

It has been claimed that the present Senate bill before us contains cash-and-carry provisions, but such is not the case, as was ably pointed out yesterday by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]. Of course, the Allies may pay cash at the beginning for war materials if we lift the embargo, but as the trade increases and the war is prolonged the lesson of experience has taught us that credit will be extended, and when credit is extended we shall then have an investment in a belligerent country which we will fight to protect. There are just three steps, Mr. Speaker, which will lead us inevitably into war: First, we furnish munitions; second, we furnish money; and, finally, we furnish men. [Applause.]

The most fallacious argument for repeal that has yet been advanced, and the one that lurks in the minds of most of the advocates of repeal, whether openly expressed or not, is that repeal of the arms embargo would help business and put our idle men to work. Indeed, the President himself in his message of September 21 to us suggested in effect that we repeal the arms embargo to help solve the unemployment problem. That was amazing and shocking coming from the Chief Executive of the land. Personally, I do not believe we can ever have prosperity by accepting blood money; and if that term is not suitable, then accept the President's phrase in his Chautauqua speech, "fool's gold," and much as I wish to see the problem of unemployment solved in this country, I do not believe it would be a healthy solution to manufacture arms for sale to other nations to destroy themselves. No Christian country should care to prosper on the misery of others. War profits are unnatural, abnormal, and unsound. At best they are temporary, and are eaten up by the depression and high taxes that inevitably follow in the wake of war.

War is the most profitless enterprise on earth. No one ever wins, and always everybody loses. To be sure, our American people enjoyed a little temporary prosperity at the beginning of the World War 25 years ago. It was nice for our farmers to receive $2.50 a bushel for wheat; it was fine for our laborers in industrial plants and munitions factories to receive abnormally high wages, but it was not half so pleasant when both the farmers and laborers eventually had to go to war to pay for the little prosperity that was so transient in character. The war boom naturally caused overexpansion in both agriculture and industry, and when the war unexpectedly ended, as all wars must, the bottom dropped out of things, and the farmer and industrialist alike went into bankruptcy. Both are still trying to pay off the mortgages plastered on them by the last war.

Mr. Speaker, we entered the last conflict out of high idealism and with unselfish motives. Without pride of power, lust of ambition, or desire for territorial dominion, we staked our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor in a cause which we believed at that time to be high, holy, and just. We transported 2,000,000 men to France, spilled our blood, spent our money, and came out of the fight without a dollar of indemnity and without a square acre of territory. Our Allies even before we entered the conflict, by secret treaty, had already agreed to share the loot and divide the spoils. They even went so far as to promise Japan certain territory of China, though China as well as Japan was fighting with them. And they never gave Italy the territory they promised her. Mr. Speaker, we did not make the world safe for democracy; we did not end war, and the futility of the last conflict along with the iniquitous Versailles Treaty, written in the atmosphere of hate and in the spirit of revenge, which established artificial lines and boundaries arbitrarily cutting up the states of Europe and imposing impossible indemnities on a vanquished foe made Hitler possible and the present war for territory and balance of power inevitable. [Applause.] True, we enjoyed temporary prosperity in wartime but afterward came the deluge, and all that we have received for our efforts has been 10 years of depression, 10,000,000 men out of work, $13,000,000,000 of bad war debts which we will never collect, and 4 cemeteries in France. The only thing we could get out of another conflict would be deeper debts, longer depressions, higher taxes, and more graveyards. We burned our hands once; should we be so silly as to rush back into the fire?

Sir, we who want the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war retained do not claim its repeal would immediately lead us into another conflict but we are convinced in our own minds, "amateurish" as they are, and are forcibly told by the consciences that we possess, that repeal would be the first step on the road that leads ultimately to involvement. It is not the last blow that is struck, but the first one that usually precipitates a battle. Woodrow Wilson was a man of high ideals and certainly did not want America to be dragged into the last World War, but the initial steps taken by our Government with all their unpredictable eventualities finally led him against his own will into the conflict. Last Thursday night, Mr. Roosevelt said, "the United States, as I have said before, is neutral and does not intend to get involved in war." Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of all Members to the word "intend." After all, our intentions and motives do not count for as much as the practical and inevitable results of our acts. I repeat, sir, that none of us wants this Nation to go to war nor do we intend for it to go to war, but by taking certain steps—and the repeal of the arms embargo is one of these steps—we shall be led inexorably and inescapably into the heart of the conflict. Are we who honestly and conscientiously believe this way to be branded as "fakers" by anyone who disagrees with us? Personally I prefer to be on the level rather than "just a little bit left of center."

Mr. Speaker, there are some good provisions in the pending Senate bill which should be incorporated in our present law. Certainly our American citizens should not be allowed to travel on belligerent ships nor should our American ships be allowed to travel in the war zone or in waters adjacent to or surrounding the belligerent countries in Europe, unless it is to bring stranded Americans home. Certainly, after spending so much money in developing our merchant marine we should demand that our American ships should have free access to the seas except in those areas that definitely threaten their safety. It is a disappointment, however, that we do not have a definite cash-and-carry plan in the present bill and that such vast discretionary powers have been

granted the President. I do not believe the American people, regardless of politics, want any more discretionary powers voted to any man in the White House whether in war or peace, and if anything, they desire their representatives in Congress to take back many of the excessive powers granted the Executive under the cry of emergency. But whatever good points we have in this bill we could enact without repealing the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war, which is the greatest barrier to our involvement. Why mix the good with the bad, and demand that we swallow the bitter with the sweet? Why not retain the embargo on munitions and add to the present law any of these other provisions which would prove to be additional safeguards to our neutrality and security?

Sir, it is neither Pauline boasting nor Pharisaical self-righteousness to say that the United States of America has been more generous and helpful to other nations and peoples than any other government of this earth. To be sure, we are not perfect and have sinned in the past ourselves; but for over a century we have played the role of the Good Samaritan. For many, many years millions of dollars have poured from America from our Christian churches of all denominations to peoples less fortunate than ourselves. Our missionaries have established churches, schools, hospitals, and other benevolent institutions in Asia, India, Africa, and on many islands in the seas. They have taken light where there was darkness and offered hope where there was only despair. The Rockefeller Foundation everywhere has been a boon and blessing to mankind. To Japan, Russia, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, China, and many other places our Government has sent medical supplies, food, clothing, and the necessities of life to people in destitution and want. We fed the Belgians during the World War and took relief to Germany after the war ended. Always, America has tried to help the poor, the weak, and the wronged. Indeed, we have helped our enemies, blessed even those who cursed us—"Blessed and cursed not." Not in a bragging manner but with a humble spirit, we can take pardonable pride in the humanitarianism we have generously shown to the world. After this splendid and enviable record of accomplishment, we are now confronted with the ghastly aspect of this Nation furnishing, not only airplanes, tanks, guns, and ammunition but also poisonous gas and liquid fire to the belligerent powers of Europe. To me, it is a horrible, unnecessary, and unjustifiable business. We are now going to establish a record, not of mercy but of butchery. British, French, and German soldiers will breathe the poisonous gas and face the liquid fire furnished by Americans. No longer will we be known for our pity but for our brutality. We shall discard all sense of honor, decency, and dignity, and revert to the law of the jungle. The law of the tooth and the claw will supplant that of tolerance, equity, and light. Not only the men who sleep in blood-soaked, rain-drenched trenches, who go over the top and crawl on their bellies like snakes through the mud, the muck, and mire under barbed-wire entanglements will breathe this poisonous gas and face this liquid fire, but the millions of defenseless women, innocent children, and decrepit old men in large cities and little towns will suffer the same fate. How it will increase their respect and love for us as a nation and a people to know that these instrumentalities of death were made in the United States of America! I can see mustard gas eating the flesh from the emaciated bones of the starving and dying. I can hear the agonizing cry of men with their eyes burned out by liquid fire, whose mothers and wives and sweethearts back home, whether they be in Britain, France, or Germany, will swear eternal vengeance and pray a curse to rest upon America. Is this the best contribution, sir, that we have to offer civilization to save it from lapsing into a thousand years of barbarism? And yet, so far as I know, the Senate of the United States last week is the first parliamentary body that ever voted its approval of permament legislation of this kind. I do not want to dwell upon the awful misery and indescribable suffering that will result from modern bacteriological and chemical warfare lest some omnipotent and omniscient high Government official will brand me as being a "breast-beating faker" and an "armchair amateur." No breast beating and no words can accurately describe the terrible picture, but the world will know it when this living hell breaks loose.

Some people honestly believe that it would be better to repeal the whole Neutrality Act and return to our traditional policy of international law. The President in his message to us at the opening of this session seemed to be inclined to accept this view, and of course every man is entitled to his own belief. However, it is a well-established principle of international law that a neutral country, after the outbreak of war, cannot change its traditional policy by legislation in order to help one belligerent as against another without becoming unneutral. Therefore we would violate international law itself by lifting the present embargo on arms in order to return to international law. In other words, we would violate the very law we would return to. And, remember this, we had international law in 1917 and it did not keep us out of war then. Our present law has kept us out of the conflict thus far, so why change it now?

Everyone knows, even the "amateurs," that war is expensive business; expensive in men and money, and the aftermath is bad or worse than the war itself. We had better pay for the last war before we enter into another one. [Applause.] In 1917 we could enter a World War when our national debt was little more than $1,000,000,000, but today with a national debt of $41,000,000,000—and if you add the contingent liabilities for which our Government is responsible it is near $46,000,000,000—hanging over us, a war would be suicide. Our present financial structure could not stand the strain. Today we are spending approximately $1,000,000,000 in veterans' pensions and compensation benefits to the soldiers of our past wars, and every year we are admitting 28,000 veterans of the World War to our hospitals and insane asylums. We are spending another billion dollars annually in interest alone on our public debt, half of which was bequeathed to us by the World War and the other half of which has been added since March 4, 1933. The first line of national defense for any nation is its financial solvency. But should we be misled by skillfully prepared and poisonous propaganda to enter this war we could reasonably expect repudiation of the Government's obligation or ruinous inflation. In either instance the disaster would be appalling. But, Mr. Speaker, we would suffer a greater loss than the money we have saved and accumulated through hard work and self-denial over past years. The minute war is declared in this country America becomes a dictatorship overnight. We shall immediately experience the loss of individual liberty, the death of democracy, and complete regimentation of our people under an autocratic dictatorship. It would be highly doubtful after the war ended if the American people ever could regain their freedom. Already the President has more excessive powers granted him under the cry of emergency than were ever given in peacetime to any of his predecessors. Repeal the present arms embargo, make wider and less rugged the path that leads to conflict, and the moment war is declared the last stronghold of democracy on the face of this earth here in our own land capitulates. This is no idle dream nor farfetched theory. In Great Britain the elections to Parliament next year already have been canceled. We do not want that to happen here, but to keep our own liberties as free men and to remain a constitutional representative democracy.

It is fearfully suggested by some that if one of the belligerents wins the present conflict in Europe, America will be her next object of attack. Such apprehension is natural but such a possibility is remote. Whichever side in the present conflict wins will be so utterly exhausted and with the readjustment of its social, political, and economic problems to contend with all the discontented and disgruntled minorities within its boundaries to suppress, it will not be able to attack anyone else for many years to come and certainly not a country 3,000 miles away across dangerous waters which remain a natural barrier in spite of the advancement of science; a country which has 130,000,000 intelligent, patriotic, highly skilled citizens with enormous industrial and commercial output, and which could raise an army of 10,000,000 men and whose every citizen would fight without conscription to the

death in any defensive war. Should we become involved in a conflict now, spend our money and our men in another futile effort to determine the destinies of the different nations of Europe, we would be weak, too, at the end of the conflict. But if we are wise and follow the advice of the Father of his Country and every other great American patriot down to the present time, we will steer clear of the historic hatreds, the entrenched greed, the bitter jealousies, and the rank animosities that have kept Europe in constant turmoil for over a thousand years. We shall remain aloof from their disputes but not indifferent to their miseries, and when the war is ended America, because of her nonintervention and nonparticipation, will be virile and strong, and because of our remoteness and disinterestedness we shall have a moral influence throughout the world which will make itself felt and heard. For our own sake, for humanity's sake, for God's sake, let us save democracy in America and not again send our sons to foreign fields to fight for democracy where it is already dead. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest, as I always do, to the remarks of my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who preceded me. The gentleman from Missouri is proceeding upon the theory that this is a vote for war or peace, yet the gentleman himself knows that an act of war under our Government is an act of Congress, and that the Congress of the United States would vote for war only if American public opinion overwhelmingly demanded it. [Applause.]

My distinguished friend talked about a thousand years of barbarism. That is what certain nations of the world are now trying to impose upon the peoples of the world, the attempt to hurl religion and Christianity, and all they stand for, back to the dark days of barbarism.

In last night's papers I read the speech of Premier Foreign Commissar Molotov, of Communist Russia, assailing the arms ban repeal. Molotov spoke officially for Communist Russia, and Dictator Stalin was present on the occasion when Molotov spoke. He spoke to 1,300 delegates controlled by Stalin, spoke in opposition to the repeal of the embargo. Do you think he did that for the best interests of the United States? Do you think he did that for the best interests of religion and the ennobling things for which it stands? Communism is the arch enemy of religion and every ideal for which decent mankind stands. Soviet Russia, in its constitution, states definitely that it is the enemy of religion, communism that would try to stop you and me from exercising our religious conscience, communism that went into Poland only a few weeks ago and took over 13,000,000 of liberty-loving and religion-loving people—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. Today no churches exist in that part of Poland.

Within the past few weeks there came from Moscow itself the admission that Catholic priests were murdered, with the lying statement that they were resisting the Communist Army. They were murdered in Christian Poland for the same reason that they have been murdered for 20 years in Soviet Russia—priests, ministers, rabbis—because they were messengers of God and doing the work of God on earth. [Applause.]

If we do not repeal the embargo, we are not only helping communistic Russia but also Nazi Germany. The world knows that Nazi Germany stands for the same objective that communistic Russia stands for. Nazi Germany is attempting to dominate all religion, and the domination of religion means its suppression and destruction. Nazi Germany and Communist Russia have clasped hands. They are both in this conflict. They are both the anti-God forces. They are both trying to destroy religion. And yet our existing law brings about results that lend valuable aid and assistance to those world forces of destruction. For that statement made by the official representative of the Soviet—Communist—Government the United States ought to recall its Ambassador. [Applause.] That should be the answer of the United States to this attempt to influence the public opinion of America and this flagrant violation of international law. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the embargo in the Spanish conflict. If the Spanish conflict was going on today, I would vote to retain it. I opposed repeal of the embargo when the attempt was made by some sources to repeal it, including the Communist Party of the United States and others.

An official statement of the Communist Party of the United States under date of September 21, 1939, states that it opposed repeal of the present law. In the case of the Spanish conflict these vicious forces favored repeal, because repeal of our law at that time would have helped the Communist element of Spain that dominated the so-called Loyalist Government. Today they are opposed to repeal upon instructions from Moscow and they are opposed to repeal today because the present law lends great aid and assistance to Nazi Germany and Communist Russia.

The Spanish conflict was more than a resort to arms. It was the attempt on the part of the Communists, backed by Soviet Russia, to impose upon the people of Spain a communistic state, with all of its viciousness and ruthlessness. If the so-called Loyalists won, Spain and its people would have become what Soviet Russia is today. It was a question whether Christianity and religion, or atheistic communism should prevail and dominate the life of the people of Spain. It was a question of Christianity and religion, with their ennobling influences, or communism, with its destructive results.

In that conflict I did not think it was for the best interests of the United States, or of religion to have communism win. My vote was based upon the conditions that existed at that time. I did not want the markets of the United States to be open to the Communists. The so-called Loyalists had free entry to our ports; the Nationalist group, under General Franco, did not. I voted for the embargo in that conflict with the intention of our country's having a neutrality policy, the result of which would not bring aid and assistance to the anti-God forces of that conflict.

When the attempt was made during that conflict to repeal the embargo, every clear-thinking person of a religious mind, under the leadership of practically all of the clergymen of all creeds, opposed repeal. They realized that the enemy of religion was trying to obtain control of another nation. They realized that the first attack would be upon religion. They realized the dangers to Christianity and to religion and to mankind. They took the position, as I did, that it was not for the best interest of the United States to have a neutrality policy which lent great aid and assistance to the open and avowed enemies of God and, at the same time, penalized those elements in Spain that believed in and followed His teachings.

Mr. Speaker, I know that no Member of this body intends to favor Communist Russia and Nazi Germany; however, the fact remains that the result of any Member's vote against repeal of the embargo is a vote that aids Communist Russia and a vote that aids Nazi Germany. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand, and I presume every Member received it, a letter from the German Bund, in which it states that this organization is opposed to repeal. Do you think that that organization is for the best interests of our country? Do you think that the Communist Party or communistic Russia is for the best interests of our country? Why, if I entered into this Chamber to vote and I knew the Communists advocated one thing, I could blindly vote the other way, and I know my vote would be for the best interest of our country.

What have we in this present conflict? We have Nazi Germany determined to destroy religion. We have Communist Russia determined to destroy religion. They are now both working together. I will make the affirmative statement that under our present law we are lending valuable aid and assistance to these destructive forces due to the fact we are penalizing the other forces engaged in the present war, forces that are not attacking religion, forces that are not trying to destroy the ennobling influences that religion brings to mankind.

Oh, there is something more in this war than what some have argued. There is the question of religion and Christianity itself being deliberately attacked. Oh, I hear no one

saying a kind word for religious Poland. Do you suppose religious Poland is going to be reconstituted by a Nazi victory or by a Communist victory? Oh, no. I hear few expressing any words of sympathy for those fine people of Poland who are, like you and me, human beings, possessed of a religious conscience—Catholic, Protestant, and Jew—who have seen religion destroyed, temporarily at least, by communistic Russia. Today in that part of Poland dominated and controlled by communistic Russia they cannot go to their churches. They are denied the free exercise of their religion, and today priests, ministers, and rabbis alike are and will be murdered. Oh, that is involved. Do you think an extension of these destructive powers is for the best interests of the United States? That is the question that concerns me.

The neutrality policy of the United States is purely a domestic question. In determining that question, our first and foremost consideration is the best interest of our country. Among the important considerations that enter into that determination are the world conditions that exist from time to time, their effect upon our country and ourselves, and, having in mind the world conditions, the adoption of a policy that will be consistent with the best interests of our country. Certainly it would be unwise, in fact, it would be wrong, to adopt a policy that immediately or ultimately would be contrary to our best interests.

I am hoping that the day will come when religious Poland will again revive so the people of that country can carry on with their liberties and their right to attend their churches as their consciences dictate.

Is it for the best interests of our country—that is the question—to permit a condition to exist here that aids the very forces that would destroy religion and would also destroy democracy? This is not a vote on war. This is a vote of common sense as to what kind of a neutrality policy the United States should have in the light of the existing world conditions.

I, as a Christian, am interested in the situation that exists. I do not want to see religion suppressed in any country. I believe it is necessary that religion, doing its work of God, and in the salvation of souls, must have a free and independent position within the spiritual field. We know that there are enemies of religion, of all creeds that are attempting to deny that right. They are enemies because a dictator who wants to maintain himself permanently in office cannot be assured of permanence as long as there exists alongside of him religion, that is free and independent, where priests, ministers, and rabbis are free to express themselves in performing their duties as messengers of God in their attempt to save the souls of men.

The United States of America is a religious nation. Our Constitution recognizes the omnipotence of God. The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence recognize that all power comes from God Himself, and you and I must ultimately answer to Him for the manner in which we exercise our conscience. If I bow down to the will of those on earth when my conscience tells me the contrary is the proper course to take, in accordance with the truths that I believe in, some day I, as everyone else, must answer to the Maker, and I cannot give the excuse on that occasion that I bowed to the will and demand of persons on earth because I wanted their votes or because I feared political repercussions.

There are many fine people whom I respect and whose opinions I value, but with whom I disagree and honestly so on this question, who fail to realize this fundamental issue, who fail to realize that this war as far as the totalitarian nations are concerned is a war against religion as well as against the other countries engaged in this struggle for other reasons. I do not care for England but I have nothing but contempt for Hitlerism and for Stalinism. [Applause.]

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge upon the Members of this House the consideration of the fundamental question that is involved, the question as to whether or not by the law of our country we shall permit results to flow therefrom that will assist the world forces of destruction; that will assist them to carry on their effort to destroy religion and all of the ennobling influences for which it stands. We cannot ignore the challenge. As Americans we cannot fail to recognize the seriousness of the situation. As Americans we should put our country in a position where the results of our law do not help the anti-God forces of the world and do not penalize those forces that stand for the existence and the permanence of religion, of Christianity, and of democracy. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the speech made by the gentleman from Massachusetts should have been made to those who are responsible for the recognition of Soviet Russia. The speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts was the most extraordinary one I have heard in the many years I have been in the Congress. It was the most warlike speech that has been made since we declared war back in 1917. If we are to police and quarantine the world for religious motives, we had better have a vote on that question right away.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this body is more in favor of immediate deportation of all alien Communists, Nazis, and Fascists than I am, but, Mr. Speaker, it is none of our business what form of government exists in any foreign land, whether it be communism in Soviet Russia, nazi-ism in Germany, or fascism in Italy, neither is it any of their business what form of government exists in the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record, as Al Smith used to say. What are the facts? The facts are that Great Britain and France for 6 months before a pact was made between Germany and Soviet Russia were engaged in trying to make a pact with Soviet Russia themselves. What would have been the position of the gentleman from Massachusetts if England and France had made a pact with Soviet Russia? I submit that no one is more opposed than am I to all dictatorial forms of government, and particularly to communism, but we do not propose sending American soldiers to foreign lands to change different forms of government and to fight different totalitarian states and their ideologies. I again predict that if the German Government is overthrown, they will have communism in Germany, and I regret to say, probably all over Europe. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no quarrel between me and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] on driving communism and fascism and nazi-ism out of this country, but I understood him to say that those of us who are supporting this Shanley amendment are supporting Nazi Germany and Communist Russia.

I want to say that any intimation that I am in sympathy with either one of those ideologies is so false, so vicious, so repugnant to every instinct of common decency that it would bring a blush of shame upon the brazen cheeks of the foulest fiend that ever howled its hideous course down the sulphurous vales of Hades. [Applause.]

Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri rose.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to say to the gentleman that I certainly never stated that with respect to any Member, and the gentleman certainly misunderstood me if he understood it that way.

Mr. RANKIN. I am glad to hear that, for I have always had great affection for the gentleman from Massachusetts.

We are striving to keep this country out of war. I am not questioning the motives of any other Member, and no one has the right to question mine or that of other Members who feel as I do about this all-important issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not only in favor of driving fascism, nazi-ism, and communism out of America, but I have always been in favor of it. If the report of the Dies committe is correct, I am in favor of driving those international Communists forever from the Federal pay roll. [Applause.]

I am in favor of throwing out any man who follows the doctrines of a foreign power that is dedicated to destroying my government. I would raise the American flag high above every bureau of this Government and let the world know that this is still the country of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, and Jackson, and those other immortals who have gone before us and who created, dedicated, and defended it in order that it might forever furnish a home for liberty, freedom, and democracy. [Applause.]

I have absolutely nothing for Hitler. He never did but one thing of which I am conscious of approving, and that was when he made it so hot for Bergdoll, the millionaire draft dodger, that he had to come back to the United States and go to jail, where he belongs, and where he ought to have gone 20 years ago. [Applause.]

I have nothing for communism. As soon as I found that Troyanovsky, the Russian Ambassador to this country, was going about over this Nation promoting communism, which was attempting to overthrow this Government and making speeches in favor of a military alliance between my country and Russia, I was in favor of sending him home then on the first boat. [Applause.]

If Fritz Kuhn came to this country and obtained his certificate of citizenship under false pretense, I am for canceling it at once and sending him home. [Applause.]

Let us remember that we men who are trying to save America from this holocaust of war are Americans with an American background [applause], and let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am a Christian, also. I do not belong to his church; I am a Protestant. I voted for this embargo when the Spanish war was going on, not because I was taking sides in what someone said was a war between Russian Jewish communism and the Catholic Church; I voted for it to keep my country out of that war, and it did that very thing. This embargo helped to keep us out of a war that a certain international element that has no sympathy for Christianity was spending money by the barrel to try to get us into.

I am very glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] joined me at that time in helping to keep America out of that conflict. Mr. Speaker, I am pro-British as between Great Britain and any other foreign country. I am especially pro-Scotch. Every drop of blood in my veins comes from either Scotch or English ancestry.

There is not a single human being in my district that I know of who was born in Germany. But I have hundreds, if not thousands, of young men in my district whose blood would be soaked into the soil of Europe if we got into another European war. I have enough humanity in my heart to do what I can, and I have done what I could to keep this country out of this war. I have been subjected to every pressure on earth. I have done what I could to induce the powers that be to intervene and ask for a truce and to bring this useless, senseless war to a close before it really begins, and I shall continue those efforts to the end. [Applause.]

I am supporting the amendment of my distinguished Democratic colleague from Connecticut [Mr. Shanley] to hold the arms embargo and at the same time to retain those Senate amendments that would keep American ships and American citizens out of the war zone. The only question with me is, Which is the best way to keep America out of this war? Practically every man who is listening to me today says that he has taken his position because he thinks it is the best way to keep out of war. I admire you for that stand. That one sentiment represents the heartbeats of 99 percent of the Christian people of America. The President thinks that the Senate amendments keeping Americans out of the war zone and keeping our ships out of the danger zone will do more to keep us out of the war than any embargo by itself. I agree with him on that point. But certainly holding the embargo still and holding those amendments put on by the Senate to keep our ships and our people out of the danger zone will "make assurance double sure" by taking a bond of fate that will guarantee that America will stay out of this war.

The war has not really begun, and, in my humble judgment, if this Shanley amendment is adopted, the war will not begin. If we repeal this embargo, we are encouraging Great Britain and France to go on into the war; to start the war, if you please, or to intensify it into a real war. They will do so believing that we are coming in. Will we be treating Great Britain and France as we should, to lift this embargo and encourage them to plunge into probably the most devastating war of all time, unless we are going in, too? They think we are coming in. Already in England they are singing The Yanks Are Coming. Two nights ago on the radio we were told from London that the English had been warned to "pipe down" on that song for the time being, which meant, of course, until the Congress lifted the embargo.

There is an international element that is singing Onward Christian Soldiers. That element wants us to go into the war, but not to protect Christianity. It is about 2,000 years too late for them to wrap the cloak of Christianity about themselves as defenders of the faith.

The people of Europe are appealing for peace. They are not fighting now on the western front. The only places in Europe they tell me that are not blacked-out are the athletic fields on the western front. The boys are playing football at night, and I hope they will keep it up.

Of course, I know the international group that expects to make money out of the war by coining their millions from the blood and tears of the suffering Christian people of the world are bringing every pressure to bear to keep the war going. They are very much afraid that peace will break out in Europe.

They have had the radio ringing with war propaganda for 2 years or more. They have control of the picture shows and have been using them for purposes of war propaganda and forcing their pictures on a helpless public by their system of block booking, by which they got over the one besmirching the United States Senate. By their advertisements they control many of the great newspapers of America that are now saying that we cannot keep out of this war. We can keep out. And, by the eternal gods, we are going to keep out of this war. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my tribute to the man I believe to be the greatest Englishman of this day and generation, Mr. David Lloyd George, the great Christian leader of England, the great Baptist lay leader of the British Empire, and a former Prime Minister, one who went through all the hell of the World War. He saw all the tragedy and all of the horrors of that terrible conflict; and today, when this international group is clamoring for war and lambasting and abusing Lloyd George, he is rising—

> As some tall cliff, that lifts its awful form,
> Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm,
> Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
> Eternal sunshine settles on its head.

He is appealing to the warring nations to gather around the counsel table and bring this terrible catastrophe to a close. I firmly believe that if we adopt the Shanley amendment and refuse to repeal the embargo and accept the rest of the Senate amendments, this war will not last 6 weeks. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am not a coward. I am not a pacifist. I hate communism with all the power of my soul. I am a real, old-time Jeffersonian American [applause], but I wish to God that those soldiers on the western front would crawl out of the trenches and say to each other, "If those war-making statesmen, those international bankers, who now control the destinies of Europe, will not ask for a conference to stop this holocaust before it goes any further, then we will stand here and refuse to fight until they do." I would love to see the German soldiers say to Hitler, "Mr. Hitler, you stop this war"; and the English soldiers say to Chamberlain, and the French soldiers say to Daladier, "Stop this war before you start a holocaust that will destroy probably ten or fifteen million of the very flower of the world's young manhood, to say nothing of the helpless women and children who will be killed by high explosives and poison gas."

If we will hold this embargo in the bill and adopt the other salutary provisions inserted in the Senate, we will do more to stop this war than all the attacks we can make upon those countries that we do not like. [Applause.]

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

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. The gentleman has been naming a lot of British statesmen. Will you name what statesman it was who said it was perfectly all right for Communist Russia to take a large portion of Christian Poland? Will you tell me why England has not repudiated that?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going into that. We know it is a scramble for European trade territory and power. We know that Great Britain is preparing to approve the confiscation of Albania by Italy. We know that Great Britain is not going to try to restore that portion of Poland that was taken by Russia. I doubt if they will ever restore the rest of it, regardless of the outcome of the war. That is not what I am driving at. What I am trying to do is to keep my own country out of it, and we can do it by adopting this Shanley amendment and holding the Senate amendments to which I have referred. [Applause.]

The gentlemen on my left do not agree with me ordinarily. This is a matter that has caused me many weary nights. As the world's greatest philosopher once said,

> Between the acting of a dreadful thing
> And the first motion, all the interim is
> Like a phantasma, or a hideous dream:
> The genius and the mortal instruments
> Are then in council; and the state of man,
> Like to a little kingdom, suffers then
> The nature of an insurrection.

I have worried and I have prayed over this question, and I have come to the conclusion that the only course I can take under my oath of office and my conscience is to vote for the Shanley amendment and for the salutary amendments placed there by the Senate of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, we went through the World War to make the world safe from just what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was preaching against a while ago. We were going to make the world safe for democracy. We were going to guarantee the integrity of small nations. We were going to end all wars. In that war we lost hundreds of thousands of men, but the worst of it was we destroyed a generation of young men. We have about 90 hospitals for veterans in America. As chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation I have seen more of the aftermath of that war than probably any other man living. God forbid that we should have another one.

I saw the mother, broken and wrinkled with time and care, turn her sorrow-stricken face toward the chair made vacant by the old fireplace and weep the tears of a broken heart. I saw a father, aged and dependent, leaning upon the staff of decrepitude, "in his face the emptiness of the ages and on his back the burden of the world," bowed down in grief for that son that we were taking by the iron hand of conscription to send to fight on foreign soil. I saw them come back broken in health and divorced from their position in life. They never did get exactly fitted back. Now, are we going to destroy another generation? With them would probably be destroyed a generation of women and children.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I read the following description of a scene of battle after these high explosives, poison gasses, and flame throwers, had done their deadly work:

> Chunks of human flesh were quivering on the branches of the trees. * * * A half dozen houses were burning. * * * Mules and horses were pawing in their entrails. * * * The whitewashed church was bespattered with blood and brains. * * * Men were running about howling with insanity, their eyes protruding from their sockets. * * * One woman was sitting against a wall trying to push her bleeding intestines back into her abdomen. * * * A man lay nearby, digging his teeth and his fingers into the ground. * * * A child sat on a doorstep whimperingly holding up the bleeding stumps of its arms to a dead woman whose face was missing.

God deliver the helpless women and children of my country and the helpless women and children of the nations of Europe from such a fate.

This poison gas and these deadly bombs will not all go to England. Everybody with any intelligence knows that they will go to England and Germany and every other country who wants to buy them. Those men who want to coin their money out of the blood of humanity and out of the sacrifice of civilization, would sell those things to anybody on earth who could pay for them. If we pass this measure and leave this poison gas and these high explosives in this bill they will be used not only to destroy innocent women and children in Germany and Austria, but they will be used to destroy innocent women and children in France and in Great Britain as well. And if we are dragged into it, as certain international influences hope we will be, it may then be used to destroy the lives of our own wives and children. Those are the things I am protesting against. For God's sake, let us rise above this petty quibbling, accept the salutary provisions of the Senate bill, hold this embargo, and bring this war to a close before it bursts into the most devastating destruction the world has ever seen. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, neutrality and democracy are born in the hearts and the minds of the American people. I might say right now that I intend to vote for the Senate bill, and I shall be proud of that vote. The reason I shall be proud of that vote is because I shall never intentionally cast a vote that will help the enemies of democracy. Communazi-ism, which represents the Godless elements of the earth, is the most dangerous enemy of democracy.

We may talk of poison gas, we may talk of arms and ammunition, but poison gas, arms, and ammunition are being manufactured every day by the enemies of democracy to create all the dread, misery, and inhumonity that has been described during this debate. Yes; they have been stored up for years by the enemies of democracy and are now being unleashed in all their fury against those who believe in the sanctity of God, religion, and the basic principles of freedom.

I shall never be a silent partner to those enemies of democracy. At this time I want to refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 84, page 8155, a speech made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON]. I agree with the statements he made at that time. He said:

> I repeat, the operation of the present act does not result in neutrality.
>
> It favors strong nations against weaker nations, and warlike nations against peace-seeking nations. The strong, warlike nations are already armed and supplied with munitions. Under international law the weaker of peace-seeking nations have a right to purchase their means of defense in the markets of the world, our own included. The present law denies that right. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] observed in his testimony before the committee, if France had a similar act during the struggle of our American Colonies for independence, that struggle would probably have been lost.
>
> The first question to be decided, therefore, is this: Do we want this session of Congress to adjourn with the present Neutrality Act on the books, knowing that it is not a real neutrality act at all, but is, in fact, a law that makes us a silent partner of nations that have rearmed?

That is the speech of the gentleman from New York, and I agreed with him then. It is a sound argument, just as sound today as it was at the time it was given. I will never, as long as I am a Member of this House, become a silent partner with the enemies of democracy, even though the gentleman from New York has now chosen to join with those who would make us a silent partner of the enemies of democracy. I abhor war; I refuse to do anything that will in any way tend toward sending any of our youth to fight on foreign soil, but I also refuse to aid and abet our enemies. It is manifestly true that the arms embargo does aid and abet those who would destroy our form of government. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the repeal of the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war presents a question to this body about which honest men may differ. When it was on for consideration in the House last June I

cast my vote against lifting the embargo. Then there was promise of a pacific adjustment of the German-Polish controversy and I was averse to our Government taking a position on that issue that may have prevented a peaceful settlement of it.

I loathe war. I know too much about it, for it has been my responsibility for many years to study and to plan a modern and effective military establishment for our country. I know that war is barbarism at its lowest ebb, that civilization's strength turns to brute force—the wisdom of the ages degenerates into the cunning of the beast seeking to kill and to exist. Because I know this so well I believed last June it would be a mistake for this country to amend its Neutrality Act in behalf of the democracies when such action may have prevented a peaceful settlement of the German-Polish issue.

The situation is changed. War is now on in Europe and to the limits of my ability I propose to keep it there and to keep this country out of it.

I propose to be entirely frank. I hold no brief for England or France. Only too well I know that both of these countries merely want us to help them in another of the wars that have been going on in Europe from the Spanish Succession to the present hour and which will continue about every 25 years apart or until a new crop of boys are reared to military age. I know too well that many of our people feel that we should not miss even one of these wars. I believe, however, that a majority of Americans prefer to stay out of this one—to skip at least every other one. Personally, I feel that our chances of becoming involved in this one will be materially lessened if the democracies are again the victors. For that reason I am now willing to lift the arms embargo and thus make available to them, within the continental limits of the United States, the products of our factories for prosecuting the war—be they airplanes, guns, tanks, armored cars, ammunition, or what not—so long as we continue to maintain an adequate reserve of raw materials for our own needs.

By so doing we promote the chances of victory for the democratic countries, thereby hastening the return of peace. Likewise, we gear up our own industry and make ourselves ready for any unforeseen turn of events.

Of course, we cannot be sure of the outcome, even though the democratic countries do manage to transport such quantities and kinds of our munitions as they may need. We can be sure of this, however, that by stepping up American industry we have promoted our own readiness to stave off any threat to this hemisphere, and there may be such threat should the totalitarian powers dictate the terms of peace and gain territory close enough to the American Continent.

With the world picture as it is today—with all Europe either in actual war or sufferers, or near sufferers, as its consequence—the speeding up of industrial production here is necessary for our own well-being. We posses the best navy in the world. We have done much to modernize all of the components of our Army, which is by no means small in numerical strength, and we are on the road to its complete implementation. Do not be fooled by propagandists here and abroad. We are well prepared for modern war on land, on the sea, and in the air. A highly geared industry producing modern implements of warfare will supply greater matériel demands should the need arise later for expansion of our military forces.

I hate war—and because I do I shall always oppose any move that may lead us into war, including proposals emanating from sources which, for some excuse or another, and always without reason, are continuously advocating military and naval establishments of proportions which no nation that has a will to stay at home and mind its own business needs.

The Congress should make every effort to maintain peace. The American people want an honest, intelligent peace. Perhaps some day the parliaments of the world can get together on how it is to be done. This is the greatest challenge to mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how the time stands?

The SPEAKER. Of the time consumed today, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has used 1 hour and 9 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used 1 hour.

Mr. BLOOM. How does the total time stand, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] in all has used 3 hours 8½ minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] in all has used 2 hours 56½ minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely regrettable that the neutrality legislation was not disposed of in the regular session of Congress, before a war broke out. I wish I were absolutely positive that I knew the right answer to this most perplexing and far-reaching problem that confronts us. I have never studied a question so intensely, nor weighed all considerations so carefully as I have this legislation. I can only hope that I have arrived at a correct answer. I pray that whatever the Congress may do that it may prove to be the right course.

I have always been opposed to embargoes as an international policy. I view it as an unwise and dangerous method. I opposed the original enactment of this so-called neutrality legislation. I took an active part in the fight to repeal it this June.

I am not now opposing the Senate amendments to the House bill because of any change in opinion on the principle of embargoes.

My reason for voting for the motion to instruct the conferees is because I agreed last June with President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull that the embargo should have been repealed then; that to do so once a war had commenced would almost certainly involve us in that war. I still believe this. I still agree with what the President and the Secretary of State believed then. I believe that to make any major change in our Neutrality Act while a war is in progress, when such change is intended to be an aid to one side in that war, against the other side, greatly increases the danger of our becoming involved in that war.

Mr. IZAC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Would the gentleman be in favor of it if it becomes necessary and in the interest of the American people?

Mr. MAAS. Oh, of course, I am in favor of voting for anything that is in the interest of the American people.

Mr. IZAC. But the gentleman does not believe this is in the interest of the American people?

Mr. MAAS. I do not believe it is at the present time in our interest.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman would be in favor of voting for war if it was in the interest of the American people?

Mr. MAAS. Of course I would.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is not in favor of taking any step that will be unneutral and unfriendly to anyone after war has started?

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. How can the gentleman say that having once passed a law, and then two nations in another part of the earth become involved in war, that should freeze us in our tracks, even if that war ran 20, 30, 50, or 100 years? We pass laws in our own right and for our own people and take our own neutral steps. We are not thereby frozen and cannot unshackle ourselves.

Mr. MAAS. Oh, I may say to the gentleman I do not contend for 1 minute we have not the right to repeal this law.

We have the right to make or unmake any law which we have passed. We also have the right to go all the way and declare war, but we should know what we are doing when we do that. The real question is not whether we can change the law, but is it desirable to change the law now that war has broken out?

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ENGEL. In my speech a week ago Monday I quoted the Secretary of State, and I want to read now what Ambassador Page telegraphed the Secretary of State regarding this very subject matter.

In December 1914 Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, introduced a resolution in the Senate aimed at the exportation of munitions of war to any belligerent. On December 11, 1914, the American Ambassador to Great Britain, Mr. Page, cabled the Secretary of State as follows:

> Sir Edward Grey unofficially expressed the hope to me that the bill introduced by Mr. Hitchcock in the Senate will not pass, aimed to prohibit the exportation by private firms of munitions of war to any belligerent.

He calls attention to the fact that this would be special legislation passed while war was in progress, making a radical departure from long-established customs, and for these reasons would be an unneutral act toward the belligerents. This is a telegram sent by Mr. Page, the American Ambassador, to the Secretary of State in 1914 on this question, which represents the English attitude at that time.

Mr. MAAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, to change the law now is a deliberate, affirmative act of partisanship. It is not only one of those steps "short of war," it is but a step short of a declaration of war, and the one is very likely to follow the other. Such a change in our law now will be such an unneutral act that we may have to ourselves answer for it upon the battlefields before this war is over.

The proponents of repeal say that the present embargo aids Germany and hurts the Allies. This, of course, is not true at all. What they really mean is that our present law does not hurt Germany in the same way that it does England and France, due to the fact that Germany cannot get munitions from us anyway because of the British blockade.

We come as near as possible to having real neutrality now because neither side can purchase munitions from us, and therefore we have no stake in the war.

The Allies knew what our law was when they declared war on Germany in September.

To stimulate a wartime munitions-making industry in this country is a most dangerous thing to do. One side in the war will control the seas and therefore prevent the other side from obtaining munitions from us, while they themselves will depend upon our production to carry on the war. Agents of the side that is denied access to our munitions will try to even things up by preventing the dominant sea power from getting our munitions. The only method possible is to destroy our munition factories and prevent arms and ammunition from ever being loaded on their enemies' ships. This happened before. It will again inflame public opinion in this country, and will be one of the potent causes of our entering the war. Every explosion, regardless of cause, will be blamed upon a belligerent. Soon an outraged public will be demanding our entry into the war. Soon we will be even more intensively propagandized that the Allies are fighting "our" war for us. If this is true, and they are fighting our war, then we should not only immediately repeal all neutrality legislation but we should openly declare war and take our place side by side with France and England. To do less is cowardly. If it is our war, let us get in now and get it over with as quickly as possible. Let us not wait, as we did before, until the Allies are defeated and then have to face a victorious enemy.

But are the Allies fighting our war? In what way are we threatened by Germany if we keep out of this war? Is this then another war to "make the world safe for democracy"? We tried that once. We all know the results. No; I do not believe that the Allies are fighting our war. The cause of this war is the same as the last one. It is a collision of two powerful European commercial competitors. We have no inherent interests in the commercial supremacy of either one.

Ideologies are not involved. It is a commercial war. We lose if we take sides, no matter who wins.

We certainly should have learned from the last war that we will again be holding the stakes and will be the principal losers. We made a noble effort to assist in solving Europe's problems in 1917 and 1918, but all we got out of it was billions in I O U's, which have never been paid and never will be. This might not be so bad, but there was needless sacrifice of thousands of the finest young men of America on Europe's battlefields. We suffered more than any nation in Europe with our post-war depression costing us up to two hundred billions and resulting in unemployment and suffering by millions of Americans over a period of years. Do we want to go through this all over again merely for a year or two of false war prosperity?

My sympathy goes out to the peoples of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. But bitter experience has taught us that going over there to butt into their wars will not help them. We learned that tragically 20 years ago. I pray that Finland may not suffer the unhappy fate of Poland, but we must know that we cannot change the course of events in Europe by participating in their wars. Both sides will listen to us if we are a powerful neutral, however.

As to the contention that if we let France and England be defeated that we will then have to face a victorious Germany alone, over here, is ridiculous. This was the same argument that helped draw us into the war 20 years ago. We are told that if we let the Allies lose, that Germany will demand and receive the British possessions—Canada, Bermuda, Nassau, and the rest of the British-American islands. If we remain out of this war, conserve our full manpower, our economic resources, and build up our own military might, even a European victor would not dare risk war with us in this hemisphere.

The purpose of this bill before us is not to improve our neutrality law. Its only effect, and I believe its sole purpose, is to enable this Government to intervene in the present war.

Otherwise, why change the law now? Certainly so long as we have an embargo on munitions our peace is not endangered by Germany, Russia, or Italy.

Then are we to believe that we will be threatened with a war by France and England because we will not repeal some law to which they object? Are we to believe that they would risk our friendship? If not, then by whom is our peace threatened by the retention of the arms embargo? How will retaining it get us into war? No one has even offered the slightest explanation of this contention.

What were the motives behind those who advocated an embargo-neutrality law in the first place? They are the very ones now demanding its repeal. Was it a genuine belief that such a course would keep us out of war? Or were they cruelly deluding the people in an effort to capitalize politically upon the popular sentiment to keep this country out of war? Were they dangerously gambling that there would be no war, and therefore no show-down, in their attempt to play up to the popular demand for neutrality?

Or did their calculations miscarry and the effect of the law appear to aid the wrong side, so that now they want to change it?

If Germany controlled the seas, would the proponents of embargo repeal be before us still advocating repeal?

Should Germany gain control of the seas—and well she may with her superior air force and submarines—will not the present advocates of repeal again demand the reenactment of the arms embargo?

How can this, by the widest stretch of the imagination, be considered neutrality?

The intent of this bill is to aid one side as against the other. That is the first step to ultimate active participation in the war. It is the same road down which we went to war the last time.

Our furnishing supplies now means our furnishing men later as surely as it did 20 years ago.

For us to get dragged into war now, a war that does not involve our vital interests, will be fatal, even if we win. Starting with a $45,000,000,000 debt will necessitate repudiation of all public and most, if not all, private debts in order to finance an overseas war.

This can be done only by a dictator. Dictators, once established, must employ drastic methods in order to maintain their power. The pattern for dictators is always the same. Their method is persecution, the arousing of class and racial hatred, the use of intolerance, with the resultant loss of freedom and liberty. All of the Old World bitterness will be transplanted over here. America will be gone, for when this comes about, the last refuge of freedom and liberty shall have perished from the earth; the last hope of the religious and racial minorities shall be crushed for centuries to come; all shall be lost.

This all too likely result may be the price we will pay for meddling in a European war, for the gravest danger in repealing the embargo is the implication it will carry throughout the world. Our own American people may not yet fully realize the consequences, but the peoples of Europe on both sides will interpret repeal as a deliberate, considered act to cast our lot with the Allies against Germany and probably Russia and Italy. Both sides will expect and plan upon our entry into the war. Certainly the recent headlines in London clearly indicate that the British will count upon full participation by the United States when full participation becomes needed.

It will stimulate the present diplomatic fencing, which is accompanied by military scouting, into a full-fledged war. It will permit the supplying of munitions to turn this juggling over there into a terrible, horrible World War—one that will last so long that we will be bound to become involved sooner or later.

Let us not forget that it was our entry into the World War which turned the tide and made possible the victory by the Allies.

It was that very aid which made possible such vindictive and drastic peace terms that Hitler and Stalin became not only possible but a certainty.

If we stay out of the war we will be in a position to mediate the dispute when the war is over and to see that justice is done and to prevent another Versailles, which turned out to be not a peace treaty but a declaration of a future war. If we do take sides, and even if that side wins, it will only result in another Versailles Treaty, with all of its resultant tragedy. The World War, which our aid permitted the Allies to win, was fought in vain.

Let us retain the embargo and conserve all of our resources for our defenses. Let us buy every airplane American factories are capable of producing for our own air defense.

We are not a European nation. But we are a pacific power. In that direction lies our destiny and our danger. Let us not dissipate our manpower, military might, and economic resources in a European war. If we keep out of such wars and turn all of our efforts to building up our own defense, no power on earth—not even a victorious combination in Europe, with the aid of any oriental power—would dare to engage us in a war in this hemisphere. If we do weaken ourselves in an overseas European war we may then become an easy prey to aggression from the Orient.

We cannot get into trouble if we mind our own business and, instead of trying to solve the problems of the world, turn our attention to solving our own urgent problems at home.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, history is valuable principally because it enables us to chart our course for the future based upon the experiences of the past. Do the results of the World War which we entered in 1917 justify our taking a step that may lead us into another World War in 1939?

For 150 years this country had no neutrality law. Our course in dealing with foreign nations was controlled by international law—whatever that is. The express purpose of the Senate bill is permanently to abandon international law, not to return to it. International law did not keep us out of the World War. After that war our people began to cast about to find a formula that would assist in insulating our country against future foreign wars. This hope, aspiration, and desire on the part of our people came to fruition in the Neutrality Act of 1935. This Neutrality Act was not quickly conceived or hastily arrived at. It was the result of years of study on the part of the peace-loving people everywhere throughout the length and the breadth of our land. Much of the argument being used in the present debate was used at the time the act of 1935 and amendatory legislation was being considered.

The country got along very well under the Neutrality Act of 1935, but after further study and experience it was thought wise to place some strengthening amendments in the law. In 1937 you will recall that the so-called Pittman bill passed the Senate and that the House considered the McReynolds bill, both dealing with the same subject but differing as to method. At that time I reached a conclusion as to what my course in this matter of neutrality legislation should be, and, in the debate on that amendatory bill, on March 18, 1937, I said in part:

> The Pittman bill writes all the rules before the advent of the war. The world is given notice that this country will not in any way attempt to furnish materials of any kind that can be used for war purposes to the warring nations. There can be no misunderstanding. There can be no partiality, and there is no discretion lodged in any agency. I therefore prefer the Pittman bill. This is a far-reaching measure, of course, and some of the implications are not pleasing. Both of these measures provide that we can only do business with any belligerent nation on a cash-and-carry basis. Under no circumstances will we sell any materials of any kind to belligerent nations unless title passes completely in this country and responsibility for removal from the country rests squarely upon the shoulders of the purchaser. It has been said that the passage of this legislation will make the United States the ally of Great Britain in the Atlantic and of Japan in the Pacific, for the reason that these nations control these respective waters, and that if Great Britain is at war she will be able to purchase on a cash-and-carry basis because she will be able to do her own carrying, and that the same will be true of Japan.

It will, therefore, be observed that cash and carry, as proposed in the Senate resolution now before us, is nothing new. In fact, the act of 1937 provided cash and carry for everything except arms, munitions, and implements of war. However, this provision of the law expired by limitation on May 1, 1939. Therefore, if the so-called cash-and-carry provision of the pending resolution is adopted, we will be but continuing the 1937 law. I know of no one who does not favor such action. Why then all this fuss and propaganda about cash and carry? One would think that it was some innovation or new proposal. I hope it is not for the purpose of confusing those who favor the arms embargo. There is no reason why we should not have both cash and carry and the arms embargo. In that same speech on March 18, 1937, I said:

> Again, the opponents of this measure tell us that we are abandoning our time-honored policy of insisting upon the freedom of the seas. There is no question but that the neutrality legislation of a year ago, and as embodied in the pending measure, do abandon that time-honored tradition. Woodrow Wilson said that we entered the World War to make the world safe for democracy. I think we all realize now that we entered the World War primarily because we insisted upon the freedom of the seas, and that the destruction of the *Lusitania* violated that policy, and overnight we were in the midst of the conflagration.
>
> Again that brings us to the question of profit or peace. Had this neutrality law been in effect in 1917, the fact that the *Lusitania* was carrying munitions of war, and American citizens knowingly and intentionally were passengers on the *Lusitania* in violation of our law, then it would not have been the duty of this country to enter the war because of the violation of a policy or a law upon which we insisted. Sad as it is, international law, as has been demonstrated so many times in the past, amounts to little when nations get at each other's throat in a war for supremacy. I reiterate that this neutrality legislation does involve a change of policy. That is what we want. The policies we have been following have led us into war; and while this bill is undoubtedly faulty in many ways, yet it is headed in the right direction and will tend to isolate us from the quarrels of other nations. Yes; it is harsh in some particulars, and there will be complaint on the part of those who want to manufacture war materials for the sake of the dollars resulting. But, by and large, the masses of our people are so opposed to war anywhere in the world that when this law is thoroughly understood it will be accepted with universal accord.

These were my sentiments as given to the House in 1937. Nothing has since transpired to change my views. They are my sentiments today. I came to this session of Congress with an open mind. I have heard the President's message. I have heard the debates. I have studied the arguments. I have not been convinced that it is wise to repeal the arms embargo at this time. Some of those who have participated in this debate leave the impression that the war now going on in Europe is a contest between idealogies. This contention was given much consideration by the House in June 1939 when the battle lines for the present war were forming and when the Bloom resolution was under consideration. In my remarks at that time, in discussing this question, I said:

Mr. Chairman, let us not be misled by propaganda that the impending war in Europe is a conflict between the doctrines of the democracy as against that of the dictatorship. There is nothing further from the truth. If these nations go to war—as now seems likely—form or type of government will not be the issue. These nations will fight for territory, colonies, boundary lines, raw materials, trade, and, last but not least, power. Our boys went to Europe once to make the world safe for democracy, and we know now that was not the issue at all. It does seem that we should have learned our lesson. We contributed our blood and treasure for what we thought was a Wilsonian ideal. We were all sincere, but we know now that it was just another European war. We changed our entire economy. We piled up billions of dollars of indebtedness. We sacrificed of the flower of our young manhood, and because of that World War we are even yet passing through the valley of one of the greatest depressions of all time. Our people are opposed to embarking upon any policy where there is even a remote possibility of repeating our experiences of the World War.

Of course, we have a preference as to the various forms of government obtaining throughout the world, yet we are not the keeper of the world; we are not the policeman of the world. We have enough to do to attend to our own business, make this a better land in which to live, and influence by example rather than by attempted force. Let us quit fussing around in Europe and put our own house in order. For hundreds of years these European territorial and boundary line disputes have raged, and there is no indication that the end is near. Why should we be drawn in? If the pending war develops, it will be but a quarrel over the spoils of the last war. President Wilson was an idealist. He though that the ways of Europe could be changed. Now we all realize the sad truth. We paid a terrible price for this knowledge.

The Neutrality Act of 1935, as amended by the act of 1937, passed the House and Senate almost unanimously, and was accepted in a similar manner by the country. A certain feeling of security prevailed among our people. They felt that their Congress had at least attempted to keep out of foreign war and had written on our statute books law that would be effective in this regard.

That law is upon the books today, the only difference being that the cash-and-carry provisions have been permitted to lapse. The first occasion arising, whereby the value of the law might have been determined, was when the undeclared war broke out between Japan and China. The law was not applied to that war because the President did not see fit to find that a war was in progress. Too much discretion was lodged in the President. When war was recently declared in Europe, the President could not escape, and so we find our neutrality law in full force and effect at this hour. The embargo has been invoked, and we are not shipping these murderous instruments of war to the belligerent nations. Who says that to sell this poisonous gas and these weapons will help keep us out of the war? Who is there among us who can stand on this floor and say that the law is not working well? It has not got us into foreign war. Of course time alone can tell whether or not it will keep us out of war. If we are to change the law let us strengthen it by adding what is good in the Senate bill and keeping the arms embargo. To repeal it now will put us right back where we were in 1914. Who wants to return to that position with all its possibilities? We traveled that route once. Several reasons have been given by the proponents of this resolution why it should be passed:

First. It is contended that the law is unneutral in that it prevents all belligerents from purchasing these arms. It is claimed that the embargo should be repealed so that the Allies might take advantage of their power to "come and get" ammunition in this country to carry on their war. It is admitted that Germany could not avail herself of the assistance of our arsenals if the arms embargo is repealed.

Second. It is contended by another group that it is our duty to assist the so-called democracies in every way possible short of war; that is, our country is a part of the world, the world must be reorganized, and it is our duty as a Nation to participate in the reorganization. It is said that whether we will it or not, we must eventually get into this war unless we render such assistance to the Allies as will make it possible for them to win. In other words, it is our war and must be won by the Allies in Europe or we must fight it out in the Western Hemisphere at a later date.

Third. It is contended that selling all belligerent nations arms and ammunition, as well as other materials, on a cash-and-carry basis, will aid in keeping us out of war.

On the other side, it is held that:

First. The present neutrality law was written in 1935, perfected in 1936 and 1937, when the world was at peace, and was notice to all the world what our attitude would be in the event of a foreign war. To change this law now would be unneutral, partial, and taking sides in an existing war.

Second. It is further held that this would not only be an unneutral act but that it would be considered a partisan and a hostile act by those nations in the war which, because of their physical condition or equipment, could not take advantage of the offer of the United States to furnish munitions and become the arsenal of the warring nations.

At the beginning of the debate in the Senate there was apparently some question as to whether or not the Congress could change our neutrality law at this time without violating international law. As a result the opinion and advice of the outstanding authorities on international law in this country have been sought and obtained. I shall not go into this phase of the matter other than to call your attention to the convincing argument made on yesterday by the distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY]. You will remember that he called the roll of these international authorities and, headed by John Bassett Moore, they were of the opinion that to repeal the arms embargo, thereby changing a law written in peacetime, and for the express purpose of assisting one of the belligerents in the war, would be unneutral. Of course, there are those who, by strained construction and labored effort, attempt to justify their position, that because the law, as it now stands, works to the benefit of one side; therefore, in order to be neutral, we must change that law so that it will benefit the other side. This just does not make sense. It does demonstrate how difficult it is to divorce ourselves from our sympathies. The debate in the Senate started out along this line but eventually Senator BURKE, Senator AUSTIN, and others removed the blue goggles, the whiskers, and other camouflage and came out squarely and told the truth as they understood it, and that truth, as stated by them, is that the real purpose of this legislation is to help one side in the conflict. No one can find fault with that sincere position of any Member.

Now we are all agreed that we do not want to get into war. Most of us are agreed that we do not want to take the first step in that direction. Some of us conscientiously feel that to lift the embargo is not only taking the first step but is a promise to take the last step. We feel that the best way to keep out of the war is to keep out of the vestibule to the war. To remove the arms embargo is to widen the road, to increase the chances, and, under certain contingencies, to make necessary the last step—war.

I am not going to discuss the horrors of war. I am not going to talk about the mothers who must make the great sacrifice. The grief and the sorrow that follow in the wake of war are known to all of us. We want to avoid these things. The matter before us today must not be decided from any emotional, partisan, or profit standpoint. We do not want another unknown soldier's grave for an unknown cause. We do not want to profit out of anybody's war. We do not want an economic stake in anybody's war.

We do want to pursue a genuine American course, making the world a better place in which to live. We believe that

this can be best brought about by putting our own house in order and adhering to the philosophy of those who laid the foundation of our Government.

This debate has been pitched on a high plane. Selfishness, greed, and partisan gain have found no place in the argument. It is a question of sincere desire and effort to do the right thing. No Member's motives should be questioned. The responsibility resting upon us is terriffic, and we must accept that responsibility with a full knowledge of what goes with it. Of course, there are two sides to any controversial question. Both sides cannot be in the right. In these circumstances, the safest guide to follow is one's individual conscience. We all have that, and democracies will endure and will function as intended just so long as the representatives of the people act honestly, sincerely, and in accordance with the dictates of that conscience.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

NEUTRALITY

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, we are all of one mind in wanting to avoid war. Democrats and Republicans, repealists and antirepealists, have this common purpose. No partisan bias governs our action. In considering the legislation now before us our single thought is, How can we best preserve peace for America?

No human being is endowed with the power to foresee the future or to foretell the consequences of whatever action we may take here. We can only express our individual opinions for what they may be worth.

One thing we do know: The decision we have to make is a fateful one, involving momentous consequences. If ever the Congress of the United States needed Divine guidance, it is in this hour.

I realize that as a result of the lengthy discussion of the neutrality issue, not only in Congress but over the radio and in the press and on the lecture platform, there is no new argument that can be offered, either pro or con. These remarks are made, not with the idea of contributing anything new to the discussion but in order to make my position clear and to explain my reasons for having come to the conclusion at which I have arrived.

THE ISSUE

What is the issue before us?

Under the existing Neutrality Act, which was passed in 1935 by an overwhelming vote in both Houses, an absolute embargo is placed upon the sale to belligerent nations of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war. No restriction is put upon the sale of raw materials or foodstuffs, nor upon the transportation of these commodities in American vessels.

In the measure now before us it is proposed to amend the law in two outstanding particulars: First, by abandoning the embargo on the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and, second, by placing our commerce with belligerent nations on a cash-and-carry basis; that is, by requiring such nations to pay cash for any goods purchased here, whether arms, raw materials, foodstuffs, or other commodities, and to furnish their own means of transportation. In other words, title would be taken by the belligerent nation before the goods leave our shores, and no American vessel would be permitted to carry them to the belligerent country. There are certain exceptions, covering our trade with belligerents not in the immediate war zone, which I pass over.

THREE ALTERNATIVE COURSES OPEN

As I view the situation, we are presented with a choice between three alternative courses:

First. We can retain the present arms embargo without change.

Second. We can adopt the proposed cash-and-carry system in full, and sell not only raw materials and foodstuffs to belligerents on that basis, but arms, ammunition, and implements of war as well.

Third. Or we can retain the present arms embargo, but adopt the cash-and-carry policy as regards raw materials and foodstuffs.

A large body of the American people have been led to believe that the only choice offered is between the arms embargo on the one hand and cash and carry on the other, but the third possibility I have just mentioned is equally open.

The fact is that there is little controversy over the question of adopting the cash-and-carry policy insofar as it might be applied to foodstuffs and raw materials. The only real issue before us is whether we shall repeal or retain the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

OPINIONS DIVIDED

The arms embargo was enacted at a time when the world was at peace, and was intended as an aid in preventing this country from becoming involved in any future war. However, one of the grounds upon which its repeal is now being asked is that such action will help to prevent war. Some of those who formerly were the stanchest advocates of the arms embargo are now equally stanch advocates of repeal. This is all very confusing, and makes the decision as to what action to take all the more difficult.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point the gentleman has just made reminds me of the remark made by Governor Bushfield, of my State, that when we are slightly intoxicated with war hysteria it is a poor time to review or revise what we did when we were sober.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think the gentleman is stating in a very concise and proper way the thought that is in our minds, that if changes should have been made they ought to have been made before war was actually declared and war hysteria existed to the extent it does.

During my entire service in public life it has always been my purpose to represent, to the best of my ability and judgment, the views of those who have sent me here as their Representative in Congress.

Along with other Members I have received thousands of letters and telegrams from constituents expressing their feelings concerning the issue before us. I have carefully analyzed these expressions of opinion and have attempted to ascertain the preponderant viewpoint, giving special consideration to communications which seemed to set forth the true and innermost feelings of the writer.

A common note pervades all letters and telegrams: "Keep this country out of war." "Preserve our neutrality." But there is no unanimity as to the best method of accomplishing this end. Many of my closest friends and advisors—men and women in whose judgment I have great confidence—have given me conflicting advice, some favoring repeal and others opposing it.

Under the circumstances, I must rely upon my own conscience and best judgment, hoping and praying that the decision I make is the right one and in the best interest of my constituents and the country we all love and desire to serve.

WE ARE CONSIDERING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

We should, of course, keep in mind that it is neutrality legislation which is under consideration here. Despite the fact that our sympathies and, to some degree, our interests, lie with the democracies, as represented by England and France, we must not, if we are to remain neutral, do anything as a Government which would amount to taking sides or intervening in favor of one belligerent and against the other. It is quite apparent, however, that many of our citizens are openly expressing a desire to do so.

If we are here considering whether we will enter the war on the side of England and France, or whether we shall give them assistance "by methods short of war"—to borrow the President's own phrase—then let us not talk any longer about neutrality. Let us face the issue squarely and without equivocation. Neutrality is not a subject which lends itself to hypocrisy. We are either neutral or unneutral. We cannot pretend one and act the other.

I take it that no Member of this House favors direct participation by this Nation in the present war, though some may

have in mind that we may safely adopt the second course to which I have just referred, namely, of giving indirect assistance to one belligerent. Whether we may do this without ourselves becoming involved in the war is at least questionable. Certainly we would run that risk, and we could not contend that our action even remotely constituted neutrality.

For my part, I do not propose by my vote upon the pending question to give any country an excuse either for declaring war against us or for instituting retaliatory measures which might lead to war. There is no necessity for subjecting ourselves to that hazard.

In my consideration of the proposal for repeal of the arms embargo, I have regarded it solely from the standpoint of neutrality legislation. I have tried to determine in my own mind whether peace would best be promoted by retaining or by repealing the embargo. In arriving at the conclusion which I have reached, I have considered the question of repeal from four viewpoints—moral, economic, legal, and practical. It seems to me that the arguments for and against repeal naturally divide themselves into these categories.

EMBARGO REPEAL FROM THE MORAL STANDPOINT

From the moral standpoint, those favoring retention of the embargo contend that traffic in arms is an unholy business, and that this Nation should not become an accessory to the slaughter of human beings, many of them noncombatants. On the other side, it is contended that if it is wrong to sell arms after war breaks out, then it is equally wrong to sell them in peacetime. It is further argued that the embargo enables aggressor nations to prepare for war during peacetime and then denies to the nation attacked the means with which to defend itself.

There is much to be said upon both sides of the moral phase of the arms-embargo issue. It is difficult to arrive at a decision either for or against the embargo by considering this viewpoint alone. Therefore I pass to the economic phase.

THE ECONOMIC ARGUMENT

One of the economic arguments for repeal of the embargo—made by no less a person than the President himself—is that the manufacture and sale of arms to the belligerent nations would not only give employment to thousands but would also aid our national defense. There is, of course, much to be said in support of this position from the material point of view. On the other hand, there are many arguments which may be made against it. So far as the economic phase of repeal of the embargo is concerned, I am inclined to disagree with President Roosevelt of 1939 and to agree with President Roosevelt of 1936, who said at Chautauqua, N. Y.:

> If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. They would tell you that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit could be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America would once more capture the trade of the world. It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitably day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace. If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer, must answer, "We choose peace." (August 14, 1936.)

A war boom is not a very safe basis upon which to build prosperity. We are still paying the penalties of the last war boom, and should not so soon be forgetting its awful consequences. The opportunity to obtain war profits—fool's gold, as President Roosevelt has called them—is not to me a convincing or compelling argument for repeal of the arms embargo. I pass, therefore, to the legalistic phase of the question.

THE LEGAL STANDPOINT

It is an acknowledged principle of international law that while a nation has the right to alter its neutrality policy during the course of a war, it may not do so when the change affects unequally its relations with the countries at war. This principle was confirmed by our own Government during the last war.

Thus, whatever may be the merits of repeal—considered as an abstract matter—new considerations now enter in because of the fact that war is actually in progress. It is true that we can be equally neutral whether we sell arms to all belligerents or whether we decline to sell them to any country. No one questions our right to have repealed the arms embargo previous to the outbreak of the war, though there are some who might still question the wisdom of such action. But to repeal the embargo at this time, after war has been declared, with the purpose and effect of helping one side, would be unneutral and would constitute an act of intervention definitely exposing us to the risk of war.

As I see it, all the attempted legal justifications for repeal are secondary to the real purpose and perhaps are more in the nature of excuses. As everyone knows, the whole object of the legislation now before us is to give assistance to one side by "a method short of war," which, in my opinion, might lead to war.

THE PRACTICAL STANDPOINT

Mr. Speaker, I am strengthened in my conviction that repeal of the arms embargo would be dangerous when I come to consider the practical aspects of the matter. There are those who, as I have indicated, openly assert that we should repeal the embargo for the definite purpose of aiding England and France, not only for the reason that we have a stake in the preservation of democracy but because the longer the war drags on the more likely we are to become involved.

Of course, if we openly go to the assistance of the Allies, then it cannot be contended that we are any longer neutral. We cannot be neutral and an ally at the same time, nor can we be half in the war and half out. If we become in effect a partner of England and France, we will to all intents and purposes be at war with Germany and must be prepared to accept the full consequences of such action.

Are we ready to take that step? I, for one, am not; and I do not believe the great majority of the American people are yet ready to do so.

Any legalistic or technical justification of our proposed changed neutrality policy will not interest the nations which are affected thereby. It is the practical effect of repealing the embargo with which we must be concerned.

What was the reaction abroad when the President sent his message to Congress demanding repeal? Did any of the present belligerents discuss the details or fine points of the President's proposals? Not at all. Britain and France interpreted the President's message as evidence that we were "coming in again" on their side. Germany interpreted the demand for repeal of the embargo as an indication that we were joining with the Allies.

And what was the reaction abroad when the Senate passed the measure now before us, substantially embodying the President's proposals? The Senate's action last Friday evening brought immediate response from the foreign press, although the reactions were in terms more guarded than before.

In Britain and France repeal of the embargo was declared in newspaper headlines to be "an Allied victory." In Germany it was regarded as giving assistance to England and France. In other words, in all three countries now at war the measure before us was regarded as taking sides, and therefore as being unneutral.

WE CAN STAY OUT OF WAR

When the crisis came last September there was a feeling on the part of many that we would inevitably be drawn in. This feeling was probably a natural consequence of the war hysteria, but it has now died down to a considerable degree. More and more our people are coming to realize that after all there is no necessity of our becoming involved in the war if we make up our minds to stay out of it. I am very strongly of that opinion, and I furthermore believe that we have no need to fear the possible outcome so far as our own future is concerned.

PRESENT WAR MERELY A STRUGGLE OVER BALANCE OF POWER IN EUROPE

Instead of the present war being one of ideologies—of the democracies making a last stand against totalitarianism—as we first thought, it is becoming increasingly apparent that it is really a struggle over the balance of power in Europe. Italy, one of the totalitarian states, is maintaining neutrality. Russia, another totalitarian state, was first courted by England and France as a possible ally, then by Germany, and now is asserting her neutrality. But although not a direct participant in the war, she, too, is playing power politics. Her invasion of Poland has been condoned and justified by the Allies. In the present situation, how can anyone say that the preservation of democracy is the issue in this war?

PARTICIPATION IN WAR MIGHT BRING END OF DEMOCRACY AT HOME

The truth is that if we enter the war with the thought of preserving democracy abroad we may end up by losing it at home. Already there have been rumors of the dictatorial control which would be set up in this country should war come, and it might be difficult to shake off with the restoration of peace. These dangers to our own freedom and liberty were discussed at length during the debate in the other body, particularly by Senator CLARK of Missouri, who on October 23 stressed the plans already made for regimenting industry, agriculture, and labor in the event we become involved, and who referred in some detail to the vast war powers which would be exercised by the President.

This possible threat to our democracy at home makes it all the more clear that war must be avoided at all costs, unless, of course, we are ourselves attacked.

WE SHOULD STRENGTHEN, NOT WEAKEN, OUR NEUTRALITY

The measure as passed by the Senate weakens our neutrality in one direction and strengthens it in another.

It weakens our neutrality by repealing the arms embargo and subjecting us to the risk of war.

It strengthens our neutrality by preventing credits to belligerents for goods purchased here and by denying American vessels the right to carry merchandise of any kind to belligerents in the danger zones. It was the sinking of American ships and the killing of American seamen which was the immediate cause of our entrance into the last war. By preventing all maritime commerce with belligerents in the war zone, we remove this hazard to American peace.

I am in favor of doing all we reasonably can to strengthen our neutrality, but I am opposed to doing anything to weaken it. Why take one step in one direction and another step in the opposite direction? Why not take both steps in the direction of preserving neutrality and insulating ourselves further against war? That is where I stand in the matter. Keep the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and enact the cash-and-carry provisions to apply to everything else.

Then we will really be doing something to preserve peace.

Mr. Speaker, there are now in Congress only 41 Members, of whom I am one, who were here in 1917 when the vote was had on the declaration of war against Germany. Twenty-two are Members of the House and 19 are Members of the Senate, although several of the latter were Members of the House at that time. My mind is very clear upon the awful consequences of our participation in that war, and I have earnestly been trying to determine how best to prevent a recurrence of the vote of 22 years ago so that we might escape another such terrible experience.

WE SHOULD RETAIN ARMS EMBARGO TO AVOID RISK OF WAR

After carefully analyzing the evidence and the opinions expressed on both sides of the question before us, my considered judgment is that we will risk war by repealing the embargo, whereas no such risk will occur as a result of its retention. I therefore favor the latter course.

We can stay at peace by keeping out of the present conflict and minding our own affairs. We have many pressing domestic problems to which we could more profitably turn our attention. If we deliberately go about seeking trouble we will find it, and by repealing the arms embargo we would in effect be putting a chip on our shoulder. I do not want this country to go looking for trouble. I have said many times—and I say once more—that I will never again vote to send our boys to fight on foreign battlefields.

In conclusion, let me summarize and make clear my position on the bill now before us: I shall vote to strike from the bill that section providing for repeal of the present arms embargo. On the other hand, I shall support the cash-and-carry provisions if confined to commodities other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

If, on the final vote, the question before the House is whether to adopt the bill as amended by the Senate, that is, with the arms embargo repealed and with the cash-and-carry principle applied to all sales to belligerents, including arms, then I shall vote "No," inasmuch as I feel that without the arms embargo the bill would be an abandonment of our neutrality and would nullify the beneficial effects of cash and carry as applied to nonmilitary supplies.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more fitting conclusion to these remarks than to repeat Stephen Decatur's toast to our country:

> Our country! in her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong!

[Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the legislative program adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

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

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I occupied 50 minutes of time on the floor of the House, yielding half the time for questioning or reply. If you read those remarks you will find that the questions at the moment went entirely unanswered. Most of the interruptions were rather irrelevant to the questions that had been asked.

I know the great majority on my side of the House will differ with me today. I have in full measure been fighting battles for the Republican Party during the last several years. I greatly desire, and I hope I have, the respect of the entire membership of this House. I have rejoiced in the belief that such was my honest claim. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who is so seldom applauded on this side of the aisle, received a great outburst of approval today—I trust that he enjoyed it, and he undoubtedly deserved it. I am not seeking applause on either side, but I desire that my views be respected.

I spent some time this morning reading the debate on the McLemore resolution in 1916. I have close friends here today who were present at that time, and all I can say is, "My God, how they have changed." Certainly we have learned what not to do. Because of the lessons learned in the World War we never would vote to send our boys to European soil to fight, and nearly all proclaim that fact; yet some, in the next breath try to frighten the mothers of those boys by drawing parallels and proclaiming that this is the same first step that will lead us into a foreign war.

I believe that no one could have given greater attention and study to this subject than I have endeavored to do. I cannot believe that repealing the embargo will lead us into a foreign war. It is now time that I declare my conscience, before it shall be stolen from me.

I must live with myself. The words of Daniel Webster would ring in our ears, if we would but listen; in effect, he said, "The ocean rolls between us; we are safe." But are we, one of the nations in the world, to pretend neutrality and express no outraged sympathy for other independent nations now destroyed? Shall morality be entirely disregarded in this instance? Shall a man stand here and say, "I sympathize with democracy, yet I shall vote for something that will bring joy to the countries under the dictatorship"? It is hard,

indeed, to harmonize expressed new points. No man's motive on this floor should be questioned. All should and will seek peace for America. However, we gave notice a year ago that we were to attempt to change our Neutrality Act. Even the administration in power warned the nations that we intended to change it. Changing neutrality in the midst of the now existing situation? Ah! I cannot find refuge in that argument. Shall this Nation, in view of the unpredictable events that have occurred since then, say that we are tied—that we cannot act for ourselves? No; I assert our right as a great nation, and as citizens of a great country, as other nations have always claimed the right, to formulate our own position regarding neutrality as the changed circumstances dictate. Legalistic! All nations seem to have established neutrality legislation simply as their own interests appeared to be affected. That has been definitely established in these debates. Other nations have often changed their neutrality acts during hostilities. Legalistic! This cannot be settled in any such manner. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] completely disposed of those arguments, as well as some other inconsistencies.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. Always.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman speaks about the legalistic theory. What about this theory of selling poison gas to kill the civilian population. Is that legalistic?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; but the horror and brutality of that was so persuasive to me that I voted against it last June. I did it hoping to keep other nations from war. It was unavailing. When you talk about dreadful offensive weapons, common sense tells us that the greatest of offensive weapons are generally the best and most effective for defense. [Applause.] If enemies are approaching, give us a torpedo to stop them before they arrive. If the morale of one nation is being broken down, shall we deny the right of retaliation to the other party? This is no defense of war. It is inhuman—a brutal, ghastly business. I voted last spring for the embargo because war is inhuman, and I desired to proclaim to the nations of the earth that we so regarded it. But it did not deter them. How vain the effort!

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was not this legislation passed not to keep other nations from going to war but to keep us out of it?

Mr. GIFFORD. It was passed to tell other nations that we would not furnish them with those weapons if they went to war. The act has proved worse than futile.

Now, my good friend—and I hope that I am not breaking with my friends on this side, whose friendship and respect I prize beyond expression—this is the forum in which the greatest and most enduring friendships are made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are mistaken about breaking with your friends. We may differ with you, but that does not affect our friendship.

Mr. GIFFORD. I should hope so. Some sharp things have been said, almost verging on the impugning of motives. I make no jingo speech; far from it. Efforts have been made to arouse the mothers to such a frantic state of mind that they fear their boys will be sent to war, and in consequence they bombard us with letters. We have those mothers in mind, and if we believed for an instant that any action on our part would send their boys to a foreign war, we could never recover from the shame of it. Why frighten them with any such declarations? Why force on us such a barrage of letters based on such an assertion? Some of us have no sons, but we may have brothers or sisters with many sons.

This has been a hard decision to make. I do not like to leave the majority of my party. My political mind dreads lest this administration be continued in power because of possible advantages which may be derived from this. I think it would be a calamity—I honestly think so—if domestic conditions as they now exist should still further continue under this administration. But, as I have said, my conscience rejects political opinion in this grave matter. Everyone knows my honest attitude on domestic questions. I could talk at length, but I have had my 50 minutes heretofore. I have listened to and read many powerful speeches and reread some of them several times. To my friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I say, I think very highly of you. You are most persuasive and enlightening, and I have reread your several speeches and carefully considered them, but my mind could not be set at rest by those arguments.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KITCHENS. A great deal has been said in the debate about the use of arms and munitions, the statement being made that we could not afford to be a party to the killing of women and children and helpless people. Does the gentleman agree with me that in this particular case, and even during the World War, such arms and munitions as we furnished were used to prevent the killing of women and little children?

Mr. GIFFORD. I must, of course, agree with the implied statement.

This is a matter of serious moment. It may involve the future of some Members. Some may fear to stand alone. I have had to do it before. Later I was joined by practically the entire congregation. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the searching attitude of the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has just spoken, exemplifies the honest conviction that is in the heart of each and every Member of this body as he or she attempts to arrive at a reasoned conclusion on this subject. No dogmatic attitude can be adopted in this debate. It is our high resolution to honestly vote as we have the light to see.

I should like at this time to ask the unanimous consent of the House to insert at this point in the RECORD my sincere convictions upon this matter, as expressed in a radio address given last evening over WMAL, from Washington, and carried over the network of the National Broadcasting Co.

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

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

The House of Representatives today began actual consideration of neutrality legislation. As a member of the whip organization of the majority party it has been my task, in cooperation with other members, to carefully check and recheck the probable votes for and against the administration plan. It is my personal opinion that the House will concur in general with the Senate action. It appears rather definite that this will be done by a margin of 25 votes.

When efforts were made during the last session of this Congress to modify existing neutrality legislation, the eyes of the world were focused on America to see what course should be determined upon as indicative future American policy in the field of international operators. By its failure to amend or modify the existing Neutrality Act the Congress at that time gave notice to the waiting and watching world that no change would be made in the type of isolation which the Nation had assumed. The counsels of the Nation were divided upon what would be the proper course for America to pursue, and the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress came to a close with the question of neutrality still uppermost on the agenda of public business—but still unsettled.

AMERICAN POSITION WATCHED

Immediately in the wake of the adjournment of Congress there followed a series of events in Europe which surrounded the subject of neutrality with an even more frightful significance. I am loathe to believe that the failure to enact a cash-and-carry plan at the last session of Congress inadvertently encouraged the ambitions of totalitarian dictators. But I suspect that no little weight was given to the American position in the final decision to plunge Europe into another war. Because of that decision and the awful consequences which have followed from it, the Congress is now in special session for the specific purpose of settling the all-absorbing question of American neutrality.

Perhaps no topic of high public importance has received such profound and widespread discussion as this one. The lines have been sharply drawn. Political and partisan considerations have been eliminated. The alternatives are apparently simple. Yet with this Congress lies the grave responsibility for the choice of the course along which the American policy shall be chartered.

The problem, grievous as it is, should be resolutely met with two factors paramount in mind. First, every proper effort should be made to safeguard against the ever-present danger that this country may be drawn into the European maelstrom. We have no

desire to reassume the role of savior of the world, and we are determined that never again shall American youth and manhood shed their lifeblood on foreign soil. Second, our foreign policy in the aspect of neutrality must be so molded as to truly preserve and safeguard the best interests of America. We must bring ourselves to the grim realization that America's interest in the outcome of the present conflict is not illusory and academic but intense and vital.

The combatants in the European war are the totalitarian aggressors and the democratic defenders. The alternatives in American foreign policy are the retention of the present Neutrality Act, which prevents our shipping arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any nation engaged in war, and the proposed inclusion in that act of a cash-and-carry plan which would open our markets to those who can pay cash for their purchases, and transport them in their own ships. There is no question in my mind that there is any neutrality of thought in America concerning the present war. On the other hand, I believe that the vast majority of Americans are convinced that the neutrality program should be shaped with a discerning realization of the nature of the conflict abroad and an understanding of the character of the combatants. Since the war in Europe is not merely a war among nations, but a conflict between philosophies of government, it is incumbent upon us to choose a course of policy in neutrality consistent with the tradition under which we have lived and prospered as a nation for over 150 years.

NOT USEFUL TO WORLD PEACE

Unfortunately, in the light of present circumstances, and through no fault of its drafters and supporters, our present Neutrality Act has proved to be a failure both as an instrument of strict and impartial neutrality, and as a useful factor in world peace. Our legislative attempt at isolation has unwittingly had the effect of indirectly aiding the well-armed and well-prepared aggressor nations while operating to the detriment of those countries which are committed to the preservation of those principles of government with which America is in hearty accord. We have then the anomaly of a partial neutrality. Our chief task, therefore, is to seek and achieve the best means of preserving a realistic neutrality, and at the same time adopt a policy in accord with American concepts of international law and democratic justice.

Fortunately, we have such a medium at our disposal. The cash-and-carry or title-and-take plan proposed to be inserted as an integral part of our neutrality law minimizes the danger of American involvement in a European war. Foreign purchasers would have to pay for their commodities in this country, take the title thereto in their own names, and transport them in their own ships. The effectiveness of such a plan has for its chief end the insulation of this country against any participation in the conflict. Thus it serves our primary purpose—no American involvement. Furthermore, the provision requiring transport in ships flying the flags of the purchasing nations safeguards against the possibility of American ships becoming objects of marine warfare.

With the embargo on arms and implements of war repealed, our foremost concern should be the protection of American merchantmen from the prowling or blockading fleets of belligerent nations. A provision that any warring nation desiring to purchase any commodities in this country must be prepared, first, to pay cash, and, second, to transport the goods so purchased in its own vessels, should materially allay that concern. The safest neutrality chart will be one drafted on the lines of the law of nations as recognized throughout the world. That law gives a neutral the unquestioned right to sell any item anywhere. With the purchases made in this country, and the transportation effected in ships of belligerents, there is no possibility of American ships being torpedoed as enemies, or their cargoes seized as contraband. An effective cash-and-carry plan will remove an inconsistent embargo upon the segment of our trade consisting of arms and implements of war, and will substitute a policy that will assert and insist upon our rights to trade under international law, and at the same time require the payment of cash on our shores, and the transportation of purchases in ships for which the belligerents bear responsibility.

CASH AND CARRY IS FAIR

An overwhelming majority of the American people wisely want the embargo removed and the cash-and-carry plan enacted into law. The motive behind this desire is not necessarily to favor any one side in the European war, but to remove the United States from an awkward international position which hampers friendly nations in their attempts to stem the very forces which are inimical to all our American principles. What really is at issue is the question of whether we shall free our hands to be ready for any eventuality which may ensue in the future, or whether we shall leave ourselves bound in the fetters that have proved irksome in the past, that will only be more difficult to break in the future, and that may very well precipitate us into a dilemma that could easily be averted if the Nation were free to act in other ways for the conservation of its real interests.

I am firmly convinced that the United States will be better insulated from the heat of the European conflagration by the repeal of the embargo, accompanied by the promulgation of a policy of truer neutrality in the form of a cash-and-carry plan. Our real object is to safeguard the welfare of this country, and I think that a reasoned analysis of the underlying principles of neutrality will inevitably lead to the conclusion that we can achieve it best by adopting a policy which is impartial in theory and fact, and which is calculated to preserve a real neutrality under the mandates of international law. The cash-and-carry plan has all of these characteristics to recommend it, and to my mind they furnish ample argument for its adoption.

Self-interest and self-preservation demand a policy of practical neutrality, a policy which has as its foundation a firm plank of nonintervention, but which at the same time cannot be used as a springboard for international mischief makers.

The choice is obvious. The best avenue to the achievement of our objective is the scrapping of the arms embargo and the adoption of the cash-and-carry plan. In this manner we shall have the satisfaction of exercising our neutral rights under the legitimate rules of international fair play, and at the same time effectuate a true neutrality closely harmonizing with the pattern of our democratic heritage.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There has been, I feel, a minimum of partisanship in the consideration of this vital subject. We honestly differ, but I am certain we all are determined to do everything within our power to keep the United States from entrance into this foreign war. [Applause.]

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, provision for an embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war, in the event of a finding by the President of the existence of a state of war between nations or a state of civil war within a nation, is a part of this Nation's international policy, having been enacted by the adoption of joint resolutions by the Congress on three separate occasions by overwhelming votes. The policy of this Government, thus resulting from the action of Congress and its approval by the President, came as a result of a demand on the part of the people of this Nation that the Congress calmly and dispassionately enact legislation that would tend to prevent our involvement in another foreign war. The embargo provisions in existing law were approved by the Congress, the President, and the State Department in 1935, 1936, and 1937, and in slightly modified form by the House when, by a large majority of 41 votes, it amended the Bloom bill this year.

The existing law is again challenged by the administration, and we, as the representatives of the people, are asked to reverse the position taken by the Congress on four separate occasions and to now repeal the arms-embargo provisions and to substitute therefor an all-inclusive cash-and-carry law. The burden therefore rests upon the administration and its spokesmen to establish, to a reasonable certainty, the wisdom and necessity at this time for such a change in our national policy. This the administration has tried to do.

It is my purpose this afternoon to answer some of the arguments that have been advanced, to the end that the judgment and verdict of this great body may be in accord with truth, facts, and reason. I shall attempt no emotional appeal, nor shall I be guided by hysteria, but shall endeavor to place before this body the factual information and testimony that in the light of calm, deliberate reasoning has determined my vote on this all-important question.

I shall vote to retain the arms embargo as written in existing law. I shall vote to reenact the cash-and-carry provisions of the 1937 act. I shall vote against the delegation of further discretionary powers to the President.

Let us therefore carefully examine the principal arguments advanced in support of the contention that we should now repeal the embargo provisions of existing law.

First. It has frequently been contended by the proponents of repeal that the embargo provisions of the present law violate international law. The mere statement, however, of such a contention, unsupported by acknowledged authority, bears slight weight. An examination of the subject discloses that the great weight of eminent authority on international law definitely and distinctly holds that the embargo provision of existing law is not a violation of or contrary to international law. It is almost universally conceded by authorities that the embargo provision is a domestic undertaking by the United States designed to avoid involvements which may lead to war, entirely outside of and supplemental to international law. This fact appears to be almost conclusive and is based upon existing precedent. No one raised the objection that such a provision would violate international law when the subject was considered by the Congress in 1935, 1936, and 1937. On the contrary, it was generally held by the President, the Secretary of State, the

State Department's legal adviser, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and many others that such action was not objectionable from the viewpoint of international law.

The majority report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Pittman bill states:

It is contrary to the accepted precepts of international law which prescribe that any belligerent may purchase any articles or material in any neutral country. It (the arms embargo) was a voluntary departure from international law by the United States Government.

This argument is fallacious and without validity and is made without citation of reputable authority.

On January 15, 1936, Secretary Hull, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as reported at pages 64 and 65 of the hearings, declared as follows:

Our view was that from the standpoint of keeping out of the war no nation has a right to go out and get into a war, no matter who is responsible for it, and then turn around to a friendly neutral and demand of it that it be furnished with the necessary war supplies to carry on the war under penalty of being unneutral. With a view of keeping the country out we felt that nobody can object to a nation carrying on normal trade, but whenever any nation demands of a peaceful nation that it go further and single out and segregate purely war material and war supplies, and feed them out to the warring nations, we said that there is not and never has been any international law or any other kind of law or reason that would compel a peaceful nation to do that regardless of the dangers involved.

At page 135 of these hearings, he further said:

If a nation in good faith thinks it is reducing the chances of being drawn into war by restricting exports of war materials to belligerents, no other nation has a right to question that, much less threaten violence, if it is not supplied with materials which it thinks are necessary.

Senator PITTMAN, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in an address before the Academy of Political Science in New York City on April 7, 1937, declared:

Our Government, in my opinion, undoubtedly has the legal right to place an embargo upon the export of any commodity. No one has seriously opposed the placing of an embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents.

Dr. John Bassett Moore, America's leading international law authority, at page 176 of the 1936 hearings, cited above, asserts:

As regards the impartial prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries which is taken over from the neutrality resolution of last year, I have no objection to make on legal grounds. The question of prohibition is one of policy.

Dr. Edwin M. Borchard, professor of law at Yale University, appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 29, 1936, urged reenactment of the joint resolution of August 1935, which contained mandatory embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war:

The bulk of that act merely confirms existing international law. The embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war is a measure which has been adopted by various countries from time to time, and is not in the least revolutionary. Dr. Moore has indicated some of the objections to that provision by way of policy, but there is none on grounds of law.

Dr. Edward S. Corwin, professor of jurisprudence at Princeton University, in a letter to the Washington Post dated October 1, 1939, discussing President Roosevelt's contention that "repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue," asserted:

The fact is that the above argument rests on a mistaken assumption, namely, that neutrals are under a positive obligation to trade with belligerents. The international law to which the President constantly appeals knows no such rule. It does require that a neutral shall not prohibit trade with one belligerent which it permits with the other. It also subjects neutral trade to the hazards to which the rules concerning contraband and blockade shall give rise. But it no more requires a neutral to stand ready to sell to belligerents than it requires a neutral to produce for them. The President's argument subjects neutral interests to an utterly unheard-of servitude in favor of the belligerents, and in the instance it quite gratuitously presents the naval powers with a grievance made up out of whole cloth.

Father Edmund A. Walsh, vice president of Georgetown University, regent of the Georgetown Foreign Service School, and well-known authority on international law and international relations, in a talk reported in the Washington Post October 3, 1939, page 6, characterizes as absolutely false the contention in the Foreign Relations Committee report which I have heretofore quoted. He said:

I protest, as one who has given some attention to international law, against the falsity of the statement in the committee report that any belligerent has the right under international law to purchase any article in any neutral country. That is a misstatement. It is absolutely false. I regret to see the truth abused by people in high places who ought to know better—and probably do know better. If the embargo is to be repealed, let it be done on the merits of the case and not on the basis of any such Machiavellian skullduggery.

Again, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 3, 1939, reported at page 491 of hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 21 and other measures, Father Walsh engaged in this colloquy with Senator Borah:

Senator BORAH. There is no doubt in your mind but what we had the right to withhold the sale of arms?

Father WALSH. Yes; very decidedly. It has been a highly debated question, and I take issue with the school that gives to all belligerents a right to purchase, creating a corresponding obligation to sell. The correlative of the right to purchase is not an absolute obligation on any government to sell, because to sell or not to sell, being a subject of national determination, is a subject for the Government, and there is no public-utility idea by which it has to exercise its franchise and sell or give service. There is no such thing in international law. Therefore I did not mention any international law which would be violated by an arms embargo, though some people hold that. The only obligation is to sell impartially if you sell at all.

Dr. Thomas H. Healy, dean of the Georgetown Foreign Service School and former professor of international law at The Hague, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 27, 1939, at page 340 said:

Today, neutrality, as I see it, is strictly domestic legislation, and that comes under the prerogative of the Congress of the United States. It has little to do with international law and has nothing to do with treaties, except by indirection it might violate one. It is traditional international practice. If a nation feels it is being hurt, it may not question your right, but it may say that, independently of your right, they are going to take action.

Dr. Herbert Wright, professor of international law at Catholic University, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 2, 1939, at pages 404 and 405 declared:

There is nothing in international law, however, to prevent a neutral state, by domestic legislation, from temporarily waiving the exercise of some of its admitted neutral rights to make more remote the possibility of being drawn into a foreign war.

Profs. Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip Jessup, of Columbia University, former legal advisers to the State Department and outstanding authorities on international law, in a letter jointly signed by them in the New York Times on October 6, 1939, had the following to say:

We must challenge the suggestion that international law has ever imposed any duty on a neutral to permit the exportation of munitions of war from its territory, and that accordingly the retention of the embargo is contrary to the precepts of international law. That is not the case and never has been. It is fantastic to call the present arms embargo a violation of international law, and it is misleading to intimate that it represents a departure from that law.

Mr. Green H. Hackworth, Solicitor and Legal Adviser of the State Department, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 5, 1936, at page 298 of the 1936 hearings, declared:

This section has to do with the placing of embargoes on the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries. There appears to be little or no serious objection to this from any quarter, even from those who tell us that we should have no domestic legislation but should constantly rely on international law. The sentiment of the people seems to be opposed to the furnishing of finished implements of war to belligerent countries.

Secretary Hull, a well-known and ardent champion of international law, championed such a provision when he proposed the draft of a treaty to the Buenos Aires Pan-American Conference in 1936, article VIII of which contained this provision:

Upon the determination of the existence of a state of war between two or more American republics, those of the high contracting parties remaining neutral shall not permit, during the continuance of

hostilities, the exportation from their respective territories of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any of the belligerents, or to any neutral country for transshipments to, or for the use of, any of the belligerents.

The conference did not adopt a convention containing this language, but I cite the effort of Secretary Hull as clearly indicating that at that time he did not believe an embargo on arms was in conflict with international law but, on the contrary, felt that its extension to all the American republics was necessary as a means of preserving neutrality. It clearly indicated that the Secretary of State at that time was so enthusiastic about an embargo on arms in time of war that he wished to write it into a treaty as applicable to the Americas.

The President himself, on signing the first Neutrality Act on August 31, 1935, said:

I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end.

In his annual message to the Congress on January 3, 1936, President Roosevelt declared:

As a consistent part of a clear policy, the United States is following a twofold neutrality toward any and all nations which engage in wars that are not of immediate concern to the Americas. First, we decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States.

Again, on approving extension of the time limit on the 1935 arms embargo, President Roosevelt, on February 29, 1936, declared:

By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations. It provides that in the event of the Executive proclaiming the existence of such a war thereupon an embargo would attach to the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war destined to any belligerent country. By the resolution I have just signed, the operation of the August resolution is extended and strengthened.

From the foregoing citations of authority, and none being found to the contrary, is it not reasonable to conclude that the right of this Nation to enact an arms embargo as part of its domestic policy is founded upon and is in accord with known and accepted precepts of international law and that argument to the contrary is not based upon appeals to reason or logic?

The President, in his recent message to the Congress, asserted:

Repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and other proponents of repeal of the embargo have projected the same argument in various terms. It is based upon the alleged validity of the contention that the arms embargo is contrary to international law. It is apparent, therefore, that with the collapse of the contention that the arms embargo contravenes international law, little weight can be given to the President's suggestion. However, I believe that the suggestion and argument should be pursued further. Since it is apparent that the weight of authority is to the effect that this country did not depart from international law in enacting the embargo legislation, the point at issue in reality resolves itself into the question of whether reliance on international law alone is a sufficient safeguard to assure this country's security from war. This thought ran like a thread through the President's message to Congress and, indeed, is very popular in certain quarters.

Many international authorities hold that reliance solely upon international law is a slender reed on which to rest the country's security from involvement in foreign war. Others, while admitting the undoubted right of this Nation as part of its domestic policy to enact embargo provisions, dispute the efficacy of that policy and favor reliance on international law. They contend that the United States was involved in the World War because this Nation failed to enforce its neutral rights. They object to the United States surrendering neutral rights under international law. We who take a contrary view contend that the attempt to enforce such rights under international law was a contributing factor in our entrance into the World War, and that a similar attitude maintained today will ultimately lead us into the present European war. The Pittman bill does not propose, as the President suggested, a reliance solely on international law, since that measure restricts numerous neutral rights of our citizens and attempts to restrict the rights of belligerents in a manner that they may consider to be a violation of so-called international law. I refer to section 11, which gives the President authority to prescribe rules and regulations regarding the movement of submarines and armed merchantmen in the ports and territorial waters of the United States. I trust that before this debate in the House has ended, serious and sustained study to the possible effect of section 11 will be the subject of further exploration.

Let us impartially examine some of the authorities who have spoken upon the question as to whether reliance solely upon international law will aid us in keeping out of foreign war.

R. Walton Moore, counselor of the State Department and former Assistant Secretary of State, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 13, 1936, said:

I do not see how you can expect to keep out of war if you are going to place your reliance on international law. Lord Salisbury said once, in a cynical way, "International law is what this or that writer thinks of it."

Mr. Green H. Hackworth, legal adviser of the State Department, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 5, 1936, said in reference to the pending bill, which contained an arms embargo:

The present bill, as I understand it, represents a compromise between two extreme groups of thought in this country. The thought of one is that we should have broad legislation which would prohibit all exports and all kinds of trade with the belligerents; the thought of another group is that we should not have any legislation at all, but that we should rely upon international law for the protection and enforcement of our rights. On that point I should only say that post-war settlements have not as a rule been very satisfactory. It is not accurate to say that all these matters can be satisfactorily settled by post-war arrangements. That is a reason why we should try to keep our people out of trouble and try to prevent these claims from arising, if it is humanly possible to do so, because we cannot settle them after the war in a manner that is entirely satisfactory or approximately satisfactory.

Secretary Hull, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 17, 1936, said:

I think we can all agree that in the war of 1812–14 our nationals got us into trouble on the high seas in connection with commerce and other considerations and we went out and fought that war. In 1917 many of us thought that the submarine activities in connection with our nationals who were in danger zones for the purpose of trade and travel, was another factor for which we went into the war and fought. If that is true, it must have some bearing on the action of Congress last August in enacting the Neutrality Act, which presumably was based upon the view that for this Nation largely to become the base of military supplies for any belligerent or belligerents would have a tendency to create an unneutral atmosphere and ultimately help to contribute to drag us into the war. We would therefore tighten up our neutrality by embargoing any shipments of any finished arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any belligerents.

Senator PITTMAN, in an address before the New York Academy of Political Science on April 7, 1937, asserted:

We relied upon international law as justification for our citizens in traveling upon belligerent vessels. We relied upon international law as a justification for supplying the Entente Powers with arms, ammunition, implements of war, and all other materials and supplies essential to the successful conduct of the war by the Entente Powers. We relied upon international law as a justification for the approval by our Government of the sale of bonds of the Entente Powers in our country to enable them successfully to conduct the war. We relied upon international law in opposing the sinking of merchantmen by submerged submarines without notice. We relied upon international law for our declaration of armed neutrality. We relied upon international law for every assertion of our alleged neutral rights. This reliance brought us no benefits or protection and was our undoing. Congress seeks to profit by our experience in the last war that we be able to keep out of the next war. It permits our citizens to sell to belligerents as well as to neutrals any and all products save arms, ammunition, and implements of war. It defines and places an embargo upon the exportation of arms, ammunition and implements of war to belligerents. This is the only embargo imposed. No one has seriously opposed the placing of an embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents.

From the foregoing it should be especially noted at this time that Senator PITTMAN contended in April 1937, that this country cannot rely upon international law to keep out of war and specifically pointed out that our shipment of arms and munitions to the Allies was one of the important reasons why the Germans in desperation unleashed their unrestricted submarine warfare and her sabotage of our munitions and industrial plants in this country, which ultimately provoked our declaration of war in April 1917.

Dr. Charles C. Tansill, professor of American History at Fordham University, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 28, 1939, at page 360, said:

> I believe that if in 1914 we had had mandatory legislation with regard to an embargo on war munitions it might very distinctly have led America along a path to peace. It is impossible to say whether it would. I think the majority of people would have been in favor of it, and I think it would have very largely stopped some economic ties that were fast forming. When one thinks that in 1916 our exports of munitions to the Allies amounted to $1,290,000,000 worth, it is an economic tie which is very powerful.

The significance of Dr. Tansill's testimony is that it comes from a scholar who has recently completed the most comprehensive, detailed, and documented narration of the events from 1914 to 1917 which led the United States into the World War. In the face of such testimony, therefore, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee rejected the plea of the President that we return to international law and proposed the present Pittman bill, with its restrictions upon our rights as neutrals, along with certain restrictions on belligerents.

It seems quite clear from the statements to which I have referred that reliance upon international law alone would constitute no assured safeguard against our becoming involved in foreign war. The evidence further clearly discloses that the insistence upon our rights as neutrals under international law would definitely lead us toward the path of intervention and war rather than along the path of peace.

Second. Another argument projected by the proponents of repeal and revision of our neutrality laws is "that the present law impairs the peaceful relations of the United States with foreign nations." This argument was advanced by the President at the very beginning of his message to the Congress on September 21. In the absence of any substantiating data to support it little can be said on the subject. Neither the President nor any of his supporters have attempted factually to demonstrate the point. If any government has protested to the United States regarding the arms embargo, that fact has not been revealed by the State Department. Very cordial friendly relations exist between this Government and the French and British. Relations with Germany are cold and strained, but this condition antedates the present conflict. For more than a year tension has existed between the Governments of Germany and the United States. This tension was not brought about, however, because of the arms embargo. On the contrary, it was caused, at least in part, by the critical speeches of the President and members of his Cabinet in reference to Germany's Government and the ultimate calling home of our Ambassador.

Assistant Secretary of War Louis Johnson, speaking at Boston on August 28, 1939, assailed the arms embargo as a breeder of war and asserted that those Senators who prevented its repeal shared responsibility as a contributing factor in the present crisis which threatens the peace of the world. However, as Arthur Krock, in the New York Times of August 31, 1939, commented:

> It cannot now be proved that the act of the Senate committee was a factor of any size, or was at all an element, in bringing about the new crisis in Europe. Only Hitler can testify in chief whether it was or not, and until or unless he does so it would seem wiser for the President to abandon this speculation.

It is apparent, in any event, that the speculation of the President and Assistant Secretary of War is beyond the point at issue. Whatever may have been at issue last summer, the question of preventing war is not now present. This country is confronted with a European war which may spread. The issue now is how can this country remain out of that war? So far it has done so. That is the test of the efficacy of the arms embargo.

Certain it is that public clamor in England and France may insist upon repeal of the embargo resulting in alleged benefits to the Allied cause. True it is that public clamor in Germany may demand the retention of the embargo in hopes that their cause may be thus benefited. However, if we as Members of Congress are to be guided in our deliberations by the clamor of irresponsible propaganda emanating from either side, we are departing from the field of neutrality legislation and immediately become engaged in partisanship.

No formal appeal from the governments of any of the nations involved in the European crisis has been revealed by the State Department, because it is apparent that reasonable government heads in those countries realize that the question of retention or repeal of the arms embargo, disassociated from partisanship and expressed desire to aid or hurt one of the belligerents, is a purely domestic problem that under all rules of international law the people of the United States have the right to determine for themselves. The argument, therefore, that the present arms embargo impairs the peaceful relations of the United States with foreign nations completely fails because of a total lack of evidence to sustain it.

Third. Another very popular argument and one which appeals to the emotions rather than the calm judgment of thinking people is the one contended for by the President in his recent address to the Congress that—

> The arms embargo discriminates against the British and French and gives an advantage to Germany.

The President advanced this argument by contending that the embargo provision—

> Had the effect of putting land powers on the same footing as naval powers, so far as sea-borne commerce was concerned.

Adding that—

> A land power which threatened war could thus feel assured in advance that any prospective sea power antagonist would be weakened through denial of its ancient right to buy anything, anywhere. This, 4 years ago, gave a definite advantage to one belligerent as against another, not through his own strength or geographic position but through an affirmative act of ours. The step I recommend is to put this country back on a solid footing of real and traditional neutrality.

Such is the President's argument, and it has been repeatedly and vigorously asserted and reasserted by proponents of repeal. It must be noted at the outset that the nations engaged in the present conflict were not belligerents 4 years ago or even 1 year ago. Moreover, the President's contention is grounded on the assumption that belligerents have "an ancient right to buy anything anywhere." As has been previously pointed out, this assumption on the part of the President has no basis either in fact or in law and therefore his argument becomes pitifully weak with the destruction of his principal premise.

An examination of the authorities on this question clearly discloses that neutral actions toward belligerents, so long as they are applied impartially, must be tested in the light of intentions or objectives rather than by coincidental results flowing from such action. In other words, the determining point is not whether such and such an action caused such a result, but whether such action was deliberately planned and taken to bring about that result. Thus the issue might be narrowed down to the contention that this Government passed an arms embargo with the express or concealed purpose of giving Germany an advantage denied to France and Great Britain. By thus narrowing the argument its absurdity will be immediately detected. When the embargo was first enacted in 1935 and reaffirmed in 1937 the British, French, and German people were on friendly terms. It is obvious, therefore, that the purpose and intent of the Congress of the United States could not have been to take sides in a nonexistent war. We established the 1935 and 1937 neutrality policies with but one thought in mind—namely, to declare to all nations of the world the domestic policy of the United States in the event a war should break out between other nations and to assure to the people of the United States so far as governmental action can give assurance that there would be no repetition of the events which finally culminated in our entrance into the last World War. We served notice

upon the world through those declarations as to what our policy would be, and any nation that thereafter became involved in war did so with full knowledge that that policy would be maintained.

It is now contended, in view of the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, that to maintain that position constitutes an unneutral act, because in the application of the embargo we are allegedly denying England and France the right to purchase arms, munitions, and implements of war which, due to their control of the seas, they could purchase were it not for the embargo. Is it not clear that in the enactment of the original embargo provisions the President, the State Department, and the Congress must have had in mind the possibility of war breaking out between any nations or group of nations and that the fundamental purpose of such legislation was grounded on the demand of our people that we keep the United States out of foreign war? No one disputes this fact. However, it clearly appears that war having broken out with England and France on one side and Germany on the other, ingenious arguments are now being advanced in an attempt to demonstrate that the maintenance of the embargo constitutes an unneutral act.

May I point out at this point the remarks of Hon. Charles Warren, formerly Assistant Attorney General of the United States, a student of neutrality, and, in fact, the father of the present era of neutrality legislation, made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 29, 1936, when he declared:

> I wish to make plain at the outset that I believe that any neutrality legislation now to be passed should be applicable to all belligerents, without discrimination by act of law. Impartiality is the most essential feature of neutrality. But at the same time I must emphasize very strongly, and all legislators must always bear in mind, the fact that the statement that neutrality demands impartiality means simply impartiality in the application of law; it rarely ever results in impartiality in operation. International law imposes certain obligations upon a neutral nation which it must perform with reference to each belligerent in a war; but international law does not impose any obligation on a neutral to see that the performance of these obligations should operate in the same manner on each belligerent. And, in fact, a neutral obligation rarely, if ever, operates in the same manner on each belligerent. The reason for emphasizing this point is that some persons now argue that if an embargo should now be imposed, either mandatorily or discretionally, it might operate unevenly as between belligerents, and hence might drag us into the war. But it must be realized that the lack of an embargo also might, and undoubtedly would, operate unevenly between belligerents and prove a potent source for controversy and friction, leading to possible war. The same thing is true as to any other measure which we may adopt to further protect our neutrality; for instance, prohibition of loans will operate unevenly as to the belligerents, and may injure one belligerent more than the other. It is no argument against the passage of such a measure to urge that it may operate unevenly if, in fact, it will help to protect this country. This point, therefore, must always be borne in mind, namely, that you can never hope to pass any neutrality law which will operate evenly amongst belligerents. If in passing a law you try to balance up what will happen to one belligerent as a result of the law as against what will happen to another belligerent, then you are allowing foreign interests and foreign nations to frame your law.

May I say in passing that in this statement to the committee, Mr. Warren placed his finger exactly upon the issue? Are we to legislate on the subject of neutrality with the interests of the United States as our sole guide or are we to attempt to legislate neutrality by permitting considerations of the possible effect of the law upon foreign nations to become our guide? It seems to me that calm reasoning demands that in the consideration of this question we lay aside all thought as to what its effect might be upon any foreign nation and confine our attention only to thinking in terms of the interest of the United States.

We were not thinking in terms of England, France, Germany, Russia, Ethiopia, or any other nation when this law was framed and because we were calm and unaffected by hysteria, partisanship, or emotion, the embargo was declared to be a part of our national policy by almost unanimous vote. Now that the thing which the law was designed to guard us against has come to pass and the stream of propaganda is beginning to make itself felt in America, we are now urged to depart from that calmly reasoned policy expressed in 1935 and 1937 for the alleged reason that in its operation the arms embargo is not impartial in the effects of its application. To many the very assertion of this argument should be the basis for firm resolution on the part of all Members of Congress to maintain our present position.

As stated by Mr. Hackworth, legal adviser of the State Department, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on page 289 of the 1936 hearings:

> During the World War, when we had no restrictions whatever, we had complaints. The Central Powers complained bitterly that we were allowing materials to get out to the Allies while Germany and the powers allied with Germany could not get them. Therefore, Germany and Austria-Hungary asked us to place restrictions on exports to the Allied Powers, and we replied that to act at the instance of Germany and Austria-Hungary would be unneutral. So that whether you have restrictions or whether you do not have them you will have complaints from belligerents because they cannot have the same access to our markets. One group will have control of the seas. That group will have complete access to our markets. The other group will be barred. Consequently, whether you have legislation or whether you do not, you will have complaints from belligerents. You cannot play this game of neutrality in a way that will be satisfactory to all parties to a war. Nor can you be charged with unneutrality for taking action, if your action is made to apply equally to all belligerents. That is the criterion with respect to neutrality—that whatever action shall be taken shall apply equally to all belligerents. I think that is as far as a neutral can be expected to go.

Similar expressions may be found in statements made by Prof. Edwin S. Corwin, of Princeton University; Dr. Thomas Healy, dean of Georgetown University's Foreign Service School; and many others, among them being Mr. Robert Lansing, as counselor of the State Department. In a memorandum to President Wilson on December 14, 1914, he declared:

> If one belligerent has by good fortune a superiority in the matter of geographical location or of military or naval power, the rules of neutral conduct cannot be varied so as to favor the less fortunate combatant. To change such rules because of the relative strength of the belligerents and in order to equalize their opportunities would be in itself an unneutral act, of which the stronger might justly complain.

It impresses me as wholly apparent to an impartial mind that whenever we permit the possible operative effect of our neutrality laws on prospective belligerents to become the basis of our consideration, we are no longer thinking in terms of what is best for America but are allowing foreign influences to determine the course of domestic legislation. I am firmly of the belief that maintenance of neutrality as between belligerents with a minimum of danger of exposure to the hazards of involvement in foreign war demands that we stand firmly upon our right to determine our own domestic policy and apply that policy with impartiality toward all nations that might become belligerents, without regard to what the effect might be upon any given belligerent. It thus appears that the argument "that the arms embargo is unneutral" falls of its own weight when viewed in the light of the motives and purposes behind its enactment and the impartiality of its application.

The people of America are composed of citizens having in their bodies the blood of many nationalities and in their hearts ties springing from associations with their homelands. It is not unnatural, therefore, that in times of stress such as the present, despite all caution to the contrary, our people are prone to take sides in any foreign war. As a result of this type of sentiment many intelligent people, viewing the future of democracy with alarm, are making the argument that the arms embargo should be repealed in order to give all possible assistance to the British and French "short of war." This argument in the current debate has not been specifically projected by the President, the Secretary of State, or the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, although I believe it is fair to state that it has at times been implied by them.

Despite all of the camouflage and insincerity that has marked much of the debate on this question, the desire to help England and France is the real reason which motivates many of our people to now demand a change in the neutrality law. Some members of another body have openly admitted that this is the motivating reason, and privately a large portion of those demanding repeal will admit it. Newspaper

writers and commentators assert that this is the real reason and that avoidance of mentioning it specifically has given the debates in another body a touch of unreality and a lack of candor. I think it is safe to say that there are few, if any, men in this Congress who are devoid of private and personal opinions in reference to the present European controversy. We all have our feelings as individuals and, as individuals, we perhaps have a right to give expression to them. But in considering a question so vital as this, I am impressed by the fact that we who are called upon to vote the policy of this Nation must not be motivated by personal feelings, but that we must view the subject through the impersonal eyes of the Government itself and what the Government's attitude should be. Therefore, in this debate I do not propose to picture the horrors of war, or the conflict in ideologies of government abroad, or to undertake to discuss here whether or not this country should assist the British and French with arms and munitions. Opinions on these subjects are personal and should be disassociated from the controlling problem of what our attitude as a Nation should be.

Have we the right as a nation now to change our neutrality law by repealing the embargo which has been laid down impartially against all belligerents and by that action help one of the belligerents and inferentially hurt another? A determination of this question in all fairness must be tested in the light of what is our purpose and what is the influence that now demands this change. The authorities consulted very clearly lay down the rule that a change in a neutral's rules which would result adversely on a belligerent cannot be made during the progress of a war for the purpose of assisting one belligerent to the disadvantage of another. A change demonstrated to be necessitated by domestic considerations alone, irrespective of its unneutral results, might be made with propriety.

The crux of the issue therefore is, What is the purpose now motivating those who seek repeal of the arms embargo? Is it because of some domestic consideration or is it because of a desire to help England and France whip Germany and drive Hitlerism off the face of the earth? Despite all hypocritical evasions to the contrary, I am satisfied from listening to the debates and from extended reading on the subject that the real motivating influence behind the demand for repeal of the arms embargo is a desire to help England and France in their fight to overwhelm Hitlerism in Europe.

It is my studied and considered opinion, therefore, that there having been no assertion or claim of any domestic consideration worthy of attention as a basis for asking repeal of the arms embargo, to now repeal that embargo would constitute an affirmative act of ours in absolute violation of international law and that we as a nation might well be subjected to the threat of a declaration of war on the part of Germany as a result.

I have read with great interest the letter to the New York Times dated September 21, 1939, jointly signed by Drs. Hyde and Jessup, professors of international law at Columbia University, in which letter, among other things, they stated:

> Hence, relaxation of embargoes after the outbreak of war may in fact and in law amount to governmental participation in the conflict. This is obvious if or when the reason for removing a particular embargo is to aid the cause of one or more of the fighting states which will vastly profit from such action because of their command of the seas. In such a situation the neutral purveyor becomes the special support or prop of the favored belligerent, and the government as well as the people of the neutral becomes in reality a participant in the conflict. Such conduct is, under such circumstances, unneutral and is contemptuous of the legal duty which the law of nations imposes upon every neutral sovereign.

On October 6, 1939, these authorities, in response to various comments on their contention, wrote a second letter to the New York Times, in which they asserted:

> We must emphasize the point that we have been far from asserting that any change in a neutral's laws and regulations, effected in time of war, would be a breach of international law. The point, however, that we have sought to stress is that the United States, having before the war forbidden exportation of arms and munitions to belligerents, cannot now permit such exportation without an affirmative governmental act; such an affirmative act, if taken for the purpose of assisting one belligerent side, constitutes a governmental taking of sides which is unneutral and illegal.

Numerous other authorities might be cited to the same effect.

May I refer to a statement made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who on March 2, 1937, said on the floor of the Senate:

> In the first place, any preparation in the nature of restraint against a particular government after war commences is, of course, looked upon as unneutral according to international law.

And again, on March 3, 1937, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee stated on the floor of the Senate:

> Undoubtedly, if anything on earth would arouse unfriendliness on the part of a belligerent against us it would be discrimination by our Government in favor of its enemy. We are speaking of a time when war exists, not of peacetime, and if Canada were engaged in war with a foreign country, and we were at peace with both of them, we would certainly arouse the intense anger and probably the unfriendly disposition of any country against which we discriminated in favor of any other country.

And again on March 24, 1937, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued this warning to the Senate:

> However, I feel that whenever we allow our sentiments or our feelings with regard to war somewhere else, with regard to who is suffering somewhere else, with regard to the cause of a war, to enter into our own personal case here, we are involving ourselves in disputes and the attempted determination of facts which cannot be determined, and it is a dangerous thing for us to attempt to do.

Similar statements have been expressed by authority after authority and reference might be made to the note sent by Secretary of State Bryan under date of April 21, 1915, to the German Ambassador as a result of complaints made by Germany in reference to the sale of arms or munitions to the Allies, wherein the Secretary of State stated:

> Any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions.

Of similar import was the note of Secretary of State Lansing sent to the Austro-Hungarian Government under date of August 12, 1915. President Wilson himself repeatedly reiterated similar sentiments, and on February 5, 1936, Green H. Hackworth, legal adviser of the State Department, stated to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

> The neutral cannot take such action at the instance of a belligerent, as distinguished from its own domestic policy, without showing partiality and hence becoming unneutral. Belligerent governments have no right under international law to demand that a neutral government shall keep its markets open to them and supply them with the implements of war if the neutral, for domestic reasons, shall decide to the contrary.

It seems very clear, therefore, that in view of our expressed position and policy on neutrality written in 1935, improved and extended in 1936, and continued in force with additional safeguards in 1937, the only way compatible with international law and impartiality of dealing between nations that we can now repeal the arms embargo would be on a basis of a showing of domestic necessity. Clearly, under the authorities, if based upon a desire to crush Hitler and to aid the alleged democracies, it would constitute an unneutral act and might be the basis of a declaration of war against us by Germany and those who might later become associated with her.

It therefore seems opportune for me to suggest at this point that if any Member of the House bases his support of repeal upon domestic considerations, we should at least be privileged as Members of this House to have those considerations now clearly expressed. The only domestic consideration that has been suggested was that of the President himself, who indicated the possibility of profits that might accrue to our people from the sale of war munitions and other materials. I was unable to take his argument seriously in view of his 1936 address at Chautauqua, in New York, when he

cautioned the people of this Nation against that very attitude and pronounced the profits to be made out of the sale of war munitions "fool's gold."

If there is any Member of this House who bases his demand for repeal upon domestic considerations, let him come forward and state what those considerations are, and if his demand is based upon a desire to help England and France, then let him not equivocate or attempt to conceal the issue, but let him stand forth shorn of hypocrisy and sham and tell the people that his demand is founded upon a desire to intervene in this war to the extent of aiding one belligerent as against another. When and if this position is taken, then I believe the application of the law to the situation is clear and that the repeal of the arms embargo based upon such a consideration would constitute a violation of international law and give rise to a possible declaration of war by Germany and those nations associated with her.

If such a controversy should arise, of what moment would it be for the proud patriots who have been shouting into the ears of the people that they would never vote a declaration of war that would result in sending a single American boy to shed his blood on foreign soil? The declaration of war might very reasonably and easily come from the other side, and then we would be craven indeed if we did not stand up and fight. It is to guard against exactly this situation that I shall vote against repeal of the arms embargo in view of the present existence of European war.

Fourth. Another popular argument that is frequently urged as a basis for repeal of the arms embargo is "that the embargo creates an artificial legal distinction among articles of war material and is thus inconsistent and illogical." The President in his recent message to the Congress pointed out that embargo provisions "prevent the sale to a belligerent by an American factory of any completed implements of war, but they allow the sale of many types of any uncompleted implements of war, as well as all kinds of general material and supplies." He further went on to say: "There is an artificial legal difference," citing various articles under embargo and other articles useful in war that may now be exported.

The distinction between arms, munitions, and implements of war, and all other commodities made by our present neutrality laws is not altogether artificial. There are very important and very practical reasons, not to mention also psychological reasons, why finished arms and implements of war should fall into a specific category for special treatment under any neutrality legislation. This fact has long been recognized by the nations of the world, as reflected in many international conferences held by them. How did we arrive at the list of articles now on the embargo list? The Neutrality Act passed August 31, 1935, did not specify what arms, ammunition, and implements of war would be subject to the embargo provision. The legislation at that time gave the President a free hand by asserting that he "shall definitely enumerate the arms, ammunition, or implements of war, the export of which is prohibited by this act." True, the legislation said nothing about an embargo on raw materials, but if, as the President now contends, there is no real difference between sheets of aluminum and airplane wings and between brass tubing in pipe form and brass tubing in shell form, then he had all the authority he needed to place these omitted items on the embargo list. He is the author of the embargo list of which he now complains. When the President first applied the embargo provisions against Italy and Ethiopia on October 5, 1935, he issued a proclamation placing an embargo on a list of articles identical with the list proclaimed by him on September 25, 1935, for the purpose of making effective the provisions of law relating to the new National Munitions Control Board.

Describing that list, the Washington Post on September 26, 1935, said:

> The list proclaimed by the President corresponds closely with several specifications of arms and munitions now in general use, notably the list of arms and munitions included in the embargo in shipments to the Chaco combatants, and the list contained in the draft treaty now before the Geneva Disarmament Conference. This list, originally, was compiled by technical experts from five Government departments, using as guides existing munition lists for embargo and control purposes. It was approved, with some minor changes by the National Munitions Control Board, which recommended it to the President. The President, at any time, may revise or extend the list, either for the licensing system, or when the time comes for proclaiming an embargo should Italo-Ethiopian war materialize.

Thus it will be seen that Congress gave the President in the 1935 law a free hand to enumerate arms and ammunition and implements of war, and that, acting upon the recommendation of experts from five departments, the National Munitions Control Board, consisting of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, Navy, and Commerce, proposed the very list which Mr. Roosevelt finally proclaimed. The bold fact stands out that until May 1, 1937, the President had discretionary power to add any article he desired to his list of arms, ammunition, or implements of war. The act of May 1, 1937, however, specifically required the enumeration of those articles previously proclaimed, and provided that the list—

> shall not include raw materials or any other articles or materials not of the same general character as those enumerated in the said proclamations and in the Convention for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War signed at Geneva, June 17, 1925.

The idea of the imposition of an embargo on arms and implements of war did not originate with our adoption of the 1935 Neutrality Act but goes back long before that time and was the repeated subject of discussions between nations for years. In all of these domestic and international discussions on the subject there was unanimity of opinion that there was good reason for classifying into a separate category those finished articles primarily and ordinarily used for military purposes in time of war. In other words, there has always been a distinction acknowledged in the law of nations between articles that were of use only in time of war and articles useful both in war and in peace.

Secretary Hull, in a statement before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on January 10, 1936, on page 16, stated:

> I have not myself seen any good reason for a complete embargo, except as to the articles mentioned in section 3. That enables this Nation to stand out before all nations of the world as permitting normal trade at all times between this country and belligerents, but definitely drawing the line between this trade and what would be avowedly aid on the part of this country to belligerents to prosecute the war by furnishing abnormal quantities of war materials for war purposes.

As stated clearly by Dr. Healy, of the Georgetown Foreign Service School, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 27, 1939, there is a very clear distinction between munitions and other materials. Dr. Healy testified as follows:

> In spite of similarities between munitions and other materials, there are important practical and psychological differences which warrant a different treatment as provided in the existing law. In the last war Germany drew this distinction and she centered most of her protests against our being a major source of supply of primary munitions to her enemies. Germany made little effort to question our right to ship other materials useful for war. She made a very practical distinction between munitions and other war material. Our answer, that we were giving equal treatment to both sides, made little impression, because then, as now, Great Britain controlled the seas and could obtain the munitions while Germany could not. When Germany's protests went unheeded, in her desperation she resorted to sabotage in the United States and other drastic measures which contributed greatly to our ultimate involvement in the war. President Wilson, in his war speech of April 2, 1917, mentioned this as one of the main causes for us going into the war. It should be noted that the sabotage was directed primarily against munitions and not against cotton fields or oil wells. At this very moment our Government is pressing claims for $50,000,000 against Germany for munition sabotage in New Jersey prior to our entrance into the World War. Similar war-provoking incidents may well be expected if the existing arms-embargo clause is changed. Permitting munitions shipments on a substantial cash-and-carry basis was a leading cause of our involvement in the World War. We did not have any ships; they were carried mostly in foreign ships, and for a while for cash. We gave them credit from then on. The purpose of our neutrality legislation is to remove causes of war involvement. One of the great dangers is that of artificial war booms. An artificial war boom is not so important for well-established peace industries, because they are normally subject to contraction and expansion in accordance with the laws of supply

and demand. They are not solely and exclusively dependent on war trade as such. They can contract and expand without necessarily upsetting the apple cart. But in the case of primary munitions factories, we might be establishing a new and artificial industry, possibly leading to a boom. It probably would, and when the cash ran out there would be great pressure to save this artificial industry, which could survive only through further war sales, and we might have an exact repetition of 1914–17.

There is an actual legal and psychological distinction between arms, muntions, and implements of war, and other materials. If we are now lured by the prospect of profits to be obtained from a boom in the sale of war munitions, we will be treading the same path that we took in the last World War. No one questions the wisdom of the President's warning to the American people as contained in his Chautauqua speech. The overexpansion of war industries in this country would mean temporary profits for a few, but when the war ends it would mean nothing but disaster economically for the Nation as a whole. We propose to ship peacetime materials of all kinds to any Nation that can come here and buy those materials for cash and carry them away in their own ships. We are thus stimulating a peacetime prosperity, and while, as the President finds, there may be slight difference between a brass tube and a completed shell, I for one at least, while willing to sell the brass tube to any belligerent, insist that they adjust their industrial economy so as to convert it into a shell rather than for us to enlarge and expand our peacetime industry into a munitions business so fraught with ultimate danger to our industrial economy. Let us expand our trade not only with belligerents but with neutrals in those articles and materials in which a profit to the Nation will recur in times of peace as well as in time of war. Let us go out and recapture our normal trade relations with neutrals and put our unemployed back to work making peacetime products rather than engaging in the hazardous business of munition making.

There can be no question but that the repeal of the arms embargo and the unlimited sale of American-made munitions to England and France will cause repercussions of hate in the hearts of Germany and her allies, just as occurred in the last World War, and it is natural to assume that Germany will adopt measures of retaliation such as were adopted by her in the last war that may have the effect of dragging us into this war, whether we will it or not. I shall vote to forego the temporary benefits of fool's gold and refuse to take the first step that will involve us in this European controversy. It is conceded that we are woefully weak in this country in every branch of our national defense and that to provide the necessary arms and munitions for our own protection industry can be speeded up to the point of absorbing a considerable portion of our unemployed.

We, as a nation, cannot be certain who our friends will be tomorrow; and it is entirely possible, if the arms embargo is lifted, that we may ship great quantities of munitions to a nation with whom we may be at war a year or two hence. I hesitate to think that bombs manufactured in this country might ever be used to destroy our own people. We have provided for a National Munitions Control Board which has its finger upon the pulse of the munitions industry in this country at all times, and that Board knows from day to day every order that is placed in this country and every shipment that is made, and it is easy for that Board to control through its licensing power unusual and unwarranted shipments of munitions to neutrals intended for transshipment, in violation of our law, to belligerents. The argument that Italy and Russia may purchase arms and munitions, being in a neutral status at present, and ship them to Germany has little weight when it is considered that the Munitions Control Board would immediately know what they were intended for.

There can be little doubt that lifting the embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war at this time for the purpose of rendering aid to England and France would be an acknowledged unneutral act on our part that would clearly give rise to an intense hatred on the part of Germany and those nations associated with her, and as stated by Senator PITTMAN on April 7, 1937:

By our unrestrained supply of credit, by our unlimited and unrestrained supply of arms, ammunition, and other contraband of war to the Entente Powers, by our failure to force Great Britain to respect our undeniable neutral rights, we excited the German people and aroused their hatred until they had conclusively determined before we entered the war to engage in war with us, either during the pending contest or after the war was over.

Clearly the record of events demonstrates beyond peradventure of a doubt that many acts of war were initiated against us by a desperate Germany long before our formal declaration of war. Germany made war against the United States because this country had become a participant in the conflict on the allied side and Congress only confirmed formally the existence of that state of war.

How did Germany go to war against America? Recall the 53 major explosions and fires in American plants supplying arms and munitions to the Allies from 1914 to 1917. Thirty-three were in powder plants or on munitions trains. Twelve occurred in gun or shell plants. Seven in chemical plants. One in an airplane factory. Several others in water-front warehouses, and so forth; unrestricted submarine warfare, sinking of ships with loss of American seamen. Surely we have not forgotten those incidents, and certainly the record of those events clearly demonstrates how the unrestricted and unlimited sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war involved the United States in the last World War. We must not take this first step.

To those who proclaim an alleged inconsistency between the prohibition of the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war and the unlimited or cash-and-carry sale of other materials, may I point out that ever since the Civil War it has been recognized that it is unneutral for a neutral to permit the sale or delivery to a belligerent of armed vessels of war? Congress legislated on the subject as early as March 4, 1909, by making it unlawful to knowingly finish, fit out, or arm any ship or vessel with intent that such ship or vessel should be employed in the service of belligerents. This law, however, did not specifically cover submarines and, of course, being enacted as early as 1909, did not contemplate air bombers. However, President Wilson and his Secretaries of State, Bryan and Lansing, very definitely held that, although the act did not specifically specify submarines, it was the intent of the law to include them within its prohibitions, and accordingly very definitely held that it was our duty in spirit at least to prevent the shipment of submarines in whole or in part to belligerents in the last World War, and very definitely held that it would be a violation of our neutral position to permit the exportation of submarines or their parts.

What is the difference, I ask, between submarines and bombing planes as engines of war? Indeed, there is no practical difference. The Pittman bill, now pending, finds no difference, for in its definitions it provides:

The term "vessel" means every description of watercraft and aircraft capable of being used as a means on, under, or over water.

Yet, if the arms embargo is repealed, it would be lawful to export bombing planes to the belligerents, but it would be unlawful, under the present construction of the act of 1909, to export submarines or submarine parts. Where is the consistency there? Is that not an artificial legal distinction? Yet it is not proposed to repeal the statute of March 4, 1909, which bans the export of vessels, including submarines. It is apparent, therefore, that the argument that the arms embargo should be repealed because it provides "an artificial legal difference" has little substance to sustain it; that all major legislation consists of compromise between the ideal and that which is practical; that in fact there are very real, practical reasons why arms, ammunition, and implements of war should be treated differently in wartime from other commodities that might be useful in time of war.

And, finally, there are those in this country who entertain avowed or secret hopes that if we can engage in the business of munition making, prosperity will be returned to the Nation and that the domestic problems that have haunted the administration from its inception down to the present time may thus temporarily, at least until after the next election, be

removed. This argument was advanced by the President in his recent address to the Congress.

I prefer to think, as do the leaders of industry in this country, that a great majority of the people of this Nation do not want profits arising from the sale of instruments of death, and that a great majority of the people if they knew the facts would much prefer to forego the temporary benefits that might accrue from a war boom as a small price to pay to insure our nonparticipation in a foreign war.

I know of no one who expressed the sentiment of the people of this country more clearly than did the President himself when he said in his speech at Chautauqua, N. Y.:

> It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men. For the nation as a whole it produces disaster. Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches, fool's gold, would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. They would tell you, and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity, that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. It would be hard to resist that clamor. It would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond, to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that come from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

Again, speaking before the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace at Buenos Aires, Argentina, on December 1, 1936, Mr. Roosevelt said:

> We know, too, that vast armaments are rising on every side and that the work of creating them employs men and women by the millions. It is natural, however, for us to conclude that such employment is false employment; that it builds no permanent structures and creates no goods for the maintenance of a lasting prosperity. We know that nations guilty of these follies inevitably face the day when either their weapons of destruction must be used against their neighbors or when an unsound economy, like a house of cards, will fall apart.

Secretary Hull, in a press release during the Italian-Ethiopian crisis, on October 30, 1935, declared:

> It is my opinion that our citizens will not be disposed to insist upon transactions to derive war profits at the expense of human lives and human misery. In this connection I again repeat that an early peace with the restoration of normal business and normal business profits is far sounder and far preferable to temporary and risky war profits.

I salute those sentiments thus so nobly expressed by the President and his Secretary of State. They, indeed, reflected sound judgment and understanding of the futility of continued prosperity in any nation based upon profits accruing from the manufacture of arms, munitions, and implements of war. They made out the case against those who now clamor that our domestic economy will be strengthened by the repeal of the embargo on arms, and nothing that I can say can add to the force of that argument.

Why this sudden change of heart now? There was no change of heart at the time of the Italian-Ethiopian War or the Spanish Civil War, and our neutrality policy worked for the protection of this Government then. What are the reasons for demanding the change now? A major war between China and Japan has precipitated no demand from the administration for a change in the neutrality law, and a threatened war between Russia and Japan provoked no demand for immediate change in our neutrality policy. Can it be that the age-old propaganda of Britain has found its mark in America at last and that our policy of neutrality is to be determined by the question as to who are the belligerents? If such is the case, and there is ample evidence to support the contention, then we are no longer legislating as Americans for the interests of the United States, but we are allowing foreign governments to dictate and dominate our foreign policy and the course of our legislation. No longer, then, are we neutral. No longer, then, can we proclaim our impartiality as a nation, for to do so would be a pretext and a sham. No longer are we safe from foreign entanglements and alliances. No longer are we safe from involvement in European war.

I, for one, think only in terms of the interests of our people, and being thus motivated I refuse to take the first step that will lead us into the present European war. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] made this statement, if I understood him correctly—that there is nothing in international law which permits a belligerent nation to purchase arms from a neutral. I say that there is everything in international law that gives a belligerent that right, and which also gives the neutral the right to sell arms and ammunition to a belligerent nation. That right has been recognized by the great statesmen of this Nation for 150 years. It was clearly reiterated in The Hague Conference in 1907, to which this Nation was a signatory and to which those nations which are at war were likewise signatories. In that proclamation at The Hague these words were written:

> A neutral power is not bound to prevent the export or transit, for use of either belligerent, of arms, ammunition, or, in general, anything which could be of use to an army or a fleet.

Therefore, there is everything in precedent and in law to uphold the stand which we proponents of the Senate bill are taking this afternoon.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York kindly yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in order that the record may be kept straight, I made no such statement as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] has charged me with making, but I suggest that he read tomorrow the statement which I made, in my extension of remarks, and if he is a lawyer, and if he is familiar with the quotations of authorities or of the authorities on this subject, he will see what the statement that I wish I had time to make was, and which I would like to make, and it would not be the statement that the gentleman quoted me as having made on this floor this afternoon.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. I said to the gentleman, "If I understood him correctly."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the present bill, as amended by the Senate, is undoubtedly the most progressive and complete neutrality measure, contains more safeguards and restrictions than any similar legislation ever enacted by any great power in the history of the world, and I am glad to support it. The cash-and-carry proviso applies to all foreign nations alike without any discrimination and will aid materially in keeping our country out of the European war, which is its main objective. This proviso is now made absolutely mandatory. In that respect it is stronger than the cash-and-carry law of 1937, which, while requiring belligerents to pay cash for war materials as a general proposition, granted to the President the discretion to permit short-term credits, a discretion not granted or permissible under this legislation.

The cash-and-carry law of 1937 also made it lawful for American vessels to engage in commerce with belligerents, subject to certain restrictions. This act will prohibit any and all commerce with belligerents in American vessels in war zones excepting in noncombat zones. It is thereby made possible for our Pacific coast shippers to carry on normal and peacetime operations so long as there is no warfare being carried on in Pacific waters.

In view of the fact that it is generally recognized that the destruction of our ships and the taking of the lives of our citizens in war zones due to submarine warfare was the most direct cause of our involvement in the last European War, it it believed and hoped that through these provisions we have

greatly lessened the danger of our being drawn into the vortex of the conflict now raging in Europe.

The major provisions of the bill as approved by the Senate, and which set forth the policy favored by President Roosevelt and our State Department, are as follows:

First. Belligerents may purchase munitions and all other materials from this country on a "come and get it" and "cash on the barrel head" basis. Title to all goods bought must pass to the purchaser in advance of shipment. A bill of lading would be conclusive evidence of transfer of title. Belligerent governments cannot obtain credit in the purchase of any materials. Private purchasers in belligerent countries can obtain credit on purchases on all articles except arms, ammunition, and instruments of war.

Second. American ships are forbidden to trade with belligerents except with outlying countries far removed from the war zone, such as Australia, New Zealand, Capetown, and countries or possessions in the Atlantic from Bermuda southward. Such exempted trade, however, applies only to general cargoes and not to arms, ammunition, and implements of war. No ban is placed on rail or inland waterway trade with Canada.

Third. American ships are prohibited from carrying passengers to belligerent ports, except those listed in the trade exemptions. American citizens are forbidden to travel on belligerent ships.

Fourth. The President may from time to time define combat areas, and American citizens, vessels, or aircraft are prohibited from entering same.

Fifth. American merchantmen are prohibited from arming themselves, except with small arms and ammunition required to maintain discipline.

Sixth. American citizens are prohibited from dealing in bonds or other obligations of a belligerent government issued after application of the Neutrality Act of the Government.

Seventh. American citizens are forbidden to solicit or receive any contributions for a belligerent, except funds for relief of human suffering.

Eighth. The President is authorized to make rules governing the use of United States ports by belligerent vessels and to prohibit belligerent submarines and armed merchant ships from entering our ports or territorial waters.

Ninth. The National Munitions Control Board, composed of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, Navy, and Commerce, is continued in existence. Its duty is to regulate munitions exports through a licensing system.

Tenth. It is declared to be unlawful for a foreign merchant vessel to fly the American flag as a ruse to avoid attack. Any vessel found to be violating the provision will be barred from entering United States port or territorial waters for a period of 3 months.

Eleventh. Heavy penalties, running as high as $50,000 fine and 5 years' imprisonment, are provided for violators of the commerce, combat-area, and financial-transactions provisions.

Twelfth. The act does not apply to "any American republic engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war."

All provisions of the act except those dealing with Presidential control of the use of ports and setting up the Munitions Control Board become effective only when the President or Congress, by concurrent resolution, declare the existence of a state of war between two or more nations abroad which might endanger the peace and security of the United States.

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

This neutrality legislation is intended and designed to keep us out of war so far as that desirable result can be achieved by legislation, and the proposed law is, in my opinion, the soundest and best approach which can be made to the problem. However, recent world events and the experience of other nations furnish abundant proof of the fact that a desire to be neutral and remain at peace does not insure peace or prevent attack by aggressor nations. Therefore I am continuing the course which I commenced in my recent radio address over a national network, and which I intend to pursue vigorously, pointing out the fact that we are not adequately prepared for a war of defense and that we should take immediate action to strengthen and increase our national defenses.

We should augment our land forces, mechanize and motorize our Army, and provide the Army with ample modern equipment—rifles, cannon, antiaircraft guns, tanks, and ammunition—which it does not possess at the present time. We should also provide facilities for the rapid manufacture of these items as required which we do not now possess.

We should provide the strongest and largest air fleet in the world, consisting of bombers, pursuit planes, and all-defensive aircraft, and antiaircraft guns, and fortifications for the defense of our cities.

We should have a two-ocean navy to properly protect our coast lines, of which we have three instead of two, as usually stated, the Atlantic and Pacific, but also the southern coast. In fact, the waters of the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea are the most likely focus of attack upon us, according to Acting Secretary of the Navy Edison. Secretary Edison points out that "the hitherto almost defenseless West Indies and the islands stretching from Florida to Venezuela might provide a maze of shelters for raiding submarines or easy stepping stones for invading aircraft."

Let us be so well prepared that no combination of foreign powers in the world would dare attack us. Let us be so well prepared that no combination of foreign powers in the world could attack us successfully.

OUR INTERNAL DEFENSES

While we are preparing against attack from foreign foes we should not neglect our defense against our enemies within. I voted for the appropriation for the investigation by the Dies committee of communism, fascism, nazi-ism, and all subversive movements. I do not approve of all the actions of the committee and realize that it has made errors, which is true of all investigating committees, for they face a difficult task. On the whole, I believe they have brought a disclosure of conditions which must be remedied by legislation. The Democratic national administration, President Roosevelt, and the Democratic majority, as well as the Republicans who have joined with us, are entitled to credit for making this investigation possible, and which should have been made years ago. If the investigation is conducted fairly much good is certain to result and the findings form a basis for well-considered legislation to curb the activities of all subversive movements in our country.

We have certainly established beyond any shadow of doubt our consideration and regard for the welfare and happiness of the masses of our people by enacting the most progressive and salutary labor legislation in the history of our Republic, as well as liberal legislation dealing with all our social and economic problems. However, we have no sympathy with foreign "isms' which a very small group in this country would substitute for Americanism.

At the same time we must in our investigation of conditions and in legislating maintain inviolate our freedom of speech, our freedom of the press, our freedom of assembly, our freedom of religious worship, which are the pillars of our constitutional liberty. I have voted against House measures to establish concentration camps in our country and to curtail the right of free speech and make it possible to convict a citizen or editor of sedition by mere oral testimony of a few personal enemies and without proof of an overt act, both of which measures failed of passage in the Senate. They were clearly unconstitutional and contrary to the decisions of the United States Supreme Court. We have the finest country and the best Government on earth. Let us keep them that way.

OPPOSED TO ADJOURNMENT

Although Congress has been in almost continuous session for the past 3 years, I am, however, opposed to our adjourning at this time.

It is true that our domestic conditions are improving. This is particularly true in my district, due to numerous causes,

and the improvement which commenced at the beginning of the year has steadily increased. The West Coast Lumbermen's Association a few weeks ago stated in regard to the upturn in the lumber industry that "the effect of the European war is a secondary influence in the improvement." As a matter of fact, orders in the 5 months previous to September 1 showed the biggest increase in any similar period in 10 years.

Nevertheless, many of our people have not as yet been absorbed in private industry, although in many communities we have more persons employed at the present time than we had in 1929. Therefore we should go ahead with a meritorious work-relief program and construct many of the P. W. A. and W. P. A. projects, which would be permanent assets to the local communities and thereby furnish jobs to the remaining citizens whom private industry is unable to employ.

We should also take up and consider cost-of-production legislation for the farmers, many of whom have not as yet fully shared in the upward trend which is so noticeable in business and industry. The farmers are entitled to a parity price for their products, and I agree with the viewpoint of the Washington State Grange and the Pomona and local Grange organizations within my district who favor cost of production. We should not compel them to wait until the regular session in January.

In connection with our national-defense program and closely related to it, we should also consider and enact legislation to prevent profiteering by the big manipulators and speculators in the prices of foodstuffs and the necessities of life.

Mr. Speaker, we could accomplish a great deal in the ensuing 6 weeks, and if we did not actually complete action on some of these matters the progress made in considering them would be time well spent and would hasten final action thereon in the regular session. I shall, therefore, for these reasons, oppose adjourning this special session when the neutrality legislation has been disposed of.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, with as much dispassion as can be summoned to the consideration of a highly controversial question, I come before you not merely as a Member of this great body, but primarily as an American woman irrevocably committed to the proposition that our country must stay out of war. I know there is an honest difference of opinion as to how this can be accomplished. I believe in the sincerity of those who differ with me. My position has been taken, I may say, after much prayerful and serious consideration. I have been influenced also by my President and the Secretary of State, realizing that theirs is the greatest responsibility and that they are using every possible means to prevent this country from becoming involved in a war. I am also taking into consideration the wishes of my constituents insofar as it is possible to do so. I believe their greatest desire, stripped of all essentials, is to keep this country free, and I say here now that it is mine to preserve the neutrality and peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests. Reason and logic indicate to me that this can best be done by repealing the present law and supporting the proposed Neutrality Act. I believe it to be a potent weapon for peace.

As I understand the new Neutrality Act, it provides:

First. That it shall be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passenger or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

Second. It shall be unlawful to export or transport any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation until all right, title, or interest therein shall be transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, or national.

Third. It shall be unlawful for any United States citizen or vessel to proceed into or through any combat area designated as such by the President.

Fourth. It shall be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of any state named in the proclamation.

Fifth. It shall be unlawful for any person in the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of any government of any state named in such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, and these provisions shall also apply to the sale by any person in the United States to any person in a state named in the proclamation of any articles or materials of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

In the main, these five provisions constitute the American concept of a neutrality designed to preserve the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of the citizens and their interests. Taken together, these five provisions embody a policy of nonintervention and a plan for the payment in cash and transportation in their own ships of goods purchased by belligerents. Conceding that we sacrifice some of our constitutional rights of mobility and freedom of action in adopting such a law, it is nevertheless unquestionable that such conduct on the part of a nation and its citizens comes nearer to the achievement of true neutrality than any other expedient devisable by means of legislative enactment. Primarily, then, it is the harmony of the proposed Neutrality Act with the end sought which impels us to accept it as the solution of the issue. It is principally for this reason that I am convinced of the wisdom of the proposed legislation.

There is, however, another aspect of the question which is of vital significance to America as a nation. At the present time, for no purpose of national interest, we are refusing to trade on a commercial basis with nations which stand in need of our products and with whom we have always traded until the invocation of the present embargo. As a result of this embargo, normal markets for products ranging from foodstuffs to armaments are closed to American manufacturers, industrialists, and exporters. There is a consequent adverse effect resulting to American labor. The repeal of the present Neutrality Act and the passage of the proposed resolution already enacted by the Senate will remove this stricture on American industry and trade and advance our domestic welfare. This purpose in itself is obviously a legitimate one under the rules of international law and in no way conflicts with our duty as a neutral. The contention that the new statute will be an economic benefit to one warring nation due to the inability of another warring nation to send ships to buy and carry away the goods which we are perfectly willing to sell on the same terms to both, is without merit in view of the fact that no foreign country or belligerent has the right to determine our policy, or what amounts to the same thing, to prevent us from changing our policy as our national interests require. A neutral nation is under no moral or international obligation to equalize the commercial advantages of belligerents.

Since adequate safeguards against partisan or partial acts are provided by the proposed statute, the American policy of neutrality is effectuated. Since travel on belligerent vessels and in combat areas is prohibited, the protection of American lives is assured. Since the sale of commodities and materials is regulated by the title-and-take plan, under which extension of credit is banned, the protection of American capital is insured and the stimulation of American business is promoted. All of these worth-while objectives can and will be achieved under the recognized sanctions of international law. By reason and logic, therefore, I believe that I have established the premises which support the conclusion that the proposed Neutrality Act should be enacted into law.

Time will not permit further discussion at this time, but let me say that in my capacity as an American woman whose chief concern is to keep this country out of war, I bring to my aid arguments which far outweigh mere analysis and reason. They are arguments drawn from the experience of women through a long and weary history of wars. They are propositions established not by analysis, but by knowledge of pain and comprehension of grief. They are the unanswerable judgments of American womanhood and of her determination that never again shall American manhood spill its lifeblood on foreign soil. We are determined that the ghastly memories of other wars shall never be repeated.

May I say we are greatly disturbed. We pray for a world without wars, where our children can grow up, happy and useful, without that terrible dread of what may happen to us tomorrow. It is my confident belief that the proposed neutrality act will be the means of keeping us free, that America shall remain at peace. This is now and shall continue to be my most fervent prayer.

May I say to my colleagues, as one who went through a World War, who saw all of its horrors, who worked day and night in the interest of our boys, that I would not stand here today and urge that we repeal the present Neutrality Act if it were not my honest conviction that it is the best way to keep us out of war. I sincerely hope that my colleagues, however they may vote today upon the question of the best means to keep us neutral, will join with me in telling the women of America that this Congress, by its vote, will never consent to send American boys to fight in a European war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 21 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that I have addressed the House of Representatives on any subject other than matters of taxation or related subjects—matters that emanate from the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. However, my deep conviction impels me to deviate from my established rule and submit a few brief observations on the pending measure.

I was somewhat surprised at the statement and position taken by my good friend the able Representative from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who took the position that if we failed to amend the present neutrality law by repealing the embargo provisions, that failure of action on our part would stop the European war. I cannot believe that that view is shared by any considerable number of the Members of this body. I had not heard that thought advanced before. Neither can I concur in it. In my opinion, it must have strained the imagination or the optimism of the gentleman from Mississippi to have arrived at that conclusion. In my judgment, the action we take on this measure will not weigh a feather's weight one way or the other in stopping or continuing the present war which is now being waged on European soil.

The paramount question for us to consider, the all-absorbing question with me is, What effect will our action have with respect to keeping our country out of that terrible conflict?

I voted reluctantly and with great hesitation for the declaration of war in 1917. I did not do that to make the world safe for democracy, as perhaps some did, or to have any effect whatever as to the type of government that other nations should adopt and maintain. I cast that vote to vindicate the rights of American citizens on the high seas and to show my resentment and what I believed was the resentment of the American people of the continued violation of the rights of our nationals in the sinking of our ships and the murdering of our citizens on the high seas, where they had a perfect right under international law to travel. That is the reason that I voted for the war resolution in 1917.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the pending measure repealing the arms-embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act and substituting for it the cash-and-carry plan will, in my opinion, do more to keep the United States out of the present European war than any other action Congress could take at this time.

Before proceeding with my brief remarks in favor of the proposed legislation, it may be well to lay down one or two general and very fundamental aims that motivate, I believe, all Members of Congress, as well as every member of their constituency. The first of these is a universal desire—so strong that it amounts to a primary rule of our national self-preservation—an almost obsession with me—that is to keep America from becoming involved in the present European conflict.

While our soil has not provided a battlefield since the close of the War between the States, the American people are well aware of the horrors of modern warfare. President Roosevelt feels just as strongly as do the American people the revulsion of war and he has, on numerous occasions, given voice to his hatred of the brutal method of settling disputes by armed conflict. Likewise, our Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, has labored unceasingly for peace and elimination of the economic barriers and restraints which have too often plunged the peoples of the earth into war.

The American people do not need to be told anew that war is a devastating monster to be avoided at all costs short of the loss of national honor and national safety. As to this, we are all agreed, as far as I know.

Moreover, I am convinced that there will be found no differences of opinion among us as to the desirability of our padding our ears to the blandishments and propaganda of those agents of foreign governments who would draw us into the European maelstrom. None of us has been exclusively appointed—nor can we usurp the right—to be the sole protector of American neutrality. And none of us has a monopoly on patriotism or the desire and determination to keep our Nation free of the European conflict. I grant my opponents the same respect, the same belief in their sincerity that I am entitled to receive.

Our duty here is not nearly so complex as some would have us believe. We are not legislating for the benefit of any foreign power. The sole test of the merit of the legislation before us—the sole yardstick by which it can be fairly gaged—is whether or not it is best for the American people. We all want neutrality as far as this purely theoretical state can be achieved by law and we want to bring this about in a way best designed to insure our national safety. Just exactly how this is to be done, however, constitutes our problem and brings about the honest difference of opinion being debated here.

We now have on our statute books a so-called neutrality law. It provides, in brief, that we can ship in American vessels, manned by our own seamen, any article or commodity so long as it does not fall within the narrow confines of the description "munitions and implements of war." The number of Swedish and Norwegian vessels that have been sunk recently carrying cargoes no nearer this description than wood pulp, bears evidence of the ineffectiveness of such a classification.

It may be easily demonstrated that the distinction set out in the existing law between finished implements of war and materials vital to a warring nation is but a shadow and, upon examination, dissolves into air. Cotton is as necessary to a country at war as gun cotton and, in fact, may be readily so converted. Chemicals, copper, and steel are as important as the shells they will soon become after their arrival upon the belligerents' shores. Gasoline and oil for the airplanes and tanks are just as essential as the guns which make them offensive and defensive weapons.

Retention of the present neutrality law would mean simply the supplying of these war essentials in semimanufactured form and thereby depriving our workers of so much badly needed employment. Moreover, and of especial importance, to allow these articles to be carried to the purchaser in American-flag ships would put our nationals into areas fraught with danger where the loss of property and lives which would inevitably follow would furnish such inflammatory incidents as led to our participation in the World War. The case of the American ship *City of Flint* furnishes a graphic instance of just how easily such an incident could and almost certainly would occur.

It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to draw a reasonable distinction between groups of exports, as even the articles useful in the ordinary life of a nation may be readily classed as war aids. To do so would simply be an idle gesture, as it would have no binding effect on the belligerents who determine what articles they consider as contraband.

Moreover, to place an embargo upon all exports would bring on economic ruin, and any attempt to prevent transshipment to belligerents, through other neutrals, would be administratively impossible.

The present neutrality law is very uneven and discriminatory in its application. It does not, in any sense, achieve real neutrality, and has the distinct vice of allowing our ships and men to go into the danger zones. Our refusal to sell finished implements of war makes defense virtually impossible for small peace-loving nations that do not have the facilities to manufacture munitions and implements of war. It encourages nations with great military strength to prey on weaker neighbors, who having no great armed might, are debarred from purchasing the weapons with which to defend themselves. Aggressor nations may lay in large supplies of arms and their victims have no way of rectifying their mistaken trust in their own inviolability, and confidence in the protection of treaties and guaranties.

We were told by those who opposed the removal of the embargo, in the last session of the Congress, that it would prevent war, and that as long as it was maintained there would be no war in Europe. These same persons now tell us that unless the embargo is kept intact it will constitute a first step that will lead to our involvement. Their first prediction did little to advance their reputation as prophets, and their opposition, resulting as it did in inaction on this important question, in my opinion, undoubtedly was a contributing factor to the outbreak of war in Europe.

In the meantime, both our great President and our capable Secretary of State warned that a European war was likely, and might break with little notice. They urged that we prepare ourselves by removing from our statutes the present ineffectual neutrality legislation, and replacing it with something along the lines of the pending bill. Persons from every walk of life, without regard to partisan policies and their positions upon other very controversial questions, concurred in this opinion.

Newspaper and syndicated writers who have previously been the most critical of President Roosevelt, are numbered among his strongest supporters on the pending issue. Men prominent in our national life, such as ex-Governor Landon, the titular head of the Republican Party; Hon. Philander C. Knox, his running mate in the last Presidential campaign; ex-Secretary of State Stimson; ex-Governor Al Smith, of New York; ex-Senator Watson, of Indiana, former Republican leader of the Senate; and many, many others are unitedly supporting the President in his efforts to keep our country at peace. Each of these persons consider the pending measure the most effectual means of accomplishing this purpose so ardently desired by each and all of us.

The present Congress at the last session saw fit to delay this matter, and war found us with this dangerous legislation upon our statute books. There seems to be no just ground for continuing this state of insecurity simply because war is now raging. On the contrary, however, that fact alone furnishes a cogent reason for immediate action. It has been argued that to repeal the embargo at this time constitutes a breach of international law. What we are doing, in fact, if the proposed legislation is adopted, is to replace one law of general application with another of equally general application.

Quoting from a recent published letter of ex-Senator Jim Watson, of Indiana, the following pertinent and succinct observations on this point should be of interest:

> Both sides of the controversy are convinced that international law has nothing to do with this proposition. We had the right to pass the Embargo Act and we have the right to repeal it. It is wholly a domestic matter, and we are under no obligations to present the question to any other nation before taking action.
>
> Under international law we have always sold everything we had to sell to other nations that wanted to buy, even in time of war, and our right to do so has never been questioned.

And I commend a further careful study of this letter, especially to the Representatives from the State of Indiana.

The provisions of the proposal are simple. Our men and ships must stay out of the trouble zone. We will sell anything our Nation produces to anyone who will come to our shores, pay cash, take title to the commodity, and carry it away in a non-American ship. That is real neutrality, sanctioned by ancient usage and international law. We are in no way responsible for the geographical location, shipping tonnage, or sea power of the purchasers of our products. We are, however, directly and inescapably responsible to the American national, the American-flag ship, and, above all, to the American people, who would be the sufferers if any army had to be sent abroad to satisfy the hatred which would be engendered by the sinking of American ships with the loss of the lives of our citizens.

This is an important and serious hour in the history of our Nation, perhaps the most momentous since 1917, when we declared war against the Imperial German Government.

In conclusion, I repeat, the controlling desire of all of us is to keep our country from becoming involved in the war in Europe. Our great President and Secretary of State, who have larger official responsibilities and also a better and more thorough knowledge of all factors relating thereto, have urged and recommended the policy outlined in the pending bill.

In my judgment, their position has the endorsement and support of an overwhelming majority of the American people without regard to political affiliations or connections. From North, South, East, and West come conclusive evidence of such support, and it is my studied, deliberate, and confident belief that the enactment of the pending measure will be taking the safest course possible at this time to promote and safeguard the peace, well-being, and happiness of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virgina [Mr. DREWRY].

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, the proposed passage of so-called "neutrality legislation" brings on a lengthy discussion as to whether the United States desires to be neutral or unneutral as evidenced by the passage of such legislation. This is confusing. The very attempt to pass neutrality legislation indicates a desire on the part of the Representatives of the people of the country to be neutral, not unneutral. It is futile, if the word "neutrality" means anything, to discuss any desire on the part of the Congress to pass legislation that would be unneutral. Therefore the question resolves itself into a discussion of the terms of the proposed legislation to ascertain whether said phraseology would constitute neutral or unneutral acts on our part.

A consideration of the terms of this legislation should be preceded by a discussion of conditions as they now exist with reference to the United States becoming involved in any war being engaged in by other nations. It should be fully stated and definitely impressed upon all that the people of this country do not want to engage in any war anywhere; that the Representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States do not want this country to become involved in any war; and that those who administer the affairs of the Nation do not want any such involvement. In other words, no one wants war, and this legislation of itself indicates that fact, and further indicates that we are proposing to pass legislation that will evidence our intention of keeping out of war and that we hope it will serve to prevent our getting into war. It might further be said that even the nations now at war and their nationals do not want war, but this statement, based upon the evidence presented to us by the acts of a European nation, if said acts be taken in their full significance, would seem too broad.

War is the use of brute force by a nation to accomplish its purposes, whether its purposes be the taking of the possessions of another state, or the gaining of certain ends desired by the aggressor state. It is the antithesis of arbitration or the settling by peaceful means of differences that arise between nations. As far as I am informed and advised, a certain nation in Europe, Germany, desired territory belonging to others, and by threatening to use armed force, succeeded in obtaining control and possession of two other European nations. The threat of attack did not terrorize Poland into yielding up its territory, and Poland was subjugated by the superior armed force. Other nations, under promise to aid Poland if attacked, were thereby brought into the conflict, and the present war between Germany, on the one side, and Britain and France, on the other, resulted. It cannot be said, therefore, that everyone in the world hates war, for the acts of the aggressor nation clearly indicate that the leaders of that nation desire to obtain by brute force the

possessions of other countries. Thinking in terms of individuals instead of nations, it is the same principle that actuates the thug and the thief to take by brute force what does not belong to them. So far as I know, no other head of a nation, except Hitler, has proclaimed such a theory as the principle that should guide nations in their relations with each other. Hitler, as the leader of the German people, has for many years spent his country's resources in building up a war machine that he might obtain by force what he could not obtain by peaceful arbitration. Weaker nations succumbed to his threats and submitted to his demands, but as time went on it became evident that not only would the possessions of the nations that succumbed to his threats be taken from them, but the liberty and freedom of their citizens as well would be subjected to his mad caprices.

Most men will fight for their liberty and freedom, although they might not fight to hold what they have in the way of material possessions; so the result is war between the aggressor nation and the one that resists. Austria and Czechoslovakia yielded, believing that their liberty would be preserved; Poland resisted, for they had witnessed the complete control of these two countries by Germany. Britain and France are now resisting because they know that promises made will not be kept and that yielding means their complete destruction. The United States must think of itself, and the leaders of the country should be thinking of our position, and we should be ready to protect and defend ourselves from attack from any nation. The United States is further intent upon not committing any act that could be construed as involving us in a war on another continent which is none of our making and with which we have nothing to do at this time. So the question that confronts this country is, how can we best put ourselves in a position to prevent our becoming involved in said war. There are two general theories as to how this can best be accomplished:

The first is to have no neutrality legislation of any kind, but depend upon the precedents established under the principles of international law, in which case every question that arose would be settled on its own merits with the application of these principles and precedents. The principles of international law have been established for hundreds of years and have been found sufficient to cover every case that arises. However, the spirit of the American people causes them to prefer action to inaction, and so there is a demand on the part of many of our people that certain safeguards should be thrown around our activities in the hope that by so restricting some of our rights as a neutral under the principles of international law there would be a better chance to avoid situations which might result in conflicts between the United States and warring nations. Of course, it is fully understood that no legislation passed by this country can affect the principles of international law. As said by the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull:

> The principles of international law as regards neutrals and belligerents have been evolved through the centuries. This Government adhering as it does to these principles, reserves all rights of the United States and its nationals under international law and will adopt such measures as may seem most practical and prudent when those rights are violated by any of the belligerents.

As more fully expressed in a note of the Acting Secretary of State to the Mexican Ambassador, March 8, 1912:

> The duties of neutrality under the law of nations cannot be either expanded or contracted by national legislation. The United States, for instance, has here in excessive caution required from its citizens duties more stringent than those imposed by the law of nations; but those statutes, while they may make offenders penally liable in this country, do not themselves put either these persons or this Government under any extraterritorial obligation. Our own statutes bind our own Government and citizens and those within our jurisdiction. If they impose on us a larger duty than is imposed upon us by international law, they do not correspondingly enlarge our duties to foreign nations.

In a statement made by the Secretary of State on September 14, 1939, he said:

> The Government of the United States has not abandoned any of its rights as a neutral under international law. It has, however, for the time being prescribed, by domestic legislation, certain restrictions for its nationals which have the effect of requiring them to refrain from the exercise of privileges which but for such legislation they would have the right to exercise under international law, such as the right to travel on belligerent vessels, to make loans and extend credits to belligerent governments, et cetera. These restrictive measures do not and cannot constitute a modification of the principles of international law but rather they require nationals of the United States to forego, until the Congress shall decide otherwise, the exercise of certain rights under those principles.

Westlake, International Law, part 2, war, 209:

> On all these enactments it will be one of the matters for our consideration whether any particular provision does not go beyond what neutral duty requires. Whether in fact it does so or not, at least it is certain that no state law of the kind is a declaration to the world of what the state in question deems to be its international duty as a neutral. It is a declaration to its own subjects of the powers which it deems necessary to take over them, whether in pursuance of its own policy or in order to ensure the performance of its neutral attitude.

It must, therefore, be kept in mind that any neutrality legislation by the United States applies only to our own citizens, and simply evidences to the world that the United States will restrict its own citizens by statutes in order to avoid incidents which might possibly occur if such restrictions were not enforced on our own citizens by their Nation. It is merely a voluntary relinquishment of certain rights for that purpose and should impress other nations with our great desire to be neutral. It is better sometimes to voluntarily relinquish rights than to get into difficulty by attempting to enforce those rights.

The other theory carries out this idea, namely, to ask our citizens to forgo certain rights which they possess and do not relinquish except for the purpose of binding our own citizens for a time. These restrictions necessarily cause some loss to our commerce and some interference with the liberty of our nationals, but those who hold to this view think that the price to be paid for these restrictions is less than the damage that would result if we were brought into a conflict by the assertion of our rights under the principles of international law. However, it must be kept in mind that this is a voluntary relinquishment and by no means is intended to admit to the world that we will give up all of our rights in cowardly submission rather than defend those rights. This country, for the 150 years of its history, has been very tenacious of its rights in all of its relations with the other countries of the world, but we have gone much further in this legislation than we have ever gone in puting into this bill the restrictions above mentioned. I do not know that the step is a wise one. If the threats of a madman can get us into a frame of mind that will cause us to relinquish our own rights rather than to fight for them, it may well be that other nations will mark our inclination in this direction, and this legislation may cause actions by belligerents to such an extent that war may be brought on instead of being prevented. However, it seems to be the thought that we proceed with legislation of this kind, and the temper of the American people seems to be quieted to the extent that they ask for instead of resenting such restrictions. If nations misread our attitude and think that we will not fight, regardless of what may happen, they will quickly find that there is a point beyond which our people will not go. I hope that they will read this legislation in the light in which we write it.

In the carrying out of this theory, the present proposed legislation has been presented to the Congress, and while there are numerous restrictions, the main controversy concerning the bill centers around the repeal of the arms embargo. The motives of those who wish to repeal the present embargo on arms were, first, that many thought that the Arms Embargo Act was more liable to get us into war than to keep us out of it; and, secondly, to come back to a sounder theory of international law and to more closely carry out our traditional policy of neutrality. Secretary of State Jefferson, in 1793, said:

> Our citizens have been always free to make, vend, and export arms. It is the constant occupation and livelihood of some of them. To suppress their callings, the only means perhaps of their subsistence, because a war exists in foreign and distant countries, in which we have no concern, would scarcely be expected. It would be hard in principle and impossible in practice. The law of nations, therefore, respecting the rights of those at peace, does not

require from them such an internal disarrangement in their occupations. It is satisfied with the external penalty pronounced in the President's proclamation, that of confiscation of such portion of these arms as shall fall into the hands of any of the belligerent powers on their way to the ports of their enemies. To this penalty our citizens are warned that they will be abandoned, and, that even private contraventions may work no inequality between the parties at war, the benefit of them will be left equally free and open to all.

President Pierce in 1854 said:

In pursuance of this policy, the laws of the United States do not forbid their citizens to sell to either of the belligerent powers articles contraband of war or take munitions of war or soldiers on board their private ships for transportation; and although in so doing the individual citizen exposes his property or person to some of the hazards of war, his acts do not involve any breach of national neutrality nor of themselves implicate the Government.

Secretary of State Fish wrote in 1874:

The exportation of arms and ammunitions of war of their own manufacture to foreign countries, is an important part of the commerce of the United States. In time of war their Government will expect those engaged in the business to beware of all the risks legally incident to it.

In 1885 Secretary of State Bayard wrote:

It is also to be observed that the fact that certain articles of commerce are contraband does not make it a breach of neutrality to export them. There has not been, since the organization of our Government, a European war in which, in full accordance with the rules of international law, as accepted by the United States, munitions of war have not been sent by American citizens to one or both of the belligerents; yet it has never been doubted that these munitions of war, if seized by the belligerent, against whom they were to be used, could have been condemned as contraband.

In 1935 we gave up our adherence to the principles of international law in this particular, which we had followed through the years, and passed the embargo arms provision, but the people of the country, I believe, now have reached the conclusion that it should be repealed. Due to statements made in the course of the debate in the Congress—in both bodies of the Congress—many of our people have the thought that upon the repeal or the failure to repeal the arms embargo depends whether this country will go to war or remain at peace. This is carrying the discussion into a very speculative field. I doubt that either the retention or the repeal of the arms embargo will bring us into war with any other nation, or will keep us out of war, but surely if it is our intention to express to the world our neutrality and our desire to avoid any conflict with any nation, repealing the embargo so that we may be on the firm footing which this country has been in this particular since its beginning, will tend to keep us out of war; when we add to that expression of a desire for peace and neutrality, the further safeguard that we will sell to any nation that comes and buys on our shores and takes its purchases in its own ships to its shores, it would seem that as nearly as possible we have expressed our intention to be fair to every nation and to treat all of them alike. Surely no one would seriously contend that we will get into a war because we agree to sell to anyone who wishes to buy the products of our factories and other materials. It does not seem to me that such a view could be a logical conclusion upon the repeal of the arms embargo.

In conclusion, certain things should be made apparent to all the world, namely, that we do intend to resent any act of aggression upon our nationals or their property by any other nation; that we voluntarily for the time relinquish some of our rights under international law by asking our citizens to forego certain things; that we legislate for our country and for our own security and not because of threats made by any nation against us; and that if cowardly submission means peace, then there will be no peace. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today on this floor I heard a very fine speech made by a man who I think is about as well qualified as any who ever sat in this House. I know of no more lovable character or no man better qualified for a seat in Congress than the gentleman from Massachusetts who made the speech I refer to today; but for that speech to go unanswered, or for me to sit idly by and not answer it, would make me feel that I had neglected my duty as a duly elected Member of the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Massachusetts implied that anyone who voted to retain the embargo was voting on the Communist side and the Nazi side of this issue—that anyone who supported this motion was either lined up with the Communist or the Nazi Party.

I am sorry to hear from back home in my little district where I live that my church priest is lined up with the Communist Party, according to the gentleman from Massachusetts, for here is what he says:

Am absolutely opposed to lifting the embargo on arms and war munitions. Am for strict neutrality.

REV. DANIEL A. DOWLING.

He is a Catholic priest. Here is a telegram from another priest:

Keep present embargo. Sending guns, bullets, and dynamite to belligerents is not the road to peace but to war.

REV. S. J. SCHLATTMANN,
Lemay, Mo.

I am sorry that the Sisters are against God, according to the gentleman from Massachusetts. Here is what they say:

We, Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, 4,000 members, demand the retaining of the embargo.

Sister CECILIA JOSEPH, *Superior.*

Here is a telegram from another branch of the Sisters in St. Louis:

The Sisters of St. Joseph Mother House, St. Louis, 4,000 strong, demand strict neutrality.

Sister ROSE COLUMBA,
Superior General.

And we have here another telegram from a group of church people:

Group of 125 churchmen urge you support such propositions in the coming Congress as will strengthen our neutral positions and keep us out of war.

CHURCHMEN'S FORUM, ST. PETERS EVANGELICAL CHURCH.

And the church people out my way—I am sorry they are not with God, according to John. They say in a telegram:

Do not recall Neutrality Act or arms embargo.

FATHER GASS.

Here is another:

Assembled today at our forty-seventh annual convention, a resolution was adopted that we maintain a genuine, strict, honest neutrality, and urge the retention in our laws of the embargo on the sale of arms, ammunition, etc.

THE CATHOLIC UNION OF MISSOURI.
NATIONAL CATHOLIC WOMEN'S UNION SECTION.
MISSOURI YOUNG MEN'S SECTION.

And we have one from the Young Sodality:

We are in favor of the Neutrality Act remaining as is. Please vote accordingly.

THE YOUNG SODALITY, ST. PIUS CHURCH.

And the Franciscan Fathers of St. Louis—I am sorry they have deserted God:

We heartily support you in fight to keep arms embargo.

FRANCISCAN FATHERS OF ST. LOUIS.

I have a letter here from the Evangelical Church:

HOLY GHOST RECTORY,
St. Louis, Mo., October 27, 1939.

Hon. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: The issue of neutrality will be before you men in the next few days, and I want to urge you to vote against the repeal. My argument can be simply stated. Repeal means selling arms to the warring forces, and selling arms means war for us. You know it.

For the sake of the mothers and boys who must suffer and carry on the war I appeal to you to keep our present neutrality law, plug up the holes that now seem to endanger our peace, and begin to mind our own business.

Let's make war on the depression and the evils that make the depression.

God bless you and keep you.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE ROST.

I have a letter here from St. Stanislaus Seminary, of Florissant, Mo., a Catholic seminary. They are for retention of the embargo, according to this letter; and the Evangelical Reformed Church, they, too, are against lifting the embargo:

"KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR!"

DEAR SIR: As a Christian woman and a member of the Evangelical and Reformed Church of America I, together with 3,000 other women of this denomination in St. Louis and its vicinity, am unalterably impressed with the truth of the statements listed below and beg of you to support them at such time when your voice and vote shall help to determine the future policy of our Nation:

1. A strengthened neutrality law.
2. Maintain the arms and credit embargo.
3. Continued pressure for conciliation, cooperation, and international agreement to solve the problems at the basis of this present world crisis.

(Signed) Mrs. WILMA SOMMERER.

The Chaminade College, a Catholic institution, goes on record against lifting the embargo:

CHAMINADE COLLEGE,
Clayton, Mo., October 29, 1939.

Hon. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: It seems to me that the welfare of our country demands that the embargo on munitions of war be maintained. I am convinced that a repeal of the embargo would be the first step into the war. It still remains to be seen whether the House of Representatives is more representative than the Senate. When common people tried to make their voices heard, their servants in the Senate and in the White House were deaf. The President dismissed the pleas of such people as of little value, because they came from inspired sources. How then can we make ourselves heard? We must place our hope in the House of Representatives.

The Senate vote showed that the party lines were quite intact. Must we infer from this that the rubber stamp is used in so important a matter? We hope our Representatives will not be deterred by the threat of loss of patronage when so much is at stake.

Let me assure you that this communication is my own responsibility and that I need no inspired sources other than those which tell me how to cast a vote for the best interests of our country.

Perhaps you can do your colleagues a service by telling them how it hurts a citizen to be classed as irresponsible by our first public servant, who had to do plenty of inspiring to attain the position he now holds.

Sincerely yours,

WM. SCHNEIDER.

It seems like everybody is out of step but John. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman inferred that anyone who would vote to retain the embargo was not an American. I will put my Americanism and my war record against the record of any other Member of this House. The time when you could tell whether an individual was an American or not was in 1916, 1917, and 1918 [applause], and in 1917, long before I was old enough to be drafted I enlisted and went to France to fight against the German forces. I think the best vote and the only American vote is a vote to retain the embargo and to keep the boys back home. Let us retain the embargo and stay out of the European war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON].

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, when the neutrality bill was before the House at the last session I voted against the Vorys amendment which placed an embargo on arms.

I also voted, Mr. Speaker, for the amendment of the distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN], which repealed all so-called neutrality statutes and proposed the return of the foreign affairs of this Nation to the basic principles of international law.

My reasons at that time were the same that prompt my action today. I believed then it was the safest course for the United States to follow. Today I believe the safest course is to retain the arms embargo.

What is the meaning of neutrality? The very heart of it is impartiality. A neutral government is no longer neutral when it moves to enact or repeal laws which may aid one of the belligerents. When it does so, it gives up its position as a neutral and all its right to the benefits and immunities of a neutral. It has deserted impartiality, which is the essence of neutrality.

The Senate neutrality bill is now before us. It proposes to repeal the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

We are permitted under the rule to offer certain amendments, and I propose to support the amendment of the able and distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY]. However, the issue is raised as to what extent a neutral government may, after the outbreak of a war, adopt new measures or change measures previously adopted.

At the outset I may say that a sovereign state has the right to repeal a law or to enact one. That, however, is not the question. We grant the power to do so, but, by the same process of reasoning, that same sovereign state may, because of its act, be answerable under international law for such action. Certainly a neutral state may elect to exercise its powers, but if its acts violate the rights of other sovereign states under international law, it is then in the light of an unneutral because it has ceased to be impartial.

But to bring us up to date—and briefly.

The act now in force was passed originally in 1935 when the world was technically at peace. There was but one thought then—to give this country what the Congress in its calm, studied, deliberate judgment conceived to be the most secure peace mechanism it could devise to keep us out of foreign entanglements, power politics, and wars.

Again, in 1937, when the world was still technically at peace, the Congress reenacted that law. The arms embargo was once more written into permanent law, and although some of the provisions of the act have since expired, the Congress thought enough of the embargo provisions then to cling tenaciously to them and make them secure.

As late as last June the House once again wrote into the Bloom bill an arms-embargo provision, weakening the present law to some extent, to be sure, but nevertheless maintaining the principle of no arms and munitions of war to belligerents, regardless of declaration of war.

I was not a Member of Congress in 1935, but had I been I undoubtedly would have supported the Neutrality Act. I did support the act of 1937. In the almost 3 years that have intervened, I have changed my opinion considerably. I did not support the act of 1939 as passed by the House nor did I support the arms-embargo provision it contained. The world was then technically at peace, and no action, then, on our part could possibly have been construed as affecting anyone but our own country and its own policies. I was convinced in June and still am, were the situation the same now as then, that a return to international law and a course similar to that pursued by Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland in the last war would be the safest way to keep us out of any war which might break out anywhere. "Freedom of action for America" is the basic philosophy of that policy.

I repeat, I voted for the Allen amendment to repeal all neutrality and return to the principle of international law. I voted against the Vorys amendment to insert the embargo. I voted against the bill.

Why? Because I honestly felt that the best way to keep this country from becoming involved was to scrap all the neutrality laws on the statute books and go back to international law.

Only one consideration is facing us today: The best way to keep us out of war.

Last June the House said to the world: "We think the best way to keep from becoming involved in any war is to keep the arms embargo." We voted to retain it. This embargo principle had been established as a national policy over a period of 4 years, and we reaffirmed it only 90 days ago.

The world was then at peace. Now, great nations are at war. I believe that if we try to change the law now, after war has been declared, we will commit an act of unfriendliness—yes, an act of aggression, if you please, and I would be opposed to the embargo today if a gigantic and cruel war were not in progress. That was my opinion last June and is my opinion today. Change the law then? Yes; a thousand times. Change it now? Ten thousand times no.

Was I alone in my belief last June?

I hesitate to call attention to the statements of the men I am about to quote. Each one of them is a sincere and respected Member of this body. Each one is able. Each one is my friend, and I call attention to their statements now not because I wish to throw their own words in their faces but because their statements are based upon undeniably true premises, reasoned through with irrefutable logic and therefore they have arrived at the soundest conclusions. I suspect that most of them do not agree with my position today; nevertheless, the conclusions they arrived at last June are inescapable.

Let us look at the record.

The distinguished ranking member from Texas of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] said:

Let me point out this to the committee that, as I said, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] so well said, if war should break out and if conditions should arise under which the American people should demand the repeal of the arms embargo on account of the conditions then existing, repeal after war had broken out would be an unneutral act (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 29, 1939, p. 8324).

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] said:

The minute we change the existing provisions of any act after warfare has started we have changed the rules in the middle of the game. We have then committed an unneutral act and an unfriendly act toward one of the belligerents. That is a very dangerous possibility and probably would result in war for us. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 27, 1939, p. 8009.)

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. With reference to that quotation, I have examined the RECORD since the statement was made. I said it would be charged or might be charged that we were unneutral. I did not say we would be unneutral.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I quote from page 8324 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 29, 1939. It is possible an error was made.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I checked that.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Member from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] said:

For a neutral to alter or change its policies, once a war is in progress, so as to affect unequally one belligerent or another, is contrary to the accepted practices and precedents of international law and may constitute a hostile or unneutral act toward a belligerent so affected.

Let us not be beguiled by the argument that we should not fetter ourselves now but should be free to meet conditions as they present themselves. Once hostilities have begun, therefore, if we repeal the present law prohibiting the shipment of lethal weapons of warfare, it will be too late to enact such a provision again, however desirous it may be for our own peace and security. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 29, 1939, p. 8323.)

In my opinion, one of the most learned authorities on international law in this body is the distinguished Member from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. The gentleman from New York said:

It is a dangerous thing for us to write down a rule of conduct binding and inflexible and then to find, as we inevitably will find, when some unexpected and unpredictable crisis overtakes us, that our rule is out of date and worthless; indeed, dangerous; and, finding that change the rule by our own act. The change will inevitably inure to the advantage of one belligerent and the disadvantage of his opponents. We may not intend it so, but it will be so. And when we change the rule * * * when we change a rule that we ourselves have made, after the game starts, then we have done an unneutral act.

I am not speaking about the rules of international law. I am speaking about the rules that we propose to adopt to govern our own conduct, our own rules. When we change those after the conflict starts we are in grave danger of getting into trouble.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I agreed heartily to the statements made by these gentlemen while the world was at peace and agree with those statements now when we are surrounded by conflict and our only effort must be toward keeping this Nation out of war.

Why are we asked to repeal the present law? To keep us neutral? To keep us out of war? No; absolutely not in my humble opinion, and the debate in another body would seem to prove it conclusively.

We change the law now to help one side as against another, and if that be neutrality, the gentleman whom I have quoted were wrong when those statements were made in June. As for myself, I believe that this action which we now seek to take is wrong. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this neutrality measure because I believe that it will help to keep the United States out of war. I am opposed to war on principle, and I am most vigorously opposed to our ever again sending an American army to fight in Europe.

Believing that the arms embargo had proven ineffective and worse, I voted for its repeal at the last session of Congress. I understand the feeling of those sincere citizens who are convinced that those who hate war should vote for an embargo on all war materials and munitions. But I have no sympathy with those supporting the present so-called embargo law. That embargo, limited as it is to arms and ammunition in their finished form, is a mere gesture wholly ineffective as to its proclaimed objective. It permits, for instance, the export of raw cotton to be manufactured into gun cotton, but forbids the export of the manufactured product. It permits the export of iron ore and steel billets to be made into cannon and machine guns, but again forbids the export of the finished articles. It permits the exportation of gasoline and oil, both essential in air warfare, but prohibits the exportation of airplanes. In short, under the present law every kind of raw material that can be used to manufacture munitions and armament can be sold abroad, and sold under conditions that are almost certain to involve us in disputes with belligerent nations patrolling the seas.

Because it is ineffective, discriminatory, and a strong potential cause of our getting into conflict with other nations, I am voting to repeal the present embargo law.

Frankly, there is another argument that carries great weight with me and that is that the present embargo aids Hitler and his Nazi regime; aids the dictators, the aggressors, the despoilers of Poland and of Czechoslovakia; aids the malign ambitions of a man mad with power and with a dream of dominating the world through the destruction of self-governing nations that stand in his way. This is another reason why the present law should be repealed.

As to the neutrality measure now being considered it is my reasoned judgment that it is an honest and carefully worked out attempt on the part of Congress to keep the United States out of war. Wherever our sympathies may be, we all recognize that this is a European conflict and we are most of us determined to keep out of it. To this end we have before us a plan of neutrality that we hope will keep us neutral and at peace.

It is argued that, while the present embargo indirectly benefits Hitler, by lifting it we will indirectly aid France and England and all the independent nations of Europe. This is because the Allies are supposed to control the seas. This is none of our doing. We are being entirely neutral because we make no discrimination as to who or what nation may buy our products. Our ports and markets are open to all nations. They can buy freely if they pay cash and take their purchases away on their own ships. It is no contriving of ours if only England and France are able to do this.

When they pay for the goods and load them on their ships, the landing of those goods at their own ports is their problem, not ours. This is entirely proper under international law. If the ships carrying these cargoes are sunk en route, it is their loss, and we who have sold the goods and relinquished all title and interest in them can have no quarrel with the power that either captures or destroys the cargoes or the ships. Thus we avert the danger of being dragged into war over loss of our ships.

Furthermore, this measure provides that the President shall indicate certain danger zones in which American ships shall not travel. This provision, while it is a relinquishing

of a right which we could legally claim under international law, is generally conceded to be one of the most effective safeguards against our becoming involved in the war.

Since we can be completely neutral under the revised neutrality bill now being considered by the House, and at the same time help to stop Hitler through permitting the sale on a cash-and-carry basis of any and all commodities, I am supporting this plan, which I think is best for the United States and best for the civilized world. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the enactment of the pending neutrality bill.

The purpose of this legislation is to give greater security to the United States against being drawn into the European war. We attempt to appraise the conditions that confront us, anticipate the most probable reasons that might lead us into the conflict, and so far as possible avoid the situations that might bring us into the war.

This legislation proposes that we prohibit our ships from entering combat zones where the conflict is now raging, and that the President be given power to enlarge these prohibitive zones as the facts may warrant.

It proposes to restrict travel of our citizens into combat areas.

It requires that property intended for shipment into the war zones shall be transferred from American ownership before it is transported. It proposes to restrict loans and credit so that the motive of collecting debts shall not be ascribed as a factor in inducing us into war.

It requires that manufacturers, exporters, and importers of arms, ammunition, and implements of war shall register and will be prohibited from engaging in such business without first procuring a license from the Munitions Board.

The past has demonstrated that the wars into which we have been drawn from the status of neutral to combatant, has been not from the fact of extending credit to belligerents nor from the fact that we sold to them, but from the entry of our ships and our nationals into combat zones.

AMERICA FOR NEUTRALITY

Unquestionably, America wants to stay out of this war. We do not feel that it is our war, and by every honorable means we want to keep it from becoming our war. I would say that the primary consideration now is to keep America in line of duty to our own Nation—not in a narrow, selfish, cowardly sense but in the sense of a clear recognition of duty and responsibility to this country.

We are a neutral nation. The American people are a proud people. They are courageous, have ideals, and where they recognize a duty are willing to sacrifice. If I could, I would not take from Americans one phase of those fine qualities.

We now see no duty that requires us to be a participant in this war. We want to preserve neutrality. It would be in vain that we would ask our Nation to be neutral in thought or not to have convictions and hopes as to the result of this war. The American people as a whole desire the Allies to win, but we are not called upon to abandon our rights as a neutral to become a participant.

We enacted the embargo before this war began. It was not enacted for the purpose of aiding the belligerents in the present war. In practical effect, it is now an aid to Germany, because it tends to deny the Allies military supplies of which, through lack of preparation, they are in need. Its repeal would probably aid the Allies. The substitute legislation now proposed, however, is not entirely preferential to the Allies, because it would withdraw American ships from the war zones and make it necessary for the Allies to use their own vessels for provisions that might otherwise come in American ships. It further restricts trade by provisions that are not in the existing law. However, the legal rights of the present belligerents are equal.

The repeal of the embargo as I see it, would help America. We would help America by relieving it of an arbitrary rule that denies military supplies to a nation regardless of how meritorious may be its claim. We relieve the country of an embargo policy that tends to encourage aggressive wars by crippling peace-loving nations and arming their aggressors. We help America by relieving it of a stupid law that would blindly bind its future conduct where the greatest freedom of action and a prudent and informed judgment reached with knowledge of the facts could better control our important affairs.

NEUTRALITY LAWS

Our neutrality acts of recent years, including the embargo attempt to establish no neutral rights for the American people. We neither create nor violate duties under international law by this legislation. On the contrary, what we have done in these acts is to waive our rights as neutrals and forbid American citizens the rights they have under international law for the purpose of avoiding circumstances which might lead us into war. In other words, we have chosen to refrain from doing what we have a right to do, in order to avoid possible conflict.

International law has no prohibition against the sale of military supplies to a belligerent nation, nor against engaging in commerce with belligerents. Some nation may be displeased with the exercise of our right to trade with its antagonist, but the law of nations has no rule that makes such trade a cause for war.

An embargo which denies our people the right they would otherwise have to engage in such trade is a domestic law enacted or repealed at the will of our Government, without just cause for any other nations to take offense. One Congress temporarily may waive the privilege of our people to exercise their rights under international law, but in so doing we do not prohibit the same or another Congress at a later date from the reassertion of those rights for the benefit of our country. Every man and nation must deal with America recognizing that its Congress has a right and duty to write its laws and change its policy as the interests of our Nation may dictate.

Congress did not consciously write an embargo law for the benefit of any other nation.

EMBARGO OF LITTLE PROTECTION

In the Neutrality Act of 1937 Congress provided for embargoes which prohibited the shipment of arms, ammunition, and military implements to belligerent nations.

Judging by the commerce that took place during the World War, these prohibited materials are estimated to constitute about 13 percent of the war-period cargoes. Probably 87 percent of our commerce in food supplies and other materials would not now be affected by the embargo.

About two-thirds of the commerce of the United States is carried in foreign bottoms. The embargo now applies only to the prohibited materials and does not otherwise prevent ships from entering danger zones.

Warfare, as we see it in Europe, is an economic contest as well as a military contest. Each of the belligerents is seeking to cut off or destroy its enemy's commerce. Submarine warfare is waged against economic supplies as well as against military supplies. The right of belligerents to seize and destroy contraband military materials is so well established that commerce in such articles is far less likely to occasion international trouble than the questionable interference with economic supplies. It is not the policy of the embargo legislation to prohibit the sale of military supplies except to the extent that engaging in such commerce may threaten the involvement of the United States in war. Neither does this problem involve the question of selling implements for the destruction of human life.

Under the present law in peacetime we sell to all who care to purchase; in wartime we sell to all but belligerents.

The facts I have just mentioned demonstrate that the embargo as proposed to be included in the Senate bill would have little practical relation to the protection of American commerce against those circumstances that might provoke war. Evidently the purpose of the embargo was to relieve our country from the menace of transporting these military supplies. The embargo is an inept provision for this bill because what we need to afford our country protection

through the violation of neutral rights is to bar our property, our ships, and our nationals from the danger zones. In order to do that it is not necessary or desirable to prohibit foreign ships from engaging in that commerce where the property, ships, or lives of Americans are not involved.

Under the Senate bill American ships are barred from the danger zones, and our nationals and their property prevented from entering such zones. Those provisions go to the heart of the difficulty without unnecessarily interfering with the transportation of American products by foreign vessels.

The present embargo is directed at only a fraction of our commerce while the protective features of the Senate bill are directed at practically all our commerce where danger may arise.

CHANGE OF LAW

It is argued here that we should not change the rules after the game is in progress. Theoretical reasons and abstractions are resorted to in an endeavor to induce the Members of the House to believe that, superior to our duties to look after America, is the fulfillment of some obligation we owe one of the belligerents in this war. It is claimed we are barred from changing that law until the war is ended.

During the Napoleonic wars we enacted and repealed an embargo while the war was in progress. In 1935 we enacted an embargo while the Ethiopian war was in progress. Later we enacted an embargo when the Spanish war was in progress, and in 1937 we enacted the present embargo while the war in China was in progress. In each of those cases we changed the laws so far as America was concerned, but we did not change international law.

Our responsibilities come from the Constitution of the United States. Our duty, as I see it, is to make and repeal laws as the interest of America requires. The rules of the game so far as America is concerned are written for the American game and not for the game of any belligerent. We enact laws to be in effect until they are repealed and no further. Every citizen of America must deal with his Government with a knowledge that no man has a vested interest in the continuance of the laws of Congress.

It is argued, in effect, that, even though circumstances may change, our neutrality laws should not change during the war.

The war in Europe had not started when we enacted our embargo law. After that war began it was the right and duty of this Congress to determine whether the embargo was proper legislation in view of the new circumstances that had arisen. If Congress is to be deprived of that right, then embargoes are a very dangerous type of legislation that may cripple Congress in its duty to look after the affairs of America. In addition to that, the effort to change the law now before us was in progress when the war in Europe was started.

This bill provides for credit restrictions and zone restrictions which practically all of us support. These provisions restrict the Allies more than Germany. Does that violate neutrality?

It is argued that we are under obligations to the belligerents not to change our law. What are those obligations to the belligerents? It is argued that the repeal of the embargo would give the Allies a source of war supplies that was prohibited by the embargo and Germany has a right to insist that we shall continue to refuse military supplies to the Allies. Can Germany complain against any neutral dealing in war supplies when she is constantly receiving such supplies from Russia, Italy, and other countries?

EXPERIENCE WITH EMBARGOES

This history of our country has made us conscious of the danger of America being drawn into a war between other nations. In the undeclared war with France before 1800, in the War of 1812, and in the World War the United States was first a neutral and later became a belligerent by reason of the transgression of its rights as a neutral.

In 1935 we passed a limited embargo act largely inspired by a desire to prevent our country from embroilment in the war in Ethiopia. Fortunately the war did not develop to the point where our embargo operated to affect either of the combatant parties or our country. In practical operation it was a nullity.

In 1936 a rebellion broke out in Spain, following which we enacted a law making it unlawful to export arms to Spain. It, of course, prohibited shipments to either side of that civil war.

That embargo was the occasion of much agitation in this country. Germany and Italy each for many months declared it was taking no part in that war. At its conclusion, however, forces of Italy and Germany were returned to their countries where they were received with world-wide acclaim. The official heads of those governments boasted of their achievements and enlarged upon the important and effective support by men and materials they had given to the winning side.

Russia gave support to the other side, which was meagerly provided with arms and supplies to support a war.

The effect of our embargo on Spain was to contribute to the result accomplished in Spain, be it good or bad, according to the viewpoint entertained.

In 1937 an undeclared war in China became a conflict of large proportions. The Embargo Act of 1937 provided for a declaration of embargo against belligerents when the President finds that there exists a state of war. No such finding was made and our embargo law did not operate. If put into operation its effects would in all probability have been mischievous instead of helpful. The embargo covers only arms, ammunition, and implements of war. It does not prohibit the shipment of the materials from which armaments are made, nor of commerce that contributes to the support of armies.

Japan is an industrial nation. Its domestic plants were not affected by any menace of attack. It had need for raw materials, but little need for the completed products covered by the embargo. The embargo if imposed would have done little harm to Japan, but it would have placed China in the position of a belligerent and denied her arms of which she was deficient and for which she lacked facilities of manufacture. It would have prohibited the granting of a credit of $25,000,000 provided by the United States through the Export-Import Bank. Great Britain also granted China a credit which would have been a violation of neutrality if the war status had been established.

So while we avoided the consequences of enforcing the embargo in the Asiatic war, it is substantially apparent that the imposition of such an embargo would have been irritating to both belligerents, pernicious in its effects, and served no useful purpose to our country. So as the record stands today our recent experiments with embargoes arbitrarily imposed demonstrates the embargoes either have not applied, or if they did apply produced no result helpful to the United States.

OUR FIRST EMBARGO

The wars between England and France at the close of the eighteenth century led the United States to restrict its commerce to avoid conflict with the belligerents. The country was drifting rapidly toward another war with England when the breach was temporarily healed by the Jay treaty. This was followed by an undeclared war with France. The general effect of the efforts made in the Napoleonic Wars to keep peace by refraining from commerce excited the contempt of each of the belligerents and inspired the friendship of neither. The embargo of 1807 under Jefferson cut our commerce from $108,000,000 to $22,000,000 a year. All our vessels found in French ports were under orders of seizure. It brought economic distress to the country as a whole. Congress finally repealed the embargo.

Adams, the American historian, describing the results of this early embargo, among other things, said—

> Morally, it sapped the Nation's vital force, lowering its courage, paralyzing its energy, corrupting its principles, and arraying all active elements of society in factious opposition to government or in the secret paths of treason.

In 1812 as an outgrowth of this situation President Madison sent a message to Congress in which he asserted that Great Britain "abandoned all respect for the neutral rights of the

United States." The embargo had failed. Congress declared war on England.

WORLD WAR

In 1914 Germany was at peace. She was in possession of her colonies and there was no menace to her boundaries from any source. She had a large navy and a world-wide commerce, with the second largest merchant marine in the world. She had a large gold reserve. She was making notable economic progress.

Not contented with this situation she made intensive preparations to attack her neighbors. Without warning and with powerful forces she cut her way through Belgium toward Paris. After 4 years of war, in which 30,000,000 perished and billions of dollars of property were destroyed, a treaty of peace was signed. It was a treaty written by the victors. It was a dictated peace. Germany had appealed to the sword and she got the verdict of the sword. Her representatives signed the Treaty of Versailles because at that time it was the best thing they could do for Germany, unhappy as the result was to them. The Versailles Treaty was harsh. It was an end to which wars lead. It is an end to which the present war is heading.

In recent years Hitler has denounced the Versailles Treaty as a dictated treaty and has assigned that as a justification for its repudiation. He wants to fight the war over in order that the victors may write another harsh treaty, a verdict of the sword, hoping that he may be the victor to write the treaty. Thus he now invokes the policy he repudiates as indefensible.

When the World War began the average American on the street looked upon it with comparative indifference and with little expectation it would bring war to America. We had nothing to gain by such a war and no purpose to enter it. As the war progressed our rights as a neutral were defied. Finally, through indiscriminate submarine warfare without notice, search, or seizure, American ships were sunk and lives destroyed. The United States entered the war.

America has long been the advocate and supporter of the freedom of the seas and the rights of neutrals. We never engaged in a war which more nearly had the unanimous support of American people than in the World War. The wisdom of our entry of that conflict may be debated, but the moral and legal justification of it from the standpoint of history can never be denied. The sufficiency of our reasons for entering the World War was recognized by Count Bernstorff, Ambassador of Germany at Washington, who, on being granted his passport, said, "I am not surprised. My Government will not be surprised either. The people in Berlin knew what was bound to happen if they took the action they have taken. There was nothing else left for the United States to do."

INDEFENSIBLE AS NATIONAL POLICY

Aggressor nations conceive their plans and long design and prepare for war. Their victims hope for peace. Desiring no war, they are reluctant to prepare for the war they do not desire.

The embargo denies us any right to distinguish between the aggressor and his victim. Some day, alone or in company with other nations, we may reach a decision that we will assume the responsibility in some instances of deciding who is the aggressor and refuse to sell him arms and ammunition for that reason. The responsibility for such a decision may be an unwise one for us to assume, but it would at least have the merit of withholding military supplies on a basis of humanity and justice and not under an arbitrary blind rule that may place the weight of America on the side of injustice and aggression. Before we commit America to a permanent policy of embargoes, let us first commit her to a policy of humanity and justice in the application of those embargoes.

The present situation leads us to the point where we can visualize a blind embargo as operating against one belligerent and through the aid of a silent partner in the cloak of a neutral supplying another belligerent with American arms. No practical method of administration is in sight to prevent such distortion of the administration of the present embargo law. Not only can military supplies be purchased by a neutral who may conceal their transfer to a belligerent, but compliance with the embargo law can be accomplished by supplying its own war implements to a belligerent and substituting purchases from America for itself.

The present embargo denies the sale to our good neighbor, Canada, that involves no peril whatever to transportation to that country.

BELLIGERENT TRADE

An arbitrary policy of refusing to sell to a belligerent in time of war without any distinction as to the circumstances, does not fit in with proper relations to nations with which we are at peace. We should not restrict sales further than are necessary for our own security. We have carried on peaceful trade with all belligerents now engaged in war in Europe. Last year we sold over $1,400,000,000 of American products to England and France and their colonies. We sold over $100,000,000 to Germany.

We can readily agree that no individual thinking only of his own interest has a right to engage in provocative activities that might take our Nation into war, with its burdens and penalties.

On the other hand, we cannot think of our commerce in terms of the few individuals who happen to sell American products. We must measure the importance of trade by its value to our producers, by the national interest, by the labor employment it affords, by the materials for which it provides a market, and by the maintenance of friendly conditions of trade after the war as well as during the war. In this commercial relation America has an important and legitimate interest.

Last year America paid hundreds of millions for the transportation of her international trade in the ships of other nations. The cargo carried in foreign ships represented approximately two-thirds of our total international trade, both in bulk and value. The embargo, so far as it operates, not only prohibits exports in American ships but also in foreign ships. It would probably be safe to assume, by comparison with the peacetime figures, that two-thirds of the goods we embargo would be carried in foreign ships without any menace whatever to American lives or property. The reason for the embargo does not exist as to such transportation. By an embargo on goods we place a greater restriction on our own commerce by prohibiting its shipment on foreign vessels than by our own. The restriction as to foreign vessels would contribute not one whit to our security. Its only effect would be to reduce our commerce, without affording us any protection whatever.

We do not need the embargo on our own ships because, under this bill, they will not enter the danger zones or carry our property or our people. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry indeed to see that the argument on this question has grown emotional. It should have been kept strictly upon a sound, practical plane. When we take action upon the present proposition to amend the so-called Neutrality Act, we must eliminate all other considerations except that of the future welfare of the United States. That is the sole and only point at issue, not whether we will be dragged into a war, not whether we will be assisting Germany, Russia, England, France, Albania, Afghanistan, or any other nation. It is simply a question of what will be the effect upon the future history of this Nation.

We must ignore all social and political prejudices and act in a manner which we believe will be most likely to favorably affect the future history of this Nation. Whatever we do will have world-wide repercussions and will affect the destinies of millions of Americans yet unborn. It is time to lay aside all sham, all subterfuge, all hypocrisy, and all camouflage and call a spade a spade.

We must carefully evaluate the barrage of letters and telegrams which has been poured upon us. Some of them are sincere, but for the most part they are but a part of an attempt to stampede us into following the advice of indi-

viduals who are not elected by the people of this Nation to be our advisors, who have taken no oath of office, who are not responsible to the electorate in any manner, and who cannot possibly be in possession of as much information as a Member of Congress can or should be in possession of before he makes a decision upon this question. It is high time that the Members of Congress took a firm stand against the irresponsible ravings of these dangerous demagogues and the intimidative threats of the heads of organized minorities, both of which influences endeavor, under the protection of the right to petition, to interfere with the orderly, systematic deliberations of a Congress elected by the people every 2 years to legislate for the Nation. We must disregard such unwarranted interference and decide questions according to the facts at hand and our own opinion as to what is best for the general welfare.

The counting of propaganda inspired form letters, post cards or telegrams, or the reckoning of names casually signed to obscure petitions is certainly a poor substitute for the consideration, study, and research which should precede and influence our decision upon any question affecting the public interest. No nation can be competently directed, in either foreign or domestic affairs, by means of irresponsible plebiscites taken in panic and inspired by either emotional or selfish considerations. There are no provisions under the Constitution for this volunteer fourth branch of our Government and it should have no part in the deliberations of men who consider themselves competent. For those who feel themselves to be incompetent, it is of course a different matter.

Let us not overlook the threats of some of the Germans and Russians within our borders who have threatened to resort to sabotage to prevent the products of our industry from reaching France or England in case we do lift the embargo on arms. I hope and believe that there is yet remaining in this Nation enough of the spirit of '76 to cause us to assert our rights to our national sovereignty and give these emissaries of this would-be "invisible empire" the rebuke to which their insolence entitles them. How long are the American people going to allow the hospitality of this Nation to be outraged to the extent of furnishing a harbor for vermin who would even consider sabotage, much less threaten it. Let us hope that it will not require an actual war to awaken us to the dangers of these filthy rats gnawing from within. For one, I express the hope that the first case of sabotage will meet with all the vigilance, promptness, and severity of which our system of justice is capable.

Whatever action we take on this matter will most certainly influence the results of the present world conflict. Let no one be deceived on that score. By our actions we will contribute toward the success either of dictatorship or democracy. We must ask ourselves the question, What will happen to this Nation politically, socially, and economically if the dictator nations win? What if the democracies win? One of the two contending forces will win, and in neither case will the effect upon this Nation be the same. Let there be no mistake about that. We are charged with the preservation and defense of our national welfare, freedom, international rights, and democratic institutions, both present and future, and it is our solemn duty to take whatever measures we deem necessary to accomplish this. We must endeavor to anticipate, as best we can, what will happen and how we will be affected, and upon this must chart a course which we believe will best secure our national interests and follow this course.

We must not hide behind a cloak of hysteria and sentimentality and say that this or that action will drag us into war. We are certainly aware that only the Congress can declare war or appropriate money necessary to carry on a war. We know full well that only in the case of extreme necessity would this body take such action. The real question before us is our national security, and we always have and, I believe and hope, always will resort to any measures, however extreme, to insure this national security. We must not allow a mistaken belief in the magic of so-called neutrality to make us indifferent to our national welfare or safety. This is a new kind of war. It is not being waged purely in the interest of economic considerations. It is a war, one of the primary objectives of which is the extension of a school of political thought. Can we isolate ourselves against such a movement simply by declaring our neutrality? It seems to me that this question has been answered beyond the possibility of a doubt. Has the Dies committee not proven to the satisfaction of this entire Nation that both Russia and Germany have, as nations, endeavored by insidious infiltration to inoculate this Nation with their brand of political thought, when they are well aware that it is incompatible with our laws, our manners, our customs, and our wishes? Have France and England maintained any organizations to correspond to the bund or the Communist Party in this Nation? England and France were only too well aware of the dangers which would result from a Russian army being brought into western Europe. Even in an extremity they saw that the price of an alliance which would make this possible was too great. If such a move would have given them victory, it would have been a Pyrrhic victory. Even at the price of throwing Germany a powerful ally, they refused to expose western civilization to this menace.

Another objective on the part of the aggressor in this war is the acquisition of territory for expanding population and as a source of supply of raw materials. It is all very well to say that Germany should be given colonies. Who is to give them to her? Are we willing to give her some of our territory? If so, just what will we relinquish? Are we willing to see her seize land in this hemisphere to the north or south of us? That is the portion of the globe where land is the most loosely held, raw material most abundant, and having the most favorable climate. Would this not be a challenge to the Monroe Doctrine? Would we in this case either not be forced to defend it or become a second-class power?

The great majority of the people of this country want to stay out of war. They realize, however, that if France and Great Britain are defeated, we, as part of the world, will be exposed to political and economic influences which will be decidedly unpleasant, if not disastrous. Therefore the great majority of the people of the United States want to see France and Great Britain win the war.

The law, as is, carries an embargo on the shipping of arms but none on the shipping of other commodities. American ships may sail the danger areas with cargoes often more essential to the prosecution of war than are lethal weapons. They are exposed to all the dangers which are generally believed to have been the causes of our entry into the last World War. We now have the proposition to substitute a cash-and-carry provision for all commodities and a prohibition against American ships trading with belligerent nations. Personally, I believe in the present proposal we are giving up too many of our rights to the freedom of the seas, but, since France and Great Britain control the seas at the present time and have Germany blockaded, this would favor them. Since Germany was determined upon conquest and aggression, she was, in consequence, well prepared. She has also effected at least an economic pact with Russia and will have access to that vast reservoir of supply. As matters now stand, our law favors Germany. The tighter our embargo the more assistance to Germany, therefore, if we do not repeal this embargo, we are lengthening the war or contributing to a defeat of France and Great Britain, neither of which are according to the desires of the American people. Of course, there are some few of our citizens who, in their intense hatred of England, would willingly see civilization destroyed if only England, too, is destroyed by the catastrophe. Then there are those who are, because of racial or other considerations, pro-German in their sympathies. These two classes, of course, favor the retention of the embargo. By far the greater majority of the American people, however, believe in the precepts of Christianity, which are based upon the golden rule. They believe in the right of the weaker nations to their national identity, the right of the individual to individual identity, and the necessity of laws being based upon justice. They know full well that western civilization is based upon these principles and that, if these principles are replaced by those now being forced upon peoples by the dictators, our civilization will fall. This civilization has brought

to the peoples under its influence those "inalienable rights" which centuries have proven to be necessary to the existence of a free people. There is no length to which the people of this Nation will not go to preserve this civilization once they realize it is in danger.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for embargo is a vote to assist the political forces which have abolished constitutions, abrogated bills of rights, forbade the exercise of free speech, free press, freedom of religion, and, insofar as is humanly possible, has suppressed free thought. A vote for embargo is an expression of belief in the theory that "might makes right" and a belief in the right of the strong to rape the weak. A vote for embargo is an endorsement of a poltical policy which denies the sancity of the contract and seeks to reestablish the old theory that the worker belongs to the state and fasten the chains of serfdom once more around the necks of the workers of the world. A vote for embargo is an assist to an economic policy, which, by means of peon or coolie labor, will drive the commerce of free peoples from the seven seas and out of the markets of the world and reduce the living standards of these peoples to the status of the peon or coolie.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of isolating this Nation from this present conflict and securing our national safety, in the interest of ending this war as soon as possible, in the interest of the commerce and standard of living of this and future generations, in the interest of freedom, justice, and democracy, in the interest of western civilization, humanity, and Christianity, I hope the House will support the proposed changes in this most unwise legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], who is the only Member of the present Congress who voted against the declaration of war back in 1917. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 63 to 30 the Senate, on Friday last, approved the administration's neutrality bill repealing the arms embargo and setting up a cash-and-carry system in dealing with the belligerent countries of Europe.

The action of the Senate, if ratified by the House, places this country definitely on the side of the Allied Powers in the European war. I refuse to call it a world war because it is a European war with which we should have no concern. I quote as my authority for this statement Secretary of State Hull, who in a letter dated May 12, 1938, wrote Senator KEY PITTMAN as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR PITTMAN: I have received your letter of May 3, 1938, enclosing a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 288 "repealing the joint resolution to prohibit the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States to Spain, approved January 8, 1937, and conditionally raising the embargo against the Government of Spain," and requesting my comment.

In recent years this Government has consistently pursued a course calculated to prevent our becoming involved in war situations. In August 1936, shortly after the beginning of the civil strife in Spain, it became evident that several of the great powers were projecting themselves into the struggle through the furnishing of arms—

Now get this—

were projecting themselves into the struggle through the furnishing of arms and war materials and other aid to the contending sides, thus creating a real danger of a spread of the conflict into a European war, with the possible involvement of the United States.

Now, you proponents of repeal, digest that.

Secretary Hull goes on to say:

That there was such a real danger was realized by every thoughtful observer the world over.

Twenty-seven governments of Europe took special cognizance of that fact in setting up a committee designed to carry out a concerted policy of nonintervention in the conflict. In view of all these special and unusual circumstances, this Government declared its policy of strict noninterference in the struggle and at the same time announced that export of arms from the United States to Spain would be contrary to such policy.

The fundamental reason for the enactment of the joint resolution of January 8, 1937, was to implement this policy by legislation. This joint resolution was passed in the Senate unanimously and in the House of Representatives by a vote of 406 to 1.

Mr. Hull goes on and says:

In the form in which it is presented the proposed legislation, if enacted, would lift the embargo which is now being applied against both parties to the conflict in Spain, in respect to shipments of arms to one party while leaving in effect the embargo in respect to shipments to the other party. Even if the legislation applied to both parties its enactment would still subject us to unnecessary risks we have so far avoided.

We do not know what lies ahead in the Spanish situation. The original danger still exists. In view of the continued danger of international conflict arising from the circumstances of the struggle, any proposal which at this juncture contemplates a reversal of our policy of strict noninterference, which we have thus far so scrupulously followed and under the operation of which we have kept out of involvement, would offer a real possibility of complications.

Get that. He said that we have been able to keep out of the war over there because we have refused to ship arms to either side.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Continuing the quotation, he states:

From the standpoint of the best interests of the United States in the circumstances which now prevail, I would not feel justified in recommending affirmative action on the resolution under consideration.

Our first solicitude should be the peace and welfare of this country, and the real test of the advisability of making any changes in the statutes now in effect should be whether such changes would further tend to keep us from becoming involved directly or indirectly in a dangerous European situation.

Furthermore, if reconsideration is to be given to a revision of our neutrality legislation it would be more useful to reconsider it in its broader aspects in the light of the practical experience gained during the past 2 or 3 years rather than to rewrite it piecemeal in relation to a particular situation. It is evident that there is not sufficient time to give study to such questions in the closing days of this Congress.

Of course, Secretary Hull was 100 percent right in what he wrote to Senator PITTMAN. I am wondering what has caused the administration to change its position on this subject. Is it due to pressure from the international bankers and the munitions makers? Just what is the President's objective and what has he up his sleeve? We are entitled to know.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that international bankers and munition makers promote and profit by war, and the records show that our New Deal leader in the White House, Mr. Roosevelt, is an ex-international banker on many fronts, and his family has recently been joined in the holy bonds of matrimony with the munitions house of Du Pont?

Mr. KNUTSON. In an address before the New York Herald Tribune forum on current problems, President Roosevelt, speaking from the White House last Thursday, took to task those who "beat their breasts" and assert that his foreign policy might send this country into war. In reply to the President's unctuous assumption of virtues that I do not feel he possesses, I would commend to him a careful reading of the second, fifth, and sixth paragraphs of Secretary Hull's letter to Senator PITTMAN.

Many of us can remember back to the period immediately preceding our entrance into the World War. Then, as now, President Woodrow Wilson assured us time after time that his foreign policy was designed to keep America out of war. As a matter of fact, he was reelected in 1916 on the slogan, "He kept us out of war."

There is this distinction, however, between Wilson and Roosevelt. Wilson wanted to be neutral but was deceived by our Ambassadors to England and France, also by Colonel House, not to mention a horde of bloodthirsty munition makers and international bankers, while Mr. Roosevelt is openly and avowedly pro-Ally. Therefore, I maintain that the danger of being dragged into war under Roosevelt is infinitely greater than it was under Wilson.

The American people wish to remain neutral. They are determined to stay out of this war at all costs, save at the expense of our national honor and security.

I blame the metropolitan press for creating such false war psychology as we may now have in this country. When the Germans seized the steamer *City of Flint* it was smeared across the front page of every large paper in America. I noticed that the action of Britain in seizing four American ships on the same day was buried in an insignificant paragraph on one of the inside pages. I submit in all fairness that if it is wrong for Germany to seize one American ship it is four times more wrong for Britain to seize four American ships. As a matter of fact, this administration should serve notice on both belligerents that we will not tolerate interference with lawful and orderly commerce. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just preceded me inferred by his remarks that a fellow townsman of mine had taken his position on the embargo because of the influence of munition makers. I have known Cordell Hull since soon after I knew my own father. I know him to be wise, honest, and big, and that his motives are patriotic and above reproach. I have heretofore had a very high regard for the gentleman who preceded me, but I am frank to say that his manner of questioning the motives and his insinuations as to the purpose of so great a man raises a question in my mind as to the purity of his fairness and the sincerity of his own patriotism. Such things are not proper in a discussion of a matter so vital to the Nation as this question.

Conceivably, I could, perhaps not with the oratory but with equal fervor and enthusiasm decry the horrors of war as I have heard the opponents of the repeal of the embargo do. Perhaps, I could wave the flaming sword, air my pro-British or pro-German attitude and my religious prejudice, but, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not think either has any part here, and, therefore, I wish to impose upon you a discussion of the embargo as it particularly relates to our own interests, to our own national defense.

National defense resolves itself, when realistically considered, into two component parts, man power and equipment.

In America we are singularly blessed in the quality of our man power. In courage, in intelligence, in strength, in agility, and in initiative the young American has no peer in the youth of the entire world, but, Mr. Speaker, he cannot successfully fight in modern war with his hands, his head, and his heart alone. The manner of recent successes of mechanized military units causes us to realize that if we pay proper regard to our own national defense, we cannot allow that character of unpreparedness which existed in 1917.

Permit me, if you will, to read briefly from a statement of the Honorable Newton D. Baker, who was Secretary of War at that time. I read:

> In the early months of the war our manufacture of guns was negligible. We bought in Canada a large supply of Ross rifles, an obsolete arm, and used the left-overs of the Spanish War, but still gave some of our recruits initial training in the manual of arms with broomsticks. That we were always able to have enough modern rifles for our men overseas was due to the fact that we were able to buy a British-owned factory built in this country after the World War began, and modified the Enfield, with which the British were armed, to our needs.
>
> We bought revolvers and pistols of every sort, ransacked the museums of city police departments for confiscated concealed metals and weapons, and we got the best our pistol manufacturers could do under speed-up production, but at the end of the war we were still short of the required supply. For months American manufacturers were unable to make heavy ammunition.

Mr. Speaker, military experts predict that the determinative factor in the present European struggle will be the airplane. How will the embargo affect American preparedness in the air? I particularly address my remarks to the gentlemen on my left. In order to answer that question it will be necessary to comment briefly on certain factors.

In the World War in which we engaged we lost 50 percent of our airplanes per month. Our Army experts now predict and calculate that in large-scale operations there will be a loss factor of 30 percent of our planes per month, which means that in the course of 1 year we would have to reproduce our entire air fleet four times. It would mean that if war in all of its fury should break now and find us with 3,300 airplanes, that in the course of 1 year we would have to produce over 13,000 planes to maintain our original strength, to say nothing of other emergencies that might arise. Does not that illustrate and prove that preparedness is essentially that of productive capacity and continuing productive capacity? The statement has been made, "Let us keep all of our airplanes that are made in America at home; do not ship any. Let us keep the embargo and keep all of our products at home." Mr. Speaker, that is short-sighted. In this day of modern invention, the genius of the human mind, scientific and mechanical progress, that would be but to invite the futility of obsolescence.

What can be said of airplanes in varying degrees can be said of other instruments of war.

Of all great nations, we alone do not have a munitions industry capable of supplying an army in action. Our 430,000 men in arms, including the National Guard, are not equipped with the quality and the caliber of equipment, munitions, and implements to successfully engage in modern military combat. If today, and we hope it will never happen, we should be called upon to raise our Army, as it was in the World War, to 4,000,000 men, we would have only 10 percent of the necessary supplies for such an army.

Happily distant though the prospect of the United States being engaged in war appears to be, nevertheless, one sure means to this end being the strengthening of our national defense, it behooves this Congress, it behooves you and behooves me, to consider the effect of the embargo on our industrial readiness and military preparedness to meet that awful eventuality, if it should come to this continent, or to this hemisphere.

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

Mr. GORE. I decline to yield. Our military experts positively assert that to meet our preparedness problem, we must begin with industrial organization for productive capacity of supplies. We must organize for mass production of equipment and supplies. In America, and thank God for this fact, we still depend upon private enterprise, on privately owned factories, to produce our supplies. These factories, these organizations, these industries, cannot afford to install machinery, finance research and experiment, employ and train labor for mass production of the modern implements of war unless they have orders for their products. Orders from other countries would provide valuable experience, and add to the efficiency of our plants. You and I have a duty to encourage such activities, rather than, by our own short-sightedness, to discourage it and drive it from our shores. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. GORE. Can we from a defensive standpoint afford this? Shall we, by an overt legislative act, deprive our Nation of that benefit of properly organized factories and skilled mechanics? My friends, sadly realizing that, throughout the world, war and armed aggression are surging in stark, unreasoning madness, destroying with ruthless abandon the life and the liberty of free and unprotected nations, adequate preparation to defend ourselves against any power, or any reasonable combination of powers, appears to be the most vital and effective means of preserving that peace and that security which we all so unanimously and ardently desire.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate repeal of the embargo because it endangers our international relationships and friendships; it endangers the peace of America; it is a menace, a definite menace, to our own national defensive preparedness and, therefore, to the security and safety of the United States; it is a boon to the aggressor, to imperialism, and contrary to the interest of peace-loving and weaker nations.

Mr. Speaker, whose embargo is this? Whose peace, whose security, are we charged with the responsibility of protecting? Who has the right to repeal this embargo? Does

France, does Germany, does Russia, even though they presume to suggest, have any right to dictate our internal and domestic policy? This Congress and this Congress alone has that right.

Mr. Speaker, in order to establish international justice, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of peace and security, I advocate the repeal of this abominable thing. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], presuming that there will be two amendments pending tomorrow, an amendment to the motion to instruct and an amendment to that amendment, I prefer this unanimous-consent request: That at 2 o'clock tomorrow the previous question may be considered as ordered on the motion to instruct; that on the amendment to the amendment there shall be 30 minutes' debate and a vote; that on the amendment to the motion to instruct there be 30 minutes' debate and a vote; and then a vote on the main question, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I want it understood that, as far as today is concerned, it is understood that debate will run as long as Members wish to remain?

Mr. RAYBURN. As long as anyone desires to stay and to speak.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will be no other business transacted tonight?

Mr. RAYBURN. There will be no motions nor any other business proposed by this side.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I object, Mr. Speaker, to that gag rule.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are so many on this side who want to be heard that we should stay here until 7 or 8 o'clock tonight.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have spoken to Members on this side and the chairman of the committee, and they are willing that that arrangement be made.

Mr. FISH. And I understood you would also request that we meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes. I will make that request later.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to that limited debate on this important question.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to that limitation of debate on this question. I object.

Mr. RAYBURN. I ask for the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] desire to yield further time?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VORYS of Ohio moves to amend the motion of Mr. SHANLEY to instruct the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House Joint Resolution 306, as follows:

Strike out all after "section 2" and insert:

"Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms or ammunition from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state.

"For the purposes of this section arms or ammunition shall include bombs, torpedoes, submarines, poison gas, flame throwers, liquid fire, and the other articles enumerated in categories I to IV, inclusive, and VI and VII in the President's proclamation No. 2237 of May 1, 1937."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 15 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, with this amendment, Mr. SHANLEY'S motion to instruct will provide the limited embargo provision which we approved last summer. It is confined strictly to lethal weapons. Implements of war are omitted from the embargo provision.

After discussing this with the National Munitions Control Board, two clarifying changes have been made to make more definite the intention of the House as expressed last summer. First, it has been found that the provisions forbidding transshipment to belligerents through a neutral country are workable and practical in time of war, and this provision has been retained.

Second, "arms and ammunition" are defined in terms of explicit, well-understood categories under the proclamation of May 1, 1937, and these categories are all included except category V, covering airplanes generally.

I wish to read category V, which shows what is excluded:

(1) Aircraft, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled, both heavier and lighter than air, other than those included in category III;
(2) Propellers or air screws, fuselages, hulls, wings, tail units, and undercarriage units;
(3) Aircraft engines, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled.

Category III, which is still retained, covers bombing and military planes. I contend that there is no difference between a commercial airplane and a truck or a horse or a bicycle. All of them are means for getting somewhere or carrying something. They are all arms or none of them is. Airplanes in general have been included in the categories in former days because they could easily be put to use in war. You can also easily change a truck horse to an artillery horse. That does not make him an implement of war. I see no reason for hampering our peacetime aircraft industry any more than our automobile industry or our bicycle industry. Therefore this amendment refers specifically to the six definite, workable, understandable categories and omits category V.

It also includes specifically bombs, torpedoes, submarines, poison gas, flame throwers, and liquid fire.

Note also that the President has no power to change this list. It is fixed by Congress in terms of the May 1, 1937, categories. This is a penal law, and its provisions, I believe, should not be left to Presidential discretion.

All raw materials are omitted from the embargo.

Now, the repealists say that it is inconsistent to distinguish between arms and peaceful commerce, but the Pittman bill, which we have before us, and which they defend so zealously, makes that distinction in three different places. In section 2 (c) shipments of arms across our borders are distinguished from other things. In section 7 (a) arms are made subject to selling terms different from everything else; we really require cash for arms. In section 12 arms, ammunition, and implements of war are subject to licensing and special control.

Of course, there is a distinction in law, domestic and international, in economics and in morals, between arms—lethal weapons—and everything else.

In international law arms are absolute contraband. From an economic standpoint the arms business prospers only on mass murder and collapses in time of peace. It is fool's gold. In law, morals, and psychology there is a great difference between the sale of whisky and the sale of a load of corn, even though whisky can be made from the corn. The same distinction applies in the arms traffic.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; gladly.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. In other words, the gentleman's amendment would allow the selling of light wines and beer rather than the selling of whisky? Is that the analogy?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. No; I would not say so.

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

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Had there never been any other distinction between arms, ammunition, and these other products, would not the fact that for the last 4 years we have had such a dis-

tinction in our own law be a distinction that would have to be taken into consideration?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; but more than that, there have been arms embargoes in our laws for over a century, and almost every country on earth has had such laws, especially all the real neutrals—Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and Switzerland. They have the same foreign policy we have. They forego the arms traffic and engage in peaceful commerce.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think in fairness it should be pointed out at this point that those nations established an arms embargo as a neutrality measure to conserve their own resources.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. They did it to serve their own interests; and I think that is why we did it.

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

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Every one of those nations has stated to me, in writing, through their ministers, that they did it to preserve their neutrality.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I cannot yield further at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the Shanley motion. I am opposed to any change in our neutrality law during time of war. My amendment is an attempt to strike a compromise between those of different views, not a compromise of principle, but to bar the means of murder, lethal weapons, and to carry on all possible forms of peaceful commerce. That is the reason this proposal is made.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As a matter of information, will not the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is the gentleman's amendment the same as the so-called Vorys amendment adopted in the House during the last session, or is there a difference? And if there is a difference, will the gentleman explain it?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I have already explained my amendment. I shall be pleased to give the gentleman a copy.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. If the argument be sound that you cannot change the law after a war is started, how can an embargo be modified without doing violence to the argument?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I am very happy to answer the gentleman's question. I think there can now be no further question that any substantial change in our neutrality law to help or hinder any belligerent is unneutral in view of the distinguished authorities we have heard on the floor of this House, among them the gentleman who just raised the question. He has explained, however, that the President notified the belligerents that a change was coming and that this makes the change a neutral act. I believe that Congress only has the power to notify anyone of changes in our laws; and this House last summer, when we thought war was imminent, within a day or so, notified the world by adopting the Vorys amendment that we believed in exactly the kind of arms embargo proposed by this amendment.

Why do we need to sell arms at all? Certainly not for profit. In the first 6 months of this year we sold $20,000,000 worth of arms, but $638,000,000 of other commodities to the countries now at war. The Pittman proposal is that to save the $20,000,000 of arms traffic we forego the right to carry the $638,000,000 of other commodities and jeopardize our entire peaceful trade. Whatever else it may be it certainly is not a proposition for profit.

They say our embargo permits aggressors to stock up before a war, while the victims do not get a chance to prepare. Let us see what the figures show. Germany, preparing for aggression, from 1937 down to the time of our embargo in 1939, ordered arms and ammunition from us in the sum of—it is easy to remember—nothing, zero. How about Poland? Poland knew she was marked for aggression. How much did Poland order or buy from us in arms from 1937 down to the embargo in 1939? This amount also is easy to remember: Nothing, zero. There is no evidence that the allies need our arms for military purposes as has been said. Only a small part of our exports in the last World War was made up of arms and ammunition. We could not supply ourselves when we got in.

I flew only French and English planes during my service overseas. The last speaker has pointed out very cogently, and I hope the House will mark the significance of what he said, the only sensible reason for our changing the law at this time. We are preparing our munitions industry, by educational orders from overseas, so that we can supply ourselves when we go to war this time. That is the real reason for proposing this change at the present time.

Let us not fool ourselves or attempt to fool any other nation. If this is our war, let us declare war and go in. We are a nation of shylocks to expect the boys of other lands to fight our battles for us with arms that they pay for. If, on the other hand, it is not our war, let us not back in by taking sides in the name of neutrality. It would make us as "phony" a neutral on one side as Russia is on the other. What we should do is carry out the policy of the honest neutral, foregoing the arms traffic and carrying on our peaceful commerce, a policy of real neutrality, not phony neutrality.

Our President has said that conditions have not changed since last January. Last summer when we had a chance for a real debate and plenty of time for full consideration, we adopted this amendment and I urge that we not change now in the middle of the war.

Mr. SHANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHANLEY. Do I understand the implication of the gentleman's amendment is that whatever is ruled out of the already frozen categories of the 1925 Geneva Conference will be nonlethal weapons?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The amendment differs from the present categories in that category 5, which is commercial airplanes, is no longer a part of the embargo and the categories which were last established in 1937 are frozen, and we no longer give the President any power to make them wider or narrower.

Mr. SHANLEY. I remember I criticized the gentleman very ardently on the floor last summer because in proposing this amendment he had not used the categories. Now, I understand he has used all the categories possible but apparently has eliminated category 3.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I have eliminated category 5, which is commercial airplanes, and I have left in category 3, which would cover bombing planes.

Mr. SHANLEY. Category 3 is still in there?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. SHANLEY. Is it my understanding the gentleman considers that civilian airplanes are not convertible into military airplanes? I know the gentleman has a profound knowledge of this subject on account of his service during the war in the operation of ships on two fronts.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. They are not convertible any more than a truck is convertible into a tank. It is possible to use parts of a truck to make up a tank. It is possible to take an ordinary horse and make a cavalry horse out of him. It is possible to take a commercial plane and convert it into a military plane, but until it is converted into a military plane it is not in fact a military plane if it was not a military plane to start with.

Mr. SHANLEY. When the 1925 Geneva Arms Conference was in session, there were some who thought that it might be possible to differentiate between civilian and military planes. At that time, in 1925, it was almost impossible to differentiate. The men who manufactured civilian planes knew they could be converted almost overnight into military planes, so that it was felt the distinction was almost about

the same as the distinction that Mr. Hoover and Mr. Lindbergh made. They were unable to cover that in the Geneva Arms Conference. Today I talked with some of the leading manufacturers, and they are convinced, as I was convinced last June, that the airplane industry has come to the point, just as our munitions industry has come to the point, where it can differentiate between a sporting rifle and a military rifle. I have a great respect for the gentleman's view on this question, because he has seen service and he comes from a district which has given him that opportunity. He believes that this will not impair our neutrality in any way?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I feel it will not impair our neutrality, in that it is not a substantial change made during wartime.

This bill passed by the Senate is a "phony" neutrality bill. The new part is not neutral.

The good part is not new; 13 out of 18 provisions are taken from the present neutrality law.

The new bill does not provide cash and carry. On the other hand, the President has full power to make the cash-and-carry principle effective right now under the present law.

The new bill gives the President unlimited power to make American citizens do anything he says, any place on earth, or to get out of the place under penalty of fines from $10,000 to $50,000 and imprisonment of 2 to 5 years, by giving him the power to designate any place on earth as a combat area. Even the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the administration's sponsor of this bill, would not stand for this power in his bill last summer and moved to take it out. On the other hand, the President has full power now to restrict shipping in danger zones by Executive proclamation, and said so in his message to Congress.

The whole bill gives the President discretionary powers in 13 places—13 powers to be unneutral, if he desires.

Section 7, the so-called strict "cash" section is "phony."

First. It does not require cash from any buyer from a country at war, unless he is a government agent, or is buying arms. Eighty percent of our exports in the last war were not arms. There is nothing in the new bill to prevent British and French corporations from arranging to buy on credit a billion dollars worth of cotton, steel, trucks, and then selling them to their own governments.

Second. The sleeper in this section which exempts renewals and adjustments of indebtedness existing at the time of the proclamation under the new law, permits any amount of loans that the President and the Allies want to arrange. Warring nations can buy here now on short-time credit under the present law and regulations. The new law contains a repeal of the existing law and if this new law passes, the present law and the proclamation of neutrality under it will be repealed the day the law is signed, and legally the war will stop until the President, acting under the new law, finds it has started and issues a new proclamation. The President can delay a day or a year in issuing his proclamation. In the meantime, with our present law dead and the new law not yet brought to life by a proclamation, the lid is off on foreign loans, for they can be renewed under the new law.

Third. If loans and financing cannot be obtained from private sources there is nothing in this law or any other law to prevent our Government from using the $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund, or the R. F. C. and the Export-Import Bank to finance war purchases by the Allies or by Germany.

And this is what they call the cash-on-the-barrel-head law.

Now, how about carry? Belligerents take it away from our shores in their own bottoms? The new bill does not prevent our ships from going to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India, South Africa, and they are all in the war. Our ships can go to Holland or Belgium right through the English Channel and the North Sea, loaded with contraband. But they say the President will stop that by invoking the combat-areas provision. He has the power now to warn such shipping to go at its own risk and he has said so. Why does he not use it?

The President has never yet approved publicly the drastic carry provisions of this Senate bill. It may not be necessary to our peace or security for us to get off the ocean just because certain nations want to fight there, but why has he not taken the precautionary steps under powers he now possesses?

The transfer-of-title provision is one of the "phoniest" and funniest parts of this counterfeit bill. The build-up for it is this: If an American ship with an American crew is sunk loaded with cotton going to England, we will not get mad if a Britisher owns the cotton, but will get mad and go to war if an American has a chattel mortgage on the cotton. I have learned that search of the records for 14 years showed only two shipments in peacetime abroad where title was not transferred, and that no sane businessman would think of making such a shipment in wartime, so there is no need for this provision. By one simple regulation under section 3 of existing law, requiring all goods to belligerents to be shipped f. o. b. seaboard, the President could secure both transfer of title and cash now. But this provision, if strictly enforced as written, would prevent an American diplomat from going to his post in England, France, or Germany unless he or she went naked and empty-handed, or got some kind foreigner to take title to his or her baggage and clothes. This certainly ought to keep us out of war.

You say this is exaggerated. Read the bill. You say that there is no danger of abuse of the new powers given the President, and that these powers are needed to keep us out of war. I say he has the powers right now to effect every one of these—cash, transfer of title, carry at your own risk, restricting shipping in danger zones—and he has not used them. Why? The President said in his message to us that he will use these powers for peace "with the repeal of the arms embargo," and apparently not before.

Is this a threat that he will not try to keep us at peace unless we agree to sell arms? I think not. It is because our shipping will not need protection until we start to peddle means of murder.

This is the "phoniest" of all—repeal of the embargo. They say it is a holy war. In the name of the Prince of Peace, we are to furnish gas and bombs to slaughter men, women, and children.

Our present neutrality law, as now administered, helps the Allies in three ways. The President under the law has barred our ports to submarines. Only the Allies can make purchases under the operation of our financial-transactions law—the cash law the President has approved. Our law to prevent the supplying of belligerent ships by ships from our ports hurts only Hitler, for the Allies have bases nearby.

We cannot be blamed for this. It was our law long before this war started, but the new bill enacts all three of these provisions all over again and adds three further aids to the Allies.

First. Any sort of carry provision means that only the Allies can get here to do the carrying, for they control the ocean;

Second. Repeal of the arms embargo is hailed the world over as helping the Allies; and

Third. The combat-areas provision gives the President power to quarantine aggressors. Thus in the name of neutrality we help one side in six different ways.

We cannot claim we did not know this. We cannot deny that "we planned it that way." There is a lull now before the storm. All quiet on our frontier on the Rhine; all quiet for our ships on the ocean; all quiet on the political Potomac; but when this antineutrality law blows things up, we cannot claim we did not know it was loaded. The President has no more intention of taking us into war than he had of taking us into debt 6 years ago, but "phony" spending leads to debt and "phony" neutrality leads to war in spite of good intentions. Suppose, however, in spite of taking sides, we manage to stay out by bottling up our shipping and developing a capacity for duplicity and self-control we have never had before. Then we fool the Allies instead of trying to fool Hitler.

Let us not be "phony."

Let us not try to fool ourselves or Hitler or the Allies. In an era of "phony" wars, "phony" peace, and "phony" neu-

trality let us not help make the world safe for duplicity. Let us have honest neutrality, not "phony" neutrality.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I have not been able to attend upon this discussion. I went out of circulation physically last May and I was not here when the House passed the bill which it is now proposed to send to conference. I shall not attempt any general discussion of this important subject which is now receiving your attention. I only want to submit a few observations for your consideration. I know that every Member of the House appreciates the solemnity of this occasion and the tremendous importance of what is being considered. We are all deeply concerned to preserve the peace of this country.

There are a number of things involved in this discussion and determination which I want to mention—two of them of first importance. One affects this country in its relation to the present military controversy in the world. The other is with reference to our responsibility in shaping international law. I do not pose as an international lawyer, but I may make an observation, and I think every international lawyer on this floor will agree with me, that international law is a very involved and a very immature sort of thing. Whether we realize it or not this vote soon to be taken will contribute to the making of international law because that is how international law is made.

Mr. Speaker, we want to prevent this country becoming involved in the present European war. One of the things we have got to be careful about is that we do not deceive either ourselves or Hitler with reference to our not fighting under any circumstances.

I was here during the World War. I have not the slightest doubt that one of the things most responsible for getting us into the World War was the fact that we did not believe we would fight under any circumstances. We deceived ourselves. We convinced Germany of that belief; we deceived Germany; and the result was the provocative acts which led us into the war. I mean to say that that attitude contributed to it. This is our situation now: The sympathy in this country is probably 80 percent against Hitler. That is a factor we have to consider as we sit here. Public opinion, public pulse is the supreme law in America. Of course, sympathy is a sentiment, but it is not very much that separates that sentiment from action when properly stimulated. Let us not be confused about that or overlook that fact in trying to keep this country out of war. The Members who sit on the floor of this House now have a very great responsibility.

I am not trying, as I said, to make a speech, I do not feel physically able to do it just yet, but I want to make one or two further observations for your consideration.

Should it be established as a part of the common law of the world that belligerents may not buy from a neutral implements and munitions of war during war? That is involved in the matter we are now considering. This country is in favor of peace. We know as a general proposition that that nation, which has as its purpose to enter upon an enterprise of conquest to disturb the world's peace, prepares itself for that enterprise before it enters upon the venture. That is just common sense. That goes all the way from the individual highjacker to the nation that wants to highjack another nation.

If it be the policy of this country to deny to a nation that is under the threat of conquest the right to go into the open market and buy there that which is necessary to defend itself, then this country is alining itself not in favor of world peace but on the side of those who are bent on war or conquest, speaking generally.

Let us reduce this to small proportions. Suppose an individual was beset by another individual who was going to rob his home. The man who went in the night to rob got his gun and got himself fixed before he went to rob this man. The same thing is true of nations. So this man who is in peril goes to the hardware merchant in his village and says, "I want to buy a gun. I am being attacked." "Whom are you being attacked by?" He informs the merchant, and the merchant says, "No; I am doing business in this community and I have to remain neutral." I do not believe there is very much difference between that and the position of the nations of the world if we adopt as a part of the common law of the world that you may not sell munitions of war during war.

The next proposition is a concrete proposition: Do we have the right to modify our policy during a war? I have listened to the quotation of authorities, but when the common law of the world—and of course, it is now being made—levels down, when it is established, it will be established, I have no doubt, that a nation may modify its policy as it pleases as long as such modified policy falls within the limitation imposed by international law. I have listened to gentlemen who said that you could modify it provided it was modified for the benefit of the nation that was doing the modifying. That is a distinction too refined ever to be adjudicated at the bar of public opinion among the nations of the world. I venture that prediction. Any nation has a right—and I do not care what these writers now on international law say, because it is common sense—to do whatever it wants to do, whenever it wants to do it, with reference to changing its policy provided the modified policy falls within that which is permitted by international law. In this case it is the sale of munitions to belligerents, which is now permitted by international law.

I have heard a number of statements made here by gentlemen to the effect that they were in favor originally of repealing our legislation with regard to neutrality and depending on and being guided and limited by international law. I wonder what would be the effect if we now should refuse to lift this embargo since the matter is presented. Would not Hitler conclude that the American people had determined from fear, or whatever reason, that regardless of what is happening in the world or may happen, they are going to fashion their policy as he and his friends demand?

It is interesting to note some of the statements made here that if we do this thing or do not do it the war will end quickly or will not end quickly if we lift the embargo. Are the statements correct that if we do not enact this legislation such failure will tend to terminate this war? How? It is being claimed that the change proposed would be operative against Hitler. Then does it mean that if we refuse to pass this law Germany would win quickly? What else could they mean? Is that what they want? What would happen in the world, then, as the result of our contribution?

Let us just face this. Suppose it should be known, suppose it should be fully believed in America, with 80 percent—and I believe that is a safe estimate, I really believe that 80 percent of the American people are against Hitler in their sympathies—suppose it should become a firm conviction of those 80 percent that Germany was about to subjugate England and France. Now, whether right or wrong, the American people visualize Hitler as a soulless, Godless, heartless being. Whether right or wrong—I say, whether right or wrong—they visualize him as the plunderer of little nations that cannot fight back, they see him at the rape of Poland and inviting Russia to participate in the rape, they see him strutting his stuff through the streets of Warsaw. We want peace. I ask you as statesmen, earnest to preserve the peace of this country, What would be the effect, in your judgment and in your honest opinion, if it should become evident that Germany was about to subjugate England and France?

I do not know myself, but I do know that with the propaganda that is being conducted—and I admit it is being conducted—it would be mighty difficult to keep this country out of war if it should be believed and if America should be thoroughly convinced that Germany was actually about to subjugate England and France in part, at least, because though permitted by international law we had denied to belligerents the right to purchase munitions to stop Hitler in his sweep of conquest over the nations of Europe. Does anybody doubt the danger of our swinging from the extreme position which we now occupy to the other extreme. If you

can hold the expression of the sympathy of the American people within the limitation imposed by international law, I mean the general limitations, you will have done a good job and all that Hitler can reasonably expect of this people. I saw many of the people who had been singing, I Did Not Raise My Boy To Be a Soldier, swing to the other extreme and bring pressure upon their Members of Congress to vote for the war resolution. We want peace.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to submit these observations for your consideration. I know there is a good deal of feeling about this matter. That is unfortunate. We confront a mighty solemn and serious responsibility. It is unfortunate that this division is so largely along party lines. Democrats and Republicans, we do not make a very good showing to the country by that character of division. As I stated I have not followed carefully the debates in the Senate or here. I apologize for speaking at all but I thought the observations which I have made might, with some profit at least, be considered by this body. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if it is agreeable, I would prefer to use some of my time before I offer my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a short editorial on the Dies committee.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a speech on neutrality by the Right Reverend Francis J. Beckman, delivered last Sunday.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a letter to the Honorable James E. Watson, former Senator from the State of Indiana, appearing in the Evening Star of Monday of this week.

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

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to not agree with my esteemed and learned friend from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, in his interpretation of international law. I do not believe the contention has ever been made that any neutral has no authority under international law to change its own policy at any time it desires. The point, I believe, behind the argument that we should not repeal the arms embargo is, Can we repeal the embargo after hostilities have commenced and still retain our position as a neutral under international law?

Now, in order that I shall not be put in an incongruous position in the debate, the same rule does not apply with respect to legislation concerning the credits and resources of a nation. It is a settled principle of international law that a neutral state shall abstain from supplying belligerents any assistance for the prosecution of the war; and inasmuch as I expect to discuss later on proposed loans by the Export-Import Bank to belligerents, I want to add also that it is quite generally agreed among the experts on international law that if the Export-Import Bank should make a loan to a belligerent government while the United States is neutral such action would constitute a violation of the neutral duties of the United States.

Now, with respect to our loans and credits, it is quite generally agreed among the experts on international law that the neutral state, which in this instance is the United States, may, for the purpose of conserving its own supplies or safeguarding its neutrality, place prohibitions upon the granting of loans or credits by persons subject to its jurisdiction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be a movement in this House to prevent the action which I propose to offer to conserve the cash, credit, wealth, and resources of the American public. That is why I have asked to proceed for a few minutes of my time before offering the amendment, so that the issue may be crystallized before the amendment is offered.

There are two questions confronting the American people today which I think are important.

The first is, Do we want to stay out of the war in Europe? I think that question answers itself. No one, of course, wants to get into any European war.

The second is just as important, and probably more important in its implications than the first question or any other question which has been presented on the floor of this House or the floor of the other body during these debates, and it is this: Do we want the taxpayers' money and credit used to finance foreign wars?

I believe this issue has been somewhat overlooked, and I believe it is the controlling one—whether we furnish the means or the credit, as we did during the last World War, for European countries to carry on the present war. The last World War, in which the United States participated, has already cost the taxpayers of the United States approximately $55,000,000,000. You say that we have protected the people of the United States in that we have passed an act called the Johnson Act, which prohibits loans to countries which owe the United States, and inasmuch as the belligerents to whom we wish to loan are now indebted to the United States, then it follows that the Johnson Act applies, and that there could be no credits and loans to England and France and to other countries that owe us money.

That is true possibly with respect to private loans and credits, but unfortunately it does not apply to loans which might be made by Government agencies. So that there might not be any question about that, I ask that you refer to the Johnson Act, which is Public, No. 151, Seventy-third Congress, and you will find, after providing that it shall be unlawful within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for any person to purchase or sell the bonds, securities, or other obligations of any foreign country, and so forth, that section 2 of that act has this to say:

> As used in this act the term "person" includes individual, partnership, corporation, or association other than a public corporation created by or pursuant to special authorization of Congress, or a corporation in which the Government of the United States has or exercises a controlling interest through stock ownership or otherwise.

So it is obvious that the Johnson Act does not apply to the use of the exchange-stabilization fund and it does not apply to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; it does not apply to the Commodity Credit Corporation; and it does not apply to the two Export-Import Banks of Washington, and does not apply to the Federal Reserve banks.

That is the point I particularly want to stress. It does not apply to the Federal Reserve banks and to many members of the Federal Reserve System and nonmember banks in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation owns the controlling shares of stock.

What shall we do about it? Section 7 of the Senate amendment provides that individuals shall not make loans. It says

"person"; and if I might take the time to read it, in part it provides:

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, or person.

I understand there was some debate in the other body as to whether that word "person" includes the Federal Reserve banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the two Export-Import Banks of Washington. I understand that the Senator proposing an amendment similar to the one I propose today was assured that the word "person" did include these agencies. If that term "person" does include these agencies, well and good; but if there is any doubt whatsoever about it, it is the easiest thing for us, while we have the inclination and the time in the consideration of the bill, to so perfect the bill in that particular that there will be no question about the clear intent of Congress in that respect. To this end I shall offer an amendment to instruct the conferees, taking section 7 of the Senate bill as the base, as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for the Federal Reserve banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, or any other agency of the Federal Government, or for any person, association, partnership, or corporation within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person, partnership, association, or corporation acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, person, partnership, association, or corporation. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i).

(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

(c) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state, the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

(d) This section shall not apply to loans, discounts, advances of credit, and other evidences of indebtedness incident to shipments between the United States and states bordering on the United States as described and provided in subsection (f) of section 2 of this act.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman's amendment include the United States Treasury stabilization fund?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is my opinion that the words I have used here "or any other agency of the Federal Government" include the use to which the stabilization fund may be put.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that under existing law the stabilization fund can only be used for stabilizing the American dollar anyway; it cannot under any circumstances be used to finance foreign loans?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Under the existing stabilization law there is specific authority for the Treasury of the United States to deal in the securities or other instruments of credit of any foreign country.

I do not want to take up the time to look up the language now, but I incorporated it in my remarks which I made in the House on October 19, page 623, in which there is specific authority granted to deal in the securities of a foreign nation.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Briefly.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. For the express purpose of stabilizing the American dollar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, what would it be for? For what purpose would you invest in foreign securities but to stabilize the American dollar, because with the pound sterling dropping all around you, the franc dropping all around you, it would be the natural excuse that the stabilization fund would be used for that purpose, but the reason why I suggest in the amendment which I put into my remarks last week, that the Secretary of the Treasury should be prohibited from using this fund for that purpose is because the pound sterling has been pegged by fiat of the British Government, and there is no reason why we should invest in the securities of Great Britain or France for the purpose of stabilizing our dollar. It is done by the fiat of the British and French Governments. So there is no need using the stabilization fund for that purpose.

Now, I think this question of credits is of much more importance even than the question of embargoes. It seems to me that the question of the arms embargo is decidedly secondary to that of credits. England and France will not have very much cash to pay for arms and ammunition, so the cash-and-carry plan will actually operate as an embargo unless they are able to establish credits here. Now, there is no gold in the Treasury earmarked for the use of Great Britain or France. So they have no gold at their disposal, if it is where it should be according to law, with which to pay cash. Now, when their meager cash resources are dissipated where can they go to buy our munitions and our arms? They must get credit. Where? Not from private sources, not from private individuals, because we have stopped that in section 7 of the Senate amendment. They cannot get credit from private persons.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They must go to the only other source available, the agencies of the Government, which are not prohibited by any law which is now on the statute books from making loans.

In offering this amendment it is my purpose to protect the taxpayers of the United States just as we have protected private investors by section 7 of the Senate bill.

Now, there are available for loans to belligerents over $12,000,000,000. There are over $8,000,000,000 available in the Federal Reserve banks. There are $2,000,000,000 in the stabilization fund. There are $1,250,000,000 available in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There are $100,000,000 available in the Export-Import Bank and an indeterminate amount available for loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Mr. Jesse Jones has said that there is no restriction against making foreign loans by those agencies. I think there should be, so that the American people will not be called upon, against their will, to finance a European war against their wishes. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: At the end of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] add the following:

"That the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H. J. Res. 306 be further instructed to insist upon the following as to section 7:

"'SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for the Federal Reserve banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, or any other agency of the Federal Government, or for any person, association, partnership, or corporation within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person, partnership, association, or corporation acting for or on behalf of the government of any such

state, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, person, partnership, association, or corporation. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i).

"'(b) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"'(c) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked with respect to any state, the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to such state, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

"'(d) This section shall not apply to loans, discounts, advances of credit, and other evidences of indebtedness incident to shipments between the United States and states bordering on the United States as described and provided in subsection (f) of section 2 of this act.'"

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is intended to clarify the language of the Senate bill in that the language shall mean just what the Senate intended it to mean; that the agencies of the Government, as well as private persons, shall be prohibited from making loans to belligerents.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, it is true that the matter of credits is a most important part of this legislation. That being the case, it is important that the House understand just what is involved in the amendment just proposed.

I desire first to call attention to an erroneous statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who just preceded me. He stated that Great Britain and France have no gold in the United States. I am sure the gentleman made that statement inadvertently. I am undertaking now to get authentic figures to show the exact situation and will submit them before I conclude. But France and Great Britain have at this time large quantities of gold earmarked and available for their use in the United States. I will have the figures from the Federal Reserve Board in a minute or two, and I will supply them for the benefit of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand, the gentleman from Michigan said that those two countries had no earmarked gold in the figure quoted by the Treasury of the United States, namely, $17,000,000,000 plus.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know the exact amount. I am undertaking to get accurate information about it in order that the House may know the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is necessarily useless in certain particulars. The Federal Reserve banks have only limited authority in making loans, or in the matter of rediscounts, or making advances, or in the purchase of securities in the open market. There is no authority in the Federal Reserve banks for the purchase of obligations of foreign governments or for conducting any of the transactions indicated in this amendment.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am informed the gentleman took issue with my statement.

Mr. STEAGALL. I suggest to the gentleman that my time is limited.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I was informed that there was no money, no fund which was earmarked for any one of the foreign countries; and this information came to me this morning from Mr. Bell, of the Treasury Department.

Mr. STEAGALL. We will have all that information definitely in a few minutes.

I have stated the law with respect to the Federal Reserve banks. The same is true of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Corporation has no authority to make loans to foreign governments and they do not undertake to make such loans. The only agencies of the Government that are authorized to make loans of this type are the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Export-Import Bank. The Export-Import Bank cannot have outstanding at any time more than $100,000,000 of obligations of any kind, and they have not a dollar available now for loans to anybody. Their funds are exhausted.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEAGALL. Because of my limited time I cannot yield.

But, if they had funds available for such loans, it would be ridiculous to treat a $100,000,000 fund as of serious importance in financing of a great world war.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized under recent legislation to sell surplus farm products to other governments wherever they can, and this is the only power they have under that legislation. We provided for the barter of 600,000 bales of cotton to Great Britain in exchange for rubber. We have provided for the sale of an additional amount of cotton not in excess of 500,000 bales and for the sale of other surplus farm products. The only possible field of operation, practically speaking, that the amendment offered by the gentleman could have, would be to prohibit the sale of surplus farm products—surely the House does not wish to do that. I hope not.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is it not a fact that the Federal Reserve banks can rediscount trade acceptances from foreign sources?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; but of the character covered by the amendment. Federal Reserve banks cannot, under the provisions of this bill, receive for rediscount, nor in the form of acceptances, nor for the purpose of making advances, nor by purchase in the open market one dollar of the securities of any foreign government in the world. Under this bill, any member bank that took such securities would take them in violation of the law, and that would automatically exclude them from such transactions with Federal Reserve banks, even if it could be done under existing law.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is talking about the Government, but I am talking about importers and foreign accounts.

Mr. STEAGALL. I am talking about the purchase or acceptance of securities, about any and all forms of transactions that the Federal Reserve bank is permitted to conduct under the law.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. For a brief question.

Mr. COCHRAN. I call the gentleman's attention to page 1017 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 27, to a colloquy between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. The question involved here is answered fully. Senator GEORGE also spoke.

Mr. STEAGALL. I must ask the gentlemen not to read that in my time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I suggest that the gentleman ask permission to include this colloquy in his remarks, for it shows beyond question that in the Senate bill the word "person" means corporation. Senator PITTMAN said it meant the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and any other corporation.

Mr. STEAGALL. It is true that the bill before us defines "person" to mean partnership or corporation. This language was used in the Johnson Act, but the Johnson Act went further and stated that its provisions did not apply to Government corporations and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I have not taken the time of the House in the discussion of this bill. I have my own views, as has every Member, and I am sure that my deep anxiety to save our country from involvement in the war in Europe is the same as that of every other Member of this House. In my

view of this matter we have gone as far as we ought to go in denying to the people of this Nation the full exercise of their rights under the law of nations. I am not sure of the wisdom of the provisions of the Senate bill. I certainly do not want to go any further. Mr. Speaker, trade and commerce are the handmaidens of civilization; they are the world's chief instrumentalities for the promotion of peace and good will among nations. If we are to adopt the policy of withdrawing our trade from nations who are involved in war it would be a good thing if every nation in the world adopted the same policy.

Citizens enjoy constitutional protection of the right to bear arms. It is a moral right and it rests also upon considerations of public policy. Unless citizens have the right to bear arms they cannot defend their liberties. And the right to bear arms is of no value without the right to purchase arms. The same is true of nations. The right is indispensable to the freedom of small nations. Any denial of this right must operate in favor of outlaw nations whose chief weapon is force and whose resort for settlement of controversies is war.

If every nation in the world should adopt the policy of complete embargo upon the outbreak of hostilities any nation regarding itself in danger of invasion or attack would have to put its military establishment on a war basis. Every decent nation in the world would have to adopt the standards of any bandit nation that threatened the forces of civilization. Such a rule would convert the world into an armed camp. Nothing could be more dangerous to the peace of the world and the advancement of international morality and decency.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri. A question was raised as to whether or not there was any gold earmarked for France and England in this country. I just now had a talk with a member of the Federal Reserve Board and he informs me there are $1,070,000,000 earmarked to the various countries, the substantial part of which belongs to England and France. In addition to that, they have $7,000,000,000 in securities which are available for their use.

Mr. STEAGALL. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. I knew in a general way what the facts would show but I did not have the figures. The Federal Reserve Board does not think it desirable to disclose the exact amount to the credit of any individual government, but we know that much the larger portion of this gold is available to Great Britain and France in addition to the enormous holdings of securities in the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] as he may desire.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, being strongly opposed to the extension of credits to belligerent nations in fact to all nations that have defaulted in their obligations to us for money previously advanced I would certainly support the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] if I had not satisfied myself that this bill already carries language that will do just what the gentleman from Michigan seeks to accomplish by his amendment. The very question arose while the bill was under consideration in the Senate. In the RECORD of October 27, 1939, page 1017, will be found the following discussion. I read from that RECORD:

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, while this matter is being discussed I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations one question regarding this section. On page 21 it is provided that whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation it shall be unlawful for any person within the United States to advance credits to foreign governments. I wish to know whether or not the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations considers that the word "person," which is also defined on page 30 as including corporations, and so forth, is broad enough to include the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. PITTMAN. The word "person" expressly includes corporations, and I therefore take it that it does include them.

Mr. TAFT. In the Senator's opinion, it includes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is my opinion, and that was the opinion of those who drafted the joint resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement. Particularly I wanted to say that my construction of the word "person" is identically the same as that given by the chairman of the committee. I think that is pertinent, because in effect it covers precisely one of the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, which was voted down in this body yesterday. I think the word "person" here does include a subsidiary of the Government, a corporate subsidiary such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other corporation which is owned wholly or practically wholly by the Government itself.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. GEORGE. I was merely adding my interpretation of the language, and I particularly wished that it go into the RECORD, because I think it is important.

That convinces me beyond question that loans cannot be made by Government corporations.

Mr. Speaker, to keep this country at peace with the world is certainly the objective not only of every Member of Congress but of the President and the citizens of our country.

Considering the events that ultimately resulted in our entry into the World War, I have concluded, after a most careful study, the enactment of the resolution passed by the Senate will eliminate so far as it is humanly possible to do so, the danger of the United States becoming involved in this terrible conflict.

It has been stated that to amend in any way the present Neutrality Act there is danger of us being involved. On the other hand, it has been charged that if we do not change our present law, there is danger of this country becoming involved.

I do not question the sincerity of either group, but I do say interference with our right to engage in trade and carry in our ships that which we sold, together with the ruthless submarine campaign of Germany, so aroused our people that war was declared in 1917, and we soon found American soldiers on foreign soil. I seek to prevent this from happening again.

What benefits we received as a result of the last war were not worth the sacrifice of one American soldier, because our only reward for our participation in that war was abuse and debts which will not be collected, at least, for generations to come, if ever.

No matter what the final decision of Congress on this question, in my humble opinion that decision will not result in this country becoming involved. On the question of peace with the world, our citizens are absolutely united, but there is a difference of opinion how to best accomplish this objective.

Those of us who, by reason of our official position, are charged with the responsibility of providing a way to keep our country out of war, feel that responsibility keenly.

In seeking the solution, no one who thinks of his or her political welfare is fit to be a Member of the American Congress.

I hope in the end that by my vote I will be able to make some contribution that will prevent one American citizen from losing his or her life.

I have been a loyal supporter of the President, but in this instance my own conscience will be my guide. I follow him today, but if I felt, for one moment, that the President's views upon this important question were not sound, under no consideration could anyone get me to support his recommendations.

The mothers and fathers and the youth of our country naturally are greatly disturbed over the situation abroad, fearing that we might be dragged into the conflict, and our soldiers will be sent to foreign soil. If it will be helpful in any way in relieving their anxiety, no matter what has been said to the contrary, I say now, there is not one person I know of in public life who wants to send an American soldier to foreign countries to fight the battles of others. There is no Member of Congress who wants war, and let it be remembered it is the Congress only that can declare war, because the Constitution so provides.

I reached my conclusion upon this important question feeling the present Neutrality Act undoubtedly will cause this country grief if it is not amended. I say this even though I voted for that legislation.

I am asked by many of my constituents why the embargo should now be repealed. My answer is that it is not an embargo other than in name. While it is unlawful to export or attempt to export arms, ammunition, implements of war, and so forth, from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in the proclamation of the President, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state, what disturbs me most is that while we cannot ship arms and ammunition, and so forth, to a belligerent state, we can sell the parts or the material that would enable a belligerent state to manufacture that which we are prevented from selling. The embargo says, and the amendment says, you cannot buy or ship the finished product, but you can buy everything you need to manufacture or assemble arms, ammunition, and other articles covered by the embargo.

It has been said that so-called isolationists desire the embargo to remain. If those who are supporting the retention of the embargo are really isolationists, the legislation they should be advocating would be an embargo that would prevent us from selling anything manufactured or produced in the United States to the countries at war. No one in Congress has made any such suggestion, and no one will. Those in favor of retaining the embargo favor the sending of material of every kind, of food, clothing, of oil, and everything else except that which is specifically mentioned in the embargo to belligerent nations. If a suggestion was made for an embargo on everything we manufacture and produce, the cry would be heard from the four corners of the country that Congress would destroy our industries as well as agriculture.

It is just as necessary to feed and clothe an army as it is to furnish the soldiers with arms and ammunition. Has anyone suggested that we not sell food and clothing to the countries at war?

In the final analysis, statistics show that during the World War only 13 percent of purchases by foreign countries consisted of arms and ammunition and implements of war. In other words, if the embargo in existing law remains and the same amount of purchases be made during this war, there would be no embargo on 87 percent of that which the nations at war might want to purchase from us.

I cannot bring myself to the conclusion where I must admit the sale of anything to anybody will require us to enter this war so long as we make them pay cash for it and, above all, require them to take possession in this country and transport what they buy in their own ships.

Just so long as we enact legislation, which is in the pending resolution as passed by the Senate, that will prevent ships flying the American flag from going into combat zones and our citizens taking passage on belligerent or neutral ships traveling in combat zones, we are not going to get into this war.

In support of this statement, let us look at a situation that exists now. Who can say if the provisions which prevent our ships from entering combat zones had been in existing law, that the *City of Flint* would have been carrying contraband or would have been in waters where it could have been captured by the German Government?

I have continually insisted, and I insist again, keeping our ships out of the combat zone and our citizens being required to travel on their own responsibility if they do travel in combat zones on neutral or belligerent ships, is far more important than any other feature of the pending resolution. Cash and carry—and I mean cash and carry, not credit and carry—is another feature of the bill which I insist upon. Never again do I want to see this country send our gold to foreign nations, no matter what nation it is, other than for the care of helpless and disabled noncombatants which, if necessary, can be done through the Red Cross. Of course, this Nation would not stand in the way of extending some little help to starving children and mothers, no matter whether they be German, English, or French, or the nationals of any other country.

The charge is made, to change the embargo provision now will assist Great Britain and France. Probably so, but who benefits by that paragraph in the law now? On the other hand, Great Britain and France will certainly resent the cash-and-carry provisions. So far as I am concerned, I care not what any nation of the world thinks of our Neutrality Act. I am not thinking of any nation in the world except our own, and it is for the welfare of our own country and our own citizens that I take the position I do.

History tells us one country is no better than the other. History shows that when they had the power, the strong would take what they wanted from the weak, so why should we care in this instance for any foreign country?

Yes, it is true Germany might not like any changes in the Neutrality Act at this time, and it is likewise true that Great Britain and France will not like the cash and carry and other provisions of the law.

The proposed changes in the Neutrality Act will not, however, prevent Russia and Japan from buying and transporting in their own ships anything they have the money to purchase in this country. True, they are not expected under the embargo provision to sell what is named in the embargo to a belligerent, but they certainly can sell that which they produce and that which they have on hand in their own countries to any belligerent, and then restock their supplies with what they purchase in this country. Further, there is nothing in the law, nor will there be anything in the law, that would prevent Russia and Japan, who are not belligerents affected by the President's proclamation, from arranging, if they can, credit to make purchases in this country, including arms, ammunition, airplanes, tanks, and so forth. Will Russia and Japan help Great Britain and France?

Mr. Speaker, the all-important question is not the embargo, not the cash-and-carry plan, or any other plan, but the enactment of a neutrality law that will keep us at peace with the world.

Because the language voices my sentiments, I include as part of my remarks an editorial from The Wanderer, a national weekly published in St. Paul, Minn. It follows:

The aim of neutrality legislation should be to keep this Nation out of the European conflict. All the measures of such legislation should keep this aim in mind. Anything that might tend to bring us into the war should be carefully stricken from any proposals now before Congress.

Whether war materials or even other materials are bought by belligerents is in itself not so important, so far as the question of keeping the American people out of the war is concerned. True, if the embargo is lifted and such materials may be bought by belligerents, France and England will be aided; because of the blockade Germany would not be able to buy American commodities, no matter of what nature. If the embargo is not lifted, Germany will be indirectly aided because both France and England will find closed markets on American shores. Strict neutrality legislation is, therefore, impossible. This should be recognized.

For this reason the question of keeping the peace aim of neutrality legislation to the fore is of such great importance.

American vessels should not be allowed to carry supplies of any nature to belligerents. If allowed to do so, they will be attacked on the high seas. Such attacks will arouse war sentiment against the belligerent making the attack. All loans, whether long or short term, should be forbidden; if supplies may be purchased on credit, American creditors will want Uncle Sam to guarantee with his guns and the lives of his youth the loans made. Shipments to European ports, even to the ports of neutral European nations, should be carefully controlled and supervised, lest cause for war may be found by any indiscreet acts of ours that are helpful to one of the belligerents rather than to the other.

No matter what neutrality legislation is enacted, one side of the belligerents will be favored more than the other. Because this is so, it becomes a matter of vital importance to preserve as much as possible an attitude of calm and peace among the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what action is finally taken by the Congress, I pray to the Good Lord it will be for the best interests of our country and our citizens, and that American lives and property will be protected thereby.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a speech by Monsignor Ryan, given over the radio on October 24 on the subject Shall the Embargo Be Lifted?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. McGRANERY. For a question.

Mr. FISH. I will yield the gentleman an additional half-minute.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I presume that because of the interpretation placed upon the word "person" by the Senate, the gentleman from Missouri can have no objection to clarifying the language as it is clarified in my amendment. If it does include the Export-Import Bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and these other corporations, what harm is there in saying so? That is all I have done in my amendment.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional half minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY].

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, during the last World War, I served in the Air Force of the United States Army; and even in my small role I had a glimpse of the horror of war which will forever remain indelibly impressed in my memory. This recollection is constantly before me and in itself would impel me to do whatever would keep America out of war, whatever would safeguard peace for our country with dignity.

An examination of the RECORD of the months preceding America's entry into the last war disclosed that the United States was drawn into war as a result of Germany's attacks against American vessels and American seamen. It is apparent that the only way our country could again be made to participate in a world conflict would be by the repetition of similar attacks upon American ships bearing American citizens or by the unwarranted searches and illegal delays of our vessels such as they are being subjected to by England at this hour. Therefore, it is imperative that the Congress enact this legislation which would prevent American vessels from entering belligerent waters. Postponement of the passage of this act might mean perhaps another flint on which the spark of war could be enkindled, with consequences too terrible to be forecast at this time.

I shall vote for the present act because I am convinced that its strict prohibition against any American vessel entering belligerent waters and its provision for cash and carry will provide adequate safeguard—indeed, a guarantee against the United States becoming embroiled in World War II.

It is the urgent duty of every Member of this Congress to keep our ships from entering zones of danger. Otherwise, we may be confronted with a situation similar to that of March 1917 when, in the words of Newton D. Baker:

> There was only one thing to do; or two, perhaps—we could yield, or we could fight.

Mr. Baker, with clarity and intensity, set forth the difficult choice that remained to America, once her ships bearing her citizens had been ruthlessly attacked upon the seas.

The United States refused to yield, and so the youths of our great country were sent across the seas to fight. The Gold Star Mothers can tell better than we the epic of the gallant and tragic end that came to many of them upon foreign soil. The naval and Veterans' Bureau hospitals shelter many of those young men who went forth in the full prowess of physical health and who returned to die slowly here at home. Many were saved from either of these two destinies, and of that number some are here on this floor today. I know the decision they will make when they are confronted with the choice of keeping our ships at home or sending millions of our youths to defend the rights of merchant ships who venture into belligerent zones.

I, for one, reiterate my previous statement that I will vote for the act which prohibits American vessels from entering areas of danger, which prohibits American vessels from bringing danger to America.

And I have the heartfelt conviction that this act providing for cash and carry will enable our Nation to be, at least, as neutral as she is today.

Of course, it is true that one who speaks of "neutrality" expresses his own definition thereof.

The present law is commonly referred to as the neutrality law; yet that law unquestionably favors one of the belligerents in the present war.

As it has been said:

> Mr. Speaker, in an aggressive war there can no longer be neutrality. We must stand with the nation that keeps its word, and we must not side, even indirectly, with a nation that, through temper, through ambition, through wrong belief, or for any one of a hundred reasons, violates its pledge and proceeds once again to bring down upon us such an avalanche as 1914 let loose.

In looking at Europe today, do we find any of those nations of such sterling character, with such clean hands as America would be proud to grasp in friendship? History answers this with an emphatic "No," and every signpost indicating the upbuilding of America tells us to keep out of Europe.

It is said that repeal of the embargo and enactment of legislation providing for cash and carry will result in our giving aid and comfort to Great Britain and her Allies.

Mr. Speaker, as an American, as a militant advocate of democracy and a Member of this Congress, I wish to state that I have no desire to plead the cause of the British Empire, which has inflicted a cruel, barbarous, and savage reign of terror upon its unwilling subjects throughout the world, whether they were Irish or Arabian, Jewish or Indian, Egyptian or African. The record of the growth of the British Empire is an unhappy, a shameless tale of aggression; that record of aggression I briefly cite:

	Date acquired	How acquired
BRITISH EMPIRE		
1. DOMINIONS		
England	55 B. C. to A. D. 410	Conquest.
Ireland	1172	Conquest.
Wales	1283	Conquest.
Scotland	1603–1707	Union.
Canada	1627–1763	Conquest.
Australia	1788–1828	Conquest.
Newfoundland	1583	Conquest.
New Zealand	1840	Conquest.
Union of South Africa	1814–1900	Conquest.
2. POSSESSIONS IN EUROPE		
Gibraltar	1713	Conquest.
Malta and Gozo	1814	Conquest.
Ascension Island	1815	Conquest.
3. POSSESSIONS IN AFRICA		
Kenya	1820	Conquest.
Tanganyika	1918	Conquest.
Uganda	1890–96	Conquest.
Zanzibar and Pemba	1890	Conquest.
Mauritius	1810–14	Conquest.
Nyasaland	1891	Conquest.
St. Helena	1673	Conquest.
Seychelles	1814	Conquest.
Somaliland	1884	Conquest.
Basutoland	1884	Conquest.
Bechuanaland	1885–95	Conquest.
Northern Rhodesia	1889	Conquest.
Southern Rhodesia	1889	Conquest.
Swaziland	1894	Conquest.
Southwest Africa	1920	Conquest.
Cambria	1807	Conquest.
Ashanti	1672	Conquest.
Nigeria	1861–1900	Conquest.
Cameroon	1916	Conquest.
Sierra Leone	1787	Conquest.
Togoland	1914	Conquest.
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	1899	Conquest.
4. POSSESSIONS IN ASIA		
Bahrein Islands	1867	Conquest.
India	1600–1858	Conquest.
Aden, Perim, Scotra, Kuria Muria Islands	1829–76	Conquest.
Ceylon	1796–1815	Conquest.
Cyprus	1914	Conquest.
Hong Kong	1842	Conquest.
Federated Malay States	1874–98	Conquest.
Other Malay States	1885–1914	Conquest.
Mesopotamia	1914–18	Conquest.
North Borneo	1881–88	Conquest.
Brunei and Sarawak	1888	Conquest.
Palestine	1914–18	Conquest.
Straits Settlements	1785–1909	Conquest.
Weihaiwei	1898	Conquest.

	Date acquired	How acquired
BRITISH EMPIRE—Continued		
5. POSSESSIONS IN AUSTRALASIA AND OCEANIA		
Papua	1884	Conquest.
New Guinea	1920	Conquest.
Western Samoa	1919	Conquest.
Fiji Islands	1874	Conquest.
Nauru	1914	Conquest.
Pacific Islands	1893-1915	Conquest.
Tonga	1900	Conquest.
Gilbert and Ellice Islands	1892-1915	Conquest.
Solomon Islands	1893	Conquest.
6. POSSESSIONS IN THE AMERICAS		
Bermuda	1612	Conquest.
British Guiana	1803-14	Conquest.
British Honduras	1798	Conquest.
Falkland Islands	1771	Conquest.
West Indies:		
Bahamas	1629	Conquest.
Barbados	1605	Conquest.
Jamaica	1655-70	Conquest.
Turk and Caicos	1765	Conquest.
Leeward Islands	1623-59	Conquest.
Trinidad	1797	Conquest.
Windward Island	1763-83	Conquest.

Every student of history knows there is a difference of opinion among historians as to exact dates in some instances. I shall be glad, upon request, to provide my authority for the dates which I have submitted. No historian can deny, however, the method of acquisition, as it has been set forth above. It is true that certain authorities use the word "capitulation" or the words "military occupation," or the word "grant," instead of the word "conquest." Nevertheless, all will agree that the method of acquisition was via the route of aggression.

England has maintained a symbol of democracy on the isles of Britain and Scotland—Scotland as set forth previously was acquired by union and not by conquest—but the guaranties of the British Constitution have been confined strictly to those subjects of the British Crown who dwelt on the two favored isles.

It should be recalled that in 1844, on the occasion of Lord John Russell's motion in the House of Commons to inquire into the condition in Ireland, Lord Macaulay said:

> You admit that you govern Ireland not as you govern England, not as you govern Scotland, but as you govern your new conquest in Scinde; not by means of the respect which the people feel for the law, but by means of bayonets and artillery and intrenched camps.

No wonder that as an American my sympathies have never been, and are not now with that British Government which, in the words of the martyred Robert Emmet, is a Government steeled to barbarity by the cries of the orphans and the tears of the widows it has made. Ever since the British invader entered the glorious island of Erin in 1172 and took from the Irish people the lands of their ancestors, the story of English dominion has been written in fire and blood.

The Irish Nation was wrongfully and viciously deprived of its inheritance in that early time. Not content with this outrage, British soldiers drove the people from their homes, and confiscated every farm and every cottage, until in 1611 the Irish were driven from their hearths to find refuge by the roadside or in the hidden mountain caves. But the British soldiers lacked the industry and the skill to till the soil they had stolen, and so gradually the natives of Ireland were permitted to return to those farms to work them almost as serfs. When they had reclaimed many of these farms from the bogs, when the dairies in the Irish hills were once more bright with pans of cream, English absentee landlords demanded enormous rents, with the only alternative, eviction. From 1760 to 1800, the people of Ireland were again maintaining themselves—from their farms, their dairies, their industries. They were self-supporting during those 40 years when the population was twice as great as it is today. Then in 1800 the mailed fist of the British conqueror showed itself again in the act of union, of which Daniel O'Connell said:

> I admit there is the force of a law, because it has been supported by the policeman's truncheon, by the soldier's bayonet, and by the horseman's sword, because it is supported by the courts of law and those who have power to adjudicate in them; but I say, solemnly, it is not supported by constitutional right.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> No, my friends; the union was begot in iniquity; it was perpetrated in fraud and cruelty. It was no compact, no bargain, but it was an act of the most decided tyranny and corruption that was ever yet perpetrated. Trial by jury was suspended, the right of personal protection was at an end, courts martial sat throughout the land, and the county of Kildare, among others, flowed with blood.

The Green Isle did indeed flow with blood, with the blood of gallant, nay, heroic, Irishmen like Robert Emmet, who died in 1803, whose last plea was for the "emancipation of my country from the superhuman oppression under which she has so long and too patiently travailed." His last protest was against "the yoke of a foreign and unrelenting tyranny."

His protest found his persecutors deaf, and still determined to torture these innocent victims of aggression. One of the most disgraceful periods in the Irish persecution followed shortly. In 1847 came the famine, when 2,000,000 died, when the inhumanity of Britain to Irishmen set a new standard of savagery. Gilbert K. Chesterton, an Englishman born and bred, has described it thus:

> The conduct of the English toward the Irish after the rebellion was quite simply the conduct of one man who tramps and binds another and then calmly cuts him about with a knife. The conduct during the famine was quite simply the conduct of the first man if he entertained the later moments of the second man by remarking in a chatty manner on the very hopeful chances of his bleeding to death. The British Prime Minister publicly refused to stop the famine by the use of English ships. The British Prime Minister positively spread the famine by making the half-starved population of Ireland pay for the starved ones. The common verdict of a coroner's jury upon some emaciated wretch was "willful murder by Lord John Russell."

And that verdict was not only the verdict of Irish public opinion but is the verdict of history—The Crimes of England.

It is not surprising that the men of Ireland became convinced that they could guarantee economic security and cultural opportunity to their children only by freeing themselves from the chains of oppression. Eighteen hundred and sixty-seven saw the Fenians organizing for a free Ireland—and the English soldiery brutally overcoming them. Independence was the prayer of the Irishman. But England, that vaunted democracy, not only failed to heed the plea but ground her heel in contempt upon her Irish subjects. Bullets and destruction formed her answer.

By every peaceful means during the succeeding years Ireland sought liberty. And each succeeding decade saw Ireland more enslaved and more impoverished, until in 1916 came the Easter Rebellion of that group of ardent young patriots led by Padraic Pearse, and the eyes of the world were suddenly focused on the small island where the most brutal atrocities were being perpetrated by the Black and Tans, composed partly of convicts sent by Britain.

I could cite instances of young men whose tongues were cut out, who were tortured, and then killed by the Black and Tans. I could point to the massacres; to the young men jailed or banished because they dared to ask for freedom. But the official report of the American Commission on Conditions in Ireland can more adequately present the facts as they were found by that distinguished membership, including L. Hollingsworth Wood, chairman; Frederick C. Howe, vice chairman; Jane Addams; James H. Maurer; Maj. Oliver P. Newman; United States Senator George W. Norris; Rev. Norman Thomas; and United States Senator David I. Walsh:

> CONCLUSIONS
>
> We find that the Irish people are deprived of the protection of British law, to which they would be entitled as subjects of the British King. They are likewise deprived of the moral protection granted by international law, to which they would be entitled as belligerents. They are at the mercy of imperial British forces which, acting contrary both to all law and to all standards of

human conduct, have instituted in Ireland a "terror," the evidence regarding which seems to prove that:

1. The imperial British Government has created and introduced into Ireland a force of at least 78,000 men, many of them youthful and inexperienced and some of them convicts, and has incited that force to unbridled violence.

2. The imperial British forces in Ireland have indiscriminately killed innocent men, women, and children; have discriminately assassinated persons suspected of being Republicans; have tortured and shot prisoners while in custody, adopting the subterfuges of "refusal to halt" and "attempting to escape"; and have attributed to alleged "Sinn Fein extremists" the British assassination of prominent Irish Republicans.

3. House burning and wanton destruction of villages and cities by imperial British forces under imperial British officers have been countenanced and ordered by officials of the British Government; and elaborate provision by gasoline sprays and bombs has been made in a number of instances for systematic incendiarism as part of a plan of terrorism.

4. A campaign for the destruction of the means of existence of the Irish people has been conducted by the burning of factories, creameries, crops, and farm implements and the shooting of farm animals. This campaign is carried on regardless of the political views of their owners, and results in widespread and acute suffering among women and children.

5. Acting under a series of proclamations issued by the competent military authorities of the imperial British forces, hostages are carried by forces exposed to the fire of the Republican Army; fines are levied upon towns and villages as punishment for alleged offenses of individuals; private property is destroyed in reprisals for acts with which the owners have no connection; and the civilian population is subjected to an inquisition upon the theory that individuals are in possession of information valuable to the military forces of Great Britain. These acts of the imperial British forces are contrary to the laws of peace or war among modern civilized nations.

6. This "terror" has failed to reestablish imperial British civil government in Ireland. Throughout the greater part of Ireland British courts have ceased to function; local, county, and city governments refuse to recognize British authority; and British civil officials fulfill no function of service to the Irish people.

7. In spite of the British "terror," the majority of the Irish people have sanctioned by ballot the Irish Republic, give their allegiance to it, pay taxes to it, and respect the decisions of its courts and of its civil officials.

In 1918, following the principle of self-determination of small nations enunciated by our great and now deceased President, Woodrow Wilson, the Irish people held a general election under British law on the question whether to remain in the Empire or to establish a free and independent government of their own. Eighty percent of the entire voting population of the country voted for an independent government, free from the Empire, and proceeded to establish such a government, which has never been dissolved.

Nevertheless, in the latter part of 1921, after continued fighting for recognition of this lawful government, which was functioning successfully even in its law courts, a truce was arranged, and at a conference in London the Irish representatives were delivered the ultimatum of England, namely, the partition of Ireland and dominion status or the alternative of immediate and terrible war.

Even today the cry for independence is heard, and will continue to be heard until Ireland is as free as Cuba.

Our own experience with England in the light of history has been a most unhappy one. It might be well to refresh the recollection of those whose memories have become somewhat clouded by the interval of time since the World War with the fact that those in high places in the British Government have on repeated occasions offered only gross insults to the United States in recognition of American aid to the Allies of the last World War in men, money, and supplies. The English response to any requests for payment of war debts has been derisively to salute the United States as Uncle Shylock.

I cannot agree with those who would place this legislation on the basis of war or no war. It is my belief that the United States can formulate a foreign policy which is characteristically American and which will safeguard American interests and American ideals in all parts of the world, without fear or favor of any nation or group of nations.

I have every confidence in President Roosevelt's foreign policy and in his determination to guard American interests and to prevent American manhood from leaving our shores to take part in the present war.

With that conviction, I am prepared to vote in favor of the act now under consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, since the opening of the special session of Congress I understand there have been something like 600 speeches delivered in the two Houses of Congress upon the subject of neutrality. There have been something like 1,400 speeches delivered over the radio on the same subject during the same length of time.

Mr. Speaker, the issue raised by the pending bill has been before this Congress for many months. It has been debated in this, as well as in another legislative division, long, loud, learnedly, and from every possible angle and viewpoint. It was discussed at length on the floor of this House when it was considered here at the last session and, in my opinion, few if any of the speakers upon the question in either branch of Congress have since that discussion said anything new upon the subject or made any substantial contribution to the argument. We have heard nothing except repetition of the same pro and con statements, couched perhaps in different forms of expression, but still carrying the same stock phrases and meaningless generalities. No wonder that the Members of Congress are weary and the general public is clamoring for more action and less words.

I have not the vanity to think for one instant that any further contribution of mine to this debate will be of exceptional value. Neither do I expect to work any miracles of change in opinion already made up or expressed. I do, however, wish above all things to keep my record in this body clear and consistent. I want my friends and the people whom I represent—men and women of this day and generation and those who may come after—to know that, during this critical time in the world's history, I stood on the floor of this House and made a plea that my country be neutral in the conflict now on beyond the seas—neutral according to the precepts of the founders of this Republic and the precedents we followed during a century and a quarter of our country's history.

It should not be necessary to go into a detailed history of our so-called neutrality legislation. It is perhaps sufficient to recall that the Seventy-fifth Congress at its first session early in the year 1937 passed the present Neutrality Act as an amendment to a former act approved August 31, 1935. It was confidently believed at that time that the measure would accomplish the laudable purpose of its enactment. Changes, however, in world conditions soon indicated the necessity for amendment. The undeclared war in China where the act was not invoked, the civil war in Spain where a special enactment was had to meet the situation, the shifting currents of political action in Europe, all tended to impress upon those who were giving the subject thought and consideration the very obvious fact that, while intended to be neutral, our Neutrality Act was distinctly unneutral; that, instead of keeping us out of war it was more likely to be a very potent factor in dragging us into controversies between nations; and, above all, it daily became more apparent that the act deliberately penalized the weaker nations of the earth and gave direct aid and encouragement to the strong nations which were either planning or actually engaged in acts of aggression and conquest. It became evident to all men who gave intelligent thought to the problem that vital amendments to this act were necessary.

In an effort to correct if possible the partial and unneutral effects of the act, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I happen to be a member, undertook the task of bringing before this House, not a new neutrality act but an amended act, one from which the objectionable features of the present law would be eliminated and to which additional provisions deemed necessary to maintain the neutral status of this Nation in time of conflict between foreign nations would be incorporated. To this end hearings were opened before our committee beginning on the 1st day of April of the present year and continuing until the middle of June.

During this period there appeared before the committee, and counseled with us, men and women from every section of the country, representative of the very highest type of patriotism and devotion. These witnesses had given to the question at issue much time and earnest study, and they gave to the committee their conclusions and the reason for the faith that was theirs. We had for study possibly every volume, treatise, or article ever printed upon the question of neutrality or upon the principles of international law involved in the question. We had before us the history of the past, the record of other years, as well as the vivid picture of current events in other lands where history was being written as we considered the problem before us. So it cannot be said—no man can charge—that there was brought to the floor of this House a half-baked, impetuous, and hastily wrought legislative proposal.

The pending bill does not, as has been so widely and intemperately asserted, repeal the present Neutrality Act. It, in fact, endorses, retains, and reenacts every provision of the present act with but one exception. That exception is the embargo clause. It adds to the present act but two provisions of any grave importance. The only practical difference between the present Neutrality Act and the pending measure is (1) the pending measure repeals the embargo against the shipment of arms and ammunition; (2) the pending act forbids the carriage in American vessels of any passengers, articles, or materials to belligerent states—the present law has no such prohibition; (3) the pending act authorizes the establishment of combat zones into or through which American vessels will be forbidden to pass; the present law provides for no such inhibition.

It should be noted that the repeal of the embargo against the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war is simply a lightening of certain restrictions imposed upon the American people by the present act. All other amendments represent the imposition of additional restrictions. As a matter of fact, the original Neutrality Act and all subsequent enactments and, in truth, any neutrality legislation that this or any other Congress ever wrote or might write into the law, is but a set of binding rules to govern and restrict the actions and conduct of our own people during times of conflict between foreign nations. By such an act we voluntarily divest ourselves of certain rights conceded to us by international law. We cannot adopt nor enforce any regulations as against other nationals, but against our own people only. Each provision of this or any other neutrality act is essentially a domestic regulation, and, instead of enlarging the freedom of our actions, each provision of the law is designed to define, limit, restrict, and curtail rights which under international law we could otherwise freely exercise.

Under the existing Neutrality Act we embargo the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, but we do not prohibit the sale and export to belligerent nations of the raw materials out of which the same arms, ammunition, and implements may be fabricated; nor do we bar the shipment of a thousand and one other different commodities essential to warring nations and any of which may at any time by one or more of the belligerent nations be designated as contraband of war. And under the present act these commodities which are not embargoed, may be transported in American ships and over all seas without regard to either zones of danger or areas of combat. It is, therefore, clearly evident that what we are doing under our present law is to merely prohibit the sale of certain commodities, while at the same time we are sending without restriction our ships, carrying other commodities of equal necessity to belligerents, into imminent danger.

The pending act, while lifting the partial embargo imposed by the present law, contains the two stipulations which, in my opinion, are the only two that to any extent will serve to obviate the danger of our being drawn into war by reason of the sinking by belligerent nations of ships under the American flag. First, the pending bill forbids the carriage not only of arms and ammunition but also of any passengers, articles, or materials of every character to any and all belligerent states in American ships. Second, the pending bill provides for the designation from time to time by the President of combat areas into and through which American ships, no matter what may be their cargo or their destination, shall not proceed.

Combined with these two restrictions, we also have in the pending bill a stipulation against the granting of credits to foreign purchasers of any commodities, and a prohibition against shipment of any such commodities until title to the same has been transferred here and vested in some foreign government, agency, or national. These last provisions are also contained in the present act, but they are not consistent with the embargo clause. Because of the embargo, these two provisions are rendered innocuous. It serves no purpose whatever to stipulate against credits or with reference to transfer of title and at the same time embargo sales. If you bar sales you remove the necessity for either credits or transfer of title. On the other hand, the two provisions as to credits and transfer of title are entirely consistent with and complementary to the repeal of the embargo and to the stipulation that all purchased commodities shall be carried away on the ships of the buyers and not upon American vessels.

Let us look into the objections being urged against certain sections of the pending bill. Disregarding as unworthy of serious consideration the intemperate assertions of rabid partisans, let us consider for a moment the objections which have been seriously and honestly urged. Do we hear any waves of opposition to the requirement that title to purchased goods be transferred to foreign agencies before shipment? I have heard none. Do we hear any serious indictment of the combat-area provision? Yes; upon the sole ground that the designation of the zones is left to the discretion of the President. This objection can always be expected.

There are people in this world who object to any delegation of authority to anybody—even to a corner policeman or to an army general—and, if they could, this class of objectors would take away from God himself His discretionary powers and subject Him to the control of a mortal commission. That objection, in my judgment, is either personal or political. Do we hear any objection to the refusal of credits and the requirement of cash for our commodities? I have heard none raised. Is there any objection to the prohibition against carriage of goods to the belligerent nations upon American vessels? Yes; by the shipping interests, and this objection has, at least, a sound basis. Such prohibition undoubtedly calls for a sacrifice upon the part of American shipping; but will anybody seriously contend that this sacrifice cannot much better be made than could the sacrifice called for by war? And so, when we boil the matter down to its logical conclusion, we find that in the consideration of the measure now before Congress the repeal of the embargo is the bone of contention.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment upon what to me has been the most remarkable development in this debate. I refer to the change in the attitude of my friend and committee colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY], upon this question. Not for a moment nor to the slightest degree would I question his honesty or integrity, for he is one of the most honorable and trustworthy men I have ever known. For this very reason, however, I attribute his present stand to the fact that in his earnest desire to reconcile his conscience to his action—in his effort to be entirely consistent—he has driven himself into an astounding inconsistency; in fact, in order to be straight, he leans backward.

At the last session of Congress, on the floor of this House, the gentleman from Connecticut most earnestly urged that our present neutrality law, including its embargo clause, was in contravention of international law and that our better policy would be to write the entire act off of our statutes. If I then understood him correctly, he doubted the consistency of his giving support to any neutrality legislation whatever, because such restrictive legislation was wrong in principle.

And now we find him vehemently urging the adoption of a more stringent restriction upon freedom of our nationals than can be found in the present law, to which his opposition was then directed.

As a reason for this change of front, my good friend gives it as his personal opinion that, while admitting the embargo to be wrong in principle, yet to repeal it at this time would be unneutral as a "change in the rules after the game has commenced." My answer to that is, that any law wrong in principle at one time is wrong at all times. When the gentleman from Connecticut favored repeal of the embargo, it was not in effect, because there was then no reason for its enforcement. He was then against it because he evidently felt that, should war come, an embargo would be an erroneous policy. Now that the policy is applied, he, in effect, asserts that it would be error to correct the error. Can a wrong be thus made right?

I am afraid that my good friend has been listening to the song of the sirens to my left. These gentlemen who are opposed to repeal do not hesitate to grasp any argument and they are advancing this one about the change of the rules regardless of the fact that they are thereby taking advantage of a wrong for which they alone are responsible.

They argue that the war having commenced, we cannot now consistently revise our neutrality laws. I call your attention to the fact that these same people who advance this argument, with the possible exception of the gentleman from Connecticut, were the ones who were loudest and bitterest in their opposition to a repeal of the embargo before the war commenced. They are the same ones who defeated the proposal at the last session of this Congress. They are the same ones who imposed upon us the necessity of action now. If these gentlemen were in a court of equity they could be estopped by two maxims—one is that "no man can take advantage of his own wrong," and the other, "he who comes into a court of equity must come with clean hands." If our country is today in the inconceivable situation that it cannot modify or repeal a bad law, these antirepealists are responsible for that condition of affairs. The wrong was theirs and the hands that perpetrated the wrong were theirs. Now they advance the most unusual proposition that it is wrong to right a wrong.

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

Mr. KEE. I yield for a question.

Mr. SHANLEY. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. I know there were no sirens back in June when I said that if we were going to change the law the time to change was then; that once a war ensued any change, particularly a change that was motivated by a policy of discrimination and not by the desire to complete or effect our neutrality, would be unneutral. I believe the gentleman wants to be fair on that question. There were no sirens then, and the gentleman certainly knows that one of the distinguished leaders of the opposition has never been a siren to me.

Mr. KEE. The gentleman at that time sang the song himself and played his own accompaniment. I recall that distinctly, and I have quoted about what the gentleman sang at that time. Now he is singing another song. Is not that correct?

Mr. SHANLEY. No. The refrain is the same. It still lingers. The refrain is that you cannot use a governmental weapon to change a law which takes a conscious and notorious realization of naval supremacy in order to discriminate, because no man can stand on this floor and give a definition of neutrality, which means abstention, which means nondiscrimination, and say you can simply change that at will to help either belligerent.

Mr. KEE. I will answer the gentleman in this way, that his own amendment changes the law. His own amendment goes farther than the present act.

Mr. SHANLEY. My own amendment makes it more neutral; it adds certain things. It is a prohibitive amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. The plain, unvarnished truth is that in 1935, when our statutes were clear and unencumbered by any attempt at so-called neutrality legislation, we wrote into our laws an unneutral act. We wrote a provision that inhibited us from selling weapons, ammunition, or materials of war for either offense or defense to any nation or nations engaged in conflict. Naturally, and as should have been anticipated, this restriction affected only those nations which needed to purchase commodities of this character and to which the sea lanes to our ports were open. The provision could not affect otherwise than favorably all nations which were fully equipped with war materials or were provided with facilities for their fabrication. As to the nations which were not so equipped, the new provision was unneutral. It denied to them access to the means of defense against the stronger nations of the world. This unneutral effect of our attempt at neutrality became soon apparent. Germany, having completed 10 years of preparation for a campaign of aggression and conquest, looked at our supposedly neutral act and smiled in complete agreement and satisfaction. It gave her a clear field for aggressive action. With her fleet of warships complete, armed and supplied, with the greatest fleet of airplanes ever assembled in the world, with her armies fully trained and equipped with the most modern and up-to-date instrumentalities known to man, with her great munitions plants and arms factories stepped up until they were capable of almost unlimited production, Germany was entirely self-dependent, with no need whatever for anything in the way of war materials that America might produce. Germany's only fear was that the nations against which she contemplated action might secure means of defense from the great republic across the sea, which was the one country alone that had the resources and facilities to fabricate these defensive means. No wonder that Germany smiled in smug satisfaction as she read the sign we had posted on our door, which said in effect to the weaker nations of the world, "no matter how grevious your need, you cannot even buy from us any means for your defense."

We were not under compulsion to put this clause upon our statutes and it was not demanded or required by any condition then confronting us. We are not required to keep it there. When we wrote it into our laws we contravened international law and voluntarily surrendered a right that we, as well as every other nation in the world, had exercised for countless years. We wrote it in as a domestic policy—as a limitation upon the acts and conduct of our own citizens alone—and as such domestic policy and limitation we have every right in the world to write it off at our convenience. By writing it off—by repealing it—we are not changing any rules during the progress of the game. We changed the rule when we adopted the embargo clause, and by repealing it we are merely restoring a recognized rule—one that through all the years down to this day has been followed by every other nation in the world, including the very powers which now offer objections to our return to it.

That we cannot revise or repeal at any time any act established by us as a domestic regulation, is an impossible position to take. Especially is this true when the provision proposed to be repealed was, at the time of its adoption and is now, not only unusual in the annals of history, but is definitely unneutral in its effect—favoring as it does the powerful nations of the world and penalizing the weak. So much for the contention that we are without warrant to change the rules.

The fact that our present embargo is not complete destroys its effectiveness as a war preventive measure. Its application is to the shadow and not to the substance. To be a protection to us it would necessarily have to be applied to all classes of commodities and not to a few. Arms and ammunition are not the sole requirements of belligerent nations. Materials of war, given the broadest definition, cannot possibly cover all essential commodities. Everything necessary to sustain human life—food, clothing, medicine, fuel, shelter—every article useful to man would have to be classed as materials of war and their shipment prohibited if we want to remove from belligerents the temptation to sink

our ships. Confronted with this obvious fact it immediately becomes apparent that it is not the sale of commodities that should be embargoed but the transportation of the commodities in American vessels. Sound reason and necessity demands that we resort to the provision incorporated in the pending bill, to wit, an embargo against shipping instead of one against sales.

The difference between the two methods is vital. If we embargo sales of all commodities we naturally not only put an end to all American shipping to all belligerent nations, but we likewise put an end to the shipment of American goods on ships of other nationals to belligerent nations. On the other hand, if we repeal the embargo on sales but at the same time prohibit carriage in American ships of the articles sold, we do not suspend all of our trade relations, we do not interfere with the commercial shipping and trading rights of other nations, we do not close our ports, but at the price of the sacrifice of a part of the shipping rights conceded to us by international law we insure ourselves against the danger of being drawn into war by the sinking of vessels flying the American flag.

It is admittedly true that the provisions in the pending measure inhibiting the carriage of commodities to belligerent nations on American vessels calls for a sacrifice by American shipping. This hardship, however, is to a large extent lightened by certain amendments inserted in the pending bill by another body of this Congress.

It has been recognized that there are certain important countries and ports, not only in the Eastern but also in the Western Hemisphere politically dominated by or affiliated with belligerent nations, the sea lanes to which are comparatively free from danger. It has therefore been considered that no reason exists for restricting American shipping of ordinary cargoes to these ports and countries. It is trite but true that danger is always where you find it, but it is equally evident that in wartime the greater danger lies in our invasion with American ships of the zones of wartime activities. While it can be stated as a correct interpretation of international law that we are not precluded from permitting our ships to enter all zones, yet we are willing for the sake of security to forego the right as to those seas which are the actual theater of war's great tragedy. We are doing this of our own volition and not under duress. That, however, we are willing to surrender a part of our rights, that we are willing to forego the freedom of part of the seas, that we are willing to impose upon our shipping a heavy burden of restrictions—a burden imposed by no other neutral nations—should not mean that we must surrender all of our rights. It should not mean the enforced retirement from the seas of all ships sailing under the American flag.

To this end the pending bill has been amended in order to leave open to American shipping ocean areas outside of actual danger zones. As designated, these areas include ports west of the sixty-sixth parallel of longitude to the north of us, the ports of South America, the Bermudas, and other sections south of 35° north latitude in the Western Hemisphere, the Tasman Sea between Australia and New Zealand, ports on the Indian Ocean, China and Arabian Seas, the Bay of Bengal, and the Atlantic coast of Africa south of 33° north latitude.

It must be understood that by these amendments to the bill, made by another body, under which American shipping may sail the seas mentioned and carry trade to the ports thereon, we are not assuming any new rights or privileges. On the contrary, we are merely reserving to ourselves the rights we already had and have had under international law since the founding of the Government. By these amendments we merely relaxed to some extent the harsh restrictions the measure imposes, by our own voluntary will, upon American shipping.

This action is not only just and fair to the shipping interests of the country but it is also demanded by the needs of our commercial and manufacturing interests, the necessities of our Latin American neighbors to the south, and the requirements of the peaceful populations of other lands who, to a large extent, are dependent upon American products. Let the belligerent nations control the seas and the sea lanes that they have the power to control and we will stay away from such areas. Let our commerce begin where their power ends.

Up to the present time the American people have stood firm in their demands for what is termed the "freedom of the seas." To us the maintenance of the merchant marine has not only been a matter of national pride but it has been one also of economic necessity. We naturally hesitate to take any steps leading to an abandonment of a time-tried policy based upon established rules of international law. But there is no sound reason why we should insist upon a continuance of this policy when to maintain our right to do so involves the use of force and must inevitably lead us into war.

We must not assume that this act, because it prohibits a number of American ships from trading with belligerent nations and entering dangerous zones will result in putting this shipping entirely out of business. To the south of us is 21 Latin American countries with which our trade relations are improving day by day. Barred from the markets of Europe, to which these nations have heretofore given a greater proportion of their trade, they are naturally turning to America for the commodities they need.

There is no reason why this trade should not be encouraged in every way and developed to proportions far beyond what we have had in the highly competitive marts of Europe. There is every reason in the world to expect that every American ship which will be barred by the pending measure from the European trade will actually find continuous employment in carrying our steadily increasing trade with the countries of South America. There the seas are open and free from danger. There our rights are clearly defined. There can be no possible justification for interference with these rights. Regardless of all eventualities in Europe, the nations of the great western continent are united with us for self-preservation. The countries of the Old World have recognized this union. The doctrine enunciated by Monroe has been firmly established by the insistence of this country through years of test and trial and is backed by all the power of this Nation. In the establishment of this doctrine as an integral part of the laws of nations and in insisting on its recognition, we have never yet failed, faltered, or retreated. We want peace—no people in the world love it more—but if any nation on earth is deliberately seeking war, it need only once insist upon violating the Monroe Doctrine. It will get what it is looking for and without any preliminary argument.

When we sum it all up we stand to lose nothing whatever from our inhibition against sending American ships into dangerous waters. On the contrary, there is promise of immediate gain and the establishment of new and permanent gainful trade relations with our southern neighbors. The prize won for us by this action is, however, far greater than any increase in trade and commerce. The prize is our security against being drawn into the European conflict by the American people's passionate resentment of the sinking of American ships and the killing of American seamen. The avoidance of this danger is the chief accomplishment of the proposed legislation. It should be evident to all men that our danger lies, not in the sale of American commodities, but in the shipment of these commodities upon American vessels through the areas of combat—the zones of danger. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I favor and shall support the embargo on arms, ammunition, or implements of war. The existing law was presented and exhaustively debated during a period of comparative world peace. I not only favor the continuance of the embargo on arms, but I believe it should be strengthened.

The supporters of embargo repeal complain of the right to ship cotton and not gun cotton, the right to ship brass tubing and not to ship shells, and so forth, and so forth. If this be an inconsistency then what is the objection to making the embargo all inclusive? The cash-and-carry provi-

sions which were in our law were permitted to expire in May of this year?

The defeat of the amendment to prohibit sale and shipment of poison gas and flame throwers was in my estimation a keen disappointment to people of this country, and I trust we may have an opportunity to vote on this vital question in the House.

Our President, in his speech at Chautauqua, made the following statement:

> It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by Congress would, in the event of war, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Let us not blink the fact that we would find thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. If we face the choice of profits or peace the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace!"

The President's prediction has become a reality, and we find, as he suggested, the thousands who while decrying war and insisting that we must not take part in it are in the same breath demanding that we make the death-dealing apparatus and sell it to the belligerents on a cash-on-the-barrel-head basis. Remove the smoke screen of alleged neutrality and you have a clear view of a plan to acquire "blood money."

Have we forgotten April 1917? Have we erased from our memory the tragic and appalling holocaust of that last World War? The repeal of the arms embargo destroys the last vestige of neutrality. The substitution of cash and carry does something which I do not believe the American people will tolerate. It will put the dollar sign on the American flag, and I hope and pray that may never be done.

In my humble opinion the surest way to keep out of this, or any other European war, is to retain the embargo. Let this magnificent Republic set an example that will redound to its credit through the ages. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the debate in the Senate on the pending bill has been so thorough and so exhaustive that I hesitate to occupy the floor at this time. On the other hand, this is the gravest and most important question that has faced me during my 5 years in the House of Representatives. I have but one desire and that is to cast a vote that will keep this country from becoming involved in the power politics and boundary line disputes of Europe. We must keep out of that war. The question is, What is best for our Nation—its present and its future? I have personal feelings and prejudices in the European conflict, but I also have a great obligation, and that is to my own country. When I cross the threshold of this Chamber I must lay aside all personal feelings and prejudices and decide the issues on their merits and their effect on the welfare of this Nation.

Since the beginning of the special session it has been my privilege to hear many speeches and read many articles on both sides of this controversy and there are substantial arguments both for and against. Much confusion has resulted from what is known as the cash-and-carry provisions of the Pittman bill. It seems to me that section is an improvement over the House bill, but we should not accept this in lieu of the embargo on articles and munitions of war. In my opinion our Nation would best be protected by the following:

First. A law defining the articles that might be carried by American ships and the destination of these ships.

Second. Legislation in regard to the travel of American citizens on the high seas and in the war zones.

Third. A law which requires a belligerent nation to secure title to a commodity before it leaves our shores.

Fourth, The embargo of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

There is general agreement as to the first two of these, but serious question as to what is the best course to take in regard to the last two. One would think from reading the press and listening to radio speeches that cash and carry was something new. The facts are, it was a part of our Neutrality Act of 1937 and only expired last May. Had the present administration requested Congress to extend it at that time it would have carried by an overwhelming vote. There are some of us who believe its extension was not requested at that time because the President was desirous of securing a credit section in addition to the regular cash provisions. As the original Pittman bill carried a 90-day credit provision, there is reason to believe that there was some basis for this assumption. Public reaction was so strong against this provision that it was removed by the Senate leadership before a vote was taken. The pending bill carries a cash provision, but let us be honest with ourselves and the citizens of this country. No one believes that if war continues for a year or more and our Nation has profited from a cash munitions trade that we are going to refuse credit to those nations that have made this profit possible. Certainly we would not take their gold and material wealth and then when they were in sore distress selfishly advise them they could not have credit.

The section of this bill dealing with the repeal of the embargo on arms and munitions of war is not only controversial but it is fraught with danger. I shall not state that the removal of the embargo will carry us into the European war, but I do say that it is the first step. By repealing the embargo we retrace our steps of 1914, when the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war was the first step toward that war. During that period our decision to sell articles and munitions of war definitely placed us on the side of the Allies and was regarded by them as an entry into the conflict on their side. The reverse situation was true with Germany, and they immediately interpreted our action as an act of war.

Certainly there is great distinction between selling articles and munitions of war and selling food materials and commodities that are used to sustain life. This was proved conclusively in the last war. The historic background of this Nation is based on Christian principles and Christian teachings, and I do not believe that we at this time can justify the sale of bombs, poisonous gas, and lethal weapons to belligerent nations for the destruction of human lives. This is our opportunity to take a definite stand. We did so when we enacted the original Neutrality Act during peacetimes when there was no pressure from any nation or any group. A retention of the arms embargo will serve notice on the world that we have some regard for Christian principles in this country. Our Nation should remain the citadel of peace. When the European conflict ends, either in a stalemate or in victory for one or the other of the groups engaged in war, our country should be in a position to render a real service in the rehabilitation of that section, as well as the establishment of a form of government that will guarantee religious and civil rights to their citizens. Now is the time for us to retain our strict neutrality, and we can be of much greater service to nations at war by remaining neutral than joining them in their conflicts.

Let us not sell our neutrality for war profits.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, every impulse of patriotism, and every consideration of real Americanism, impels me to vote against repeal of the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

I am convinced that repeal of the arms embargo, under the circumstances of the hour, endangers the peace of America.

If the United States finally becomes involved in this war, it will be because we wade in one step at a time. I feel strongly that repeal of the arms embargo would be the first step. No nation ever determines upon a policy of war at one gulp. War develops always through a series of steps, through a series of events and policies, each of which gradually conditions the public mind to the hateful attitude which alone can make war.

We have learned at a terrible cost during the last 25 years that the United States cannot make and maintain the peace

of Europe. But we can make and maintain and guarantee and insure the peace of the United States.

This is not our war. It is Europe's war—brewed of age-old hatreds, class conflicts, religious antagonisms, and boundary disputes. Europe is a seething cauldron of diplomatic intrigues and real-estate aggressions. Should we allow ourselves to become involved, America would be in this cauldron for a hundred years to come, and the end surely would be the black-out of representative government and freedom in the United States.

Brutal aggression against the richly flowering independence of Poland by Germany and Russia is spread upon the pages of history as one of the greatest international crimes in human history. The wanton destruction of an independent state revolts the heart and mind of all mankind against barbaric aggression.

America's duty is to relieve and assist the victims of this crime in a substantial and practical way. We can render this assistance only in food and clothing and the materials of shelter, which would instantly be cut off should we go to war. We can only render this assistance through the enormous productive capacity of America at peace.

Furthermore, if we will maintain peace we will continue to hold aloft the beacon light of freedom for all humanity. And so long as that hope lights the skies of Europe there remains a real inspiration toward reconstruction and a new emergence of national independence, national culture, and national vitality. But the minute America should enter the conflict as a military participant all these hopes would die forever, and all of Europe would fall into a war of extermination, which could end only at the threshold of a new Dark Ages—an era of perhaps centuries, in which the whole history of the Continent would be written in two dreadful words, "bloody chaos."

If the world is to be redeemed from its present dreadful plight of international anarchy, it is to be redeemed only by the power and benign authority of international morality. It can never be redeemed by more aggression, more invasion, more destruction, and more anarchy.

Secondly, I oppose repeal because this country took the position officially in 1915 that any change in our neutrality law or policy after the outbreak of war would constitute "a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States."

History records that in 1915 the German Government urged the United States, then neutral, to forbid and prohibit the sale of arms to the Allies. Compliance with this request, bear in mind, would have involved at that time a positive change of neutral policy during the progress of a war. In a letter to the German Ambassador under date of April 21, 1915, Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan said:

> This Government holds * * * that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war, which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war, would be an unjustifiable departure from the principles of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions * * *. The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States.

That same logical argument ought to apply today. It is an accepted fact that the proposed repeal of the embargo "at the present time," would "affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war" and, therefore, it would "be an unjustifiable departure from the principles of strict neutrality."

Americans want no part of the war in Europe. Neither do they want any blood money—any war-boom prosperity, to be followed by another and a worse post-war depression. Above all, we do not want to solve our unemployment problem by sending our unemployed into the trenches, or into the munitions factories to prosper in instruments of death, destruction, black despair for 500,000,000 men, women, and children of Europe.

As an American, and responsive to the pleas and supplications which have reached me from home, I take my stand on the side of the constructive and beneficent forces of peace—against the destructive, demoralizing, and decadent forces of hatred and war.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sentiments—and what I believe to be the sentiments of a majority of my constituents—on the gravest question which has confronted the American Congress since the fatal declaration of war in 1917 .

That question is, Should the arms embargo be repealed? But it might also be stated in any of the following ways:

Should we forsake our traditional neutrality and take sides in a war which is not our war?

Should we engage in the murder business and permit munition makers to reap profits out of the tears, the blood, and the agony of modern warfare?

Should we sell bombing planes, poison gas, and death-dealing weapons to be used in the destruction of women and children and helpless civilian populations?

In other words, should we deliberately adopt a policy that will threaten the peace and security of our beloved America?

Mr. Speaker, during the past 5 weeks I have received no less than 15,000 replies to these questions from peace-loving citizens of my district. What do they say? What do the people want?

Almost unanimously they say: Keep the embargo. We want real neutrality. This is not our war and we should have nothing to do with it. Let us keep the law which makes it a crime to sell instruments of death and destruction to belligerent nations.

It is gratifying to learn that a majority of my constituents agree with the position I took last March when I warned the House that:

> Unless Congress intervenes to strengthen existing neutrality legislation as a counter stroke to the current administration effort to weaken such legislation, the history of the Wilson administration will be repeated.

And also the stand in favor of the embargo which I took in the House last June when I said:

> The price for peace to me seems reasonable. But at its highest, it is small indeed by comparison with the horrible price which war exacts. But the price for peace can be paid in only one currency—the currency of strict, honest, straightforward, sincere, mandatory neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the only real question before Congress today is repeal of the arms embargo. Opponents of the embargo have attempted to cloud the issue and deceive the people by declaring that we cannot have cash and carry and the embargo at the same time.

It is clear, to any thinking person, that it is false reasoning to argue that the choice is between the embargo and cash and carry. The two are separate and distinct. We can and should have cash and carry for all general supplies. But we need not at the same time sacrifice such an important safeguard against war as the arms embargo.

The contention that we cannot have both the embargo on munitions and cash and carry for general commodities is a deliberate deception, an utterly foundationless falsehood.

Friends of the embargo pleaded most earnestly for continuance of cash and carry in our neutrality law last May when the administration permitted it to expire. It expired because a Democratic Congress refused to act favorably on Senator VANDENBERG's praiseworthy resolution to continue cash and carry in effect.

Do not therefore be deceived by this false contention. The opposition is not to cash-and-carry, but to the unneutral proposal to authorize what is now strictly prohibited—the shipment of instruments of death to nations at war.

Enemies of the embargo have asked: Why do we need to ban arms exports if we are to have a strong cash-and-carry provision? The question is easily answered.

In the first place, the arms ban keeps us from engaging in the bloody and unholy business of being an arsenal for death-dealing weapons.

Secondly, it is necessary to keep the arms embargo because, as the World War proves, the armaments racket is the one trade which depends most upon war and encourages and prolongs it. It is the one trade best calculated to produce an unhealthy war boom, with all its attendant risks and evils.

Mr. Speaker, I am British-born—a native of Scotland—but I love my adopted country with a zeal that is firm and genuine and my only concern in this critical hour is for her future welfare.

My devotion is so strong that I would not jeopardize her security, or gamble with the lives of her young manhood, by supporting a policy of open—and dangerous—assistance to the side with which it is my natural inclination to sympathize.

Deep down in my heart I believe America can stay out of this war if we have the courage to remain absolutely neutral. But we cannot stay out if we are pro-British, pro-German, or pro-anything but pro-American.

I voted for the arms embargo along with a majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—when the Vorys amendment was passed in the House last June. Subsequent developments in Europe have only served to deepen my conviction that the embargo provides us with the strongest possible peace insurance.

I intend to stick by my guns and again vote against repeal of this safeguard against American involvement in the European war. I hope and pray that my colleagues will have the courage to do likewise.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] as much time as he may desire.

AMERICA! KEEP OUT OF EUROPE; STAY NEUTRAL; KEEP OUT OF WAR

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] because, in my judgment, it is a safeguard most likely to keep us out of a foreign war. It retains the arms embargo and adopts the cash-and-carry provisions of the Senate amendment which will retain and strengthen our neutrality. We must remain neutral, keep out of Europe, and keep out of war. In the solution of this problem let us consider only what is best to preserve our own peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is so far reaching and so vital tc the welfare of our country that it transcends all party considerations and must be considered free from partisan factors. Our only objective must be what is best for the happiness and preservation of the peace and security of our country. The observations I shall make will be based on that premise.

We are legislating for America, and for no other country, and should therefore be guided by what is best for America. We should not permit our sympathies for European nations, wherever they may lie, to shape our action and involve us in foreign conflicts. Our people almost unanimously believe that we should keep out of foreign wars; that we should not become a party to the present European war; and that we should not, at any future time, send our soldiers overseas to fight on European or other foreign battlefields. I most heartily concur in these beliefs. We should, however, put our own house in order, build up our defenses and our armed forces, our Navy and aircraft to that degree of efficiency that we will be able successfully to defend our people and our possessions against all comers. It should, however, be a force of defense and not of offense.

This legislation now before us has two objectives which are diametrically opposed to one another. They clash with each other. The one is the repeal of the mandatory arms embargo, which does away with our neutrality, and thereby tends to involve us in foreign controversies. The other, the cash-and-carry provisions, and bans on trading, shipping, and intercourse with belligerents, is a safeguard against involvement. These two objectives should not be combined in one bill, because the repeal section is controversial and should be considered separately on its own merits. The other provisions could have been enacted with such modifications as could easily have been agreed upon at the very beginning of the special session, and would have gone a long way toward relieving our country of embarrassing incidents such as that of the seizure of the American ship, the *City of Flint*. In fact, it was proposed in the other body that these provisions of the pending resolution be separated so that the so-called cash-and-carry provisions could have been enacted into law without delay, and the controversial issue—that of the repeal of the embargo—be considered by itself, so that ample time could be given for its solution. However, the administration forces refused to separate the issues, and they are before us now in one measure.

The mandatory arms embargo was enacted in 1935, almost unanimously—63 to 6 in the Senate and 376 to 13 in the House—by a Democratic Congress and signed by the President. The necessity for its passage was forced upon us by our experiences in the World War. We were operating at that time under international law, and we were unable to maintain a neutral position, and as a result were brought into the war as a participant. Our experience, in the loss of American soldiers, the expenditures of vast sums of money, and the utter failure to achieve our objectives, led the American people and the Congress to resolve that America should never again become a party to a foreign conflict—that we should maintain an absolutely neutral position in foreign wars, not take sides, and refuse to sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war to either side, and devote our energies to solving our own problems here in America. As a result, when we were free from war, we enacted the neutrality statute, with this mandatory arms embargo, for the definite purpose of keeping neutral during foreign wars. We had had one bitter experience, and we were determined henceforth to keep out of Europe's wars. We knew the sale of weapons and munitions took us into the World War, and we were determined it should not be repeated.

Arms embargo is a principle recognized in international law and one we ourselves had invoked in times past, and one which many of the nations of the Old World have followed. In the World War our furnishing of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the Allies was our undoing. It engendered the animosity of Germany and brought on the submarine warfare, involving our ships and citizens, resulting in sabotage in our factories, docks, and terminals, and in the death of many Americans, ultimately leading to a declaration of war. There was fresh in our minds at the time this statute was enacted the memory of the determination of our people that we should not enter that war. Shortly before our entry President Wilson said:

> More than this, proposed at this time, permit me to say, would mean merely that we had lost our self-possession; that we had been thrown off balance by a war with which we have nothing to do, whose causes cannot touch us, whose very existence affords us opportunities of friendship and disinterested service which should make us ashamed of any thought of hostility or fearful preparation for trouble.

In fact, President Wilson's campaign, to a large extent, was based on the slogan that "he kept us out of war." And yet in April following his election the Congress voted to enter the war. We are reminded now, as we discuss this momentous issue, that everyone on both sides of the question are vehement in assuring the Nation that we will keep America out of war and that we will not enter this or any other foreign conflict.

We cannot forget that, notwithstanding we took the same viewpoint before the World War, that nevertheless in a few months we were in the war. We relied upon international law; we failed to maintain a neutral position; we took sides by attempting to furnish the Allies arms, munitions, and implements of war, and as a result Germany retaliated. The so-called incidents took place, American ships were sunk, American property destroyed, American munitions factories sabotaged and destroyed, American docks and ships were blown up, and many American lives were sacrificed. As a result, the feelings of America were aroused and the very ones who a short time before had been proclaiming we would not enter the war, that "he kept us out of war," were urging that the Congress declare war, which it promptly did. Those in the Congress who refused to vote for the declaration of war were held up to ridicule and scorn. Anyone familiar with this history cannot but note the striking similarity between what took place in those fateful days leading up to our entry into the World War and what is taking place today.

It is argued by those who favor lifting the embargo that there is no proof that by doing so, and thus taking sides, and supplying weapons and munitions to one side, that we will be brought into the war. We only know that in the World War we took that course and it put us in the war. In the World War our first step on the road to war was selling arms and ammunition to the Allies. It was followed by credits and then sending American doughboys to the battlefields of France. Will we now take the first step on this road to war, the one we took on the road to the World War, namely, selling to one side arms and munitions? If we do, can we retrace this step, once taken? Congress does not declare war out of a clear sky. Such a declaration is preceded by many steps in a long process. Steps taken by our own Government, accompanied by denials that they are leading to war, but which enmesh us in foreign controversies, may end in war, as they did in 1917. Will we gamble again that we can give up our neutrality by repealing the arms embargo and sell arms and munitions to one side only and still keep out of this war? It may be done, but we are playing with loaded dice and American lives are the stakes. We lost before. Must we take this gamble again?

In order to avoid another catastrophe of this kind in 1935 the Congress enacted a mandatory embargo statute, which it is now proposed to repeal. It was reaffirmed in 1936 and in 1937, and in the latter year the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, referring to our World War participation, said:

> We relied upon international law for every assurance of our rights, but the reliance brought us no benefits and no protection, and was our undoing.

When the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] referred to this in the other body, in his remarks on October 2, the Senator from Nevada said:

> I take exactly the same position now. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 2, p. 68.)

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in discussing the reason for the enactment of the embargo law, said:

> It would seem that by now the nations of the earth would have learned that war does not pay. We have learned it in America. * * * Having learned our lesson, we are determined to set our house in order so that when the storm breaks we shall be prepared to safeguard as best we can our peace and prevent our involvement, if possible. * * * We will prevent our country or our citizens from selling or furnishing to nations engaged in wars arms, ammunitions, or implements of war, and this bill does just that. It is permanent legislation.

The Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, referred to the Embargo Act of 1935 as follows:

> The Neutrality Act of last August, in embargoing exports of finished war materials to belligerents, was to keep us out of war.

Mr. Hull also said, in 1936, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (p. 42, Hearings):

> We could not see how a neutral could deliberately help to feed the fires and flames of war by delivering the essential materials right straight to the belligerents, helping not only to carry on war but to prolong it indefinitely; and nobody knows much better than we that every day that war is prolonged the danger of the war spreading would be increased, with increased dangers to us of being involved.

The President of the United States himself, in discussing the Neutrality and Embargo Act, said:

> If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. They would tell you, and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity, that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations, that credit could be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America would once more capture the trade of the world. It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace. If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer, must answer, "We choose peace."

We note by the press that large shipments of bombing planes and other aircraft are now awaiting the passage of the repeal of the arms embargo before shipments to France and England proceed. We may "choose peace" but the answer seems to be "profits."

The Congress knew, and the country knew, that we were led into the World War by reason of our selling arms and munitions to one group of the belligerents and not to the others. There were other causes, also, but supplying arms and munitions to one side only was the first step on the war road and led directly to the destruction of our property and American lives, which followed precipitating a declaration of war.

It is true, we also sold other goods and merchandise, such as foodstuffs, clothing, grain, and oil, but this did not bring us into trouble. The supplying of the arms and munitions to Germany's enemies placed us squarely in an unneutral position; it fed the flames of war, for, indeed, arms, munitions, and instruments of war are the very symbols of war, and any nation furnishing such sinews of war to one belligerent, to the exclusion of the other, is, to that extent, joining in the conflict. It is intervention, and leads, ultimately, to full participation. We found it so in 1917. I fear we will find it so again.

It is now proposed that we repeal this arms embargo and give up our neutral position for the definite purpose of selling arms and munitions to one side and go back where we were prior to the World War, and subject ourselves to the very same influences that forced us, even against our wishes, into the World War. It is now frankly admitted that by repealing the arms embargo we are taking an unneutral position. We are taking sides. As Arthur Krock, editorial writer on the New York Times, has said, it is generally admitted the real purpose of the administration in repealing the arms-embargo statute is to render aid to England and France. He said:

> There has been little official concealment that this is the real reason for the recent unsuccessful attempt to eliminate the ban. It is the actual, rather than the technical, reason which engages the opposition.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], in charge of this legislation in the other body, very candidly said:

> I simply want to say that I do not think it concerns the United States whether it is neutral or not.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], a very able exponent of repeal, said:

> I speak no more of the arms embargo as an expression of strict neutrality. It is not that. It checks the belligerents that I want checked. It favors the belligerents I want favored.

On the other hand, the national commander of the American Legion, Raymond J. Kelly, says:

> The voices of more than 1,000,000 American World War veterans united in a common chorus that America must maintain real neutrality—that under no condition shall it be distorted into a deceptive and misleading attempt to take sides behind the scenes.

Whose voices should we follow: Those who urge us to forego our neutrality and take sides with one of the belligerents in this conflict, which may again lead us to war, or those who counsel strict neutrality without taking sides behind the scenes? Which is more likely to promote the peace and happiness of America? Retention of the embargo on arms cannot lead toward war; its repeal may involve us again in war.

As Secretary of State Cordell Hull said in 1936:

> We could not see how a neutral could deliberately help feed the fires and flames of war by delivering the essential materials right straight to the belligerents, helping not only to carry on war but to prolong it indefinitely * * * with increased dangers to us of being involved.

This is the crux of our problem. Shall America give up its neutral position—one which it took in times of peace, after careful and painstaking consideration, for the purpose of being neutral in foreign wars—in order that we may not become involved therein, and for the particular purpose of keeping us out of such conflicts? It is now contended that

we should repeal the arms embargo, make America the arsenal for the Allies, take sides in the conflict for the avowed purpose, as disclosed by the leaders of the repeal movement, to give aid and succor to England and France, to help them win the war.

By so doing we are not only taking sides but we are becoming partners in the project. We are, to that extent, entering the war. We are furnishing, to one side only, the death-dealing agencies that are necessary for carrying on the war. We are not only deliberately helping "to feed the fires and flames of war" but we now propose to furnish flame throwers. Well may we ask, Does the sale of arms, munitions, and poison gas tend toward peace? Will it contribute to our peace, or does the refusal to sell weapons tend to keep us out of the war?

As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said, we cannot become the arsenal for one belligerent without becoming the target for the other. We found that literally true in the World War. By giving up our neutral position, taking sides, furnishing arms, ammunition, and implements of war to England and France, to the exclusion of Germany, we will bring the war to our very shores. We are inviting disaster, and it is reasonable to believe that the results will be the same as they were in 1915. May we hope that Germany will stand idly by and permit these shipments of arms to her enemies, without reprisals? Or will she send her submarines to our very shores and seek to inflict upon us the same reprisals she did in the World War? Will it not again result in the destruction of American lives and our entry in this war, a repetition of 1917?

Is it not logical that Germany will take the position our own Secretary of State took in writing to the German Ambassador on April 27, 1915, expounding our own official neutrality doctrine. when the Secretary of State said:

> This Government holds * * * in view of the present indisputable doctrine of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustified departure from the principles of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions.

This position, taken by our own Government, is upheld by the leading authorities on international law. Professors Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup, of Columbia University, on September 20, 1939, in a letter to the editor of the New York Times, in discussing this question, said:

> The question of the hour is whether the United States is today, with its present neutrality law on the books, free, under the law of nations, to remove embargoes in order to help the enemies of Germany. It is believed that the United States has not been free since September 3.

What is our purpose in this undertaking? Is it to protect America and to keep this Nation at peace, to keep it on the road of genuine neutrality, even though at the cost of economic sacrifices? Or is our purpose to aid England and France, regardless of the consequences—to take the steps that in 1914 to 1917 led us into war, for the avowed purpose of giving aid to one group of belligerents? If that is our purpose, and if it is our duty to fly to the aid of England and France, we should indeed repeal the arms embargo, which, as Secretary Hull said, was designed to keep us out of war.

If indeed we are convinced that England and France are engaged in a great moral crusade, that they are fighting our battle, that they are again seeking to make the world safe for democracy, that our first line of defense is on the Rhine, that they are engaged in a war to end war, and that we should go to their aid, then should we not go the whole way? Can we be half in and half out? Let us not take the first step unless we are willing to take the other steps which will surely follow. Let us keep all the way out or go all the way in. There is no middle ground. If it is our fight, which I do not believe it is, and therefore we should go to the aid of England and France, we should not do so with any sordid motives of seeking to profit by the transaction. The cash and carry is a merchandising scheme. Crusades are not fought that way. Our liberty was not purchased that way. If the die is cast, the fight is ours, the crusade is on, and we are partners in the conflict, let us take up the battle in earnest, not with cash registers for profit only, but with guns and men to win our war. As the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said in this House:

> If this be our destiny, then let us now highly resolve that we shall accept it; but let us accept it courageously, boldly, manfully, with our eyes open. Let us solemnly resolve now to plunge this Nation into this new conflict.
>
> Let us once again become the savior of Europe, the hero of aspiring minorities, the champion of self-determination. Let us wage war again to preserve Europe and make the world safe for democracy. Let us wage war to end war. Then let us resolve that within a quarter of a century we shall do it all over again, and again, and again, until hatred, greed, racial and linguistic animosity and economic desires, ambitions, and covetousness shall have been removed from the European cauldron of war.
>
> In short, let us highly resolve to continue to do so in perpetuity, and let us devise and bequeath that burden to our posterity, so that they, too, may periodically renew the conflict and join the battle, the burden of America, our destiny.

For my own part, I cannot subscribe to this doctrine. It is not our war. We should keep out. America's destiny lies in other paths—paths of peace, not war. The embargo against the sale of arms and munitions was a humanitarian measure. Its purpose was to keep us out of war and not to further the prosecution of wars. Our experience under the operation of the act has not shown it to be ineffective. No arguments have been advanced justifying our surrender of neutrality and the taking of a partisan position. We should not enter the power politics of the Old World. There is no moral crusade involved. The same issues are present in this war as in the wars of old. It is a question of balance of power, territory, and raw materials. It is not a contest in which we here in the Western Hemisphere are directly concerned. It is the same old European war. It is not an American war. It involves no issues vital to our welfare. It is interesting to note a news item which appeared in the Hartford Courant, dated October 29, 1764, 175 years ago. It reads:

> PARIS, August 10, 1764.—Within these last 3 days no less than 18 different couriers have been dispatched to Madrid. All is hurry and confusion at Versailles. Expresses are every moment sent to the different seaports; and if some whispers are to be credited, we are on the eve of a new rupture with the most formidable of our neighbors. This, and the distractions which are but too justly apprehended in Poland, threaten to deluge Europe afresh with blood, and throws an uncommon air of dejection over this metropolis, which was just beginning to recruit from the miseries of the late war.

The same controversy of 175 years ago is being repeated today.

I call attention to the compilation of the wars in which England and France have been engaged in the last 150 years, as set forth in an editorial of the Seattle Star of July 10, 1939. From this it is shown that during this period of 150 years, England was engaged in 54 wars lasting 102 years, or 68 percent of the time, and France was engaged in 53 wars, lasting 99 years, or 66 percent of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the permission of the House to extend in the RECORD at this point a list of these wars in which England and France have engaged in the last century and a half.

The list is as follows:

WARS OF ENGLAND

1778–81	First Mahratta war.
1776–83	North American (and with France).
1780–84	War with Netherlands.
1793–1802	Revolutionary war (with France).
1782–84	First Mysore war.
1790–92	Second Mysore war.
1803–14	War with France.
1815	Hundred Days War (Waterloo).
1801	War with Denmark.
1802–6	Second Mahratta war.
1806	Sepoy revolt.
1810–12	War with Sweden.
1807–12	War with Russia.
1812–15	War with United States.
1814–17	Goorkha war.
1817–18	Third Mahratta war.
1824–25	First Burma war.
1824–25	Ashanti war.
1826	Burma war.
1826	Intervention in Portugal.

WARS OF ENGLAND—continued

1827	War with Turkey.
1832	Intervention in Netherlands.
1838–42	War with Afghanistan.
1840–42	War with China.
1840–41	Egyptian insurrection.
1843–49	Sikh wars.
1845	Intervention in Uruguay.
1845–56	Intervention in Argentina.
1851–52	Kaffir war.
1852–53	Second Burma war.
1854–56	War with Russia.
1856–57	War with Persia.
1856–60	War with China.
1857–58	Mutiny of the Sepoys in India.
1863–64	Ashanti war.
1863–69	Maori war.
1867–68	War with Abyssinia.
1874	Ashanti war.
1878–80	War with Afghanistan.
1879	Zulu war.
1880–81	War in Transvaal.
1881–85	War of the Sudan.
1882–84	Occupation of Egypt.
1885–89	Third Burma war.
1895–96	Ashanti war.
1896–99	War of the Sudan.
1897–98	Intervention in Crete.
1899–1902	Boer war.
1900	Boxer Insurrection.
1901–2	Somali war.
1903–5	Tibet expedition.
1908	War on the northwestern boundary of India.
1914–18	World War.
1919	Afghan war.

(Total for 150 years: 54 wars, lasting 102 years, or 68 percent.)

WARS OF FRANCE

1779–83	War with England (North American).
1792–97	First Coalition War (against Dutch, Rhenish, Italians, Spanish).
1789–1800	Second Coalition War.
1793–1802	War with England.
1793–96	War in Vendee.
1795–1802	Egyptian Expedition of Napoleon.
1791–1802	Insurrection in San Domingo.
1805	Third Coalition War.
1806–07	War with Russia and Prussia.
1809	War with Austria.
1803–14	War with England.
1808–14	War with Spain.
1812	War with Russia.
1813–14	War Against German States (Hundred Days War—Waterloo).
1823	Spanish Expedition.
1827	War with Turkey.
1832	War with Holland.
1834	War with Portugal.
1829	War on Madagascar.
1845	War on Madagascar.
1838–39	War in Mexico.
1830–47	War in Algeria.
1838–40	War in Argentina.
1847	War in Cochin China.
1849	Roman Expedition.
1843–44	War with Morocco.
1845	Expedition to Uruguay.
1854–56	Crimean War.
1859	Austro-Italian War.
1862–64	War with China.
1857–62	War with Annam.
1860	Syrian War.
1861–62	Cochin-Chinese War.
1861–67	War in Mexico.
1860–61	War for Papal State.
1870–71	Franco-Prussian War.
1873–74	War in Tonkin.
1867	War in Rome (against Garibaldi).
1883–85	War with Tonkin.
1884–85	War with China.
1894	War with Tonkin.
1883–85	War on Madagascar.
1895–97	War on Madagascar.
1881–82	War on Tunis.
1893–94	War on Morocco.
1890–92	War on Dahomey.
1890–94	War on Sudan.
1893	War on Siam.
1900	Boxer Insurrection.
1907–12	War on Morocco.
1914–18	World War.
1925–26	Riffian War.

(Total for 150 years: 53 wars, lasting 99 years, or 66 percent.)

An examination of the wars in which these two nations—England and France—have been engaged brings most forcibly to our minds the motives which actuated Jefferson, Washington, and Monroe when they laid down our foreign policy, which we have followed all through the years, with the exception of the one time we cast it aside to enter the World War in an endeavor to settle the controversies of Europe and make the whole world safe for democracy. It is as true today as it was when Washington said:

> Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?
>
> The nation which indulges toward another a habitual hatred or a habitual fondness is in some degree a slave.
>
> It is a slave to its animosity or its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest.

Thomas Jefferson said:

> Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs.

President Monroe wrote:

> In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. * * * Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy.

Daniel Webster, referring to this foreign policy adopted by our young Republic for the purpose of keeping us out of European embroilments, said:

> Sir, I look on the message of December 1823 as forming a bright page in our history. I will help neither to erase it nor tear it out; nor shall it be, by any act of mine, blurred or blotted.

While England and France throughout the years have been engaged in many wars, many of them wars of conquest, we also appreciate the contribution they have made and are now making to civilization. For my own part, my decision in this momentous question now before us will not in any way be governed or influenced by my sympathies with any of the warring nations. We all want to see the democracies throughout the world prevail. We want to see our own ideals of government and justice preserved. We hate dictators. We loathe wars of aggression. We would like to see the nations of the Old World cast off their dictatorial regimes and restore to the peoples of their countries the liberty which we cherish and enjoy. But our duty is at home. We must do the thing that will bring peace and security to America and protect our democracy. We cannot jeopardize that in a futile effort to adjust the ideologies of the Old World, and attempt to force at the point of a gun or bayonet upon the peoples of the Old World our theories of government. They must work out their own destinies, as did we. The responsibility is theirs, not ours.

We want to help them, by our own example, but we cannot convert them to our ideals through war. And I most sincerely believe that we should not attempt to control the destinies of our foreign neighbors by furnishing the sinews of war—death-dealing arms, munitions, and poison gas—that one or more of these neighbor countries may blot out the others.

The proponents of repeal counsel that we should give up this policy which we have followed for 150 years of keeping aloof from foreign entanglements.

They contend that our America, being one of the family of nations, cannot live apart from the world but must join with the foreign nations in resisting aggression and in stamping out injustice and in giving protection to the weaker nations which are being preyed upon by the stronger, that we have a moral duty to perform. I do not believe our moral duty requires us to sell guns, bombs, and poison gas. We joined with the Allies in the World War. It indeed was a crusade to end all wars and to make the world safe for democracy. We now realize how impotent we were to bring about that most desirable objective. Instead of preserving democracy it has completely disappeared from most of the nations of the Old World, and indeed our own democracy would be imperiled by another such conflict. Should we again enter the lists in an endeavor to correct the ills of the

Old World and to bring to their knees the nations now opposing the Allies in the present conflict, we will again learn to our sorrow that our efforts would be misspent. We would only have left bitter memories of bloody battlefields, broken and maimed bodies, wasted lives, and back-breaking taxes and a bankrupt treasury. It is believed America's destiny is to make America safe for democracy and to prove to the whole world that our democracy will work, and by our example and our endeavor help to maintain the peace of the world. Let us keep out of this hotbed of European disputes and seek to solve our own domestic problems.

Another reason advanced by those favoring repeal is that we should develop our trade with foreign nations, particularly with England and France, and to that end should sell arms, munitions, and implements of war, including poison gas, on a cash-and-carry basis, in order to put to work our unemployed and help restore prosperity. It is reasoned that we should not send the materials abroad from which arms, munitions, and implements of war are made, but should make these materials into instruments of war here in our own factories and sell them to England and France and thus give American labor employment. Even the President himself in his message to the Congress on September 21, said:

> From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here.

In the other body it was proposed to impose an embargo against the sale of poison gas and flame throwers. The administration forces, however, overwhelmingly defeated this proposal, giving notice to the world that America, in order to reap profits, is willing to manufacture and furnish to the warring nations of the Old World these most inhuman instrumentalities of death to be visited upon innocent children, women, and other civilians, as well as those actually engaged in warfare. It may be freely admitted that we have many unemployed—perhaps 10,000,000 at the present time. And we have many millions on relief and seeking aid from our Government. However, it is inconceivable that America, a Christian nation, presumably with high ideals and humanitarian instincts, should, in order to make a profit and to furnish jobs to our own people, manufacture and sell these inhuman instrumentalities of death to foreign countries, with which to snuff out the lives of their victims. It should be remembered in considering the proposed inhibition against the sale of poison gas and flame throwers that under this amendment, if adopted, all the nations may buy this nefarious stuff from us. We will be unable to foretell who will be the victims of its use. If the embargo on arms is repealed and we are drawn into the war, our own bombs, shrapnel, and poison gas may be turned upon our own people. General Pershing said with respect to it:

> Chemical warfare should be abolished among nations as abhorrent to civilization. It is cruel, unfair, and improper use of science. It is fraught with the gravest danger to noncombatants, and demoralizes the better instincts of humanity.

The Washington Arms Conference, in 1922, upon the proposal of our own country, adopted a proposition against the use of poison gas and other similar materials. The section reads:

> The use in war of asphyxiating, poisoning, or other gases, and all analogous liquids, materials, or devices, having been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world, and a prohibition of such use having been declared in treaties to which a majority of the civilized powers are parties, the signatory powers to the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as a part of international law binding alike the conscience and practice of nations declare their assent to such prohibitions, agree to be bound thereby as between themselves, and invite all other civilized nations to adhere thereto.

If this House approves this measure, as this and other wars progress, the news will be brought to us and to the world that great groups of soldiers and civilians, men, women, and children have been struck down and brought to an excruciating death by means of poisonous gases, bombs, and shrapnel furnished by America. We cannot, I hope, take much satisfaction from these reports, even though we know that jobs have been furnished to some of our unemployed in manufacturing these devilish instrumentalities of death, and that our manufacturers and munitions makers have increased their bank accounts by profits made therefrom.

The following portrayal of a Kansas editor is significant in this connection:

> I don't want to get poison gas in my lungs. I don't want a piece of shrapnel in my stomach. I don't want my legs riddled by machine-gun bullets. I don't want maggots crawling in my brains that have been laid open by a splinter from an aerial bomb. I don't want to die. I am 37 and want to live. I hate those who have brought the United States closer to war today than it was in 1915. I wasn't old enough to fight then, but I was old enough to watch the war hysteria being aroused until it tempted the United States into a ruthless struggle for power in Europe. And I was old enough to see what it cost then and since.

Furthermore, it is conceded that by building up a war boom in the sale of arms and munitions we are only providing a temporary relief, and in the end an economic crash is sure to follow, leaving our industrial and economic structure prostrate as it was following the crash after the last World War.

Mr. Speaker, America can play a significant part in world affairs. It can do so, however, not through the sale of arms, munitions, and instrumentalities of war, and particularly poison gas and flame throwers, but by helping the world to discard war as an instrumentality for settling disputes between nations, and to return to the conference table. Should we not help to outlaw war rather than attempt to further our own economic interests by resort to world traffic in war materials? Is it not better by far that we follow the advice of our forbears and refrain from entering into involvements with power politics of the Old World, and mind our own business, and seek, by mutual cooperation and good will to secure and retain the respect and confidence of all the nations of the world, and to maintain a neutral position in their quarrels and to seek to help as a good neighbor rather than in the role of an enemy and a combatant, purveying instrumentalities of death? Should not America, as a Christian Nation, in this critical hour of its existence, turn from wars in Europe to peace in America?

Rather than furnish lethal weapons, poison gas, and liquid flame to our neighbors overseas with which to visit death and destruction upon their enemies would it not be more fitting for America to heed the supplications of the following prayer which in times past has gone forth from many of the pulpits of America to Him who charts our courses and directs our destinies?

> O God, break Thou the spell of the enchantments that make the nations drunk with the lust of battle and draw them on as willing tools of death. Grant us a quiet and steadfast mind when our own nation clamors for vengeance or oppression. Strengthen our sense of justice and our regard for the equal worth of other peoples and races. Grant to the rulers of the nations faith in the possibility of peace through justice, and grant to the common people a new and stern enthusiasm for the cause of peace. Bless our soldiers and sailors for their swift obedience and their willingness to answer the call of duty, but inspire them none the less with a hatred for war, and may they never for love of private glory or advancement provoke its coming. May our young men still rejoice to die for their country with the valor of their fathers, but teach our age noble methods of matching our strength and more effective ways of giving our life for the flag.
>
> O Thou strong Father of all nations, draw all Thy great family together with an increasing sense of our common blood and destiny, that peace may come on earth at last, and Thy sun may shed its light rejoicing in a holy brotherhood of peoples.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, now that Europe is back again at its 1,100-year-old job of war, the primary job of the United States is to keep out of that war. In defending the present neutrality law in 1936, President Roosevelt said:

> We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves against war.

We, who are opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo, agree with the President's 1936 statement. We are not isolationists. We are simply against entangling ourselves in Europe's war.

If Great Britain, France, and Germany had waited until 1943 to open hostilities, it would have been exactly 1,100 years since the foundation was laid for today's European war, by the treaty at Verdun in 843. Charlemagne had conquered and ruled as one kingdom what is now Italy, France, and Germany. But following his death and the death of his son, Louis the Debonair, Charlemagne's three grandsons, Lothaire, Charles the Bald, and Louis the German, began fighting for the rule of that kingdom.

Finally, after Louis and Charles had defeated Lothaire, the grandsons signed the Treaty of Verdun, dividing Charlemagne's kingdom. Charles the Bald took France; Louis took Germany; and Lothaire was given Italy and the central Frankish lands which today are known as Alsace-Lorraine. Thus began modern Germany, France, Italy, and the recurrently disputed Alsace-Lorraine and the rich Saar Basin.

Surely a war which began almost 600 years before Columbus discovered America does not call for interference by the United States. Let us look at what has happened during these 1,100 years since the Treaty of Verdun. The world has seen Frederick Barbarossa cross the Alps and subdue Italy; Joan of Arc burned at the stake by the English; Louis XIV invade, seize, and hold lands from the Atlantic to beyond the Rhine; Napoleon of France crush both Austria and Germany, march across Poland to the east, to be checked only by Russia's own destruction of Moscow and by the severe winter. The world has seen Frederick the Great, Catherine of Russia, Bismarck of Germany, and Disraeli of England set up what each was pleased to call a balance of power, meaning that a small buffer state, such as Poland, Rumania, or Austria, was to be used to checkmate the bloody moves of the greater powers. But corruption and greed crept in and unbalanced the scales. So the World War came.

With the Treaty of Versailles, there was another attempt to restore the balance of power. But the treaty makers overloaded the scales with unnatural frontiers and uneconomic divisions. This September the scales toppled over, and there is another European war—just a continuation of the 1,100-year struggle.

No wonder that in his Farewell Address George Washington warned us:

> Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns.

Washington, knowing history, saw the European situation clearly. Saw it as we should see it today. And because Europe's wars are "essentially foreign to our concerns," I, Mr. Speaker, will oppose any and every attempt to drag this country into them. It is my belief that if we repeal the arms embargo we will be dragged into this conflict.

I want America to remain neutral and impartial. I do not want America to take sides and fight. America has no interest in that old quarrel. The United States received nothing from the World War but a several-billion-dollar war debt, thousands of wounded young men, and shiploads of flag-draped coffins.

Arguments for the repeal of the arms embargo are that England and France need our arms, ammunition, and implements of war; that such purchases by these countries will bring prosperity to us. I believe that England and France can supply themselves with arms, ammunition, and implements of war and do so as cheaply as they can buy of the United States. During the World War the Allies had plenty of such supplies. In fact, they furnished the American troops with cannon and airplanes. Not an American cannon fired a shell over the front line, very few American airplanes flew over an enemy trench.

It is true that if the belligerents should all buy from the United States it would create a temporary prosperity, but it would be a false prosperity. A few years after each war ends there is always a financial depression. That was true after the War of 1812, the Napoleonic wars, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the recent World War. Munition plants that boom during war days must be dismantled when war ends. Airplane factories that build machines for war purposes must be closed when there is no need for planes of this type. And the balloon of false prosperity will be exploded. Men will be thrown out of work and again we will have bread lines, want, and distress. A few will have made millions of dollars. The last World War created 22,000 new millionaires. Millions of average Americans will feel the pinch of hard times, because wartime high prices will prevent their putting aside any of the wartime high wages.

Of course, we know that those who will make money out of the war will not be those who will make the supreme sacrifice if America is drawn into the present European struggle. War mongers, munition manufacturers, and international bankers seldom die on the battlefield. They usually die in bed, surrounded by doctors, nurses, and the comforts of home. But has it come to a point where average America must raise a crop of boys every 20 years to be slaughtered in Europe? In 1917–18 President Wilson told us we were going "to war to end all wars." Yet here is another crop of boys and here is another war to slaughter them, if we permit it.

Let America be an example to the world that a great nation can remain at peace with all the world. Little Switzerland, Holland, and Denmark remained neutral in the last war. They are doing the same in this war. If such small nations find it possible to remain at peace when their back porches overlook the French and German battlefields, surely the United States, over 3,000 miles away, can keep her young men off these same battlefields.

It is not true that our foreign trade will suffer and that labor will lose its wages if we do not repeal the arms embargo. We need not sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the quarreling nations. Instead let us sell trucks, automobiles, food, and other nonmilitary supplies in accordance with the present neutrality law, but sell these supplies on a cash-and-carry basis. Our factories will continue to run and our farms continue to produce. We will have a healthy market. We will sell all that the world requires of us. But the truth is that the world, at peace, has required only 7 percent of our produce. We consume 93 percent of all we produce. Hence an increase of over 7 percent—7 cents of every dollar—is, for us, the difference between war and peace. The question then is, Shall we be satisfied with our normal 7 cents on the dollar or shall we attempt to double the amount with arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and in that attempt permit America to be drawn into the European conflict?

I feel that I know the heart of labor, and I am satisfied that not a laboring man wants wages that are to be blood money. Not a laboring man wants to sell his son or the son of his neighbor into the European war for a doubtful increase over the normal 7-percent export trade that America does in peacetimes. Not a laboring man wants to run the risk of the danger of possible sabotage in our munitions plants. Such sabotage could well be the signal for an uprising of all radical elements in America, and we would have a war right here at home—a war quite as horrible as the recent civil war in Spain.

Instead of repealing our present arms embargo let us merely put some teeth into the act. Let us invest in Congress and Congress alone the power to make any decision which might lead to war. Let Congress define all combat areas. That is a power which could easily irk one side and please the other. If American citizens or American vessels insist on traveling among the belligerents, let them understand that they do so at their own risk.

Keeping all these things in mind, shall we then tie our own hands with "help Europe" schemes? Shall we entangle ourselves in Europe's eleven-hundred-year-old quarrel?

I am a veteran of the World War and I fervently believe that we should never again soak Europe's soil with American blood. Let us not scrap our present neutrality law—passed almost unanimously by Congress in the calm of peacetime—

and designed to keep this country out of war. Let us have an army, navy, and air force sufficiently strong to protect our borders from aggression, and then let us stay at home, keep out of all wars, and enjoy the American way of life without foreign entanglements. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, since the President called Congress to special session for the purpose of changing our Neutrality Act, I have received thousands of letters, cards, petitions, and wires on both sides of this most important and controversial issue. I have read every communication sent to me. Never have I given more intensive study and consideration to a problem, for I consider this to be the most vital issue to have faced the Congress during my 12 years as a Member of that body. While I have specialized in other fields during my service in Congress, I believe that the study I have given to this question justifies the positive stand that I have taken.

I regret exceedingly that there are those among my correspondents who felt that I would yield to political pressure, or that I could be intimidated by threats to annihilate me politically.

This problem is far too grave to be affected by political consideration, and, without attempting to be dramatic, may I say I would resign my job before I would vote on this problem contrary to the dictates of my conscience.

This issue, stripped of all excess verbiage, is: Shall the United States supply the belligerents in the current World War with arms, munitions, and all other implements of war? And in a practical sense, in view of the Allies' mastery of the seas, it means shall we change our Neutrality Act so as to become the arsenal of the so-called democracies?

To this end we are being subjected to the same propaganda methods that dragged us into the last World War and continued in relation to the questions of the foreign debts, the World Court, and other European power diplomacy objectives.

Between 1914 and 1917 this campaign to embroil us in war reached its zenith. Recall, for they will now be repeated, the atrocity stories, terrifying in every detail, since proved in large measure to be without authentic foundation. Remember the great moral issue that was drawn at that time between democracy and autocracy. "Save the world for democracy." "Fight a war to end all wars." Recall the appeals to our self-interest:

If you do not fight this enemy of democracy on European soil, you will have to fight it in America.

Remember the flood of trained lecturers who overran the country delivering these very same arguments.

The results that followed are well known. We lost the lives of 126,000 of our finest American boys, tens of thousands more wounded, permanently maimed, disabled, or bereft of reason.

I ask you to take a trip to any veterans' hospital and see these human wrecks of the last World War. Place yourself in my position. Would you cast any vote—I am not even going to say that will—that may involve this Nation in another European war.

The last war has cost us over $64,000,000,000 to date. And we have not finished paying the bills yet.

We fed Europe's starving millions and we loaned them billions, and now we cannot even collect the interest, let alone the principal. Instead, they called us "Uncle Shylock," giving living proof of the old Shakespearean adage, "A loan oft loses both itself and friend."

We also made 23,000 new millionaires in the United States through World War profiteering. The big fellows who make huge profits in wars are anxious to get in the game again. I am opposed to giving these merchants of death a chance to pile up their millions as they did before.

Today history is repeating itself.

The propagandists have already started to work as they did in the World War years, disseminating the same fallacies calculated to lead us into another world inferno.

Let me allude to some of the principal fallacies. They will have a familiar ring. Perhaps you have unconsciously been impressed by some of these specious arguments which have already flooded the country.

First and foremost, now that war rages in Europe, they say the United States will not be able to keep out of it. This argument rests on the false premise that we are bound to take sides with the so-called democracies. Otherwise they predict democracy will be destroyed in the world, and we will be the next marked for extinction; our trade, commerce, and financial relationships would be decimated by the victorious, ruthless dictators. Such assertions assume that if we do not fight in Europe we will be forced to fight here. The answer to this fallacy is plain. If we must fight in self-defense, by all means let us be prepared to make a fight that will insure a smashing defeat of our aggressors. Let us build an Army, Navy, and Air Force not only adequate for our protection but that will command the respect and forbearance of the world. Let us spend billions for self-defense but not one penny to send American boys to death on foreign soil.

Secondly, the claim will be made by these propagandists that we have an obligation to assist Britain and France in their so-called defense of democracy against totalitarianism by every means short of war. There are those who proclaim that civilization is at stake. Well, if such be the case, it should be our role not merely to supply arms and munitions for others who dare to fight, but to give these defenders of civilization the full support of all our resources, including our manpower. To assume any other position would be an act of cowardice. However, I do not for a moment conceive that this is a war of ideology. It is but another page in the bloody history of Europe's continuous fight for the balance of power. Our experience in 1918 should be sufficient proof that this new quarrel is none of our business. I do not believe we can be half in and half out. We should go all the way in or stay all the way out, and I prefer the latter.

I have my sympathies and you have yours, but I conceive that during my 16 years of public life I have never had a more serious or solemn obligation to my countrymen than that which confronts me now—the solemn duty and grave responsibility of keeping America from participating in the present European war.

I do not approach neutrality from the standpoint of being pro-anybody except pro-keeping America out of war. My ancestors came from the British Isles, but I hold no brief for any government apart from the American Government and the American people. I am a sincere believer, as most Americans are, in the American system of individual liberty, free enterprise, and constitutional rights of freedom of religious worship.

With strange inconsistency, it seems to me, the administration recommends that our ships be barred from war zones, loans to both sides forbidden, our citizens prohibited from travel in war areas—may I add that I am in full accord to this point—indeed, every effort save one would be strained to effectuate an appearance of neutrality. Militantly, however, they demand in the name of neutrality one reservation; that one thing is the most dangerous, the most certain to result in trouble; namely, furnishing arms, munitions, and materials of war to the belligerents of one side.

Furnishing one side with the deadly weapons of war is the most definite sort of favoritism, the rankest unneutrality. Does anyone contend that we improve and strengthen our neutrality by supplying either or both sides with tanks, gas, guns, ammunition, and other implements of war with which to kill each other?

To my mind, it is unthinkable that we can escape involvement in the European war, and at the same time advocate intervention. It is real intervention to threaten before or during a war to sell death-dealing instruments to one of the belligerents.

If we start selling munitions on a cash-and-carry basis, and build up a huge industry with only two consumers, this is what is going to happen:

When the cash runs out, rather than lose our customers and dislocate our domestic business structure by allowing the munitions industry to collapse, we will substitute credit for cash.

The next step will be to make loans to the Allies, to protect the credit that has been advanced.

And then, finally, we will send American boys overseas again, just as we did in 1917. That would be a terrible mistake.

Once we set our feet on that path, the result is inevitable. First, make war profits from cash sales, then give credit, then make loans, then send men. You doubt that? Well let me give you a little history from the last war.

During the World War we sold munitions, at first for cash only. The State Department at first declared that to extend credits would be unneutral. The munitions industry was enlarged to meet demands. Only the Allies, who controlled the seas, could buy. Allied cash gave out. Financial interests brought pressure on the State Department for permission to extend credits.

The President authorized Secretary Lansing to give bankers—without quoting him—the "impression" they were free to extend credits. Credits became exhausted. Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo wrote the President—

> To maintain our prosperity, we must finance it.

The President then authorized Lansing to convey "orally" to the bankers the opinion that the Government would take no action if loans were extended. The Allies were threatened with defeat. Our Ambassador to England cabled to the President:

> Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present prominent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted.

We went to war.

This experience of the last World War shows that the present proposal to put arms and munitions on a cash-and-carry basis means that once more we take the first step down the road to war. To me it is shocking that the issue has been so posed in Washington that Members of Congress have to choose between the repeal of the arms embargo and a system of cash and carry.

Why is it that no one on the other side of this issue does not want to apply cash and carry to everything except arms and munitions? Less than 2 years ago Senator PITTMAN, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, stated:

> No one can seriously oppose the imposition of an embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents.

Surely the sale of arms and munitions does not strengthen our neutrality.

To the contrary, I charge that the proposed changes are unneutral and deliberately designed to aid Britain and France.

And, this, I repeat, is the first step we are taking to war. I am not among those who believe our frontiers extend to the Rhine.

Is there anyone who will deny that every plant in the United States making arms and munitions will immediately become a target? Do you remember the Black Tom, Kingsland, and Morgan explosions during the last war?

Are we not inviting retaliation?

Picture several booming munitions plants blown up, hundreds of workmen killed. The passions of our people aroused by skillful propaganda. Do you think we will be able to resist the temptation to get into war?

That is the situation invited by the cash and carry of arms and ammunitions.

Cash and carry is of itself a subterfuge. This war cannot be carried out on a cash basis.

At this point I desire to read from a statement by President Roosevelt delivered at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936. Please keep in mind that he was discussing our present Neutrality Act:

> It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of war, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens.
>
> Industrial and agricultural productions for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster.
>
> Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.
>
> They will tell you—and, unfortunately, their views will get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work.
>
> If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace."

Those were the President's sentiments in 1936. They are mine today.

I know that if and when America goes to war democracy will die in America as it is dying in Europe, and the day of its resurrection will be long postponed.

I believe that if we will we can keep America out of this war. It will require courage, determination, and planning for peace. It will require that we seek our prosperity in peace trade and in supplying the needs of our own people, not by trying to coin other people's blood into our gold.

We are a peaceful people. The plain people of America ardently desire the opportunity under the protection and guidance of their own benevolent Government to find some secure basis for the employment of their abilities, their talents, their labors—to live like normal Americans of generations past, to work, to marry, to raise their children in prosperity and peace. This is their modest appeal to their public officials. I, for one, do not intend to fail them.

America should be ready for any eventuality, however remote, which threatens the security of our ideals and institutions in the future; be prepared to meet any enemy, or any combinations of enemies which may seek to undermine or overthrow our American Government. When the time comes to fight, and it well may, whether it be nazi-ism, communism, or any other ism or power, in defense of American soil, American principles, and aspirations of freedom, equality, and justice, let us be equipped to annihilate such aggressors. Till that day comes, while making ready for any challenge to our rights, let us be tolerant of others, neutral in word and deed, repel all smooth talk or propaganda hostile to our safety, and continue ceaselessly to work to avert war and preserve peace.

As a Member of Congress I conceive it to be my duty to think and act in terms of the well-being of the United States first, last, and always.

I want no vote of mine to cause the youth of America to shoulder a gun in someone else's quarrel.

I want no vote of mine to help create a new generation of Gold Star Mothers.

In closing, may I utter this fervent prayer—that the Congress will, in its wisdom and mature consideration of this grave problem, prevent future generations from condemning or indicting us as having betrayed the trust imposed in us by the American people.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the confusion which exists among the Members of this House and throughout the country over what has taken place here in Congress and in many parts of the world. I marvel somewhat at both American and British diplomacy. England is selling material and war supplies to Russia so that Russia can send those supplies to Germany to kill English soldiers. The President of the United States declared an embargo on the shipment of war supplies to England, Germany, France, Canada, Australia, the British possessions, and Poland. Russia joined Germany in crushing Poland with war supplies furnished by the United States and Great Britain. We have no embargo against the shipment of war supplies to Russia. For the last 18 months the people of this country have tried to get the President to exercise his discretionary power by stopping the shipment of war supplies to Japan so as to end the war in China, but he has refused to do so.

We hear some expressions of alarm today on the part of Members on the majority side about Russia. Mr. Speaker, this measure as it has come over from the Senate is not intended to affect Russia in any manner, either through the United States Government or through Great Britain, because

the administration intends to continue shipping war supplies to Russia as can be done today under a license from the Secretary of State, authorized by the President, and England intends to do likewise.

Now, maybe I am expressing my ignorance here today when I say I cannot understand the diplomacy of either England or the United States. I favor protecting our American ships and our American citizens. I favor the cash-and-carry plan if it is a cash-and-carry plan.

My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] offered an amendment, and I am supporting that amendment; and I shall speak in behalf of it at this time.

The best reason for the adoption of the amendment was the argument made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] and also by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. The amendment will surely make clear that the Federal Government, through any of its agencies, cannot extend credits to the belligerent nations. Of course, the gentleman from Alabama tried to make it perfectly plain that they could not do it under existing law and that there was no power whatsoever for them to extend credits to these belligerent nations. There are always, I would say, woodchucks in every woodpile, and there is a joker in this woodpile.

In order to make the cash-and-carry provisions of the bill effective, these belligerents will come to the United States for munitions and they are supposed to pay cash "on the barrel head," as the President said. Now, the President does not care where they get the cash, just so they pay the cash for the munitions and other supplies they are able to buy. He does not say they cannot go to the stabilization fund in the Treasury to get the cash. He does not say they cannot go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or other governmental agencies or even to the Federal Reserve System.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] seeks to make plain and clear that neither the stabilization fund nor the Federal Reserve nor any other Government agency can extend credit or make dollar exchange available to any belligerent nation.

Now, the gentlemen say this cannot be done anyway. Let us see what Mr. Morgenthau said about it when he appeared before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures last spring, when he was asking for authority to continue the stabilization fund. He said:

> There also are occasions when rate between the dollar and the currency of a country with small gold holdings is subjected to pressure because of unfavorable political or economic developments. The fund can be employed, and has occasionally been employed in such circumstances, to help stabilize the dollar exchange.
>
> For example, our arrangement with China was just such an operation. There was strong pressure against the dollar-yuan exchange, and China needed dollars in order to strengthen the dollar-yuan exchange rate, thus avoiding additional obstacles to our trade. To eliminate any risk of exchange loss, China agreed to repurchase the yuan at the same rate at which the United States purchased them, and China's promise was backed by adequate gold and silver collateral which was kept on deposit with Federal Reserve banks.
>
> An arrangement of like character was made with Brazil in 1937, but, owing to subsequent developments, the arrangement was not utilized.
>
> A similar arrangement was made with Mexico. We purchased Mexican pesos and in exchange made dollars available. Again, as in the case of China, the Mexican Government agreed to repurchase the pesos at the price we paid for them and deposited adequate collateral with the Federal Reserve banks.

Here is how they propose to work it. When these belligerent countries run out of money and cannot pay cash on the barrel head, they will make an arrangement with Mr. Morgenthau, through his stabilization fund, to sell British pounds or French francs to him. Then they will make an agreement with him that they are to repurchase those francs or pounds at the end of the war for the same price that he paid for them, and then he will provide dollar exchange for the belligerent nations so that they may buy their munitions and other war supplies and comply with the cash-on-the-barrel-head provisions of the bill.

Now, that is all there is to it, and when the gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment to prevent the use of Government credit, I would think that the proponents of this legislation would be ready and willing to grasp it in order to make perfectly clear that the rank and file of the American people will not be called upon to finance this war out of the United States Treasury.

Dollar exchange is what the belligerent nations need in order to pay cash for munitions and other supplies purchased in this country. It is estimated that France and England and their nationals now have approximately $8,000,000,000 in bank deposits and security investments in this country, which includes the earmarked gold of over $1,000,000,000. Wars cost money, and when the available funds are used up they will begin drawing on the stabilization fund and other Federal agencies for credit so as to provide dollar exchange.

Since Secretary Morgenthau has already stated that dollar exchange may be provided by the equalization fund, it is only reasonable to assume that he will extend the facilities of such fund to England and France. Both of these countries have been closely associated with the Secretary in joint operations of their respective currencies. They are all members of the so-called tripartite agreement. The adoption of the Wolcott amendment will prevent the use of this fund to provide credit or dollar exchange for any belligerent nation.

The United States should not be called upon in any manner to stand the cost of the present European war. We paid for the last war in manpower and money. Furthermore, we have already contributed a staggering sum toward the cost of the present war in Europe. The generosity of our Federal administration has no limit when it comes to helping foreign citizens and foreign governments. Since 1934 our Federal Treasury, under orders from President Roosevelt, has purchased nearly $5,000,000,000 in gold from the British Empire. We did not pay them the old price of $20.67 an ounce, which sum was paid to American citizens for the gold that they had on hand in 1934, but generously offered them $35 an ounce for all gold that they could ship into this country. They took advantage of the President's offer, and the Treasury made them a magnificent present of around $2,000,000,000 as a premium for the gold sold to America.

France sold us around $3,000,000,000 in gold and received a premium from Uncle Sam of more than $1,000,000,000. This policy of the New Deal is the reason why both France and England now have such large bank balances in this country with which to purchase war supplies and other products. Yes, the American people have already made their contribution toward paying for the war, and it is the business of Congress to protect our people from future assessments.

The United States Treasury now holds more than $17,000,000,000 in gold, most of which is buried in the ground in the State of Kentucky. This represents nearly 70 percent of the world's supply of gold. Monetary experts predict that in a short time this country will own 90 percent of the world's supply of gold, which will mean that gold will be discontinued as a medium of international exchange. When such time arrives, Uncle Sam will be like King Midas, and our buried gold will lose its monetary value. We will then be driven out of world trade unless we follow the barter system or are willing to permit foreign producers to ship into this country competitive imports in excess of exports. Either program will be detrimental to American producers on farms and in factories.

Section 7 of this bill provides against the sale of foreign securities of belligerent nations to individual citizens of this country and it prevents citizens of this country also from extending credit to foreigners. Yes; they have protected you, Mr. Individual, who buys foreign securities and extends credit, but they have not protected the rank and file of American citizens who pay the taxes to the United States Treasury and they are willing to leave that loophole, or woodchuck in the wood pile, so that our own Government may extend the people's credit and provide dollar exchange to belligerent nations when they run out of American dollars.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is there not another woodchuck in the wood pile? Section 7 is the cash-and-carry provision. Section 7 has a prohibition with reference to the issue and sale of and exchange of bonds, securities, and other obligations of foreign belligerent countries, but subsection (b) of section 7 states that "the provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation." The prohibition goes into effect at the time of the proclamation but prior to the time of the proclamation the foreign belligerent countries can issue and sell securities and other obligations without limit and then refinance them after the proclamation has been issued.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is the trouble with the whole bill. It is founded on the discretionary powers of the President, and the bill does not go into operation until such time as he is moved by some spirit to invoke the provisions of law. Too much discretionary authority has already been vested in the President. The powers delegated to him should be restored to Congress for the welfare of the people. Congress should stay in session to protect our country—not only to maintain neutrality, but to attempt an honest solution of the distressing problems confronting agriculture, labor, and business.

If the House will adopt the Wolcott amendment, the only controversial issue remaining will be the President's demand to lift the embargo on munitions and implements of war. All Members are agreed that this country should remain out of the European conflict. I feel that my colleagues are sincere in whatever stand they have taken for or against the repeal of the embargo. After weeks of sincere deliberation I have come to the conclusion that our neutrality can be best maintained so as to keep us out of the European conflict by retaining the embargo as provided in existing law. I shall therefore vote for the Shanley amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. I also urge you to vote for the amendment offered by my colleague from Michigan, as an additional safeguard for the welfare of our country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short resolution recently passed by the Thirty-sixth Division Association, at Fort Worth, Tex., and another resolution passed by the Farmers Union of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my colleague from New York [Mr. BLOOM] that he request that all those who have spoken on this bill have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BLOOM. That request was made yesterday and agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, for the information of all Members, states that that permission has already been granted.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion which has developed with reference to the more than $1,000,000,000 of gold earmarked in this country for Britain and France, and the several billions of dollars of American securities that they hold which can be converted into dollar exchange, I ask unanimous consent that I may at this point in the RECORD extend my remarks and quote some brief excerpts from a statement made by Secretary Hull before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, dealing with that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARMS EMBARGO AND FINANCIAL INVOLVEMENT

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the first thing that the House debate ought to accomplish is to bring forth, and answer, the real motives and reasoning which were involved in the Senate debate but which did not gain ascendency until that debate was closing. Defense of democracy involves dealing with the naked truth, realistically and unequivocally, and above all dispassionately and without blinking any of the facts. It would, in my view, be a tragic mistake to yield to panic and its spawn of hate, and attempt, or encourage other nations to attempt, to crush Hitler by crushing the German people. If we want to eliminate the possibility of a Hitler triumph over the less palpable oligarchies, then Britain and France must be kept from the folly of waging another futile war to the finish against Germany. Thus far Hitler has not attempted to crush democracy. He has now no excuse for extending his blitzkrieg to that end; but he will have such an excuse if war if forced to a showdown that cannot possibly attain the grandiose objectives set for it by those whose judgment is now warped by fear and hate.

Hitlerism is a result of causes that cannot be removed by war. Repeal of the embargo is therefore at best a futile gesture, if we would prevent the spread of autocracy to America. At worst, it is an abdication of democracy by resort to war.

As a matter of keeping out of war and maintaining neutrality, the disposition of the Seventy-sixth Congress has at no time been that changes should not be made in the neutrality law. Only a legislative stalemate over the character of changes could produce that result.

The character of the issues was clearly drawn, however, only at the very close of the Senate debate, when it was admitted that the pending legislation is neither a neutrality bill nor a cash-and-carry bill. The possibility of a stalemate, therefore, exists in the destruction of the argument for the new bill as a measure which will keep us from being drawn into war through financial involvement. This is not affected by the fact that the original law was not a cash-and-carry measure before the provision for title and carry expired last spring; for there has been implicit in the whole program for reenacting and tightening of cash and carry the admission that the arms embargo as a measure for avoiding a war boom and consequent financial involvement might be repealed only if an actual cash-and-carry provision, with teeth in it, is put in its place.

Such a cash provision has been attempted but not actually afforded. Particularly have the exemptions from the requirements for title in foreign shipments, which seemed necessary as to Canadian trade and certain ocean traffic, left gaping loopholes in the provisions of section 7a, prohibiting extension of credit for war trade.

The problem which should be brought before the House, were the administration minded to treat the matter unequivocally, is that of so amending the act (if the arms embargo is to be repealed) as to avoid not merely the development of the "fool's gold" motive in equipping Europe for self-destruction, but rather to prevent the imposition of a collapsible capital credit structure erected upon war orders, so that American motivation cannot become the naked one of war for war's sake. Such a motive will wholly eclipse the objectives of peace and make virtually certain a repetition of the follies of 1917 when plain facts were distorted, even by President Wilson, as a camouflage for our self-deceptive diplomacy. If we are to make war, we must not be in the position of a Shylock who is ignored when the smoke of battle blows away and peace is to be made. America must stop subsidizing the British Empire as a means of defense. We surely must seek to enter into the situation, if at all, as a self-defended, dominant influence for a real and just peace divorced from European power politics. A heroic effort must be made to break the vicious circle of war-causing, boom-causing, depression-causing, tyranny-causing war, and so on, ad infinitum ad nauseam. The menace of dictators cannot be removed by any other course.

At the very start of these financial considerations it must be recognized that we are already financially involved in the

survival of "Sterlingaria"; for assuredly the British scheme of money systems managed through central banks with reserves of gold will be thrown out by a German peace, and with it most of the dollar value of our Kentucky hoard. Our own installation of a central bank in the "Sterlingaria" system has bogged down; witness the plea of the Federal Reserve Board for congressional guidance in its report for 1938, and the authoritative comment on this situation by Professor Westerfield, of Yale, in the Annalist last September, in which he pointed to the "twilight" of the Reserve System.

In the face of this critical situation, with Uncle Sam holding the bag with a 17,000-ton gold brick in it, we find the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senator WAGNER, passing up these crucial issues in Senate debate by a plea that only the pending Senate investigation by his committee, which has been procrastinated for over a year and now has nothing done toward even beginning work months after appropriation was provided, can afford authoritative guidance. The Senator obviously prefers to treat our economic smallpox as if it were a skin disease—prefers to meddle with industrial relations through superficial measures which have proved to be not even palliatives. In the Senate debate, therefore, this critical issue of financial involvement is left "with both feet firmly planted—in the air"; and Congress has only the categorical and evasive opinions of Secretary Morgenthau, which were offered in reply to a query from Senator VANDENBERG, as a guide in shaping a policy to avoid further financial entanglement in the affairs of Europe.

In view of the stringent exchange controls set up by the belligerents, it is clear that financial involvement through war credits could be avoided only by a true cash requirement for all war purchases. Such a proviso was suggested by Senator DANAHER during the closing debate. My colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has also offered an amendment to section 7a in a similar attempt to tighten the restriction of credit. If there is any other way to avoid loopholes and financial involvement under repeal of the embargo, I cannot see it.

Yet we cannot blink the fact that a strictly cash measure would suppress much trade that apparently need not be suppressed. Even though it be an almost negligible part of our total commerce, why interfere with Canadian trade as it is? Let us not forget, however, that all our foreign trade, even at its peak, has never materially exceeded 10 percent—last year it was less than 5 percent—of our national income, so that, even though we conduct a trade in arms proportionately larger than in 1915–16, which seems not to be in prospect at this moment, such trade will be small in every sense except that of its disastrous effect on our monetary system and the unstable credit structure which that system now permits.

I believe that it is possible to work out a change in our money and banking system which would obviate the development of such dangerous contingencies in our highly capitalized industrial system. But the exigencies of the present situation, which the administration is wholly unprepared to meet, despite huge appropriations for congressional and departmental investigations of the fundamental issues involved, obviously preclude such action at this time. Senator WAGNER's investigation has not even begun, and Congress can take no early action to obviate the dangerous possibilities of a war trade based on foreign-government contracts. Those results can occur, and doubtless will, even though deliveries be paid for in full with United States money. It is certain that such trade will have repercussions far larger than its own size, for in large measure it must force an internal credit expansion in the form of capitalization which will be many times as large as the resulting war income in terms of foreign trade. Billions in "fool's gold" will thus be injected into our industry and our circulating medium of exchange.

The conclusion is inescapable, therefore, that our present action, to keep from becoming a victim of this war rather than a self-defended and controlling factor in peace, must include the addition of an arms embargo to the bill as the Senate has passed it. Such a provision does, indeed, and most emphatically should, prevent the undertaking and financing, by a large expansion of internal bank credit, of those finishing processes of munition manufacture which cannot be undertaken with our existing capital structure in the heavy industries.

It is precisely such an expansion in capital credit—such an "outlet for savings"—which has been advocated by the Assistant Secretary of State, Dr. Adolph Berle, Jr., and other administration experts, in testimony before the Temporary Economic Committee, as a measure for attaining internal prosperity and employment. Attached to a war boom that kind of expansion will certainly prove disastrous, for has not the Federal Reserve Board warned the Congress that the System is devoid of control over these conditions? Why has the administration persistently ignored this warning and procrastinated not only action but even investigation or any effort to determine a line of action?

Mr. Speaker, in the existing law as well as the Pittman bill which is now before this body for consideration, our economy is placed in the hands of England and France just as it was in the period 1914–19. Again we sow the seeds of future trouble and for which we shall have to pay dearly. We know full well that England and France have the money and they have the ships with which to purchase and transport that which we would make and sell. In saner days that were filled with less emotion than at this hour the Congress more fully recognized the enormities of a war boom. But now emotion is in the saddle and war hysteria is taking hold of our reasoning powers. Even our Secretary of State Hull back in 1936 pointed out to us the dangers, but where is his voice in this crucial hour? With the permission of the House let me here quote the words of the Secretary of State which he made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in those saner days of 1936, and at which time the Senate was conducting hearings looking forward to strengthening our 1935 neutrality legislation. Mr. Hull said:

> The theory of the Neutrality Act of last August (1935) in embargoing exports of finished war commodities to belligerents was to keep us out of war. Of course, we all know that. That was the primary, paramount, controlling purpose of it. The theory of section 4 in the present bill, relating to embargoing of such abnormal shipments of prime war materials as might take place, is just as much or perhaps more to keep us from being drawn into war as the embargoing of these finished implements of war.

Commenting further Secretary of State Hull said:

> Our view was that from the standpoint of keeping out of the war, no nation has a right to go out and get into a war, no matter who is responsible for it, and then turn around to a friendly neutral and demand of it that it be furnished with the necessary war supplies to carry on the war under penalty of being unneutral. With a view to keeping the country out we felt that nobody can object to a nation carrying on normal trade, but whenever any nation demands of a peaceful neutral nation that it go further, and single out and segregate purely war materials and war supplies, and feed them out to the warring nations, we said that there is not and never has been any international law or any other kind of law or reason that would compel a peaceful nation to do that regardless of the dangers involved.

As has been pointed out, a war boom will create in this country a vested interest in the prosecution of the war—a financial stake in the continuation of the war. We know that at the present time England and France have enormous demand deposits in our banks subject to their check; they have earmarked gold stored in this country; and they and their nationals hold vast equities in our industries; and all of these forces can, at their command, be converted into dollar exchange with which they can purchase our goods. When this fountain of purchasing power is turned loose in our economy the prices of the necessities of life will begin to rise, and there will follow discontent among our citizens whose cost of living will become more burdensome. In due course all war orders will cease to flow to industry in all countries. When the day arrives for the closing down of the industries that have opened, expanded, and been built on the foundation of war orders, economic collapse will be with us, and the equities of millions of people in the common walks of life will again be washed out.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask, Why the changed attitude of the administration? Can it be that the design of the Pittman bill and the proponents of the bill and the supporters of the President have become so imbued with the idea of winning a war for England and France that all thought of protecting the economy of the people of the United States has been set aside? We are mindful that there is a national election only a few months away, and we are realistic enough to know what a high level of business activity will be worth to the party in power at that time. We wonder what weight, if any, is being given to this factor. The business interests of this country since their first flush of wild activity in early September have somewhat cooled off, and there is a marking of time at the moment. This, in itself, is now serving as a brake against rapidly mounting prices. As we have heard so dramatically pointed out on this floor the last few days, the participants in the war are moving very quietly, and major battles are not yet raging. But let the Pittman bill be enacted; let the bombing planes begin their deadly work in earnest and the cannons begin the death roar, with the destruction of whole cities, industrial works, and helpless citizens, and the brakes will be off and we will be on our way to a big war boom.

Unless and until America is forced into an actually defensive war everything possible must be done to prevent the development of a war boom. Our present situation in no sense involves any such contingency as self-defense. Nor is the fate of democracy in Europe now concerned except as Britain and France are forcing such an issue. The existing facts do not warrant any confidence in anyone's ability to defend democracy by such a war. Every expectation from either logic or experience indicates a precisely contrary result. The hope of democracy lies in abandonment of the aggressive use of force to crush a supposedly dangerous theory of government. Let America support no such program if she seeks the survival of liberty and free enterprise.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the important question involved in this legislation is a challenge to the finest virtues of our patriotism. It is a question which may involve life and death and perhaps the destiny of our Nation. It, therefore, addresses itself to the true nobility of our souls and to the exalted dignity of our statesmanship and manhood. I hope, therefore, that none of us will permit our decisions to be influenced by narrow prejudices, sinister impulses, or fond partialities.

The unhappy situation which exists in the world today has aroused deep sympathies and likewise hideous passions and other emotions which have caused the minds of our people to be greatly disturbed.

Our people are still devoutly devoted to the high ideals of peace. Our people hate and despise the evil influence which has again involved Europe in another deluge of human blood. I believe that the average American hates and abhors Hitlerism and all that it stands for, but we should permit neither our sympathies nor our passions to cause us to turn our backs again upon our traditional policy of minding our own business.

When the Bloom bill was before the House in the last session of Congress I called it a "tragedy of errors" and a "legislative monstrosity," which I was unwilling to embrace. I was then of the opinion and am now of the opinion that had the bill been enacted into law in the form in which it was then proposed it would have provided a springboard from which our Nation would have plunged into the carnage, the devastations, and the shambles of war.

If we would avoid the vortex of war we must stay out of the vestibule of war. This I have maintained from the beginning and this I now maintain.

We must make a sacrifice for peace, and we are willing to make a sacrifice for peace. We must curtail our commerce and restrict our shipping and the movement of our citizens. We must keep our citizens and our ships and our flag out of combat areas and danger zones, and this the House bill did not do.

Under the bill as amended by the Senate, which we are now considering, neither our citizens nor our ships nor our flag will be permitted in combat areas or zones of danger.

Upon the passage of this bill the world will know that our ships are not engaged in the business of transporting implements of death to nations at war and we will have the satisfaction of knowing that our citizens will not be permitted to ride the seas upon floating arsenals, thereby jeopardizing the peace and security of our Nation.

The Senate has repudiated the House bill and has in effect vindicated the position of those of us who sought to provide safeguards for the peace and security of our Nation when the bill was considered in the House last June.

The Senate has repudiated the House bill and has sent to us a bill every provision of which I am willing to support. This bill now contains a cash-and-carry plan, a plan which I believe will meet with the approval of the American people. This bill more clearly conforms to the ideas and views of the administration as expressed by the President in his speech which he delivered upon the calling of this special session. This bill will keep our citizens out of war zones and our ships out of submarine-infested seas and belligerent ports, and I hope it will enable us to avoid involvement in a conflict in which we have no immediate interest or concern.

I am happy in the thought that we are willing to make a sacrifice of our commerce and restrict the privileges of our citizens and that we will not permit war profits and the allurements of greed to lead us from the pathways of peace.

No law which we may here enact will guarantee either the peace or the security of our Nation. Public opinion reigns and rules above the law and still controls and directs the affairs of our Government. We cannot by law control public opinion, nor can we control the passions of the human race, and neither can we by law or by brute force purge humanity of its less admirable traits and annihilate all of the diabolical passions which animate the breasts of evil and wicked men.

An enlightened public opinion is democracy's best garrison and America is democracy's best hope. Certainly America is the citadel of democracy's greatest triumphs and I am not afraid that democracy will be banished from the earth. Our Nation is rich and great and beautiful and our system of government is the best that the mind of mortal man has yet devised. In it we have faith and to it we will cling and here in America we will continue to enjoy and to intensify the manifold blessings of a great and free government.

Our Nation has learned the supreme lesson which civilization has to teach, the lesson that might does not and cannot make right and that problems should be solved by reason rather than by brute force, and we will not, therefore, permit ourselves to become involved in the controversies between other nations of the world. We should again dedicate this Nation to the noble arts and pursuits of peace which minister to the welfare and progress of our own people. We still have many great problems upon the proper solution of which may well depend the survival, the supremacy, and the perpetuity of our own great system.

I am sure that no one will now contend that the House bill contained a cash and a carry provision as was so generally believed by the people of our Nation. You know and I know that it did not contain either a cash or a carry plan; yet many people thought and believed that the Bloom bill contained a cash-and-carry plan and that such a plan was at that time supported by the administration. I feel certain that everyone now knows that the bill did not contain any such plan but only contained a credit provision which would have permitted the sale of arms and implements of war and other articles and materials to the warring nations of the world upon credit. The bill only provided for the divesting of all American interest in the cargoes to be transported and did not even pretend to contain a cash-and-carry provision which required payment in cash for arms and ammunition and implements of war and other articles and materials, nor did it prohibit or in any way prevent the shipment of arms and implements of war in American ships. There was a provision in the House bill which was often referred to as the

"so-called" cash-and-carry provision, but all of us know that it was neither a cash nor a carry provision, and all of us must know that it was absolutely nothing in the way of a safeguard.

But for the Vorys amendment, the compromised embargo which was inserted in the bill notwithstanding committee opposition, there was absolutely nothing in the bill which would have prohibited either our ships or our citizens from sailing into submarine-infested seas, into combat areas and into the ports of belligerent nations. It was stated to the House at the time we were considering the bill that the bill would have permitted the mixing of babies and bullets and women and weapons and men and munitions on American ships, flying the American flag, and destined for war zones and belligerent ports. This would have led our country into the vestibule and into the very vortex of war.

It is not our job to police the world and we cannot afford to police the world which is today but a temple of tumult and a tower of discord. Our job is to save America and her own institutions to the end that the world may have at least one citadel of democracy in which the torch of freedom will continue to burn. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the time of the House at this late hour in discussing a phase of this question which it seems to me ought to be discussed before we vote upon the bill. Under the circumstances I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I assume that there is no Member of this body who at this time seriously contends that to repeal the Arms Embargo Act is in itself a neutral act or an act tending to promote the neutrality of this Nation in the present war now going on in Europe. I assume further that the perfectly obvious fact is admitted by all the proponents of the repeal of the arms embargo—that it would be a definitely unneutral act designed specifically to put the United States in a position of taking sides in this armed conflict by favoring one side, England and France, as against the other side, Germany.

It is an amazing spectacle in American history that on a question holding within it perhaps the issue of life or death for millions of our youth, those in high places should within a short period of 12 months completely change their attitudes and contradict themselves utterly and absolutely.

Nothing has happened, Mr. Speaker, to change the situation; no new conditions have arisen to make the Embargo Act any less logical as a measure of neutrality than it was when it was passed. Why, Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1938, in a letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, which document was placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 597, by our distinguished colleague, Mr. KNUTSON, of Minnesota, the Secretary of State said:

> In recent years this Government has consistently pursued a course calculated to prevent our becoming involved in war situations. In August 1936, shortly after the beginning of the civil strife in Spain, it became evident that several of the great powers were projecting themselves into the struggle through the furnishing of arms and war materials and other aid to the contending sides, thus creating a real danger of a spread of the conflict into a European war, with the possible involvement of these United States. * * *
>
> In view of all those special and unusual circumstances, this Government declared its policy of strict noninterference in the struggle and at the same time announced that export of arms from the United States to Spain would be contrary to such a policy.
>
> The fundamental reason for the enactment of the joint resolution of January 8, 1937, was to implement this policy by legislation. This joint resolution was passed in the Senate unanimously and in the House of Representatives by a vote of 406 to 1.
>
> In the form in which it is presented, the proposed legislation, if enacted, would lift the embargo, which is now being applied against both parties to the conflict in Spain, in respect to shipment of arms to one party while leaving in effect the embargo in respect to shipments to the other parties. Even if the legislation applied to both parties, its enactment would still subject us to unnecessary risks we have so far avoided.
>
> * * * In view of the continued danger of international conflict arising from the circumstances of the struggle, any proposal which at this juncture contemplates a reversal of our policy of strict noninterference which we have thus far so scrupulously followed and under the operation of which we have kept out of involvement, would offer a real possibility of complications. From the standpoint of the best interests of the United States in the circumstances which now prevail, I would not feel justified in recommending affirmative action on the resolution under consideration.
>
> Our first solicitude should be the peace and welfare of this country, and the real test of the advisability of making any changes in the statutes now in effect should be whether such changes would further tend to keep us from becoming involved directly or indirectly in a dangerous European situation.

Mr. Speaker, who is there in this Chamber who honestly believes that to repeal the Embargo Act in order to give Great Britain and France added advantages, by reason of British naval power, over Germany, will, in the words of Secretary Hull, "further tend to keep us from becoming involved directly or indirectly in a dangerous European situation"?

Mr. Speaker, I shall let the Members of this House and the people of this country judge for themselves what possible logic or sense or consistency could have persuaded the Secretary of State to write a letter on May 17, 1939, exactly a year from the date of the letter I have just quoted, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the then acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, in which he completely reversed himself, contradicted his previous statements of a year before, and said:

> In considering the present proposals for legislation, we must keep in mind that no matter how much we may wish or try to disassociate ourselves from world events, we cannot achieve disassociation. The simple fact of our existence as a great nation in a world of nations cannot be denied; and the substance of the legislation adopted in this country inevitably influences not only this country, but also other countries. * * *
>
> If we go in for embargoes on exports for the purpose of keeping ourselves out of war, the logical thing to do would be to make our embargo all inclusive. * * *
>
> Our conclusion that embargo on export of arms is undesirable is not new, and experience has confirmed our belief.
>
> For the reasons heretofore stated, it is my firm conviction that the arms-embargo provision of the existing law should be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I shall leave it for the distinguished Secretary of State to explain and justify before the people of this country such a complete contradiction of policy and such a complete reversal of position in the short period of 12 months.

I am moved to say, Mr. Speaker, that consistency of either policy or position seems to be the least consideration in this matter of repealing or not repealing the arms embargo.

Back in 1935 and 1936 when the embargo legislation was being considered, Members of both Houses of the Congress stood up and solemnly assured the Nation that in that time of cool sanity and freedom from emotionalism or prejudice or propaganda the only possible course to prevent us from becoming entangled in foreign quarrels and foreign wars was to lay down a law, a course of action, which would govern us and which we could follow when the inevitable time came that foreign conflicts would rage, that emotions would boil over, that propaganda campaigns would be under way, as now, that old prejudices and hatreds would be reawakened, that sanity would be replaced by hysteria, and at that time this Congress by an overwhelming vote said, "This is the course we should follow when hysteria and emotion and prejudice tend to lure us from the path of neutrality."

Why, Mr. Speaker, it was against exactly this time we are now in, it was against these very circumstances which exist today, it was against the very pressures which now are being exerted on the American people and on the Members of this House, that the Congress overwhelmingly adopted the Embargo Act in the first instance and strengthened it in 1937.

Some of the very men who then told us that the embargo on arms and munitions was the only possible way in which to lay a foundation for absolute neutrality and thus remain at peace, I regret to say, now tell us that we must abandon the embargo in order to be neutral.

Back in 1935 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations specifically stated the point in the course of the hearings that the only argument against the embargo at that time was that England with her naval dominance could come to us for arms and munitions while Italy could not. It was specifically stated in those hearings at that time by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee that to fail to pass an embargo act would be such a direct advantage to England, would so obviously help England as to constitute us an ally.

Yet today we are being told, presumably with serious intent to convince us, that the purpose of repealing this Embargo Act is to maintain a position of strict neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, I could fill pages upon pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with statements of different spokesmen, from the President down, proving that there is not the slightest intent on the part of the administration to be neutral in the war now going on in Europe. Let me quote a few excerpts and let us see how neutral they are in spirit and how neutral we will in fact be if we yield to the pressure to repeal the Arms Embargo Act.

At St. Paul, Minn., on October 9, 1936, the President said:

A prosperous world has not permanent room in it for dictatorship or for war.

At Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, the President said:

There are newborn fanaticisms, convictions on the part of certain people that they have become the unique depositories of ultimate truth and right.

At Chicago, on October 5, 1937, the President said:

The peace, the freedom, and the security of 90 percent of the population of the world is being jeopardized by the remaining 10 percent who are threatening a break-down of all international order and law. Surely the 90 percent who want to live in peace under the law and in accordance with moral standards that have received almost universal acceptance through the centuries, can and must find some way to make their will prevail. * * *

It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading.

When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease. * * *

War is a contagion, whether it be declared or undeclared.

Again, in a statement published in the New York Times on November 20, 1938, the President said:

The news of the past few days from Germany has deeply shocked public opinion in the United States. * * *

I could myself scarcely believe that such things could occur in a twentieth-century civilization.

Again in a radio address on November 4, 1938, Mr. Roosevelt said:

In other lands across the water the flares of militarism and conquest, terrorism and intolerance, have vividly revealed to Americans for the first time since the Revolution how precious and extraordinary it is to be allowed this free choice of free leaders for free men.

No one will order us how to vote, and the only watchers we shall find at the polls are the watchers who guarantee our ballot is secret.

Again in the same radio address the President said:

If our democracy is to survive, it must give the average man a reasonable assurance that the belts will be kept moving.

Dictators have recognized that problem. They keep the conveyor belts moving—but at a terrible price to the individual and to his civil liberty.

In a speech at the New York Herald Tribune Forum on Foreign Policy, October 26, 1938, the President said:

It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher or more enduring quality than peace by the sword.

There can be no peace if the reign of law is to be replaced by a recurrent sanctification of sheer force.

There can be no peace if national policy adopts as a deliberate instrument the threat of war.

At Kingston, Ontario, on August 18, 1938, the President said:

But there is one process which we certainly cannot change and probably ought not change. This is the feeling which ordinary men and women have about events they can understand. We cannot prevent our people from having an opinion in regard to wanton brutality, in regard to undemocratic regimentation, in regard to misery inflicted on helpless peoples, or in regard to violations of accepted individual rights.

Again in a speech at Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif., on July 14, 1938, the Chief Executive said:

We fervently hope for the day when the other leading nations of the world will realize that their present course must inevitably lead them to disaster.

Again in a radio address on the occasion of the opening of the San Francisco Golden Gate Exposition, February 18, 1939, Mr. Roosevelt said:

By setting an example of international solidarity, cooperation, mutual trust and mutual helpfulness, we may keep faith alive in the heart of anxious and troubled humanity, and at the same time, lift democracy high above the ugly truculence of autocracy.

In his message to the Congress on January 4, 1939, the President said in part:

Storms from abroad directly challenge three institutions indispensable to Americans, now as always. The first is religion. It is the source of the other two—democracy and international good faith. * * *

There comes a time in the affairs of men when they must prepare to defend not their homes alone, but the tenets of faith and humanity on which their churches, their governments, and their very civilization are founded. The defense of religion, of democracy, and of good faith among nations is all the same fight. To save one we must now make up our minds to save all * * *.

* * * We have learned that God-fearing democracies of the world, which observe the sanctity of treaties and good faith in their dealings with other nations, cannot safely be indifferent to international lawlessness anywhere. They cannot forever let pass, without effective protest, acts of aggression against sister nations—acts which automatically undermine all of us.

* * * Words may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. There are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people.

At the very least we can and should avoid any action, or lack of action, which will encourage, assist, or build up an aggressor.

Mr. Speaker, I am content to let the American people judge of the quality of neutrality expressed in these sentiments.

Let me now turn to a few excerpts from statements made by an authorized spokesman of the administration and a member of the President's Cabinet, Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture. It is understood, of course, that on a matter of international relations no member of the President's Cabinet would think of speaking without the approval of the President.

In the New York Times of April 9, 1938, Mr. Secretary Wallace is quoted as saying:

It is vital to the peace of us and our children that the Americas turn a stony face to the European dictators who are intent on destroying democracy.

These nations look at the thinly populated Americas with envious eyes. They covet the trade of the Americas and do not scruple to use methods which we in the United States have not hitherto cared to use.

In a radio speech on September 17, 1937, Mr. Secretary Wallace said:

There are leaders in other lands who would like to see the forces of disunity conquer this country. They would like to see democracy fail in order that their own nervous belief in dictatorship might be strengthened. They jeer democracy and say a democratic government acts only when it is too late. In their minds there can be no progress and no unity in a democracy. For them there are no men of good will; there are only men of force.

Again, in an address in New York City February 12, 1939, Secretary of Agriculture Wallace said:

Claims to racial superiority are not new in the world. Even in such a democratic country as ours there are some who would claim that the American people are superior to all others. But never before in the world's history has such a conscious and systematic effort been made to inculcate the youth of a nation with ideas of racial superiority as are being made in Germany today.

He said further in the same speech:

Thus the dictatorial regime in Germany, masquerading as propaganda in pseudo-scientific terms, is teaching the German boys and girls to believe that their race and their nation are superior to all others, and by implication that that nation and that race have a right to dominate all others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I leave you to judge whether or not those sentiments are reeking with neutrality.

Now let me turn to another authorized spokesman for the administration and quote briefly from his public utterances. I refer to the genial and ordinarily soft-spoken Secretary Ickes, of the Department of the Interior.

Said Mr. Ickes in a radio address on February 22, 1938:

In all parts of the world it [democracy] is beset by two fanatical foes, which have the will to conquer at all costs. Democracy cannot live side by side in the same country with either fascism or communism. * * *

Totalitarianism, either of the right or of the left, is alien to the spirit that dominates the English-speaking democracies of the world. Totalitarianism is subversive of the ideals upon which our democracies are founded.

In a radio address in Chicago on April 3, 1938, Mr. Secretary Ickes said:

Let us make no mistake. Totalitarianism is insidiously boring today from within the temples of our liberty and assaulting it from without.

Again, in an address at Cleveland, Ohio, on December 18, 1938, Mr. Secretary Ickes said:

Recently it has come to be believed by many that we must go back to the Middle Ages to find a pattern into which the political life of the present European dictatorships will properly fit. But this is an insult to the Middle Ages. * * *

* * * To seek a true comparison [with the dictatorships] it is necessary to go back into that period of history when man was unlettered, benighted, and bestial. * * *

Certain sections of Europe today have made it possible for ethnologists and anthropologists to study primitive man without having to sift kitchen middens or attempt to reconstruct a social order on the basis of a human jawbone or a few crude implements used in the daily life of long ago. The intelligence and culture of a humane people, by a sudden and swift revulsion, has been sunk without trace in the thick darkness of preprimitive times. * * * Superstition once more rules the minds of men, and modern dictators have set themselves up as high priests of a more cruel, if a more refined, voodooism.

Mr. Speaker, in these statements I challenge any Member of this House to find a trace of that which we call neutrality, or impartiality, the basis upon which should rest the relations of this country with its foreign neighbors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me quote from some of the voluminous expressions of the administration's recognized spokesman in another body, one who is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of that body.

On October 7, 1937, the gentleman referred to, speaking of Japan's course in China, said:

Our Government can no longer refrain from asserting the facts and publicly condemning Japan.

* * * The President has suggested the method of compelling Japan to desist from its barbarous warfare of destruction. He holds that Japan is disseminating war disease which may involve the world and that Japan should be quarantined as every civilized community quarantines against contagious disease.

The Neutrality Act was never intended to meet such contagion. * * * What is required now is a quarantine to prevent the spread of the war disease and to stamp it out. * * *

Let the civilized governments which are backed by 90 percent of the people of the world ostracize Japan. Let them refuse to have any dealings with the country. Let them refuse to continue any commercial or credit relations with Japan and there need not be a single shot fired. Such action (economic sanctions) is more powerful than the Army and Navy of the United States.

No government can conduct war under such ostracism, in my opinion.

It might be stated in passing that, up to this time, no other nation has approved these sentiments.

On December 23, 1938, this gentleman, speaking in his official capacity, said:

1. The people of the United States do not like the Government of Japan.

2. The people of the United States do not like the Government of Germany.

3. The people of the United States, in my opinion, are against any form of dictatorial government, communistic or fascistic.

4. The people of the United States have the right and power to enforce morality and justice in accordance with peace treaties with us. And they will. Our Government does not have to use military force and will not unless necessary.

On January 5, 1939, referring to the President's message to Congress, this gentleman said:

The President very clearly stated that we had the right, and it was our duty, to refrain from aiding those conquering dictators, and it was equally our duty in every way, except through the use of armed force, to aid democracies in their fight against these dictators.

It is evident to me, and undoubtedly to the President, that the so-called Neutrality Act has not, and probably will not, accomplish this purpose (of aiding the "democracies"). In fact, in some cases it may result in the contrary. If this conception is correct, then some action by Congress is essential.

On January 23, 1939, on the American Forum of the Air, this chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of another body said that we must—

Resist with every legal means short of war the advance of these dictatorial government toward our country and our neighbors and be prepared to repulse them with armed force if such advance is not stopped.

Again on February 21, 1939, this gentleman said in ridiculing the policy of appeasement:

The policy of appeasement has not only been unsuccessful and ultimately destructive but has been immoral. It is evident that a person can die but once, and the period of life is limited, and that it is far better that he die a few days earlier for Christianity, justice, and liberty than that he live a little longer in cowardice and degeneracy.

The gentleman here was referring to the youth of America. He was declaring, in essence, that he was ready to fight to the last drop of their blood.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who publicly made these statements for the world to hear is the author of the measure at present before this body for consideration.

Where is any neutrality to be found in these statements?

Let it be understood, Mr. Speaker, that I am not addressing myself to the sentiments which these various spokesmen of the administration have expressed. Let me say to you here and now that I abhor oppression of minorities, suppression of individual rights, and the dictatorial form of government, whether it be rightist or leftist, whether it be somewhere else in the world or in the United States, as much as any Member of this body possibly could. But I am at this time addressing myself to the falsehood in which this measure has been garbed, or the attempt at least to dress it in the attire of a neutrality measure.

It is perfectly obvious to any thinking person that in being asked to repeal the arms embargo the administration has not the slightest intention of achieving that repeal for the purpose of preserving the neutrality of this Nation and this people in the war now going on in Europe.

The expressed purpose, the purpose expressed in the very statements I have just read to you, statements by the President and by authorized spokesmen for his administration, show clearly and plainly that the repeal of the arms embargo is sought, not for the purpose of neutrality, but for the purpose of permitting the administration to involve this Nation in taking sides with certain belligerent nations against their adversaries.

Now, Mr. Speaker and colleagues of the House, if we want to be unneutral and repeal this arms embargo, frankly for the purpose of aiding England and France in their war with Germany, and if we are willing to do that realizing in advance that we are taking the first step down the road to war, then in God's name let us be honest with the American people and with ourselves, and state the fact and take our action in the light of that fact.

If we are willing to ignore the advice of George Washington, if we are willing to repeat the folly of 1917, well and good; let us be honest with the American people and with ourselves and say we are ready to run that risk by repealing the arms embargo.

There comes to my mind an excellent editorial in the Detroit Free Press of September 24, 1939, which so simply and succinctly expresses the facts of the present situation

that I again want to refer to it, although I placed it in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 594. This editorial pointed out that our forefathers came to America because they wanted to live more free, wholesome, and comfortable lives than was possible in feud-torn and quarrel-cursed Europe. They came to America because they wanted to get away from the enmities of the Old World and the barbarous wars which were continuously resulting therefrom.

Then in 1917, this editorial points out, we found ourselves bullied into going back into the old mess and again wallowing in the quarrels of the Old World.

The results of our foolishness were the loss of the lives and limbs of thousands upon thousands of the best of our youth, a war debt of billions of dollars, a moral and economic upset from which we have not yet recovered, and flagrant, and in some cases abusive, ingratitude from those we had aided.

All we did was a total loss. We did not help Europe, but we did injure ourselves grievously and dangerously.

Mr. Speaker, if we are ready to repeat that folly by repealing this embargo act and again messing into the wars of Europe, then in God's name let us be honest with the American people and with ourselves and state plainly what we are doing and why we are doing it, and then prepare in the next session of this Congress to vote many more billions for increased armaments in preparation for our inevitable entrance into the European war.

Let me say that I do not and would not deny to the proponents of this bill the right to urge their case, nor do I question their sincerity in believing that we must take sides in the war in Europe in order to maintain democracy.

I do want to point out, however, that the very first necessary act which this Congress must perform when this Nation goes into war, or even when war becomes imminent, is to adopt a mobilization plan that absolutely extinguishes constitutional democracy in this Nation and sets up a military dictatorship as complete as any dictatorship existing in Russia or Germany or Italy today.

The irony of this whole situation to me is the fact that we even talk about going to war to preserve democracy, all the while knowing that our very first act of war will be to wipe democracy out of the picture in our own country. Not only will democracy be extinguished for the duration of the war, but, Mr. Speaker, the very terms of the 1939 revision of the Mobilization Act recognize that that dictatorship will have to be continued for an indefinite period after the emergency is ended, and preparations are to be made, preparations which will be validated by this Congress at the beginning of the emergency, for the continuance of that dictatorship after the emergency has ended and for so long a time thereafter as the Commander in Chief of the armed forces, the President of the United States, shall deem the continuance of the dictatorship desirable.

The American people would do well to ponder those facts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to introduce an editorial which appeared recently in the Detroit News. It appears to me to be the finest analysis of the President's address before the opening session of the Congress I have seen. I commend it to the careful consideration of every Member of this House:

ROOSEVELT ON NEUTRALITY

The President's address to Congress contained no single reason for repealing the arms embargo.

That curious fact sums up the significance of the address. Purportedly it gave Congress the President's advice on how the Neutrality Act may be changed to help us remain neutral in the European war. Actually it advised how the act might be amended to help the Allies, without too great risk, in the President's judgment, of American involvement.

This summarization of the message may not sound familiar to readers who failed to give it critical attention. The words "help the Allies" did not appear in it. The idea was conveyed, rather, by such sentences as this:

"We know what might happen to us of the United States if the new philosophies of force were to encompass the other continents and invade our own."

Suggestions of that sort—of American interest in an Allied victory—were repeated in various other ways. The conclusion never was reached that, therefore, we should help the Allies. This too was only suggested, by the device of asserting farther on that the arms embargo is "in my opinion, most vitally dangerous to American peace."

The reader will search the address in vain for an explanation of why the embargo is "most vitally dangerous." There is no explanation, except by referring back to the prior warning of what might happen if the Allies were defeated and the "new philosophies of force" prevailed.

This was to our mind an extraordinary public document in its failure to discuss directly an issue of such importance. Yet we should note in passing that our comment on its evasiveness does not imply doubt of President Roosevelt's desire to keep the country at peace. It was the evasiveness of a man who, convinced that peace can be had only by an Allied victory, still dared not advocate to the country that "neutrality" be formulated with that end in view.

In order to clarify our analysis of the message, it is necessary to review three passages in it that looked like arguments for embargo repeal, but weren't. The President said at some length and in different ways that "returning to international law" in our dealings with belligerents was the best way to remain neutral. (He did not explain why nor take note of any kind of the fact that the embargo, far from abrogating international law, only refrains from exercising some of our rights under it.) He suggested an analogy between the present embargo and the "disastrous" embargo and nonintercourse acts of 1794–1808, which preceded our involvement in the War of 1812. (He did not actually state the analogy, since none exists, the earlier embargoes having been punitive in character and designed, as was the War of 1812, to force recognition of our rights under international law.) He asked "what advantage" would come to this country from refusing a profitable trade in munitions and implements of war. (He did not answer his own question, for there is no advantage except that, as claimed by supporters of the embargo, of helping keep us out of war.)

Let us now state once more the theory on which this assumed advantage of the embargo is based. It is believed that if the trade in munitions is permitted, there will grow up in this country a munitions industry and a whole economic state of affairs dependent on the Allied cause. It is recognized that such a state of dependence will exist anyway by virtue of a prosperous war trade in commodities other than munitions. But it is held that this dependence would be vastly enhanced by a munitions industry, whose products could not conceivably be turned to peacetime uses. Thus it is feared—on the basis of 1914–18 experience—that unless this inevitable community of interest with the Allied cause is discouraged, it will lead gradually to a state of mind favorable to giving military as well as economic aid.

The President failed, as stated, to answer or even mention this theory of the provision of law that nominally was the subject of his message. But he did go far in his remarks to justify the theory, when he suggested the embargo should be repealed to help the Allies. If we accept now that we must give the Allies economic aid to safeguard our own peace and security, will we be prepared later on to let them face defeat? Will we not have conditioned ourselves, mentally and morally, to give them military aid whenever they appear to need it for victory?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHITE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, early in September I issued a statement in which I declared:

Whether or not the United States of America is neutral in time of war depends more upon the conduct of foreign policy than it does on any legislation, no matter how designated, that may be placed upon our statute books.

I pointed out at that time that really objectionable features of our present neutrality law were those sections which gave discretionary power to the President. I did not then, and I do not now, think that the embargo question will either keep us out or get us into war. Whether that is true or not, only the future can prove. Under any circumstances, I do believe that the granting of vague, and in some instances unlimited discretionary power to the President is of the utmost importance in the matter of keeping this country out of war. I also object to back-door credits, subsidized credits through agencies like the R. F. C., the Export-Import Bank, and the stabilization fund. I believe poison gas should certainly be banned. I likewise object to the fact that the Senate bill is open to only very limited revision in the House. However, it is mainly because this bill makes and continues so many grants of discretionary power that I must oppose it. I have found that there are at least 16 specific and direct grants of discretionary power to the President in this bill. Of course, the applicability of virtually the entire bill is made dependent on the President's will in section 1-A. Very little in this bill becomes effective unless the President—

shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States.

Under that discretionary grant of power the President could close his eyes to the existence of a state of war, just as he did in the conflict between China and Japan, and just as he has done in regard to Russia's invasion of Poland in the present European conflict. Here we are writing what amounts to a blank check for the President in the field of foreign relations, giving him power beyond his constitutional prerogatives in that sphere. We are empowering the President, in his discretion, to apply stringent regulations on shipping and stringent regulations on commercial transactions with certain countries. The President need not apply these restrictions against any country, or, if he wishes, he may apply them against any country that he regards as engaging in war.

In another part of this bill we are giving the President wholly discretionary power to prescribe combat areas and to make whatever rules and regulations he sees fit to govern the passage of American citizens and ships through such areas. There is nothing in the "combat area" section of this bill—section 3—that requires the President to apply his proclamation describing combat areas impartially and equally against all belligerents in a given war.

Again in section 11 this bill gives the President discretionary power to place such restrictions on the use of our ports and territorial waters by submarines or armed merchant vessels. This section contains nothing that would require the President to apply such restrictions impartially and equally against all belligerents. Under the section the President may make special rules restricting the movement of submarines, while leaving armed merchantmen free to proceed as they please. Moreover, the term "territorial waters" is not defined in the bill. Until 2 months ago that term was generally understood to mean a distance of some 3 miles off our coast lines. But since the outbreak of the war in Europe, the President at his press conferences has undertaken to give a new meaning to the term "territorial waters." He has said that American territorial waters extend as far as American interests. Under the inspiration of our Government the American republics last month proclaimed the so-called Declaration of Panama which, in effect, would ban hostilities by any belligerent in an area from 300 to 600 miles off the coast line of the North and South American Continents. Everyone is agreed that the Declaration of Panama is either a meaningless gesture or is a very dangerous undertaking. If this Government is going to police an area from 300 to 600 miles off the American coast lines in the Atlantic Ocean, we are taking on the most gigantic task ever assumed by any nation in history. And yet, under section 11 of this bill and in view of the several statements regarding territorial waters made by the President in his press conferences recently, I am not so sure that we are not giving the President authority in section 11 of this bill to carry out, in part at least, the terms of the Declaration of Panama. If I am wrong about that, if nothing more is meant by the term "territorial waters" in this section than the usual 3-mile area off our coast lines, why is not that definition written into this bill? This is a glowing illustration, to my mind, of the vague and undefined authority which we are giving to the President in this measure.

Now Members of the House may say that the President will not abuse the discretionary authority that we are reposing in him. I am not making that argument. But the President has certain ideas about the relationship of the United States to the present European conflict with which I heartily disagree. I believe that the United States has no place in a European war. I believe that the United States should keep out of war and I do not believe we should even risk getting into war by activities which some may call short of war, but which in the end may well turn out to be a short cut into war.

We do know from the speech which the President delivered at Chicago in October 1937, and in subsequent utterances, that he very definitely believes the United States has an obligation to take a hand against aggressor nations. I do not. We, likewise, know that the President believes this Government should give all assistance possible, short of war, to certain belligerents in the present conflict. I believe that the European conflict is no affair of ours and that we should maintain a strict impartiality and neutrality in regard to it. And it is reasonable to assume that the President will administer the discretionary power granted in this bill in an effort to effectuate the objectives he believes in and which he has made so abundantly clear to us. In this connection I would like to call attention to a letter written to the President under date of November 30, 1935, by his, then, very close adviser, Mr. Raymond Moley, who for several years was head of the New Deal "brain trust." Mr. Moley prints this letter in full in his recent book, After Seven Years. I call to the attention of the Members of the House the following language from Mr. Moley's book:

> Now it requires little demonstration to show that the instruments you are using—that is, the men in whom the delicate execution of the job of preserving neutrality is vested—are, almost without exception, of that school of thought that believes that participation in international coercive movements can save us from war. They are of that mistaken group that guided Wilson along the road, first to war and, beyond that, to bitter disillusion. I say "mistaken" because it was their advice in 1915, 1916, and 1917 which induced us to enter the war to end war and to save democracy, and subsequent events have shown them to be wrong. Apparently they are still firmly in the saddle, some of them in person, some of them through proteges (i. e., as Bingham, of House), others, career men trained under the old dispensation—all of them the intellectual brethren of the naive Lansing with one foot at Broad and Wall and the other at Geneva. They tell us now, in one form or another, that we can stop wars by engaging in wars to stop wars. These are the men designated to effectuate your decisions and to provide you with the information necessary to guide you on a dark and dangerous road. (And no one knows better than you, I am sure, how settled are the policies of the State Department and how they differ from your own progressive principles.)

There are many other interesting things about the foreign policy of this administration contained in the Moley letter that I cannot read to the House on this occasion, but I think Mr. Moley casts a very illuminating light upon the purpose of this administration in the foreign field. His letter demonstrates the danger of blank-check discretionary power to the President under the guise of a neutrality act. And it is for these reasons that I feel that I cannot support the bill passed by the Senate.

The full text of the letter from Mr. Moley to President Roosevelt is as follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1935.

The PRESIDENT,
Warm Springs, Ga.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I was delighted to have your frank and earnest note of November 23. It gives me the opportunity to speak with equal freedom of matters which I have hesitated to discuss with you and so I shall ask your indulgence for what is going to be, I know, a rather lengthy outpouring. I ask leave to tell you, in this letter, just as I should like to if I were sitting with you, all of the thoughts your note has stirred in my mind.

The issues raised in your letter are of transcendent importance, not only to the country and your party but to your own future. I am concerned with these issues on that level, and not on the basis of personal feeling toward members of your State Department. Instead of these differences arising from the events of 1933, it is more truthful to say that those events arose from these differences of opinion which long antedated that time. I found in the State Department under Stimson, even before my official service began there, an atmosphere foreign, it seemed to me, to the vital spirit which characterized the campaign of 1932. That atmosphere has not changed since Stimson's departure. It closed around me and I had not served in office a month before I knew that it would be intolerable. I escaped with my convictions. Those who were in opposition to what it seemed to me were the interests of progressive thought in this country remained.

They remain.

But, as they labor in the shaping of policies that I deeply and earnestly believe to be dangerous, I have left to me the right to criticize, to oppose, and, if possible, to convince you, too, of the existence of the danger.

Now, I want to speak to you specifically of the Canadian treaty. I have consistently advocated a general reciprocal agreement with Canada in many private conversations with you and with the Secretary of State before my resignation, in printed articles, and in a speech made in Canada after I resigned. I say this to call attention to the record of my belief that we should seek more trade with Canada. Incidentally, I did not, in the editorial about which you wrote to me, discuss the wisdom of a trade agreement with Canada or the specific provisions of the agreement just concluded.

When the existing law on reciprocal trading was before Congress I published a carefully phrased editorial dated March 24, 1934, favoring the bill but indicating my belief that (1) to attempt to carry

out the reciprocal-tariff policy while we adhered to the most-favored-nation principle would lead to serious consequences, and (2) that, in making the treaties, a forum should be provided for discussion "under conditions that conserve the public interest." I have since held firmly to these two beliefs and in the face of that fact I should have been a dishonest journalist had I not spoken my mind once again, even in the face of a popular treaty with Canada.

What troubles me with respect to the present Canadian treaty is the fact that the quotas allowed are "global" and that hence, according to the experts, a certain proportion of the articles admitted will not come from Canada at all but from nations from whom we receive absolutely no quid pro quo on this deal. To that extent, the treaty is not a trade: it is a gift at the expense of American producers.

But as you say, the danger that we will be flooded with imports is avoided by the use of the quota. In other words, economic and political disaster is avoided by the use of the very device which Secretary Hull denounces. If such circuitous calculations must be followed to avoid the effects of adherence to the most-favored-nation principle, why not achieve our ends directly by eliminating the most-favored-nation concessions entirely and by making bilateral agreements in which we give and receive definite and specific concessions in trade limited by quotas?

Why bother at all to maintain the fiction of most-favored-nation treatment, if fiction it is, and then attempt (not altogether successfully) to avert the consequences of such action by the quota device?

The answer is that those in whom you have vested the authority to administer the reciprocal-tariff policy want to achieve a general downward revision of tariffs without congressional intervention—an end which will most certainly injure your administration and split your following. And I might add, in this connection, that it is this intent, this fixed purpose to lower tariffs on the part of those entrusted with the administration of the Reciprocal Tariff Act that makes so dangerous the indirect, roundabout method now being followed. If the act were administered by men of another view, by a KEY PITTMAN, or by a BOB LA FOLLETTE, one might be less fearful; under the present circumstances, apprehension is understandable.

My education on the tariff question goes back a long time, but the conclusions to which it impelled me really crystallized during your preconvention campaign. You will remember that the reciprocal-treaty idea was set forth by you in your St. Paul speech. The position you took in that speech was not only an astute one, politically, but a sound one, from the point of view of economics.

The tariff plank in the Democratic platform was written subsequently without reference to your expressed views. It was so ambiguous that, despite every effort on my part to comprehend it, it remains to this day wholly meaningless to me. I believe that this was your own reaction to it also and that this was the reason why you quite properly carried into the campaign your own tariff policy.

May I add that it seemed perfectly clear to me at the time that the policy you advocated during the campaign could not be carried out if we adhered to the most-favored-nation principle, and that I took it for granted that we would abandon it.

In this connection, you will remember the communications received from Secretary Hull (then Senator), via Mr. Taussig, during the campaign, and the discussion of his suggestions by you, Senators PITTMAN and WALSH, and myself. Your Sioux City speech, which rejected the idea of any general tariff reduction, was the result.

When I served in the Department of State, I found opinion here unchanged with respect to general tariff reduction and adherence to the most-favored-nation principle, and, despite earnest consideration on my part, the arguments in support of this position seemed to me to be completely unconvincing. In fact, in May 1933 I wrote a syndicated article (which you read in advance of publication) expressing my conviction that the London Conference could do little on tariff except to effect an exchange of views.

You will recall the fact, I know, that the general-reduction-by-10-percent idea was introduced into the conference and promptly withdrawn. You will recall further the speech of the Secretary of State addressed to the conference advocating a general lowering of tariff barriers which you and Billy Phillips very considerably amended.

As to the element of secrecy in the consummation of treaties such as the one we have just made with Canada, I must stick to my guns. I made it clear in the editorial to which you refer that I was aware of the "hearings" that are granted, although the Associated Press dispatch which you saw did not.

But, in my opinion, the hearings now granted do not permit sufficiently detailed exploration of the specific points contemplated in reciprocal treaties. To say that if such hearings were granted some of those injured would make outcries so loud as to defeat the treaty is not adequate answer to the objection that interested parties are not given sufficient chance to present their arguments.

The present method does not ultimately prevent the outcries in any case. They only come after the event, rather than before, and then they are the more deadly to you politically because those who emit them can howl that they have not only been injured but that they have had no chance to defend themselves—a charge which always gets public sympathy.

I am not convinced, moreover, that a treaty would be defeated if a fair public hearing were given after initialing and before final Executive action. At that point there might be introduced into the proceedings the admirable device embodied in Senator Norris' bill vetoed by Hoover and endorsed by you in your Sioux City speech in 1932, thus:

"Another feature of the bill * * * contemplated the appointment of a public counsel, who should be heard on all applications for changes in rates before the commission on the one hand for increases sought by producers, often greedy or for decreases asked by importers, equally often actuated by purely selfish motives, or by others seeking such reductions. I hope some such change may be speedily enacted. It will have my cordial approval."

And now since you have made it possible for me to explain my views on this tariff matter I shall take the opportunity to speak of a much more serious question about which I have even graver apprehensions—neutrality. Here the issue is drawn in much the same pattern—conviction on my part that you hold views with which a vast majority of the country agrees, but with respect to which those through whom you are acting are intent upon making a quite different national policy prevail. I have given a great deal of thought to this of late and, while I have occasionally spoken to you of my uneasiness, I have not outlined the circumstances that cause it.

There are, of course, two extreme views with respect to our foreign policy, the one advocating utter isolation, the other complete entanglement. If I were to describe your following realistically, I should say that, on the whole, your most loyal followers lean toward the first point of view. The first ballot at the convention in 1932 was a fair indication of the type of men who were supporting you, and the subsequent enlistment into their ranks of the western progressives reinforced this element of your support. Surely such internationalist advocates as the Baltimore Sun and the New York Times could not be counted as sympathetic supporters. Your domestic policies have accentuated this cleavage—a fact which has warmed my heart and enlisted my enthusiasm.

I realize, however, that you should not take an extreme position and hold dogmatically to it. In this instance, the task is to retain national independence of action but to move so far toward internationalism as is safe and expedient. To do this, however, compels the painstaking pursuit of a hazardous course of action. The success of such an operation requires fine instruments and accurate information. Otherwise disaster may result to the Nation and to your own loyal following.

Now it requires little demonstration to show that the instruments you are using—that is, the men in whom the delicate execution of the job of preserving neutrality is vested—are, almost without exception, of that school of thought that believes that participation in international coercive movements can save us from war. They are of that mistaken group that guided Wilson along the road, first to war and, beyond that, to bitter disillusion. I say "mistaken" because it was their advice in 1915, 1916, and 1917 which induced us to enter the war "to end war" and to "save democracy" and subsequent events have shown them to be wrong. Apparently they are still firmly in the saddle, some of them in person, some of them through proteges (i. e., as Bingham, of House), others, career men trained under the old dispensation—all of them the intellectual brethren of the naive Lansing with one foot at Broad and Wall and the other at Geneva. They tell us now, in one form or another, that we can stop wars by engaging in wars to stop wars. These are the men designated to effectuate your decisions and to provide you with the information necessary to guide you on a dark and dangerous road. (And no one knows better than you, I am sure, how settled are the policies of the State Department and how they differ from your own progressive principles.)

This apprehension concerning your international advisers explains why Congress acted as it did last summer when it rejected section 1 of the McReynolds resolution.

The issue was not new to Congress. In March 1933 John Bassett Moore had written a letter, read in the hearings of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, exposing the irreconcilability of a discriminatory embargo with law, common sense, or peace. Mr. Moore sent a copy of that letter to me.

Despite this warning and despite an obviously overwhelming opposition in the Congress, the State Department urged upon you the advocacy of a contrary course this August. Those who spoke for the Department failed to point out to you that a discriminatory arms embargo is a denial of neutrality—that to commit an act of war in the name of peace is a clear reversion to the notion of wars to end war; and, while there are those who believe in this principle, I venture to suggest that an overwhelming proportion of the country agrees with Congress that it is a notion which is self-contradictory.

It is true, as the Department argued, that the President may, by maladroitness, involve us in war. But the great power of the President does not in itself justify asking that he be invested with a complete and unreviewable determination as to which of two foreign belligerents is right or wrong. Yet one of the very top layers of your advisers on foreign relations—not the Secretary—said in writing that he wanted this power for the President because in an international crisis Congress might not act and thus sacrifice our vital interests. This is a strange doctrine, indeed.

The Pittman resolution was passed in spite of these representations and under it you very properly recognized a state of war between Italy and Ethiopia, pronounced the embargo, and uttered the corollary warning. This was excellent.

But following that a series of pronouncements came from members of the administration which have confused and alarmed me.

Perhaps I can best express my feelings by quoting an editorial that I am publishing this week—issue of December 7:

"Under our form of government Congress determines what national policies shall be and expresses its decisions in the laws it makes. The members of the executive branch of the Government have the duty of enforcing these laws. That is the meaning of their oath of office.

"When a neutrality resolution came up for consideration in Congress last summer, the executive branch of the Government asked for discretionary power in imposing discriminatory restrictions and embargoes on American commerce in case of a foreign war. It asked, in effect, to be allowed to choose between nations engaged in foreign war upon the basis of a moral judgment as to the right and wrong of the quarrel. Congress refused this request and announced a policy of strict impartiality in all relations with reference to warring nations.

"That imposed upon the Department of State the obligation of leaning over backward in carrying out a policy which its duty but not its conviction commanded.

"How is the administration carrying out the neutrality resolution of Congress? Let us look at its record, not legalistically but realistically.

"In Europe the opinion apparently prevails that economic sanctions on the part of the League designed to coerce Italy will be ineffective unless the United States cooperates. Europe does not care a rap—and let us not forget this for a single moment—what name we choose to call our participation in sanctions or what explanations we make as to the reasons for our policy. The thing that Europe cares about is the effect of our decisions.

"The early acts of the Government of the United States in carrying out the neutrality resolution of Congress were correct and sound and raised no issues in Europe. But with the growing disposition on the part of our Government to restrict the export of oil, scrap iron, copper, cotton, and other articles not included in the statutory embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war (and this despite the fact that Senator PITTMAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, gave on the floor of the Senate last August 21 a definition of the term 'implements of war' which did not include such articles), the tension in Europe has become acute. It has become apparent that the coercing nations of Europe will move against Italy with respect to such items as these only if the United States takes the lead. More ironic still, it is not certain that they will all participate even if the United States does take the lead. This has definitely made us a determinant factor in the general effort to coerce Italy. The members of the League recognize this situation. Italy must certainly recognize our course of action for what it is—the beginning of an almost inevitable logical sequence of acts which, if carried out, would most certainly end in downright hostility to Italy and which would violate the letter and spirit of the neutrality resolution.

"That we have already as a government passed moral judgment on the issue between the sanctionist powers and Italy seems to me to be obvious. The note sent by the Department of State to the League of Nations on October 26, while it does not name Italy, nevertheless stamps Italy as a wrongdoer, using instead of the term 'League of Nations' the alter ego of the League Covenant, the Kellogg Pact.

"Anyone who knows the subtleties of diplomatic language knows that when we, as a nation, look with 'sympathetic interest' upon the 'concerted efforts of other nations' to coerce Italy, which we euphemistically call an attempt 'to preserve peace or to localize and shorten the duration of war,' we obviously favor such action. There is no use quibbling about language. The meaning is clear.

"To express 'sympathetic interest' and then to stop with the expression is, of course, one thing; but to give utterance to this expression and then to follow it up with actions that have the effect of implementing 'sympathetic interest' definitely puts us into a position of taking sides in the present European situation. It is a departure from the letter and spirit of neutrality. I cannot say with too much seriousness that taking sides in this fashion will almost automatically make us a party to the wider war that might easily develop out of the present small war."

When in the pursuit of my duty as a journalist I find it necessary to disagree with my friends, it hurts. Nothing so hurts as to disagree with you. All I can do in such an instance is to be terribly sure that I am right and as nearly as possible consistent with myself. On these two subjects of the tariff and neutrality I feel that assurance. I am glad of only one thing: That they constitute a small—however important—minority of the public policies which you profess.

When I must disagree with any of them, I share a feeling that the V. P. (Vice President) expressed to me on one occasion last winter. He said, "I love this man in the White House because he is for so many things that I have always hoped for and believed in. And when he does things that I don't believe in, I love him enough to tell him the truth."

Ever with sincere regard and affection,

RAYMOND MOLEY.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by including as a part of them the full text of a letter from Mr. Moley to President Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debates in the Senate and on the House floor. They have been real contributions in connection with this legislation. After listening to the debates and after considering the matter, I intend to vote against the repeal of the embargo provision. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, Congress is now in special session and once again the House of Representatives is debating neutrality legislation. There is much misinformation and much confusion as to the real issues involved in this debate.

A vast majority of the people do not want the United States to take any step that will send American soldiers to European battlefields.

This question is entirely different from the question as to the type of legislation on which we are about to act. The Constitution of the United States says:

The Congress shall have power * * * to declare war * * *.

No other agency of the Government has that power. The only way in which the United States can become involved in war is to have the Congress meet and declare war.

So the question of a declaration of war is not before us at this time. Regardless of other claims and other issues, this Congress is faced with the question of repealing the embargo against furnishing arms, munitions, and implements of war to foreign countries which are engaged in war. That is probably the only issue that confronts us at this time and date.

In 1935 Congress enacted neutrality legislation. Congress enacted neutrality legislation—and an embargo against shipment of arms, munitions, and implements of war has been in force ever since that date. An attempt to repeal it failed at the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Since that time a new World War has developed and it is now in progress, and the countries of the Old World are repeating the performance of 1914 and succeeding years.

After following the debates on this question, I am convinced that a repeal at this time of the arms embargo can have but one effect—it will favor one side of the war controversy in Europe and will act to the disadvantage of the other. I do not let my sympathy guide my judgment in the decision I have to make. If I did, you can assume that my vote would be different. If we have reached a point where we definitely want to line up with one of the belligerents, as against the other, the direct and proper step is to repeal the arms embargo. I cannot believe that we want to do that at this time.

The United States of America, in my opinion, by keeping for the time being entirely out of European conflicts, occupies a position of world dominance and can do more for the cause of lasting peace than it can do by becoming one of the partisans. If we retain the arms embargo we maintain the same situation that has existed since 1935. We favor neither side in the World War controversy. We hate neither of the belligerent people. We are friendly to all belligerent people. Through our executive department we are able to say to the leaders on both sides of the war controversy that the United States stands ready, if either of the belligerents should refuse to do the right thing, to throw its power and influence against that belligerent. In my opinion, the greatest opportunity in its history now confronts this Republic, namely, the opportunity as a neutral nation to help bring peace to the warring powers of Europe. It can do this by remaining neutral. It can do this by a policy that shows no favoritism to friend or foe, but insists that each nation respect the rights of the other. Such an attitude will command respect in the Old World and will accomplish many objectives which the flame and the sword would be required to bring about. To pass legislation at this time destroys the role of peacemaker and definitely makes an alliance between the United States and certain countries engaged in the present World War.

The pending bill has many good features. I would like to vote for some of them. I believe in the cash-and-carry plan

so that all countries in the Old World that want to buy our products should come here, pay for them, and take them away in their own boats.

I also believe that one of the leading methods to prevent this country from becoming engaged in the European conflict is found in the pending bill. I refer to the proviso that American ships shall not trade with belligerents or carry passengers to belligerent ports. If given an opportunity to vote on these measures separately, I would cast an affirmative vote. They are, however, unfortunately tied up with the section of the bill which provides for repeal of the arms, ammunitions, and implements of war embargo law.

I realize that developments in the Old World are significant and that conditions may change from time to time. If they do change, and if new problems arise so that the safety of America is threatened, I reserve the right to vote for new legislation which will meet any such emergency.

If the time comes when any country in Europe threatens the safety of the world, I will not hesitate to vote to repeal all neutrality legislation and to support such new legislation as may be necessary to preserve the principles of freedom and democracy and the safety of our homes, our people, and our country. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point on the pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the fact that on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], shortly after I had spoken on the pending legislation, yielded himself 30 seconds in which to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I had made when the House neutrality resolution was up for consideration at the last session of Congress on June 29.

I am flattered by the fact that anything said in debate by a mere mine-run Member of Congress like myself is noticed and considered worth 30 seconds of the valuable time of the distinguished gentleman from New York. The 30 seconds were consumed in reading the following statement from my remarks on June 29:

> When you pass a neutrality act you fix and publish to the world the rules under which you will play the game and which must remain fixed after the game starts. To change the rules then would be an unneutral act.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for or retraction of that statement. What the gentleman did not inform the House of was that it was made in an argument by me for the repeal of the arms embargo before the start of the present war in Europe. It was made in anticipation of the repeal of the arms embargo at that session of Congress. The neutrality legislation, carrying a modified repeal of the embargo, was later passed by the House and sent to the Senate in ample time for final disposition at the last session of Congress.

The reason it was not disposed of at that session was that the leader of the isolationists in the Senate took the position with the President, by whom he had been called into consultation, that there would be no war in Europe in the immediate future, or during the vacation of Congress, and therefore there was no need of amending the Neutrality Act.

Now that the war is on the isolationists argue that it is too late to amend the act by repealing the embargo. This was my point in my remarks on the floor on yesterday in relating the story of the Arkansan who could not fix the leaky roof of his house because it was raining, and who did not fix it before the rain started because it did not need fixing then.

So Congress, threatened with an isolationist filibuster, adjourned leaving the repeal act pending, but with notice to the world that in the event war broke out in Europe Congress would be recalled to resume consideration of the legislation, which is now before the House, and with notice to the world that the arms embargo might be and probably would be repealed. The Senate has already voted to repeal it by a 2 to 1 majority and I have every confidence the House will also vote to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, in my speech of June 29 I stated 12 reasons why I favored repeal of the arms embargo. The gentleman from New York quoted 4 lines from the second of these 12 reasons. But the first of these 12 reasons renders superfluous the other 11. I quote it from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 29, 1939, page 8245, as follows:

> First. If the present mandatory embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war favors the dictators, and this is admitted; and if the pending bill favors the democracies, and this is the claim of its enemies, that fact alone is sufficient consideration for my support of the bill. [Applause.] First, last, and all the time, I am for the democracies and against the dictators; and I am for them, neutrality act or no neutrality act.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I am not so egotistic as to think, after the long debates that have been extended over this subject, that I could shed any great amount of new light at this hour. But let us consider this sort of legislation. It is important to think why this kind of legislation comes forth in the life of a country which under its Constitution is 150 years old; a young nation.

A people decides to be a nation and go into business. Of course, we could talk of the throes of activity that were gone through with to bring this people into life and pursuits on the earth as a nation. The idea was to come here and do business on a new basis. We call it today "the American basis." We wanted to worship as we felt. We wanted to be a democracy. Now, that meant something to our Nation's makers. It means something to us. We are over here in the Western Hemisphere, and we want to do business as ourselves. I think it is cringing and cowardly, I think it is weak and vascillating and anticonstructive for us to take the position that, because nations on another part of the globe, far removed from us, men may throw themselves into war, and we have to go a step back and alter from that which would be our natural program, or, because they hurl themselves into war, we are frozen in our tracks to stand like a figure carved on a vase unable to amend legislation to take care of ourselves on our own shores.

Let me say, further than that, that the minute a nation gets to playing politics with the world—and an effort is being made here to do that—the minute a nation gets to playing politics with the world to such a degree and extent that it becomes forgetful of its own material development and strength and advantage, that nation has reached the highest point in its natural growth and its travel along the roadway of time. It stands under the zenith in the sky of its existence. That is what happens. If we stand here and permit ourselves to get so far removed from our first duty, from the duty of self-preservation, looking out for No. 1, Nature's first law, that we cannot stand on our own two hind feet and say that we are weaving the whole warp and woof for us, for our folks, and for ourselves, then our best days are behind us. That is not the American way. It never will be the American way so long as we stand stalwart and true for the things that have made America what she is today.

Today we are asked to do what? While we are sending the makings abroad, while nations have armed for years, we are asked to be so forgetful of ourselves that we are to pass legislation or continue legislation that has only been on the statute books for a short time, that will tend to dry up the manufacturing industries in America. We are a "have" nation. We dig our ores from the earth, and we go forth to make and manufacture things. For what? For sale as well as use. That is how a nation does business. That is how we go forward. We make things from the soil. We cultivate the good earth, and we make things to sell to our neighbors, whoever comes here to buy. Who says that America cannot stand on her own hind legs and make her own stuff into her own things at her own doors to sell to whoever may come and buy? Would that be unneutral? How do we know who may have the advantage on the seas? America is not responsible for the advantage on the high seas today or who may have the advantage on the high seas tomorrow. They do not ask what our neutral laws are. We do not pass their laws. If we would take ourselves a little less seriously and our business a little more seriously, we could turn out better legislation for

the people that we represent all over the United States of America. That is what is the matter, but embargoes have been a failure. The history of the embargo is the history of failure. An embargo is but a sieve through which passes everything it pretends to convey.

What will result from this sort of legislation? We shall drive our manufacturing into other nations when we so need it here. Then they ask: "Why not keep our industries humming at home to make our own stuff?" It has to turn over. We do not make a whole bunch of airplanes and store them away. It is an industry—it is a growth and development, the wheels of progress, the spinning spindles, and the activities of a nation's manufacture and other business forces—that stand and turn over day after day until an industry has grown and developed.

It feeds people, keeps them from being hungry, from walking the streets, and looking for jobs; yet here you are being so charitable toward an uncharitable group of nations that you would drive our industry into Canada and Europe, where they will in all probability stay. The worst of it is that nothing is accomplished even then, because if they have the makings, if they can get the makings, as they can regardless of this embargo, they do not give one continental darn about whether or not it is assembled; they can assemble it. So that is what we have done; we have impoverished ourselves, we have endangered our own industry, we have dried up the stream that we need so sorely to have running today, and accomplished absolutely nothing.

Mr. Isolationist is a funny fellow. When his neighbor starts a fight he pulls down the front window shades. Then they get to fighting on the other side of the house; he says he cannot pull the other shades down because the fight has already started. He cannot change the rules after the game has started.

It is said we cannot change the rules during the game. Why, this is not our game; we had nothing to do with starting it. This war may last for 25 or 30 years. Should we be asked to remain neutral or unneutral? As a matter of fact, there is nothing unneutral about it. There is nothing unneutral about looking after our own affairs. They do not gage themselves by what we do here. We ought not even to look, if we are being sincerely neutral, we ought not to look across the seas if we are sincere in our desire for neutrality. And so, as far as that is concerned, we are technically just as neutral as can be; and that is as far as any nation can honestly go. How may we know that next year Germany and her group may not have the advantage on the high seas? Then when they come here and pay cash on the barrel head they can get the goods and carry them home; that is all this proposed neutrality law is.

I was not greatly influenced by the argument advanced by my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. The fact that he and others find consolation in that viewpoint and vote like that just swells our majority, I suppose, whatever that majority may be. My idea is that if we are sincerely neutral as a nation that is enough, and that we not only have the right, but our duty is to our people; our first duty lies in our taking care of the best interests of the 130,000,000 people that make America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the St. Lawrence seaway project.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] 7 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I am in agreement with a statement made by the President of the United States in his message at the opening of the special session wherein he said that the issue involved in this legislation goes beyond any thought or phase of domestic politics. Domestic politics do not belong in and should not in anywise affect this legislation. Each and every Member of this Congress should express his views and cast his vote in accordance with his own convictions as well as his conscience. I believe it is the fervent hope of the Members of Congress that whatever action we take on this resolution may be done with a view that it is for the best interests of the people of our country. And so, although we may differ honestly and fairly in our opinions, such legislation as may be enacted should represent the majority views of this Congress.

I also agree with a further statement of the President wherein he said:

> We must be guided by one single hard-headed thought—keeping America out of war.

It is the will of the great majority of American people and the will of the membership of this House that we stay out of the war that is now raging across the seas.

The principal issue in this resolution, and which has been debated for 5 weeks in the Senate, is whether or not this Congress should reverse its action in 1935, in 1936, and in 1937, when it declared that arms, ammunition, and implements of war could not be sold to belligerents. To repeal the embargo at this time is, in my judgment, an unneutral act. I cannot believe it is either neutral or morally right for this Congress to place its stamp of approval on the manufacture and sale to warring nations for profit, of all kinds of deadly weapons, including bombing planes and poison gas.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that so many of our people have been led to believe that we cannot have the cash-and-carry provisions of this measure if we retain the arms embargo. This is not true. Every Member on this floor knows that we can have every one of the protective provisions contained in this resolution, and at the same time retain the embargo on the sale of deadly weapons of war to belligerent nations. The overwhelming majority of this Congress is in favor of the cash-and-carry provisions of the bill as they apply to non-war materials. American ships should not be allowed to carry merchandise that may be contraband to belligerent nations. I believe we are also unanimous in the view that no credit should be extended to countries engaged in war.

I am not one who believes that our action on this resolution will be the determining factor as to whether or not our country will be drawn into the quarrels of Europe. The repeal of the embargo, in my opinion, however, is more likely to lead us into that direction. I do not believe we are going to become involved in that catastrophe; but I do think the retention of the arms embargo and the adoption of the protective provisions of this measure will further safeguard our neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, only 2 years ago the Senate voted to retain the arms embargo by a majority of 63 to 6; and, in the House, the vote was 376 to 13. The President supported the legislation and, in commenting upon it in March 1936, said:

> The policies announced by the Secretary of State and myself at the time of, and subsequent to, the issuance of the original proclamation, will be maintained in effect. * * * The result of earning profits not possible during peace, and especially with the result of giving actual assistance to the carrying on of war—would serve to magnify the very evil of war—which we seek to prevent.

Our great Secretary of State, speaking of the embargo on arms and munitions adopted in 1935, said:

> The Neutrality Act of last August, in embargoing exports of finished war commodities to belligerents, was to keep us out of war.

Mr. Speaker, since this act was passed by an overwhelming majority in the calm, cool deliberations of peacetime—what is it that has changed the situation so drastically, so critically—that we must now reverse our policy, that we must now sell weapons of war to belligerent nations? Why is it

that this Congress is not willing to adopt the safety devices and protective provisions of this resolution, and retain the arms embargo? Is there any Member on the floor of this House who can tell us from what source has come this great demand for the repeal of the arms embargo at this time? Who wants it, and why? Oh, I know, and I have said before, that there are plenty of us who want the cash-and-carry features of the bill, but what I am asking here and now, is from what source comes the demand for making our country an arsenal for the warring nations of the world? The struggle in Europe was hardly under way when it was demanded that Congress repeal the arms embargo. The strange thing about it is that no one seems to know the source from which that demand came. Certainly, the people of the United States did not rise and ask that Congress immediately proceed to permit manufacturers and munition makers to get busy and sell for profit the machines of war.

There are some who are in the minority and who want the embargo lifted to stimulate industry in this country. Two years ago, the President referred to this attitude in his remarks, when he said:

> If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

However, in his message to the special session of Congress in September, he said he could see no objection to our manufacturing and selling implements of war for profit. He said:

> From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there, when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here?

Much of the pressure for the lifting of the arms embargo comes about because of the sincere feeling of a great many of our people who believe it is our duty and obligation to take sides in the present conflict. They argue that it is only fair and right that this country should assist England and France and their allies, and help them win the war.

I have just as much sympathy for England and France in this conflict as anyone else, and am just as much opposed to Hitlerism and Stalinism. But let me call your attention to something, these advocates of lifting the arms embargo tell us they would sell weapons to warring nations just so long as they have the cash with which to buy them. Are we so cold-blooded we are willing to approve the sale of bombing planes, lethal weapons, and poison gas to be used for the wholesale murder, not only of soldiers but of men, women, and children having no part in the combat, so long as the countries that need them are able to "lay the cash on the barrel head?"

If you believe it is our business to furnish munitions and other implements of war to help certain nations win the war, then they should be sold without profit. And we should go all the way and furnish these supplies whether they have the cash or not, just as long as they need them. It is when such nations are unable to pay for their war supplies that they will need them most.

By the terms of this resolution our Government is saying to the nations of the world, "Come to our country and we will furnish you the most deadly weapons that the mind of man can contrive, provided you will pay a profit to our citizens for them."

Do you mean to say that the repeal of a law prohibiting the sale of death-dealing instruments of destruction, furnished for a profit, is a policy in the interests of world peace? Do I understand that the refusal to sell poison gas, bombing planes, and bombs is an act on our part that will lead us into war? No government has a right to approve the sale and profit from instruments designed to create misery and anguish and death to innocent people. To permit it is wrong. I do not want to be a party to it. Do you think we would be contributing to the betterment of mankind? Do you think we need to do it, as some have said, because our battles are being waged and our interests are jeopardized? Then you cannot say to these belligerents that when you have not the money to pay us for your war supplies you will have to carry on our battles. You will have to do it without our help.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution places too much power and authority in the hands of one man. This Congress on other occasions has surrendered many of its responsibilities in the name of emergency to the Chief Executive. Under the terms of this measure, in the time of great emergency we again relinquish additional power and authority, such as were never given to any President in the history of our country.

I further believe the provisions of this measure should be mandatory and not discretionary on the part of the President. In other words, if the law is good at all, then it should become operative when a state of war is known to exist.

Mr. Speaker, I have said I do not believe the United States of America is going to become involved in this war. Our tragic experience of the World War should teach us that we must preserve our neutrality. We lost 40,000 American boys in that war. There were 200,000 wounded, another 100,000 who died of disease, and there are 350,000 now receiving disability allowances and who are entitled to it, by reason of that world catastrophe.

Let the world understand that we will protect our country against all enemies—that we will defend it against any attack of every kind. We will use all our material resources, as well as all our manpower in doing so, if necessary. But we do not belong in the European conflict. We are going to stay out of it.

Mr. Speaker, the time will come when a war-worn and war-torn people—in a world sick and tired of the useless ruthlessness of armed combat—will need a neutral, friendly nation to whom they can turn for help in binding the wounds and assisting them on the path of peace. The only nation that can do it is the United States of America. When that time comes, we can be of the greatest service to humankind and to the world at large, by preserving our neutrality and by maintaining our integrity as well as our ideals of democracy. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly believe it is the sincere hope of every Member of this Congress that whatever action is taken on this measure will be for the best interests of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to say some things along a different line from what anybody has spoken yet. I take it that every Member of the House is in agreement on two points: First, he wants to keep America out of war, and second, he wants to save democracy. On the one hand, those who appeal for repeal of the embargo take the position that by repealing the embargo we will be taking a step toward saving democracy. In my opinion the most important thing that needs doing to save democracy is the solution of the unemployment problem in the United States and unless that is done any other contribution we may make is going to be ineffectual. Further, if the embargo should be repealed, the next important duty which should be performed at once by this Congress is the imposition of a stiff tax on the profits of the munitions trade and all war trade in order to prevent a runaway boom in these industries. If that is not done, we will be headed for trouble and will have another war-trade boom, inevitably followed by a disastrous depression, the consequences of which will be serious for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, if this embargo is not repealed, let no one believe that this fact alone will keep America out of war, unless the need of our own people for employment and income is met. That, to me, is the important thing this Congress has to address itself to in connection with these two things. Keeping America out of war can be done best by our keeping so busy with the solution of that problem at home, which is our responsibility, that we will give the people to understand that they have a great hope for the future in connection with the solution of all these problems.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. In section 7 (a), with regard to financial transactions, the gentleman will note that these transactions and extensions of credit are prohibited to any person acting as an agent for any state or political subdivision thereof. My interpretation of that is it would permit these transactions to persons who are not agents of these governments. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs if that is his interpretation? If so, does he not think there should be some language placed in this section that would prohibit the extension of credit and financial transactions, not only to persons who are agents of these governments, but to all persons who are residents or citizens of these states, and will he assure us that he will make an effort as one of the conferees to include such language in this section, and does he not think that is desirable?

Mr. BLOOM. I can assure the gentleman that the House conferees, so far as our side of it is concerned, will take that up in conference and present it at the conference and see that everything possible is done about it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman agrees with me it is desirable that such language be included?

Mr. BLOOM. I think something of that kind should be included.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. It would be desirable so there will be no mistake about the intent of the section to prohibit the extension of credit to persons whether or not they are known to be agents of a government or not.

Mr. BLOOM. The only thing I can say to the gentleman is this: I will agree our conferees will present that matter at the conference. We will do everything we can to see that such wording as the gentleman has suggested is placed in the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman, I think, agrees that would be desirable and he will try to include it?

Mr. BLOOM. I am not trying to bind myself or anyone else. I say I will present it at the conference, and I can assure the gentleman every consideration will be given and every effort made to see that the suggestion offered by the gentleman is taken.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I appreciate the gentleman's answer. If the gentleman did not agree with me that it is desirable and highly desirable to have this done, I do not think he would take it upon himself to make the suggestion or to act as a member of the conference committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply interested in the matter the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] has presented. It appears to me from what I have been able to gather concerning the matter it is a most important one with regard to these credits.

Mr. DARDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DARDEN. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs if that is not taken care of in the provision which prevents sales to other than states?

Mr. BLOOM. Whether it is taken care of in that section or not, it should be suggested and proposed to the conference. That is all the gentleman is asking. That is all the chairman of your committee is saying he will do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the Wolcott amendment covers that proposition, and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] wants to make sure about it he should support the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not agree with the gentleman at all on that.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. If what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has in mind goes through, we could not sell to a Canadian a typewriter on credit. We may go too far.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am not concerned with typewriters, but I am concerned about scrap iron, cotton, and some other things which are used in war. I would not want to see an extension of credit to any person whether they were known to be an agent of a foreign government or whether they claimed they were not an agent of that government, because I think it would be equally dangerous. I believe the section should be very clear and explicit with regard to that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I should merely like to point out in conclusion that, regardless of what one's views may be about the embargo question, many things are contained in this bill of the utmost importance in the protection of the United States against involvement in war. I hope very earnestly that the House will consider the bill as a whole when it comes to the final vote, regardless of what action may be taken on these other matters. Let me reemphasize again, however, that reliance for keeping America out of war cannot be placed in a measure of this kind. America can only stay out of war if Americans keep very earnestly at work at the economic problems of our own democracy. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to say that I certainly endorse the first part of the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who just preceded me. I believe he struck the nail squarely on the head when he said our most vital problem is right here at home. Our great task is "over here," not "over there." Our getting into war would frustrate the unfinished task. That, however, is not the matter we are debating here today.

Again I want to agree with the gentleman in that it is quite important that we have a true cash-and-carry provision calling for cash on the barrel head, foreigners' cash not borrowed from us, and not have lurking in this measure some provision which will permit the extension of credits which we do not now see on the surface. We must safeguard against adjustment of old debts upward and thus in effect thereby extending new credit, or permitting it in any other way.

I wish to say, although my time is brief, that I have listened with great interest to the speeches on both sides of this aisle, and I have attributed sincerity to my colleagues on both sides, although our thinking is very, very wide apart. I beg you to credit me with sincerity and patriotic motive.

On June 30 last, I voted for the Vorys amendment, which retained the embargo on guns and ammunition. I would not want anyone to attribute my vote on that occasion to my anxiety to help Hitler or Stalin or Mussolini. I would be very resentful if anyone attributed such a motive to me in that vote. I had quite other motives in the back of my mind last June when I cast my vote on that question in the last session. I voted to add the Vorys amendment to the Bloom neutrality bill without giving it full consideration as a permanent policy, but rather as a protest against our lack of certain legislation limiting profits. Struck with the horrors of munitions profits and believing that one of the imperative demands of our people is a reasonable curb on the coining of blood into profits, I felt that we should have some reasonable and sane legislation to take the profits out of war before opening the door to such blood profits.

After carefully studying this whole situation, listening to debates for the past several weeks, reading every telegram and letter from my constituents, and otherwise sounding out public sentiment in my State, I am convinced that it is the wish of a majority of my people that the arms embargo be repealed. I feel that a majority would favor repeal if that were the sole issue in this measure; but, in view of the fact that there are many other provisions designed to minimize

the chances of our involvement in war, a much larger majority of my people want this measure enacted. Of course, practically all of my people want us to keep out of war. I know, of course, that if it were put squarely to a vote whether we should accept the proposal before us, the Senate amendment, a large majority of my people would favor it, and I shall do so.

Although I voted for the Vorys amendment last June, I feel that I should vote against the Shanley motion now and also the Vorys amendment to the motion at this time before the House. This would be equivalent to voting to lift the embargo.

However, there is one thing in the original motion by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] and also the present amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] to which I have given considerable thought—the matter of poison gas. I do not presume under the present rule it will come to an open-and-shut vote on this matter, but if it does I shall vote to retain an embargo on poison gas.

I wish the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs would pay close attention to me now as he did a few moments ago when I presented this matter to him. He said he would make note of it and present it in conference. If there is no opportunity to put the question of keeping an embargo on the sale of poison gas to a straight open-and-shut vote in the House, I do want the conferees to keep that point in mind and retain the embargo on poison gas. I make a vast distinction between arms and ammunition on the one hand, as recognized by international law, and poison gas, which is outlawed.

Many Members have spoken in this debate as if we were now considering a vote either to declare war or not to declare war. That certainly and really is not the question, in spite of the effort to make it appear so. I believe the enactment of the measure substantially as it came over from the Senate will have the effect of keeping us out of war. Keeping this country out of war is my prime consideration. I am positive that 99 percent of our people want us to keep out of war. This bill, substantially as it stands, if enacted, is far more apt to keep us out of war than is our present law.

Many mothers have written to me, "Preserve our sons and do not send them to European battlefields." I want to assure those mothers that I am thinking of our sons, and I am also thinking of our sons' sons. I want this world to be fit for our children's children to live in. I am not defending English or French imperialism. I will not give one American boy to keep the status quo of their ill-gotten gain. However, if we give free run to brute force, if we give a free hand to those madmen of Europe, and if we do not furnish the sinews of war—I am not at all neutral now—to the democracies, when we see that Russia proposes to remain "neutral" and furnish the sinews of war to Nazi Germany, we are derelict in our duty to ourselves, as well as humanity. We would be betraying our faith, breaking our trust to support law and order, if we encouraged this world to be dominated by power and anti-Christian forces as represented by Hitlerism and Stalinism.

It is for the sake of our sons' sons, as well as for the sake of our own sons, that I wish now to use all legitimate means short of war toward saving democracy and peace-loving people for the future. I am not thinking of the fool's gold of war prosperity; I am not considering big profits of munitions makers or any other profiteers; I am not coveting blood money for a depleted National Treasury; but, leaving all these out, I feel that our self-interest requires that England and France be not crushed in this war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is one of great importance. The problem, so far as I see it, involves not so much the question of neutrality as the welfare of our own country.

I am satisfied that this Government has the right to lift the present embargo if it so desires. That the law will result in giving an advantage to one group of nations as against another group should not deter us if we are prepared, so far as we are concerned, to put all on an equal basis.

The present law operates to place Germany and Russia at a decided advantage in the war now being waged. I am of the opinion that we have much to fear should that advantage be continued.

The first thought of every one of us is to remain out of war. None of us wants to take a step which would tend to involve us abroad. Whatever may be our sympathies, we cannot afford to plunge the country into a European war. We shall settle nothing by our participation and we shall lose much.

But to close our markets to the democracies of Europe at a time when they are fighting for their lives seems to me dangerous and short-sighted.

Certainly neither England nor France chose to resort to arms save as a last resort. The ruthless aggression of Hitler has reached a point where only armed conflict will save them. They have no choice in this situation. Hitler and Stalin cannot be placated by offers of compromise. Poland, devastated and crucified, was a victim of wanton aggression.

Austria, Bohemia, and Moravia have been overrun and their peoples subjected to the most barbaric and inhuman treatment. Force is again on the march. Tyranny and oppression challenge civilization.

We are being asked to refuse supplies to those nations who because of their hope for a peaceful solution of the problems of Europe refused to turn themselves into armed camps.

Their destruction will mark the beginning of the end of western civilization.

We cannot hope to escape unharmed in such a catastrophe.

I cannot close my mind to what I believe to be the paramount issue in this struggle. Individual liberty has disappeared in Germany and in Russia. It will disappear in all countries subject to their will.

Mankind's struggle has forever been to strike the shackles of slavery from him. The history of our country is the story of a people who would be free. Certainly in this dreadful hour we cannot say to those who value freedom as highly as we do that they shall not be allowed to buy from us those materials which are vital to their very existence.

I cannot bring myself to take such a stand. I intend to vote for the repeal of the present embargo, not only because I believe that such a vote is in the interest of humanity but also because I feel confident that such a step is our surest guaranty against involvement in war. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, In this solemn hour, when the gravest issue in many years is before us, I make this decision, after many weeks of calm deliberation, thought, and study, of the vitally important issues underlying the discussions, as to whether we should repeal or retain the arms embargo. It is my conviction that the war in Europe today is not a battle to defeat or maintain democracy, but rather the continuation of the age-old fight for supremacy of power, the same that has gone on for centuries. It is the old story of new leaders and dictators seeking new powers and domains that have been lost. Europe will likely long continue to face such wars, as other new leaders seek to regain lost ground and, as shown convincingly, in the last great World War, whatever we do, we cannot change this war course in Europe.

Lifting the arms embargo means opening American markets to one set of combatants. This to my mind is a very definite step in taking sides in the present European war.

In discussing this vital issue, I wish to recall the main objective the Congress had in mind in 1935 when it enacted the first Neutrality Act. In that legislation, we believed that one of the most effective ways of staying out of war was to refuse to sell arms and ammunition to countries that resorted to war. Most of the Members of Congress then felt, and still do today, that our unrestricted sale of arms and munitions during the World War was a major reason why we became involved in that conflict. Congress overwhelmingly adopted that resolution and the President approved it. It became the national policy of our Government.

In 1936, Congress again approved an embargo on the selling of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. At that time, the vote in the House was 353 to 27, and so unanimous was the support of the embargo in the Senate that a roll call was not asked. In 1937, Congress again approved an embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war in legislation containing other safeguards for our neutrality which are not now in serious dispute. The Senate approved the 1937 legislation by a vote of 63 to 6, while the vote in the House of Representatives was 376 to 13. I voted for that bill.

The President likewise gave his approval to these measures, making them law. In the summer of 1936, the President enthusiastically endorsed such provisions as the arms embargo as "new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality" in time of war abroad. Also on that occasion, the President warned us to be on our guard against those seeking "fool's gold," who would, when war came, attempt to "break down or evade our neutrality."

Secretary of State Hull, who favored the neutrality law, also said at that time: "The theory of the Neutrality Act of last August in embargoing exports of finished war commodities to belligerents was to keep us out of war. Of course, we all know that. That was the primary, paramount, controlling purpose of it." These words, coming from the man who is now the Secretary of State cannot be treated too lightly. He is a man who has had a great experience in the field of international problems.

In recalling this background, I simply desire to emphasize the fact that the arms embargo was adopted, only after the most thoughtful deliberation, with the approval of the President, repeatedly expressed, and with virtually the unanimous support of all parties and factions in Congress and the Secretary of State.

Congress wrote the neutrality code in 1937 with amazing unanimity. The President signed and the country applauded it. Including its arms embargo, it represented our best thought as to what would be best for America in the event of another foreign war. It represented our best thought while we could still think calmly and dispassionately. In this code we told the world what to expect of us in the event of another alien war. We gave the world our notice, and it is certainly not neutrality for us today, because of what our sympathies may be to change the law, to fit some particular nation or group of nations that are presently engaged in war.

The last war cost us 50,510 American boys killed in action, 193,663 wounded, 69,446 who died of other causes, 350,000 who now receive disability allowances at the rate of $36,000,000 a month. It cost us $40,000,000,000. Despite these tremendous losses in lives and financial setbacks, the war to end all wars proved tragically futile and we should not forget those experiences.

I am fearful that the repeal of the embargo will be a direct route to foreign entanglements that may lead to war. I believe we should keep inviolate a neutrality program that was enacted under calm deliberation, without stress or duress.

The administration desires to remove the existing statutory embargo against such sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Such action would create an arsenal here in America for the very purpose of supplying some, and some only, of the belligerents with these materials of war. This, in my opinion, is very definitely taking sides, and no one knows where it will lead us to.

The war in Europe involves the greatest military nations of the world. Its causes are even more remote from American national life than the scene is from this land. This is not our war and it is nowhere near us. How this Nation can promote peace by becoming a munitions factory for warring Europe is a mystery to me. I believe that by changing our present course at the very beginning of this war, we are inviting disaster.

Nobody honestly knows whether or not the lifting of the arms embargo will eventually lead us into war, but there is, however, a strong feeling abroad in this land, in the light of our experience during the World War, that it is a first step and will bring our involvement.

Why should we take the chance? My deepest sympathy lies with France and Britain, but my primary interest is to keep America out of war. The United States today is in the most critical economic condition in its history, and plunging this country into another war, with the tremendous expenditures necessary to carry it on, will ultimately lead us to financial ruin, chaos, and possibly dictatorship.

We should immediately give attention to our own defense needs, and provide sea, land, and air forces with the best in armaments and material, because we know that preparedness is the most effective preventive weapon against the threat of war.

For over 300 years, ever since the landing of the first settlers, the people in this New World have lived, sacrificed, and died in order that they might be free from the entanglements of Europe, and to build here in America a new nation where peace would prevail and where they would be free from the tyrannies of the Old World to which their forefathers were subjected.

We have seen in our day great governments of the world topple overnight. Can we afford in these days to take a chance? Are we unmindful of the great sacrifices our forebears made down through the centuries? If we are not unmindful, let us be on our guard to preserve for ourselves and posterity the great institutions of freedom, liberty, and peace, that they built for us. We can do that best, in the present instance, by retaining the arms embargo. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, for the interest of the Members of the House, I have had tabulated certain information relative to the national defense expenditures of the various major countries of the world, the relative power of Europe's armies, navies, and air corps, and also the total licenses issued and exports of arms, ammunition, and aircraft of both Great Britain and France for the first 9 months of this year.

National-defense expenditures of the world, 1932–39

[In millions of dollars]

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938 (approximate)	1939 (estimate)
North America:								
United States	667.8	540.3	710.0	911.7	964.9	992.1	1,065.7	1,336
Europe:								
Britain	426.1	455.5	480.6	595.6	846.9	1,263.1	1,693.3	3,500
France	509.2	678.8	582.7	623.8	834.4	909.2	1,092.1	1,800
Germany	253.5	299.5	381.5	2,600.0	3,600.0	4,000.0	4,400.0	4,500
Italy	270.6	241.2	263.7	778.1	916.1	573.4	526.0	550
Union of Socialist Soviet Republics	282.5	309.5	1,000.0	1,640.0	4,002.4	5,026.0	5,400.0	7,300
Far East: Japan	199.1	253.1	271.9	296.2	305.1	1,129.8	1,755.3	1,800
World total (60 countries)	3,783.7	3,962.8	5,031.4	8,776.0	12,976.0	15,468.7	17,581.3	(1)

[1] No estimate.

RELATIVE POWER OF EUROPE'S ARMIES, NAVIES, AIR CORPS

(By Associated Press)

Prime Minister Chamberlain's declaration that Great Britain was at war with Germany came to a Europe girded for conflict with the greatest armament the world has ever known.

For more than a year nations in both hemispheres have been spending a billion dollars a month for arms, and most of the money has been expended by European nations.

The best available estimates on the army, navy, and air strengths of the leading European powers follow:

Country	Men under arms	Naval tonnage	Air strength	
			First line planes	Production rate [1]
Great Britain	600,000 to 700,000	2,079,863	3,000 to 4,000	2,000
France	3,000,000 to 8,000,000	815,531	2,000	1,000
Poland	2,000,000	16,500	1,000	(2)
Germany	2,000,000 to 2,500,000	541,023	5,000 to 8,000	2,000
Italy	1,300,000	717,920	5,000	1,000
Russia	2,000,000	290,589	8,000	1,000

[1] Number of planes per month. Production rate is considered highly important in air strength because of huge losses during conflict. Some experts expected as much as 100 percent a month.

[2] No estimate.

	Small arms								Ammunition					
	Category I (1), rifles and carbines		Category I (2), machine guns, etc.		Category IV (1), revolvers, etc.		Total		Category I (4), in excess of caliber .22		Category IV (2), in excess of caliber .22		Total	
	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports
GREAT BRITAIN														
January 1939					$79	$106	$79	$106	$1,022	$1,019	$6	$19	$1,028	$1,038
February 1939	$24						24		46	46	23	23	69	69
March 1939		$24			60	60	60	84	10	4			10	4
April 1939	54						54		27,000	17	116	100	27,116	117
May 1939		54			34	34	34	88	558	27,536	155	171	713	27,707
June 1939	38				665	473	703	473	28	6	89	23	117	29
July 1939	313	38			45	45	358	83	817	807	22	67	839	874
August 1939	1,000	38		$1,000	56	248	1,056	1,286	190	222	74	49	264	271
September 1939														
Total	1,429	154		1,000	939	966	2,368	2,120	29,671	29,657	485	452	30,156	30,109
FRANCE														
January 1939									182		120		302	
February 1939	50	35					50	35						
March 1939														
April 1939	33	48					33	48		86		63		149
May 1939			$1,000				1,000		228		55		283	
June 1939			210,000				210,000							
July 1939	34						34		43		3		46	
August 1939	35	69					35	69		253		55		308
September 1939														
Total	152	152	211,000				211,152	152	453	339	178	118	631	457
LICENSES REVOKED SEPT. 5, 8, AND 10, 1939														
Great Britain											47		47	
France			210,000				210,000		118				118	

	Aircraft											
	Category III (1), aircraft, combat		Category III (2), gun mounts, etc.		Category V (1), aircraft, noncombat		Category V (2), propellers, etc.		Category V (3), engines, aircraft		Total	
	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports	Licenses	Exports
GREAT BRITAIN												
January 1939	$4,000,000	$1,126,604			$195,000	$1,700	$253,155	$110,279	$22,210	$180,419	$4,470,365	$1,419,002
February 1939	7,115,600	1,692,962			113,866	63,823		104,560			7,229,466	1,861,345
March 1939		1,794,104	$1,970		1,600	208,293	457,841	14,229	1,030,026	14,000	1,491,437	2,030,626
April 1939		2,163,694			51,168	39,038	222,547	2,954	323,348	333,014	597,063	2,538,700
May 1939	200,000	2,585,433			21,600	110,049	205	17,028		4,544	221,805	2,717,054
June 1939		3,435,279			34,800	32,300	23,300	80,608	29,434	6,220	87,534	3,554,407
July 1939		5,421,946			29,800	17,200	43,960	108,164	445	3,776	74,205	5,551,086
August 1939		295,050			215,600	20,061	596	9,945	17,700	107,250	233,896	432,306
September 1939		1,422,800										1,422,800
Total	11,315,600	19,937,872	1,970		663,434	492,464	1,001,604	447,767	1,423,163	649,223	14,405,771	21,527,326
FRANCE												
January 1939		1,250,000	1,620	$500	261,675		305,769			39,246	569,064	1,289,746
February 1939	5,000,000	1,300,000			8,612	261,675		84,056	16,400	274,785	5,025,012	1,920,516
March 1939	4,980,000	1,350,000				9,010	8,136	55,917	550,000	42,236	5,538,136	1,457,163
April 1939		868,850		160			336,560	239,496	32,000		368,560	1,108,506
May 1939	9,492,400	708,880						6,467		147,085	9,492,400	862,432
June 1939	1,159,860	2,493,455			184,400		734,949	15,600	12,954,901	39,907	15,034,110	2,548,962
July 1939	31,523,300	2,629,575			12,275	12,275	1,112,718	5,045	2,771,000	383,665	35,419,293	3,030,560
August 1939		1,638,171	38,249			96,102	993,956	229,944	119,800	1,478,607	1,052,005	3,442,824
September 1939		4,392,766						36,557				4,429,323
Total	52,155,560	16,631,697	39,869	660	466,962	379,062	3,492,088	673,082	16,444,101	2,405,531	72,498,580	20,090,032
LICENSES REVOKED SEPT. 5, 8, AND 10, 1939												
Great Britain	12,275,752		1,970		230,000		1,220,575		952,510		[1] 14,680,807	
France	39,876,294		39,209		91,000		3,087,949		15,111,287		[1] 58,205,739	

[1] Includes licenses issued prior to Jan. 1, 1939.

NOTE.—Data for above table extracted from monthly press releases of National Munitions Control Board.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the ostensible object of the proposed legislation is to keep our country from getting into the war in Europe. In the discussion of its purpose of late, much has been said about other angles of the situation, such as our responsibility to assist in again making the world safe for democracies, resist aggressors, and incidentally to profit through the sale of munitions, equipment, and supplies to the end that our long-delayed prosperity may be brought about.

It is said that the embargo provision of the present law is contrary to a just neutrality because it is of advantage to Germany, which for the time does not need our war supplies, and to the disadvantage of Britain and France, which desire the full force of our resources and especially munitions, war planes, and so forth.

To adjust such advantages and disadvantages, it is proposed to repeal the embargo and permit all nations, belligerent or otherwise, to purchase from our great war industries to the full extent for which they can put the cash on the barrel head. It is known and stated that the allied nations, having control of the seas, will thus be able to supply themselves fully, while other nations may not.

Hence by not selling war supplies to any nations at war it is alleged that we have become unneutral and that there is

danger of our being drawn into war on that account. Consequently it is proposed in the present measure to change our neutrality, which is of disadvantage to two of the warring nations, by making it particularly advantageous to those nations. We are to define our policy, not according to what will keep our country out of war from our own standpoint, but to lend the weight of our influence and war power to the nations which desire the change in the form of our neutrality from that of not supplying any of the belligerents to that of supplying those which our Government favors.

In the discussion of the present measure there has been constant mention of our right to determine the form and substance of our neutrality under international law. In fact, it has been repeatedly proposed to repeal the entire neutrality statute and permit the President to determine our war policy under international law, whose provisions are so broad and ill-defined that they are construed by all belligerents in every war to suit their own purposes. It was under those same broad and undefinable provisions that other nations succeeded in drawing us into the World War.

But, until the debate upon the Senate bill opened, there was one principle of international law fairly well defined, understood, and acknowledged, and that was that it was contrary to at least the theory of international law that a neutral country should change the form and substance of its neutrality after a war had begun.

The following statement is from a letter from the Department of State to the German Ambassador on April 21, 1915:

WASHINGTON, *April 21, 1915.*

EXCELLENCY: * * * In the third place, I note with sincere regret that in discussing the sale and exportation of arms by citizens of the United States to the enemies of Germany, Your Excellency seems to be under the impression that it was within the choice of the Government of the United States, notwithstanding its professed neutrality and its diligent efforts to maintain it in other particulars, to inhibit this trade, and that its failure to do so manifested an unfair attitude toward Germany. This Government holds, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions, and I respectfully submit that none of the circumstances urged in Your Excellency's memorandum alters the principle involved. The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States. It will, I feel assured, be clear to Your Excellency that, holding this view and considering itself in honor bound by it, it is out of the question for this Government to consider such a course.

W. J. BRYAN.

That international law seems to be of convenient construction by those interested in construing it to their own purpose is evidenced by the varying claims put forth as to our right to change our policy of neutrality from that of nonsupplying all combatants to that of supplying all combatants who can come and get it and pay for what they get.

Our present neutrality policy was pointed to with no small measure of pride at the time of its enactment. It was described by our President as "new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality."

In an address on international affairs at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, the President not only emphasized the importance of the legislation passed by Congress to "provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war," but he went further to dwell also upon the importance of that neutrality in keeping us out of war, and of the dangers to our country of the demands of those who would seek fool's gold through war profits and prosperity.

This address, made in time of peace, when a great conflict abroad seemed far distant, evidenced full approval of the present neutrality law. If there were indications that it would prove to be an unneutral act then, no mention was made of them. And if it was a policy of just neutrality then, certainly other nations as well as our own people had reason to believe that it would not be changed as soon as war started abroad.

I quote that portion of the President's speech of August 14, 1936, relating to the neutrality:

NEW WEAPONS PROVIDED TO MAINTAIN NEUTRALITY

The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.

The President of the United States, who under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

Nevertheless—and I speak from a long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

WARNS AGAINST PLEA FOR PROFITS FROM WAR

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor! it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"we choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

With that wise and experienced man who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the mediation, the prayer, and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

ASSERTS WE WILL DEFEND OUR NEIGHBORHOOD

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day-to-day decisions.

At this late day, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the Great War in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

Of all the nations of the world today we are in many ways most singularly blessed. Our closest neighbors are good neighbors. If there are remoter nations that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighborhood.

We seek to dominate no other nation. We ask no territorial expansion. We oppose imperialism. We desire reduction in world armaments.

We believe in democracy; we believe in freedom; we believe in peace. We offer to every nation of the world the handclasp of the good neighbor. Let those who wish our friendship look us in the eye and take our hand.

The bill before us, but for the proposed repeal of the embargo provisions, might be considered as strengthening the present law. The restrictions as to credits, the cash-and-carry plan of dealing with nations at war, limitations of the

rights of our vessels to enter war zones and of our people to travel on the ships of warring countries, might serve to keep us out of war, and also protect us from the attempts of war profiteers to enlarge their fortunes at the risk of our involvement in the conflict. Although there are differences of opinion as to the merit of some of these proposals, in the main they could be adopted as amendments to our present law without great controversy were it not for the accompanying provision to repeal the embargo and make our country a war-supply depot for all countries who are in the European war and all others who may enter.

Repeal of the embargo makes possible our participation in the wholesale murder and destruction which as yet is only in the beginning abroad. Whether or not it shall prove to be the first step toward our entry into war, it certainly makes the peace-loving people of our country who abhor war contributors to the war to the extent that we further the bloodshed by materials and equipment, and by the labors of our people who by force of circumstances are engaged in the making of the agencies of death and destruction.

Our people learned fully of the disasters of war in the World War. In the 21 years since its close they have continued to declare that never again shall our young men go overseas to settle international differences. They still so declare, and they demand that not even the first step shall be taken which might involve us to the remotest degree.

All assurances that the present measure will keep us out of war, and that there is no danger of aligning our country with other nations in the conflict, are not satisfying. The previous expressions of our President and many others favorable to the law as it is as a means of maintaining peace fully warrant the fears of the people that repeal of the embargo now would be dangerous. Such fears are not lessened by the attitude of the people of London and Paris, whose confidence that ultimately we shall enter the war on the side of the Allies seems based in large part upon the fact that the Administration is seeking the repeal of the embargo. Evidently they regard that repeal as the first move toward our involvement.

In my opinion, there is no question that our shipments of munitions and war supplies to the allied nations at the opening of the World War in 1914 led to our becoming involved. In 2 years, 1915 to 1917, our sales of munitions to the allied armies exceeded $2,000,000,000. In other ways we gradually approached the conflict and, notwithstanding the assurance of our political leaders that America would not enter the war, we entered it within 6 months after our people had gone to the polls and reelected a President upon the slogan, "He kept us out of war."

There are those who look to repeal of the embargo as a means of profit to our industries and thus to our people. Some seem to believe that the depression may be ended through the war orders of the desperate nations which will buy to the limit. Certainly, our World War experience should warn us against such expediency. One-third our present national debt is owing and the interest upon it is being paid by our taxpayers to the amount of $1,000,000 per day because of that disastrous experience in trying to prosper through the catastrophe of war. Thirteen billion dollars of war debts still are due us, largely from the very nations which are anxiously awaiting the repeal of the embargo that they may again draw upon our industry and resources, notwithstanding the default of their contracts and payments of their debts of the World War. One more such experience in keying our industries to wartime production and the consequences may be, and in my opinion will be, dangerous to our future. It might and probably would lead to an economic collapse which would seriously endanger our Government structure.

Opposition to the repeal of the embargo may be considered not only from the standpoint of the European war. There is another war in China, just as ruthless and destructive as the march of armies into Poland. There has been no embargo enforced even under the present law as to Japan, whose greed and aggression is as great as that of any nation in Europe. Over the protests of our people, the profiteers have continued their trade with Japan, and our money and our materials have been as responsible for the conquest of China and the destruction of innocent civilians, including women and children, there as have all the forces of Japan, which but for the assistance we have rendered them long ago would have been compelled to withdraw from the Chinese provinces.

The sense of outrage has been so strongly evidenced by the American public that there are pending in both Houses of Congress measures intended to place an embargo upon shipments to and from Japan. Our Department of State has given notice that in January next it will abrogate our trade treaty with that country. Undoubtedly, Congress would favor any move to stop our participation with money and goods in support of the brutal march of Japan upon China.

If we pass the measure before us which would permit all nations to arm themselves and carry on wars from our shores, Japan certainly will benefit equally with others. Abrogation of our trade treaty with them would become a useless gesture. We would continue to lend our moral and material support to an instance of aggression as great as any the world has ever known. We cannot thus participate by supplying Europe with equipment with which to destroy itself without continuing to condone the destruction of China by the same form of profiteering.

I am heartily opposed to the repeal of the embargo provision, and I shall so vote. That would be my own judgment and determination as a matter of right and justice under any circumstances. I would rather retire from Congress forthwith than to so vote that I might feel that I was in the remotest degree contributing to the wholesale butchery of war, or that my vote might favor a single step toward our country becoming involved in war. In that attitude I believe that I am honestly expressing the sentiment of a large majority of the people of the district I represent. [Applause]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. JENKS] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, it is my solemn conviction that inextricably bound up in the action taken on these proposed amendments to the neutrality law is a decision, as yet, however, remote, either for or against war.

I feel convinced that the rejection of the proposal to repeal the embargo on arms and munitions would immeasurably strengthen the possibility of the United States being kept out of war, and I am equally confident that the acceptance of this proposal would entail and increase the possibility of leading this country into war—first on the economic front, as before, and later with our entire resources, including manpower.

The neutrality law was placed on our statute books in the comparative international calm of 1935 in order to clearly define our policy and guide our action in the unfortunate event of the development of just such a situation as that with which we are confronted today. At the time of its passage, it was almost unanimously acclaimed as a plan in the interests of peace and a safeguard against the involvement of the United States in foreign wars. It served notice on the nations of the entire world that we had adopted the humanitarian principle to refrain from ever again engaging directly or indirectly in mass murder by supplying to warring countries actual weapons and implements of war, the sole purpose of which is the destruction of human life. Because the loss of American lives at sea through submarine warfare was conceded to be the primary factor in drawing us into the last European conflict, there was written into the neutrality law a provision to keep Americans and American ships off the seas and away from the ports of belligerent countries. After carefully weighing our rights as a neutral Nation, it was wisely concluded that it would be safer and less hazardous to abandon the illusion known as freedom of the seas in favor of this precautionary measure that would eliminate the possibility of loss of life and treasure.

Unlike the President, I do not regret that the Congress passed the neutrality law and that he approved and signed it. I only regret that it was not kept intact by renewing and extending the cash-and-carry provision on noncontraband materials and supplies which expired last May; had that been done, there would be no occasion today for quibbling over what our foreign policy in the present European crisis should be. I believe that provision should be restored.

Unfortunately, within 2 years after the passage of the neutrality law its undermining was begun. We all recall the President's speech at Chicago in October 1937, when, for reasons known only to himself, he suggested that the United States should help quarantine the aggressor nations of the world; his address in Canada when he conjured the possibility of the invasion of our friendly neighbor on the north. Nor have we forgotten the flurry over whether the President did, or did not, state to a Senate committee that our first line of defense was in France. Again in his message to Congress of last January he warned that there were methods short of war to bring home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of the people of the United States, all of which indicated that the administration was swerving from a neutral policy of noninterference and was drifting toward meddling in the affairs of foreign governments. Lesser incidents could be enumerated to show that the public mind was being conditioned toward taking sides in the disputes of Europe rather than encouraging the rank and file of our citizens to take a neutral attitude toward them in accordance with the law of the land.

The people of the United States are not indifferent to the trials and tribulations or the wrongs and injustices inflicted on the peoples of other nations. There is no question but that without any official suggestion or pressure the sympathy of the vast majority of the people of this country would be, just as it is, with the cause of the European democracies, but at the same time I contend that on the Administration devolved the responsibility of fostering and maintaining the official neutrality we might have had. In that, we all know now, it has deliberately and completely failed. Instead, the overwhelming majority of our citizens are laboring under a cross-current of purposes—as yet insistently demanding that the United States be kept out of war but at the same time vitally and keenly alive to victory for one side and defeat for the other. And so we must admit that the high hopes for official neutrality that we once entertained have been destroyed which, doubtlessly, is the reason that the representatives of the people are now meeting in special session for the purpose of burying the remains of the structure on which those hopes were built.

Incidentally, we must not overlook the fact that by moving into the poker game of European power politics the attention of the American people has been distracted from the dismal failure of the Administration to solve the problems at home—that unemployment, bankruptcy, relief expenditures, and deficits have been supplanted in the headlines of the daily newspapers of this country by the moves of England, France, Germany, and Italy, and more recently Russia.

In writing into the law of this land an embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to warring nations, no conviction was held that this restriction would prevent war among other nations, because it was a well-known fact that less than 10 percent of the exports from the United States during the last World War consisted of actual weapons or implements of war. Rather this embargo was based on the premise that we as a nation would not be instrumental in aiding, abetting, or promoting death and destruction among the peoples of other nations. It was a humanitarian principle we had adopted which at the same time served as a symbol of our neutrality in foreign conflicts.

To those who contend that this embargo operates to the detriment of the European democracies, let me point out that the limited amount of war munitions that the United States is geared to supply, beyond its own requirements, would have little bearing on the outcome of the conflict; if the United States is to be an active factor in European defeats or victories, now or at any other time, considerably more than the quota of war munitions we are prepared to supply would be required. But now that war has come, as the chips fall under our neutrality law, let us see the result. England having control of the seas and, with France, having certain financial resources and shipping facilities that the dictatorships do not possess has access to our raw materials and food provisions. Certainly nobody will contend that the availability of our supplies is not an advantage and something of a factor in the success of the countries having access to them. So we see that without tampering with our neutrality law as originally enacted the European democracies, because of their geographical position and superior sea power, have the advantage under that law.

Let us not forget that the arms embargo was adopted some 4 years prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Europe. Having served notice on the world what our policy would be in future conflicts, there is justification for the contention that to alter it now would be unneutral.

Mr. Speaker, the situation today parallels in many respects that of the years 1914–17. The same forces are again opposing each other. Once more a figure has appeared on the horizon whose aims and ambitions must be annihilated. We hear again that democracy must be saved, and there is reechoed, as before, that if the side with which our sympathies lie is not victorious the next target of the dictatorships will be the United States. Fear again is awakening, and once the floodgates of propaganda are thrown completely open, hysteria will again stalk the length and breadth of the land, which is not the least of the driving forces that precipitate the decision to go to war. Let me insert here what ex-President Hoover says in the October 28 edition of the Saturday Evening Post:

> We are again told that unless we join in, western civilization may be destroyed and we will be the next victim. Therefore, eventually, why not now? Aside from the fact that Britain and France with their empires can defend themselves, if they stay on the defense, great wars do not end that way. Great wars often enough end in peace before either side is the victor. When one side is the victor in modern wars it is because the other side has become exhausted. At that moment the victors are but one lap behind in the race of exhaustion. Neither at the armistice in 1918 nor at the end of any other war were the victors or the vanquished ready for or desirous of starting another war. In other words, not even the victor is going to pounce upon a powerful armed neutral. Especially they do not attack 130,000,000 people 3,000 miles overseas who have a capacity of 10,000,000 soldiers and 25,000 airplanes. * * * Beyond all this, when all great wars end, all the peoples take out their sufferings upon their leaders, either by putting them out of office or by revolution. And therefore the whole setting changes. The voice of experience says we should discard these forebodings about being the next victim.

The United States is again confronted with a decision: Shall we for the second time disregard the advice of George Washington who counseled—

> Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or very remote, relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the vicissitudes of her politics or the combinations and collisions of her friendships and enmities. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. * * * Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice—

Or the warning of Thomas Jefferson who admonished that—

> our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. * * * I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal wars. * * * On our part, never had a people so favorable a chance of trying the opposite system, of peace and fraternity with mankind, and the direction of all our means and faculties

to the purposes of improvement instead of destruction. * * * Our difficulties are indeed great, if we consider ourselves alone, but when viewed in comparison to those of Europe they are the joys of Paradise. * * * I expect that Europe will again be in a state of general conflagration. What a divine contrast is the calm of our condition to the volcanic state of that. How do our little party bickerings and squabbles shrink to nothing compared with the fire and sword and havoc of that arena of gladiators.

There are those who try to counter the soundness of this advice by the contention that times have changed, that through inventive genius space has been diminished, oceans have shrunk, and tucks have been taken in world maps, but do not let us overlook the fact that at the time Washington and Jefferson voiced their warnings against European entanglements there were still territorial sections of this continent that were under the domination and rule of European governments. Despite the more rapid communication and transportation facilities of our day, Europe was then closer to us than now.

After heeding the counsel of Washington and Jefferson for nearly a century and a quarter, we disregarded it for the first time in 1917 when we entered the World War. The situation in Europe today proves beyond a shadow of doubt that our participation in that war contributed little, if anything, toward the solution of the problems that have grown out of centuries of European diplomatic intrigue and the struggle of power politics, rendering lasting peace on that continent still a bedraggled and forlorn hope.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, the obligation to define or redefine the territorial boundary lines of Europe does not rest on the United States. Despite anything we can do those lines will continue to shift in blood and smoke until Europe itself finds its own way toward amity and peace.

With a repeal of the embargo on arms and munitions, I say the trend is easily foreseen: First, arms and supplies on a cash-and-carry basis; the floodgates of propaganda thrown wide open, rapidly developing fear and war hysteria; next, pressure for arms and supplies on credit, with the accompanying unwarranted industrial and agricultural expansion; and then, as before, a clamor to sustain the boom and protect the credit and investment, which would eventually entail our entire resources, including manpower.

If the United States again becomes involved in a foreign conflict we will sacrifice and utterly destroy our real mission in world affairs; I believe that the greatest contribution we as a Nation could make toward world stability would be through the preservation of our own democracy, undiluted by the ravages of war, holding steadily aloft the lamp of freedom and the light of liberty. Therefore, let us cling to every safeguard to our neutrality that we have or can devise. Let us perpetuate the humanitarian principle we have adopted of refraining from selling arms and muntions, instruments of death and destruction, to all warring nations. "War is hell." Let us keep out of it; we want none of it. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this Senate bill for three reasons:

First. It has no clear prohibition against the United States financing much of the war by devious methods—by whipping the devil around the stump. My colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has gone into some of these facts in detail. I hope to have the privilege of voting "aye" on his amendment barring the use of the funds of the Export-Import Bank or the R. F. C. or any other Government corporation in financing any purchases under this bill in the United States. The Senate gave negative approval—that is, that body voted down two amendments which would make impossible the use of R. F. C., Export-Import Bank, or the manipulation of the two billion stabilization fund to aid purchases of war or contraband materials or commodities in these United States.

These Taft amendments voted down were:

Amendment No. 1:

"(d) Subsection (a) of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the first sentence thereof, the following new sentence: 'The Secretary of the Treasury shall not at any time hold currency, or bills of exchange payable in the currency of any state named in any currently effective proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) of the Neutrality Act of 1939, for which he has expended more than $20,000,000 from the stabilization fund.'"

Amendment No. 2:

"(b) Neither the Government of the United States nor any agency thereof (including a public corporation created by or pursuant to special authorization of Congress, or a corporation in which the United States has or exercises a controlling interest through stock ownership or otherwise) shall make any loans designed to finance or assist the export of goods, materials, or merchandise of any kind to the territory of any foreign government named in any currently effective proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) of the Neutrality Act of 1939."

Already there had appeared a statement by Mr. Jesse Jones, head of the R. F. C., on September 1. It read:

Mr. Jones expressed the opinion that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation could finance exports of commodities as does the Export-Import Bank, and that neither agency was affected by the Johnson Act forbidding loans to foreign governments in default of war debts. However, he pointed out that all Export-Import Bank transactions are with private enterprises and not foreign governments and that neither the bank nor the R. F. C. has any application from governments.

What is the difference whether a government is aided by the use of these funds, I may ask Mr. Jones, or John Q. Bull, a private citizen buys munitions under this Neutrality Act and receives aid out of the American pocketbook.

This Senate bill opens wide the doors to financing a belligerent in this war. If we are to have cash and carry, we ought to know whose cash it is. I want to know from Mr. Jones or the Export-Import Bank how much gold profit to foreign nations is going to belligerents to support credit. The Senate did not answer those questions, Mr. Morgenthau did not answer them, and we are asked to accept them blindly.

When we do this we are going out to pick figs from thistles and plums from thorn trees. We will be paying again for 20 or more years. I am opposed to any system, any plan, or any legislation that permits profits to be picked in pennies from dead men's eyes.

War is now, always has been, eternally will be, the result of two principal causes.

Greed—to get what others have.

Self-defense—to hold what one has, and get more if possible.

Greed has been the impulse of war. It conquered and enslaved. It hitched human beings to chariot wheels. It looted cities and carried off women and slew the men. It made armies and navies. It stole from savage Indian and cheated him in payments. It tortured and squeezed and trampled, ravaged and raped, steaming its face in the hot blood of a thousand million victims. It died as it lived, perished as it performed, by the sword. It made Alexander weep and filled Caesar with ambition.

Let us expand these two causes of war and see if there is a justification for any war that has been fought if we can visualize the aggressor and the other party to war.

First. Desire for power and territory.

Second. Desire for plunder and loot.

Third. Ambition to rule in place of another.

Fourth. Religious wars.

Fifth. Desire for greater self-expression culminating in revolution.

Sixth. Support of a ruling family in some nation other than the one making wars.

Seventh. No just cause but under treaty contract to become an ally.

Eighth. Desire for trade monopoly.

Ninth. Protection of concessions made by one nation to another.

Tenth. Protection of a nation's interests in another country.

Eleventh. Pique, pride, and egotism.

It is 1900 years since Christ wandered about Palestine scourging the consciences of the vicious, selfish, greedy, covetous, avaricious, thieving, mendacious, murderous, and ambitious humanity he found around him. He trampled with

heavy feet on the law of revenges—an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth—he swept aside the doctrine of blood and preached the doctrine of gentleness. He gave the world a new rule for living. He took the iron and steel of materialism and softened it to malleability. He had blistered the skins of Pharisee and doctrinaire alike. He preached revolution, not retribution, not against the status quo but against mental slavery of fixed formula. He planted flowers of spirituality where had grown the poisonous plants of selfishness. He said that the neighbor was to be loved. I have no idea that Jesus of Nazareth, the carpenter, or Christ, the preacher, wanted war but he knew it was coming. Did he not prophesy the destruction of Jerusalem? He lived in the same atmosphere of conquest his race had encountered for centuries. His own people were enslaved and ruled from Rome. If anything could stop war it was the religion of Christianity. If any text or preachment can stop war it is something above the material; it must be spiritual and measured in terms of giving and not of getting.

I have a letter from a dear friend of mine who says this war overseas is to preserve civilization. If so, God help civilization. You cannot shoot civilization into this world with cannon or machine guns; you cannot achieve it with

Blood gushing warm and wet
Along the glistening bayonet.

You cannot make a new civilization—you may destroy it with deadly gas, its victims to live on in broken body, seeping wounds, destroyed black-spotted lungs, blind of eye, skin warped and distorted, and you here in this House are asked in this Senate bill to vote the sale and shipment of this gas. I shall not.

I have wondered for the last few days, my friends, if the Unknown Soldier, sleeping out there in Arlington, was one who went over the top on some dark night for his "rendezvous with death at some disputed barricade" in apple-blossom time and died from deadly fumes of phosgene or mustard gas.

I here desire unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD category VI and category VII of the President's proclamation of May 1, 1937, naming the taboo poison gases. I ask this since I find it impossible to pronounce the names and if I organized this House into a spelling school none could spell them.

CATEGORY VI

(1) Livens projectors and flame throwers.
(2) a. Mustard gas (dichlorethyl sulfide).
b. Lewisite (chlorvinyldichlorarsine and dichlordivinylchlorarsine).
c. Methyldichlorarsine.
d. Diphenylchlorarsine.
e. Diphenylcyanarsine.
f. Diphenylaminechlorarsine.
g. Phenyldichlorarsine.
h. Ethyldichlorarsine.
i. Phenyldibromarsine.
j. Ethyldibromarsine.
k. Phosgene.
l. Monochlormethylchlorformate.
m. Trichlormethylchlorformate (diphosgene).
n. Dichlordimethyl ether.
o. Dibromdimethyl ether.
p. Cyanogen chloride.
q. Ethylbromacetate.
r. Ethyliodoacetate.
s. Brombenzylcyanide.
t. Bromacetone.
u. Brommethylethyl ketone.

CATEGORY VII

(1) Propellant powders;
(2) High explosive as follows:
a. Nitrocellulose having a nitrogen content of more than 12 percent;
b. Trinitrotoluene;
c. Trinitroxylene;
d. Tetryl (trinitrophenol methyl nitramine or tetranitro methylaniline);
e. Picric acid;
f. Ammonium picrate;
g. Trinitroanisol;
h. Trinitronaphthalene;
i. Tetranitronaphthalene;
j. Hexanitrodiphenylamine;
k. Pentaerythritetetranitrate (penthrite or pentrite);
l. Trimethylenetrinitramine (hexogen or T_4);
m. Potassium nitrate powders (black saltpeter powder);
n. Sodium nitrate powders (black soda powder);
o. Amatol (mixture of ammonium nitrate and trinitrotoluene);
p. Ammonal (mixture of ammonium nitrate, trinitrotoluene, and powdered aluminum, with or without other ingredients);
q. Schneiderite (mixture of ammonium nitrate and dinitronaphthalene, with or without other ingredients).

I am for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, or as added to by the Vorys amendment. The gentleman from Connecticut is not lured from his honest convictions by pressure from profit-making munition factories in his own State and district. He realizes that there is no aggregate final profit in the sale of war munitions.

This bill is not a neutrality bill, notwithstanding its verbiage and its hypocrisy.

This is a bill of alliance with Great Britain and France. Out of the Senate debate two alone were declarants that this is so. I honor those two men for their honesty. We are passing this bill to aid France and Britain. They know it over there.

I spoke here on the fraudulent neutrality in the Bloom bill. That bill was troubled with pernicious anemia. This Senate bill is suffering from pernicious hypocrisy. It pretends one thing and means another.

I am for neutrality, a neutrality that removes America from the field of war, that keeps American munitions from killing anybody, that holds to our ancient traditions of being true to ourselves. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of Americanism there is probably no one thing on which our citizens are more unanimous in agreement than that of a policy of strict neutrality on the part of the United States plus a fervent desire and hope that we remain out of any future war. Some of the most able minds in our country may and do differ as to the best means of accomplishing our ideal. Because we may differ as to method, we do not charge them with advocating a United States participation in a foreign war. I refuse to believe that for political or personal reasons, any officer or employee of our Government would wilfully plunge our country into a war.

We know from bitter experience the price of war. From a material standpoint should we be drawn into the present European conflict, we would have everything to lose and nothing to gain. From an idealistic standpoint there is that somewhat shop-worn phrase of "make the world safe for democracy." Now we are fully aware that this new war is being fought to see who shall eventually be the big boss in Europe. Some 20 years ago we sacrificed the lives and health of thousands of the young men of this country and we spent billions and billions of the taxpayers' money, trying to make the world safe for democracy. History tells us that we won that war. If we did win it, I challenge any one to point out some concrete evidence of that fact today. We surely did not win a lasting peace. It is needless for me to enumerate now the pain, suffering, and heartaches that are still with us as a result of that war, and I refer primarily to those of our comrades who made the supreme sacrifice, and to those and their dependents whose bodies and minds have been wrecked as a direct result of participation in that war. In addition we still have a tremendous debt in dollars and cents staring us in the face, which must eventually be paid by that fountain of governmental revenue, the American taxpayer.

We are traditionally a peace-loving nation. We do not want war and we entertain no thoughts of aggression. We are loath to see war in any part of the world and have always gladly offered our good offices with the end in view of a peaceful arbitration of international disputes. There are some who are of the opinion that we should take a more active interest in world conditions, world politics, and the brotherhood of nations, but a great majority of our people favor a policy of minding our own business, avoiding foreign entanglements but always with the open hand of friendship extended to the nations of the world. At the present time

we have no quarrel with any country. Individually we might not approve the tactics, customs, or form of government of some of the nations or peoples who happen to inhabit this globe on which we have the opportunity of spending a few short years. This fact does not, will not, and cannot justify our going to war with them. We well realize that our country, notwithstanding some economic dislocations and the teachings of international reformers, is a land of milk and honey, compared to most other nations. We have a degree of freedom unequaled and unparalleled anywhere. We intend to keep for ourselves and our posterity those blessings of freedom and happiness, and should they ever be endangered by invasion of a foreign power, the 130,000,000 people of our Nation will arise as one in defense.

The American people do not want war, nor do I, and I hope and pray, as does every other loyal American, that we will not ever become involved in another war. If we are to avoid war, we must of necessity remain neutral in the present European struggle. How we may best bring this about is a matter of the utmost importance. Surely we will not contribute to the peace of the world if we manufacture and sell to warring nations the materials with which to wage war. The proposition of an aid to our own economic recovery has been advanced as a justification for the processing of raw materials into implements of war for sale to belligerent nations on a cash-and-carry basis. It is also advocated that we should return to international law which permits and advocates the unrestricted purchase of munitions of war from any nation not a belligerent. I cannot agree with either of these theories. I feel that we may far better employ the talents of our vast industrial empire toward the building up of civilization, rather than the production of instrumentalities designed to destroy it. Since the days of the founding of our Nation, we have continued to build and not tear down or destroy.

Does the balance of power in Europe, or who is to be the greatest nation in Europe, or who is to have certain priorities in Europe concern us so much that we must take sides, or if not openly take sides, then slyly furnish aid and comfort to one side, knowing that the other side may not avail themselves of the same opportunity? Going back to World War days, how much attention was paid to international law? So long as it is convenient for the parties concerned to follow established custom—and that is all international law is—then and only then will such law be followed. It is subject to change without notice, and the only remedy for violation is war or retaliation in kind. As one writer so ably put it, "International law is what war makes it." It is true that from a national-defense standpoint we could go into the production of arms and armament with some advantage to ourselves. We could use the battlefields of the world as a proving ground for the development of the most deadly instruments of war, and it is conceivable that with our system of mass production we could produce better implements of war at less cost than any other nation in the world, especially when consideration is given to the fact that we possess an abundance of certain essential raw materials. There can be no doubt of the advantage to our national defense by the unrestricted sale of war materials. It is also true that American industry would make a nice profit. These profits would not mean a lasting prosperity and would tend to further upset our own economic machinery, just as they did during the World War.

I am not unmindful of the result of embargoes in the past. They always have the effect of denying someone a right they otherwise had. It does seem to me that if the present arms embargo was proper when enacted by the Congress and signed by the President at a time when Europe was at peace, that it would be most desirable now when Europe is at war, for our embargo law did not become effective until war was declared abroad. Such law was on our statute books and constituted due notice to the world of our position at that time. Are we now going to do an about-face in our foreign policy?

Public opinion in my own congressional district, and, after all, it is these good people who have committed to me the duty of voting their convictions in this matter, is almost unanimous in the retention of the present arms embargo, believing that this is the best means advanced so far toward keeping our country out of war. I full well realize that there is no law or action that the Congress may take that will absolutely guarantee our not becoming involved in a war at some date in the future. We can take some comfort in the lessons of the past. We do know that a policy of freedom of the seas, with unlimited commerce in all munitions of war, is probably the quickest and surest way of our becoming involved. It was with this idea in mind that the Congress enacted the arms embargo. Has the situation fundamentally changed? Is it the intention of our Government to merely permit industry to make a nice profit out of war materials, with none of the attendant risks of delivery to foreign shores? Or do we deep down in our own hearts intend to aid France and England with the thought of our own safety and peace of mind in the future?

We have witnessed within the past few years many startling alliances between some of the nations of the world. With these alliances we have no particular concern. In the Spanish war we saw German and Russian fighting against each other. Now they are supposed to be allies, at least for the time being. Japan and Germany, together with Italy, formed an alliance which for the moment bid fair to upset the international apple cart. England and France permitted Italy to destroy the Ethiopian Government. These same two governments are now said to be fighting to preserve the Polish Government. How did Hitler get into power; who furnished him with the necessary credits to rearm Germany? Who permitted him to violate a solemn treaty, which treaty was made possible by the feats of American arms? Who will be allies and enemies 5 years from now, no one can answer. I know one thing, and that is the American public is not going to enter such a picture without a clearer objective than was made known to us during the World War.

It is not my purpose or desire to analyze the foreign political set-up. While we naturally are concerned over a war anywhere on the globe, we cannot and should not take the position of world policeman in order to preserve the peace of the world, regardless of how some of our idealists might feel about the matter. We have witnessed our World War efforts entirely erased from the pages of accomplishment. We should have learned our lesson.

The policy of the United States should be one that avoids hates and loves. It should be one that seeks to maintain the friendship of all established governments, without regard to form, religion, or race. It should be one that definitely prescribes America for Americans, and God pity the foreign power that encroaches on any part of the Western Hemisphere. This policy was laid down by Washington and Monroe and is still applicable today.

If such a policy is reaffirmed by the United States, and I feel certain that in the minds of most of our people and by common custom—excluding, of course, the World War period—we have in effect adopted such a course, then America need have no fear of the future.

Modern commerce, communication, and transportation perhaps might preclude us from adopting a complete isolationist policy. Regardless of what might be said as to the latest thing in mechanized military might, I for one feel that we in the United States are reasonably safe from foreign invasion. True, we must always be prepared to repel an invader, but if all the shipping in the whole world outside the United States were available to an enemy, it would be months before a sizable army could be landed on American shores. Let us as a peaceful nation be not entirely taken in by this war talk. Let us contribute everything we can for peace. I am not a pacifist. As a member of the House Military Affairs Committee I have labored incessantly toward an adequate national defense. I still am prepared to go all the way toward that end. I also intend to do everything I can to make war impossible, either on our own shores or abroad.

The President in his speech to the Congress pointed significantly to the breach in our present law, which permits the

shipment of raw materials to warring nations, but not the finished product. The President drew the parallel between a sheet of aluminum and an airplane, cotton to guncotton, brass tubing in pipe form and brass tubing in shell form, and a motortruck to an armored motortruck. He further made a point of the financial gain to our workers in the processing of implements of war. I, for one, would hate to see our own industrial recovery predicated on the miseries of war. Neither do I want to see my country become the munitions maker for the rest of the world. If history repeats itself we will be infinitely worse off economically when this war is over than we were at the height of the depression brought about by the last World War.

Our people are clamoring for a strict neutrality, and I believe most every Member of both the House and Senate would hesitate to do anything that might be construed as an unneutral act. In this connection it is interesting to turn back a few pages in our own national history and find that in 1914 we had an embargo act. Efforts to change that act after the declaration of war by the European powers in 1914 was then said to be an unneutral act and a violation of international law. The principal exponent of this doctrine was Lord Grey, then Prime Minister of England. However, President Wilson and Robert Lansing, who later became Secretary of State, were of the same opinion. If it was unneutral to change our position then, after war had been declared, it is emphatically just as unneutral to change our position now. This also is the conclusion reached by other able and outstanding American authorities on international law.

It is indeed enlightening to read the public pronouncements of some of the proponents of the present move to lift the arms embargo that were made prior to the enactment of the existing law. In 1935 the President said, and I quote:

> I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end.

Again speaking on the first Neutrality Act the President stated:

> This Government has for several years observed a definite policy of refusing to promote and encourage the export trade in arms, and of forbidding its representatives abroad from taking any action which might be construed as an effort to increase the sales in foreign countries of implements of war manufactured here.

In his annual message to Congress on January 3, 1936, the President declared:

> As a consistent part of a clear policy the United States is following a twofold neutrality toward any and all nations which engage in wars that are not of immediate concern to the Americas. First, we decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States.

Evidently we are to change our neutrality policy entirely if the action taken by the Senate on the pending measure is confirmed. Perhaps there is a reason for this about face. If so, what is it? Let us have more light on the subject. Let us remain in session in order that all pertinent facts may be fully developed.

Thousands and thousands of words have been written and spoken on both sides of the present proposal. The question of the arms embargo has already been given the most sober thought and consideration on the part of this House. Are we going to be stampeded into an absolute reversal of our most mature deliberation, by this war talk? It is high time that we awoke to the realization that we can do nothing by our entering this new war, to definitely solve the European situation. We must conserve our energies for the future. When the war is over, we will have ample opportunity to practice humanitarian principles. We will probably be called upon to feed the starving, bind the wounds, and contribute to the rebuilding of the warring nations, just as we did during and after the last war. To my way of thinking, one of the most humanitarian things we could do for the unfortunate people of Europe who personally do not want war, is to refuse to sell their governments the implements of war. We should retain the arms embargo in the sincere hope, even if it be a vain one, that such action on our part might in some fashion contribute to the peace of the world.

There are few who will deny that foreign trade is most desirable for the well being of our country. Ours is a land of plenty. We produce more wheat, cotton, and other foodstuffs than we can consume domestically. The nations of the world who are now at war need these commodities. There is therefor a tremendous potential market for our surpluses. However, we still remember some of the lessons of the last war and of the impracticability of insisting upon the doctrine of absolute freedom of the seas, if we are to avoid being drawn into the present European conflict. Suppose an American ship laden with sugar, cotton, or wheat, consigned to Sweden, a neutral country, should strike a mine in the North Sea or accidentally meet with disaster at sea. Clever propaganda could very easily make a U-boat attrocity out of the affair, causing public opinion to at once flare up, and we might have a repetition of 1917-18.

During and immediately preceding the last war we lent millions of dollars to European countries to buy the products of our farms and factories. Victor and vanquished alike were the recipients of our largess. Hardly any of that money has been repaid or ever will be repaid. Where did that money come from? You and I know that it came from the pockets of the American taxpayer. At the start of the World War we had a national debt of one and a half billion dollars; now it is over $40,000,000,000. Regardless of what may be said as to the reckless spending of money during recent years, I would rather double our Federal expenditures for domestic needs than to advance one cent of credit to those European nations who so blithely took the hard-earned dollars from our people and then refuse to recognize their obligations in order that they might continue to prepare for the day when their own hatreds and jealousies would again bring them into another conflict.

Yes; we can profitably sell Europe many different kinds of goods that are not in the category of implements of war. But insofar as I am concerned they will have to come and get it, for I refuse to sacrifice the life or liberty of a single American seaman or one ton of American shipping, and they must lay the cash on the line.

We are a free people and have always enjoyed the right of travel anywhere in the world without restraint insofar as our Government is concerned. However, national emergencies have always laid certain restrictions on a free people. There is a proposal in the present measure which I think is a good one. It is the prohibition against American citizens traveling in war zones. We should use every effort to keep our nationals at home during the present European conflict.

My whole thought and interest in this entire matter is the burning desire for peace and the preservation of our United States.

We must face the undeniable fact that "nobody wins a modern war." America can keep out of war. America must keep out of war. Let us keep our emotions down and our intelligence up. Let us not start on a path that ends with a sentry walking past the tomb of another unknown soldier. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the able, genial, and always courteous and obliging chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will remain in the Hall while I make my few remarks, because I have a question that I would like to ask him. I am not here to read a speech nor to say how I am going to vote on this measure, but I desire to discuss the measure earnestly. The rule under which we are operating in the House is supposed to be the most liberal rule ever offered under like circumstances. Perhaps it is so far as the opportunity for oratory on the part of the Members present is concerned, but it certainly is not a liberal one when it comes to the possibility of any Member being able to offer amendments. I understand that only three amendments may be offered to the

pending motion to instruct the conferees, and that I may not be recognized for that purpose. Under these circumstances, with all humility and all that sort of thing, I wish to make some suggestions for the conferees when the bill does go to conference. I do that because I have very carefuly tried to study this thing with all of the best interests of my country at heart.

The first question I want to ask the able gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is the same one that I asked him the other day, for which he did not then have an answer. Section 2 (a) of the bill provides that no American vessel can carry anything to any belligerent country and section 2 (c) provides that anything that leaves the ports of the United States, destined to one of these nations named in the proclamation shall have its title transferred to some foreign government, corporation, or individual, or what not. The question I propound to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is, in his judgment, does that language or any other language in the bill prevent American vessels from carrying goods classified as contraband, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, the title to which is vested in a foreign government, corporation, or individual, perhaps a belligerent, to a neutral nation for transshipment to a belligerent.

Mr. BLOOM. They are not supposed to be transshipped, but how are we going to know it?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is the question.

Mr. BLOOM. And when the gentleman says contraband, he should please remember that every belligerent country has its own list of contraband.

Mr. HINSHAW. I amend my remarks, to mean those items mentioned in section 12 (i) of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. As far as shipping goods is concerned, according to this legislation we can ship any goods we want to.

Mr. HINSHAW. On American vessels?

Mr. BLOOM. To any neutral nation. We are not allowed to ship any goods on American ships to any of the belligerent countries. If one of the ships is a carrier of any contraband goods, as the gentleman refers to them, and transships the goods to somebody else—of course, they are not supposed to do it, but you do not want to have it put on the shoulders of the United States to follow every ship that carries goods and to find out where it is going when according to law they are not supposed to do that.

Mr. HINSHAW. The thing that I am vitally interested in and concerned with in this bill——

Mr. BLOOM. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. HINSHAW. Not altogether.

Mr. BLOOM. It is pretty good?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; that is pretty good, but not good enough. The thing that I am vitally interested in and concerned with in this bill is the fact that during the World War it was perfectly possible and legal for American vessels to carry arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents and to carry passengers on the same vessel. I insist that this measure should contain some provision that will prevent American vessels from carrying arms, ammunition, and implements of war to warring nations and also to carry passengers on the same vessel. I do not see how that can be accomplished under the bill as it stands today.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. There is no provision in this bill which would permit an American vessel to carry contraband of war and passengers at the same time.

Mr. HINSHAW. But there is no provision in this bill that would prevent it.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Certainly there is.

Mr. HINSHAW. Absolutely not. I ask the gentleman to show me where.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. We have the cash-and-carry provision all through the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not talking about that. I am talking about some provision that will prevent American vessels from carrying arms, ammunition, and implements of war destined to a belligerent, but to a neutral port for transshipment——

Mr. BLOOM. To a neutral port?

Mr. HINSHAW. For transshipment.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. There is nothing in this bill that says anything about transshipment except that it is not allowed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; I know. There is nothing in the bill that prevents it.

Mr. BLOOM. Under this bill they can send it to any neutral port.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right. Under the old bill it says you cannot carry it directly or indirectly to a belligerent. That is what I am getting at. If it could be stated in section 2 (a) that they shall not carry anything to a belligerent directly or indirectly, that is something else, but I do not want to limit it that far myself.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that as far as that is concerned, under the present law, through the control of the Munitions License Board, munitions are not to be carried on American ships?

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be in the present law, but I am talking about this bill that we are going to vote on. I want somebody to show me in this bill where it will prevent American vessels from carrying passengers and arms, ammunition, and implements of war in the hold, consigned, if you please, to a belligerent or an agent of a belligerent, but destined to a neutral port.

Mr. BLOOM. It cannot be consigned to a belligerent nation. I would advise the gentleman to please read the bill and he will find that that is impossible.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will you show me that in the bill? It says in section 2 (c) that the title must be transferred to some foreign government. It does not say that any belligerent government shall be deprived of the right to have goods consigned to it. I want to find that and if I can find that I will be very happy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because I am unable to offer an amendment to this bill under the rule, I have here what I had intended to be an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask unanimous consent that it may be read out of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HINSHAW respectfully suggests that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Joint Resolution 306 consider insisting upon the following subsections of section 12, following subsection (i):

"(j) It shall be the duty of the Board to prepare and keep a record of the exports from the United States of the material resources of the United States, to obtain frequent reports from the several administrative agencies of the Government concerning the condition of the supply of material resources, and to render reports at not less than quarterly intervals to the President and the Congress, which shall contain such recommendations for the conservation of the material resources of the United States as the Board may deem advisable. Such reports shall state, in respect to any material resource, that the domestic supply of such resource is inadequate for domestic purposes, or is becoming dangerously depleted, and that, in the opinion of the Board, the export of such material should be limited to quantities which may be stated by the Board, or should be embargoed from export.

"(k) Whenever the Board shall determine that the domestic supply of any material resource named by the Board under subsection (j) is adequate for all domestic purposes, and that an adequate surplus in fact exists, the Board shall so notify the President and the Congress of this condition, and the quantitative adequacy of the supply."

The managers on the part of the House shall be further requested to insist upon the amendment of the title of section 12 to read "National Munitions and Resources Control Board."

Mr. BLOOM. May I answer the gentleman now?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Under section 2 (a) it states:

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

On page 16, section (c), line 1:

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported, from the United States to any state named in such proclamation, any articles or materials—

And so forth.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is not the whole of it. The rest says "until title has been transferred."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HINSHAW. May I have 5 more minutes?

Mr. FISH. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. HINSHAW. No. I want to complete my statement, please.

That section which the gentleman just read provides that the title must be transferred before the goods shall be shipped.

Mr. BLOOM. No, no. It does not. I did not read about the title.

Mr. HINSHAW. But there was no period where you stopped.

Mr. BLOOM. If you want, I will read the other part, but what is the use?

Mr. HINSHAW. You will find that section 2 (c) reads as follows:

(c) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export or transport, or attempt to export or transport, or cause to be exported or transported, from the United States to any state named in such proclamation, any articles or materials (except copyrighted articles or materials) until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government, agency, institution, association, partnership, corporation, or national.

Mr. BLOOM. I would like to have the gentleman, after we adjourn, come to my office, and I will be glad to debate it with him for the balance of the evening.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would be happy to do that.

Now I want to refer to my other suggestion that was just read. My other suggestion has to do with the material resources of the United States. Everybody knows that there is a war on in other parts of the world than Europe, but very few people in the House have considered that that war is in existence. Certainly nobody in high office has found that there is a war over there.

I have suggested the insertion of this subsection into the bill in order that if occasion should arise that the United States would find that it was getting short of scrap iron or gasoline, or a few other things like that, which are national resources, that the Munitions Resources Control Board could so find, notify Congress, and in order to preserve our national resources, we could place an embargo on same. I do not believe the Members of this House have considered what is going to happen under this bill if it passes as it stands, and its effect on the situation in other parts of the world than Europe. It is a very serious situation, and I hope that somebody will give it adequate consideration before the bill is passed.

I have another suggestion in line with the one just made and that is to insert in section 1 (a) the words "or conserve the resources of" after the word "peace" in line — so that it shall read as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF A STATE OF WAR BETWEEN FOREIGN STATES

SECTION 1. (a) That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace or conserve the resources of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they may become involved in the war.

Those words key into the suggested amendment just read by the Clerk. Even if there is no embargo in this bill and the old one is repealed, these amendments may aid the United States in preserving its neutrality in the Orient. I earnestly commend the idea at least to the serious consideration of the conference between the House and Senate on the disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include certain quotations, I desire to quote a letter directed to a Member of the other body from my State of California:

WASHINGTON, *October 8, 1939.*

Senator HIRAM JOHNSON,
The Capitol.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Why is it that so little has been said in the Senate debate about the effect of the propossed repeal of the arms embargo on our relations with Japan? Is it attention so focused on Europe that we have forgotten Asia? Are we planning to help Japan to dominate the Pacific? Do we want to have to go to war to prevent the Pacific from becoming a Japanese lake? Are we not likely to get embroiled with Japan if we fail to treat them fairly, as neutrals, and sell them the munitions they bring cash for?

At present they are at war with China, but as war has not been declared they cannot, under international law, blockade the ports of Shanghai, Tientsin, or Hong Kong. They cannot seize vessels taking munitions to Hong Kong for sale to the Chinese. They have not declared war because under the existing Arms Embargo Act they could not then buy supplies as they have been doing on the Pacific coast.

But, if we repeal the arms embargo and adopt a cash-and-carry plan with regard to airplanes, arms, and ammunition, so as to be able to sell these necessary munitions to England and France, how can we prevent the Japanese from coming to San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Seattle with gold or silk in their hands and buying the munitions they need to crush English interests in eastern Asia and dominate the Pacific?

It is obvious that when we repeal the arms embargo the Japanese will at once formally declare that war exists in China. They can then institute a legal blockade. They can squeeze the British out of the Far East by the use of the airplanes, arms, and munitions which we sell them.

With the British Fleet busy in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, the Japanese can dominate the sea lanes in the Pacific. Having made friends with Russia so that Stalin is even willing to put to death 300 officers of the army in Outer Mongolia for being anti-Japanese, as was reported in the New York Times last Saturday, she can probably borrow gold from Russia to add to her silk credits and help her keep our munitions factories busy making material to help her drive the British and French out of eastern Asia. Do we want to see that happen? Can we prevent it?

If we deny the Japanese the right to operate under the cash-and-carry plan, while permitting it to England and France, we shall be committing an unneutral act of vitally serious import. All international lawyers agree with Mr. George Rublee that in the sale of munitions it is the obligation of the neutral "to afford equal opportunity to each side." We cannot have one law on the Atlantic coast and another on the Pacific, unless we are willing to be embroiled with Japan.

The British have been advised by their chief authority on propaganda, Captain Rogerson, whose book has gone into a second edition, that "it would be a natural and obvious object" of their propagandists to succeed in embroiling us with Japan, "just as during the Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany." Are we going to help them do it?

It has been reported in the press that we—that is, our Government, through Secretary Hull—asked our airplane manufacturers on the Pacific coast not to sell airplanes to the Japanese to be used in killing Chinese, and they have agreed not to do so.

But if Japan declares war on China—and possibly on Australia and New Zealand, where the climate suits them and the unoccupied land attracts them—and we have no embargo on the sale of munitions but offer to sell to all and sundry who bring the cash or credit in their hands, as is provided in the pending legislation, will you please be so good as to tell me how we are going to refuse to sell to Japan when, convoyed by an adequate number of men-of-war, her merchant ships come to our Pacific ports and offer to pay cash for large supplies of munitions?

You know the oriental mind. You have had long experience with orientals in San Francisco and California. Is it your opinion that the Japanese will be satisfied with excuses and Executive rulings when they bring the cash and ask for the goods?

They have been satisfied hitherto because they have been glad to have the administration willing to see no war in China and so

to permit them to buy enough scrap iron to make all the steel they have required during the past year. They have even been willing to forego the advantages of a blockade. But do you think it will be long before they take advantage of the proposed legislation which forces our merchant ships off the routes to China, Australia, and New Zealand, which the author of the present bill so blithely says will not hurt us, monopolize that trade for themselves, and politely insist that we be genuine neutrals and sell to all comers?

As has been pointed out by Senator NORRIS and several of the keenest minds in the press gallery, it is no secret that the object of the present bill is to help Britain and France. But will it really help them to be driven out of Asia?

Russia has long had her eyes on Persia and India. With her new friend Japan, she, too, can bring her gold to our Pacific coast and buy the munitions to help drive the English out of India. Busy as they are in the Atlantic, how can the Allies, Britain and France, spare enough ships to prevent Russia as well as Japan from contributing to the rapid development of our munitions factories on the Pacific coast? As long as Russia was at odds with Japan, her fleet in far-eastern waters was large enough to keep the Japanese from dominating Pacific lanes. But now this is changed—at least for the present. Why do we want to help Russia and Japan? Can the advocates of repeal possibly contend that their bill will not help? Will it not hand over to the Japanese the carrying trade across the Pacific?

It seems obvious that our attention is so engrossed by what is going on to the east of us, and that we are so sure that England and France need what we can sell them once the embargo is repealed, that we are blind to what is going on to the west of us and what is likely to happen when we legally permit Japan and Russia to come and get that which will destroy the Allies in the Pacific.

Would those who favor repeal be willing to adopt an amendment that it shall apply only on the Atlantic and not on the Pacific?

Sincerely yours,

HIRAM BINGHAM.

Mr. Speaker, this is serious business we are engaged in here. The bill under discussion carries wide implications, and yet the debate is distinctly limited in spite of what is called a generous rule. I cannot get and hold the floor to inform the House, and neither can anyone else except the ranking members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and even they are limited. The President says that a mistake was made in enacting the present embargo law, which he heartily endorsed at the time. Now he regrets it. I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, with all respect to my dearly loved father, who celebrates his seventy-second birthday on Friday of this week, but I will lay a bet that the enactment of this bill into law as it stands today will be as heartily regretted unless in conference it be vastly improved over its present condition. I sincerely hope that when the bill goes to conference, where the conferees may do to it almost what they please, that it will be properly amended so that I can conscientiously vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have offered the suggestion, which the Clerk has read, because I believe deep down in my heart that unless some provision be made to control the export of materials, some provision that will permit the United States to conserve its resources for our own safety, that we will not have a means, a reason in statutes, to stop the export of material resources necessary to the safety and convenience and necessity of this country. While I am not here debating the rightness or wrongness of shipping scrap iron, it is true that the scrap piles of America are almost cleaned out, and scrap iron is a vital necessity to our own economy and our own national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me the figures showing the tonnage of scrap iron that moved through the Panama Canal west-bound between March 10 and April 10, 1939. It reached the staggering total of 124,341 tons in that 1 month. In addition to that thousands upon thousands of tons were shipped to the Orient from Pacific ports. Mr. Speaker, scrap iron is a national resource. In addition to iron we are shipping millions of barrels of petroleum and its products abroad in all directions, and meanwhile our Navy is trying desperately to try to get hold of oil reserves for our own fleet. We must be insane. Now I read in the papers that Russia would buy from us 10,000 tons of rubber. Sure they would buy rubber from us and then a war on the Pacific could cut off our supply. The world has gone plain nuts and also cuckoo, cockeyed crazy. Shall we join the morons in the dance of death?

Now, Mr. Speaker, earlier in this debate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] advanced one of the really valid arguments for repeal of the embargo. He said, in substance, as I recall, that it was necessary now to preserve the safety and more adequately provide for our national defense by permitting our manufacturers to gear up production facilities for airplanes and other arms and equipment by making and selling them to nations now at war. He pointed out that if the United States had to go to war, we must expect to have destroyed over a thousand planes per month. Think of it. Consequently, we should take these foreign orders.

Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think of losing 1,000 splendid young pilots per month, not considering 1,000 planes per month, at a cost something like $100,000 apiece on the average. But that is not the real story. We have not enough first-class military planes on hand and on order right now to last us 2 months. I say that advisedly. Talk about war; we would not last 2 months in the air.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendous capacity to build planes in this country; we have a capacity to build 1,000 planes per month in our aircraft factories right now. They are working, many of them, short-handed and one shift per day. I say that if we need planes for national defense let us buy them right now and build up our own air force until we have enough first-class fighting planes to hold off an enemy while we are replacing those we lose. It is rank folly not to do so now. In my district is located one of the greatest aircraft factories in the world, the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, of Burbank, Calif. This factory builds the fastest and best intercepter pursuit plane built in the world. That plane, the *PY-34*, will rise into the air and climb 5,000 feet per minute and it will cruise—cruise, mind you—at 420 miles per hour. A plane of that type made it from California to New York in a trifle over 7 hours. How many of these ships has our Government ordered? Just 66. Mr. Speaker, we should have at least 10 times as many ships that will do that or better, if possible. If our plants need business to prepare them for war, then let us here in the United States give them the business. That is one of the best ways I can think of right now to successfully mind our own business, which is to stay out of war and be strong enough to keep out.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, presumably we are here in Washington in special session for the purpose of considering neutrality legislation which will keep America out of war. But after listening to many declarations here in the House during the last couple of days and in the Senate during the last 4 weeks, one cannot but be convinced that we are here for no other purpose than to place weapons and implements of war in the hands of one European belligerent to be used against another. That to my mind is not neutrality. Not only is it not neutrality but it is intervention. If the arms embargo is repealed, then we cannot say that America has not taken definite sides in the conflict abroad.

I have the privilege, Mr. Speaker, of being one of the few Members of this House who served as an ordinary enlisted man in the Army of the United States during the entire period in which America participated in the last World War. I was a sergeant in the Twenty-sixth (Yankee) Division, the first National Guard division to be sent to France, and I served for 19 months there.

I do not parade my war record for the purpose of self-glorification, but rather to impress upon the membership of this House that I can speak about the horrors of war at first hand and that, because of this knowledge of the horrors of war, to try to convey to this membership that we must see to it that there is no recurrence of the days of 1917 and 1918.

My service included Chateau Thierry, the Argonne, and St. Mihiel. I was in the first wave that went over the top on that September day in the St. Mihiel drive, and I still carry with me the very vivid and horrible recollection of seeing enemy shells and machine-gun bullets smash into that first wave, making gaps where my buddies—yes; some of them boyhood chums—had stood. I can remember of saying to

myself on that awful morning, "In God's name, what are we, Americans, doing here in France fighting someone else's battles at such terrible cost?"

And because of those memories, which will always be with me, I cannot subscribe to any legislation such as has been proposed for the repeal of the embargo when I firmly believe that such legislation is fraught with every possibility of other young Americans being sent abroad as we were in 1917. I am determined that they shall not go.

Call me a complete isolationist if you will, but I cannot for the life of me find any plausible excuse, morally or otherwise, for our country to sell to any belligerent any weapon or implement of war, regardless of how great the material gain to our economic condition, as long as there is even the slightest possibility that such weapon or implement might snuff out a life.

We cannot lift the arms embargo and at the same time proclaim to the world that we are neutral. We cannot select through legislation a belligerent we desire to favor, regardless of how our personal feelings lean, and still say we are neutral. We cannot be half in and half out at the same time.

The Lord knows that I have no sympathy for the nazi-ism of Hitler or the communism of Stalin. But this war is not of our making, it is none of our business, and I cannot but firmly believe that we should absolutely stay at home and mind our own business. In the last World War we were propagandized that we should "make the world safe for democracy." And we fell for it. The last 20 years have proven to us how completely we were fooled and how little of democracy was made safe. The slogan is worn out, so let us not be fooled again.

To my mind the whole of Europe or any part of it is not worth the sacrifice of one young American life. Let us legislate to protect those young American lives, insuring that they will not be sacrificed upon the altar of the munitions makers and money-mad profiteers to our everlasting discredit and shame. When this arms-embargo provision comes before us for disposition, I will vote for its retention with the complete realization that I am doing so in the sight of God, of my own conscience, and of the souls of the 130,000 young Americans whose lives were so needlessly sacrificed in the World War.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I understand the situation now, no further amendments are in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Any amendment offered now would be in the third degree and not permissible under the rules of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I shall address my remarks principally to the distinguished, affable, popular, and very able gentleman who is chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

I do not believe any Member of this House desires to extend or permit the extension of one dime of credit to any belligerent nation, as it is my belief that we all appreciate the fact that the extension of credit to England and France was one of the primary causes for our entry into the World War 22 years ago. As I said on the floor of the House yesterday, I do not want an American citizen to have the right to go into Canada or Mexico, or elsewhere, and consummate a deal whereby we may extend credit to any foreign belligerent nation. I wish the Members of the House to bear in mind that under the provisions of section 7 (a), as written, that very thing may occur and the provisions of the law may be circumvented in that fashion.

This section also contains the following language in lines 9 and 10 on page 23 of the bill, which are extremely objectionable, namely:

Issued after the date of such proclamation.

Now, what is the effect of such language? To bring it down to a practical point of view it means this: That this Government or any citizen may purchase or acquire any and all securities of belligerent nations issued prior to the proclamation made by the President declaring that a state of war exists, thereby assisting and aiding in the financing of the war of belligerent nations. In other words, until such proclamation is issued by the President of the United States under this bill, it is possible that foreign belligerent nations could acquire on credit an unlimited amount of goods and then issue evidence of indebtedness immediately before such proclamation and thereby circumvent the operation of this law. The language referred to should be stricken out of said section, otherwise all kinds of subsisting obligations of foreign countries at war could be dumped and sold into this country and we would again be tied up in a financial way with England and France, which might ultimately cause our boys to be again sent to the shambles of Europe.

I have great faith in the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the ranking minority Member of the House, Mr. FISH of New York, both of whom I believe will work to see these objectionable features of this proposed law corrected. As it stands now, it seems to me that so far as extension of credit by the Government and the citizens of this country to the belligerent nations of Europe is concerned, this bill has loopholes large enough through which could be driven a yoke of bulls. Under no circumstances do I want this war financed by American citizens in whole or in part. That is the one thing that we must avoid under any and all circumstances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Montana that I thank him for the information. I will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and give his statement full consideration after reading it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in 5 minutes one cannot adequately discuss neutrality as a principal of international law. But in his answer to protests of the Imperial German Government, Secretary Bryan in 1915 stated the proposition as it should interest us when he said that any change in the law during a war which produced an advantage to one belligerent and a disadvantage to another was an unneutral act. That is precisely what the repeal of the embargo on arms and munitions would be at this time.

Why not be frank and honest and say that the reason for the repeal of the embargo is to enable us to sell munitions and implements of war for the money we can make out of it, for the profit we can wring from the desperate and unhappy peoples at war? Why not say to Germany that we want her to understand that we are neutral and are not furnishing the Allies these weapons of war and other munitions because we want to help them—that would be taking part in the war against Germany. We are simply doing it for the money we can make out of it.

Or, be equally honest and say we are not doing it for the money we can make out of it, but we want to help the Allies. This would be purely unneutral and would be tantamount almost to a declaration of war.

We were told by the President there was such an emergency existed that it demanded the presence of the Congress and that the embargo on arms should be repealed. Whose emergency was it? It was certainly not the one created by Democratic policies which leaves twelve or fifteen million idle men in this country, for the reason that President Roosevelt expressly stipulated that domestic legislation outside of raising the embargo should be left strictly alone.

Was it a British or French emergency? Then it was an unneutral act to change the law during a war for the reason that England and France would reap an advantage from such traffic while Germany would suffer a loss. There could be no better definition for an unneutral act under international law and might easily lead to war. At least it is a step in the direction of war.

Last spring I voted against the repeal of the arms embargo in the opinion that it was a vote for peace, which is the ultimate hope of everyone; and would do so again. For the same reason I voted to deny the President any more power, believing the Congress should keep its own finger on the trigger.

It is not our war, anyway We should keep our hands off of it and our noses out of it.

The important and controlling fact is the attitude and the real intention of this administration. The lamp of experience is the greatest teacher of mankind. Let us look back over our shoulder to 1914. At the beginning of the World War it seemed that Providence had placed in the White House just the man for that crisis—Woodrow Wilson, "too proud to fight." That was not a mere epigram; it was the deep and deliberate conviction of a masterful mind and a sincere heart. He told the people on the screen of every picture show in the country to even think neutral and not to applaud war pictures lest some belligerent think we favored its antagonist. Woodrow Wilson was the cooing dove of peace that November of 1916, in the Presidential election. George Creel, Democratic publicity man, wrote the greatest political advertisement since Caesar wrote his political pamphlet The Gallic War—

> You are working, not fighting;
> You are living, not cannon fodder;
> Wilson kept you out of war.

That elected Woodrow Wilson. What a travesty on truth; what a tragedy of duplicity. One hundred days after the result of that close election was known war with its bloody knuckles was knocking at the door of every American home clamoring for its best blood. A great many people believe Wilson deliberately deceived them; that as bright a man as Wilson was would have known what might happen 4 months after the election.

But assuming that he was sincere and that suddenly after the election he saw the light and plunged the country into war. Might that not happen again? Again we have a President cooing for peace. We heard him on the radio and again in the House on September 21. In the light of what the President has said about "quarantining aggressors," that our "frontiers may be in France," and of his demands for unusual powers for the executive department, I confess I have no confidence in anything he says about peace.

Among Democratic politicians I have discovered a thinly disguised satisfaction that the war has come in Europe. They remember that the last war came when Democratic policies had stretched out huge bread lines and established soup kitchens in every city in the United States. Then the war industries took up the slack in employment and saved the Democratic Party by the skin of its teeth in 1916. Does the President want to cover up nearly 7 futile years of dismal failure in bringing back prosperity by building up a huge war industry for England and France which cannot help but be unneutral and finally end in war?

The argument has been presented that if we do not furnish the Allies with munitions they may be defeated and that then Germany would attack us. Even should there be an Allied defeat, which is next to assuming the impossible, nobody in Europe, particularly Germany, would dare to attempt the task of crossing the Atlantic with an army large enough to make any impression on us with the vast supplies necessary for such an expedition. Such speculation is nonsense. Besides, no one wants to fight us from the Atlantic side; certainly not at this time and especially not after an exhausting war at home in Europe.

Of course, we can get into this war if we want. It is not a private affair, not an exclusive party. I am sure we have been invited. Was the visit of Their Majesties to Washington and to Hyde Park a purely social call? Was the visit of Lord Beaverbook recently at the White House merely an occasion for reminiscences with an old pal?

Is Lord Marley, Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords, making a speaking tour in the United States to enlighten our people in regard to Shakespeare and Bacon or is he here rather to take home the bacon as did Balfour in 1916 and 1917? Is Alfred Duff Cooper, recently First Lord of the Admiralty of the Mistress of the Seas, who just arrived on the steamship *Manhattan* to conduct a lecture tour in America, here merely to enlighten Americans on the flora and the fauna of the British Isles? Is it not openly said here in the Capital that the British Ambassador, Lord Lothian, and the State Department keep the President in constant and instant touch with London?

At any rate we will not lack an invitation to participate in this war, but, having been once sadly burned, our memory may save us from being carried off our feet by propaganda and the war hysteria that so often follows incidents like that of the *Flint*, or more serious affairs. The American people must exercise restraint when these cyclones of emotion and hysteria sweep the country. The Congress must likewise steel itself in firm resistance to pressure that would lead us into a war that we had nothing to do in its creation. It was fathered by the hatreds and grudges that are ages old and utterly foreign to the thinking of our people. These ancient quarrels do not concern us and we should not permit either propaganda or war hysteria to sweep us into some other nation's war.

There are some things that justify us in waging war, as in case of foreign invasion, the abrogation of the Bill of Rights, the right to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and the maintenance of the Constitution.

And we can and must keep out of foreign wars. We did not start them and it is not our duty to stop them. This we should do if we, the Congress, must stay in session until Christmas.

Believing that the repeal of the embargo is the first step, no matter how slight toward involving my country in this suicidal war, I am going to vote against its repeal. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it seems the real reason some Members feel inclined to vote for repeal of the arms embargo is that they think that if Hitler wins he will "get us next."

No conqueror since Caesar has ever succeeded in digesting all of Europe including England. No force, military experts inform us, has ever succeeded in invading a foreign shore if met with reasonable resistance. We have more to fear from an American invasion of Europe than from a European invasion of America.

For years it has been apparent that European affairs were approaching another climax. America has been pursuing a policy of using weapons "short of war" to buttress British strategy. A foreign policy so dependent upon suggestions from Great Britain tends in my opinion logically to lead us toward war every time England goes to war.

It seems to me, moreover, that England is likely to have war more frequently in the future than in the past. Though we have the greatest affection for Great Britan we must realize that that little island which is her seat of government is in a very precarious position, increasingly difficult to defend in terms of modern warfare. Well British statesmen know what may happen unless they use the utmost ingenuity in dealing with their neighbors.

British foreign agents have, no doubt, been doing their best and it is not for us to criticize them. But can we trust them to be the arbiters of American destiny?

Surely it is evident by this time that there would not be an embittered and militant Germany today if there had been ordinary tolerance and justice in the treaty settling the World War. Or if there had been cooperation with the German democracy set up after the war. Or if there had been ordinary diligence against German rearmament after the dictator came to power.

The British did not bother to crush him while he was still easy to crush. Now that he is prepared for war they say to us that even America cannot be sure of peace until he is destroyed.

We are already helping them in many ways "short of war" and now we are asked to ship arms. How much fur-

ther will they urge us to go? Many say that England will win this war, but cannot completely crush Germany without American money and perhaps without all the help of which America is capable.

England has never lost "face" nor territory in a war. Should not we wait until she loses something before we discuss sending arms to help her?

You say that there is no risk to American peace in shipping arms. There was testimony before the Senate committee which investigated the activities of the munitions industry that that industry has influence in the "highest places" in government. That it corrupts public officials. That it stirs up wars. That it once foiled the attempt of a President of the United States to procure world disarmament. That it was an irresistible force drawing us into the World War.

We are asked to assume this risk to help the British program. But what is the British program? All we are told is that it is intended to crush Hitler. But will crushing Hitler exterminate nazi-ism?

Have you read Mein Kampf? It is the campaign literature of the politician, Hitler. It sounds like a garbled version of the German post-war philosopher Oswald Spengler. Mein Kampf is an appeal to sentiments already kindled in the breasts of a people already persuaded that if they become efficient enough they may rise from their knees and achieve for German children of tomorrow as much as British children have today.

Shall we vote to furnish guns to kill people for being induced to believe such political voodoo? Can you reform people by shooting and gassing them? European gossip now is that our "good-neighbor" policy is imperialistic toward South America. Would it improve our national thinking if some nation tried to end the "good-neighbor policy" by sending bombers to destroy us?

The more arms we send the more devastating this war will become. Can we conscientiously send them? What can we show posterity that we have done to prevent this war?

For some time we have held in America almost all the gold in the world. Did we offer to pay Germany to disarm? Germany was underfed. Did we offer to bribe her citizens with food? I am not endorsing our Uncle Santa Claus foreign policy. But it does seem that we have given billions away all over the world except in the one troubled spot where it might have saved a war.

Does that idea seem fantastic to you? Well, to me nothing seems so utterly fantastic as helping people slaughter one another. If I voted to lift the embargo I fear that I should walk the halls at night thereafter, like Lady Macbeth, rubbing bloodstains from my fingers.

If it was wise to try to avoid European involvement in the days when we had a Washington as President, a Franklin acting as roving ambassador to foreign nations, a Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury, surely it is prudent to preserve American independence of foreign entanglements now that we have not a Washington as President, a Franklin acting as roving ambassador to foreign nations, a Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury.

While we still followed the example of these national ancestors we came a long way up the path toward civilization. If in this hour of indecision we once more adhere to their great principles I believe that we shall become a greater world force, not toward war, but toward peace and understanding. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Illinois a moment ago prayed for a Washington and a Hamilton at this time. I should like to remind the gentlewoman that Franklin D. Roosevelt and Washington and Hamilton pursued the same course as far as an arms embargo is concerned. I read in the RECORD yesterday a declaration by Secretaries of State Pickering and Jefferson of Washington's first administration in which they insisted on our right to sell arms to belligerent nations. Washington. Jefferson. Henry Clay, Presidents Franklin Pierce, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, all insisted on our right to purchase arms for our own defense and consistently persisted in their rights under international law to sell arms to foreign belligerents for their own defense. Franklin Roosevelt is following a historic traditional policy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Permit the Chair to announce that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has consumed 6 hours and 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has consumed 5 hours and 29 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used an hour more than the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. FISH. Let me say for the sake of the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, that due to the courtesy of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] we reached an agreement whereby, having a few more speakers on our side, the time used now would not be taken into account in considering the final time and we would have the same amount of time tomorrow morning on both sides.

Mr. BLOOM. That has been agreed to and is satisfactory, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary on the ability of this Congress and its importance when we seek as we have been during these 2 days of debate to limit, as we are, the time for debate on so important a measure. At no time in the history of the Nation has there been a more important measure before this House. I for one cannot conceive of trying to cram this thing down our throats under the application of a gag rule which would attempt to dispose of so important a measure in the period of 3 days, and I, for one, can see no reason for this haste.

Who is it that wants this haste? Who are the people that are in such a hurry to get this bill passed? Not I, and probably not any of you. It is the men behind the scenes, a small group of selfish interests, who are pulling the wires, that want to hasten this bill through. I venture to suggest that it is not in the interest of the great masses of American citizens whom you represent to allow this thing to be put over. I for one believe we should remain in session until Christmas, if necessary, or longer, in order to dispassionately and deliberately debate this important question.

As I have read or listened to the debate in the Senate, and as I have listened to the debate here in the House, I have tried to pick out the one point which is most important on which we can fasten our attention and say, "This is the point which must be decided." As I have listened to the debate here on both sides of the aisle, it has seemed to me that the question revolves on whether or not it is in the interest of the United States to go to the aid of England. Those who are proposing the repeal of the arms embargo insist that it is in our interest to do so. I deny the truth and verity of any such statement. Why, the death knell of the British Empire has already been sounded. Do we want to fasten ourselves to the tail of the kite of a rotten, decayed, and dying member of the society of nations?

Do not deny that the death knell of the British Empire has been sounded! It was sounded in October 1935, when Mussolini went across the Mediterranean and down into Ethiopia, then and there thumbing his nose at the great British Navy. It has been sounded on various occasions since then by Hitler, by Mussolini, and by Hirohito in Tokio. It is being sounded every day.

England is already out of power in the Orient. England is going out of power in Europe. Her Empire is disintegrating. India is on the point of revolt. England is submissive to control by Japan in the Orient, and every one of her dependencies is ready to cut loose if they can do so and safeguard their own hide.

Probably the great reason for this situation is that England is bankrupt, bankrupt mentally and bankrupt financially. Have you ever known any individual or nation that could not pay its just debts that was not bankrupt? How many months and years now has it been since England has been

able to pay her just debts to us? Bankrupt! Do we want to fasten ourselves to a dying member of the society of nations, to a bankrupt kingdom? If England is not bankrupt mentally and financially, then I am not standing here in the House of Representatives before you. It is just as true as the fact that I am here.

It has also been suggested that England may be somewhat poverty striken morally, judging from some of the things which have occurred in the British Empire during recent years. In any event, be that as it may, I say she is bankrupt mentally, judging from the mistakes which have been made by the British leadership. During the recent months and years we have been watching her and I venture to say there is no one here but is convinced of the errors that have been committed in judgment and in mental ability by the leadership of that erstwhile great empire as they have gone swiftly and surely down the road to another war.

Do we want to be a province of England? Do we want to be considered to be a colony of such an empire still, or did we cast off from her over 160 years ago? This makes the question, it seems to me: Shall we take the leadership in this year of 1939, a leadership for peace for the world and for the United States, or shall we continue to debase ourselves by attaching ourselves as a follower, as a minor state, to the British kite, which is always a kite for war and not a kite for peace, as history indicates and as has been so well pointed out during the past few days of this debate? Do we want to do that, I say, or shall we take a new leadership, a world leadership, if you will. Instead of being a tail to the British kite, let us use our heads; let us be smart, not emotional; let us be the leaders. Is not that the real question which is facing America and the Members of this Congress today—Whether to be the leader or be led as in 1917? Have we not learned from that lesson? [Applause.]

MAKING HISTORY

We are making history here today and we want to write the record well. History was also made in April 1917 and again on the 11th of November in 1918, then later in the Treaty of Versailles. We all know there is considerable difference of opinion as to the wisdom of some of the history which was written in those years.

How well we write it in November 1939 will depend largely on how much you can extend your wisdom beyond the ordinary, for, make no mistake, this is a great hour and a great problem. No ordinary judgment or wisdom can suffice or serve us now. Rather, we need the wisdom of a Solomon, the wisdom of the ages, of all the best minds of America today—indeed, more than that, we need the wisdom of the Infinite to guide us in order that we shall make no misstep.

So far in the course of this debate very faint has been the voice of wisdom. We have heard some good speeches; yes. We have heard some bursts of loud oratory, but, on the whole, there has been more or less repetition of the arguments used in 1916–17 and again in 1935 to 1938. I might add one exception to that statement, and that is that the best minds, the cleanest, clearest minds, all seem to favor the retention of the arms embargo.

JUST A BUSINESS PROPOSITION

This is a business proposition. All war is and ever has been, and unless we keep that fact in mind we lose sight of a very vital point in our consideration of what to do and how to do it. In much of the debate which has been going on here we have allowed our emotions to take charge of our better judgment; consequently the time put in on this discussion is considerably valueless. But the fellows behind the scenes pulling the wires and giving orders are, I imagine, satisfied and well pleased because we have failed to grasp the real situation while we continue to blind ourselves with their smoke screen of argument on this, that, and the other kind of neutrality legislation.

It is very likely that, as I said in my address here on June 28, when we get all through legislating neutrality, and the administration or the majority has its way, we will find that we overlooked something or that we failed to take into consideration some future event or that we made other errors of judgment and lacked in foresight in our zeal to serve the business interests who are so anxious and intent on lifting the arms embargo and in promoting the cash-and-carry program for the benefit of the British Allies.

It is very apparent that we learned nothing in 1917–19. We are still messing around right where we left off then, seemingly unable to pull ourselves out of the morass of British propaganda and influence. In this matter the President has been taking active leadership.

BIASED DIPLOMACY

But in one extremely important respect President Roosevelt differs from his predecessor Wilson with regard to the conduct of foreign relations: He wants, by deliberate avowal, to follow a biased policy toward the nations of Europe.

Unlike Wilson whose bias was concealed behind a rhetoric of impartiality and was only discovered and exposed after he had carried this country into war, Roosevelt intends to take bias as an indispensable element in policy and to deduce from it a line of conduct for the United States. The bias is to be founded in his private judgment of the relative guilt of the warring nations. He will pick and name the aggressor powers. This incredible procedure prejudges the causes of the opposed powers in Europe in a fashion that makes Wilson's efforts appear like that of an amateur.

The validity of Wilson's bias was not ratified by events. On the contrary, his ignorance, real and feigned, of the actual facts of the outbreak of the war and the secret treaties in which the allied governments had divided the prospective loot of the war, made his bias absolutely fatal to the aims he professed. He committed himself to one side when his aims could only be achieved by the position of impartial arbiter, if at all.

Roosevelt proposes to rule himself out of the picture as impartial arbiter with equal finality, but much earlier in the game. By becoming the avowed partisan of one side, he commits himself to their cause in utter ignorance of their intentions should they win the war. He divests himself of any power to act as a moderating force on the cupidity which will rule their councils when victory has been achieved. The fatal flaw in Wilson's calculations was his misjudgment of the real nature and purposes of the side he came to favor. This is not to argue that he should have aided the other side, as some debaters may assume. It is rather to insist that Wilson achieved the very peak of his insight into the first World War when he came nearest to being neutral and sought to use his good offices to arrange a negotiated peace. On that peak he clearly saw the war as a consequence of—a phase of—power politics in Europe. Roosevelt has never achieved that peak. He has shown no disposition even to struggle toward it. He proposes to begin in the error into which Wilson slipped after many weary efforts to make some sense out of the terrific struggle of 1914–17.

The final verdict on these matters is not yours or mine; it is the verdict of history. It is my guess that if Franklin Roosevelt, through your aid, contrives to incorporate his bias into public policy—even with the support of the liberal war mongers and the plug-uglies of the upper classes—he and you will be condemned by history.

The role of bias in the diplomacy of the United States during the first World War was a fatal role. Those who did most to foster and forward it today stand condemned.

President Roosevelt is bent on following a course which parallels theirs. He complacently ranges himself in the company of Wilson, Lansing, House, and Page. These are the men who sold us down the river in 1917. President Roosevelt threatens to repeat the deal at a time when conditions down the river are worse than ever before.

The argument in favor of a biased American policy toward Europe has its roots in propaganda. The dogma that the United States has a vested national interest in a particular power pattern in Europe was first established in the American mind by British propagandists and their allies during the first World War. It was adopted by Woodrow Wilson

as a basic element in his diplomacy. Its general acceptance today is a triumph of propaganda over common sense, for its unreality was demonstrated by Versailles. At the Peace Conference it was conclusively proved that such a view was a fantastic oversimplification of the real issues in Europe.

Today it is leading to the identification of American interests with the survival of British Tory imperialism and French reactionary imperialism. The only common denominator in this jumble of interests is preservation of the status quo. But on any realistic assessment, American interests can only be realized in a changing world. A static world can only repeat the pattern of peace and war which began to become monotonously familiar in 1914 and now continues.

AMERICANS SHOULD BE NEUTRAL

For myself I do not feel that we should go to the aid of either side in this conflict, nor should we sell munitions and gear our national production to a war economy. What we need rather to do is to take a constructive leadership for peace. Do not forget this is a business proposition. Do not be mistaken or think that it can be solved by restricting business or by half measures, measures short of war. Oh, no; we will not be able to save our own hides thereby. Most certainly it will only be solved by rising above the commonplace, by rising above mere consideration of the surface problems. I do not believe we can afford to be either pro-British, pro-German, or pro-Communist. I imagine if all my ancestors could be paraded out here on the scene before us today it would be found that they are predominantly of British origin. Probably Scotch, with a sprinkling of Dutch, German, and Scandinavian. In other words, I, like most of you, am a mixture of European races. Consequently I feel sympathetic for all of them and their problems and their sufferings in this war. I feel especially sorry and sympathetic for the poor British who really do, without a doubt, need our help; but we must not let our sympathy or emotions sway us in our consideration of this matter. We must only be pro-American if we are to be real patriots.

As I stated previously, we must realize that the British do need our help, that they are bankrupt, that they are not a success, that they are a liability in a world intent on peace. Consequently we cannot afford to follow them further. Rather we must be the leader in order to save our dear British cousins from complete destruction. There is every good reason why we should do this, because we are now the only democracy left on the face of the earth. We are the only nation still able to maintain a representative form of government. We are the only nation where the people want peace, are peace loving, and are able to control the actions of their government along the ways and in the paths of peace.

ONLY BASIS

If the administration forces insist on having their way in this matter and are successful in repealing the arms embargo, I suggest that as a part of the bill before it is finally presented to the President for his signature, that the proponents of repeal should insert a clause, a proviso if you will, to the effect that when we are drawn into the war on the side of the British, as a result of the action of this Congress—notice I say "when" we are drawn in, not if we are drawn in—then we must be permitted to write the terms of the treaty of peace which will some day be written after the wasting of a lot of lives and other valuable assets. Let us not go on further making the same mistakes which we made in 1919 when we allowed the master minds of Britain and France to write the terms of the peace treaty. The fatal results of that error on our part, of our failure to take over and to hold the leadership for peace at that time, is now altogether too apparent to require further argument or discussion.

In the name of the peace of future generations yet unborn, in the name of the present sons and daughters who are about to be again sacrificed on the altar of war, in the name of mothers who are standing with outstretched arms beseeching you to keep America out of war, in the name of democracy and all that it means to the world, and in the name of Christianity, I beseech you for them to put aside partisan, narrow, and selfish sentiment, to rise above the ordinary, the commonplace and to stand for the right as represented by a refusal to repeal the embargo against the sale of supplies and war munitions. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUTHERFORD] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, the most important question before the Congress is, Will the repeal or failure to repeal the arms embargo tend to get us into the European war? In deciding this question we must lay aside our sympathies, likes, and dislikes and judge the question solely on its merits and according to the facts as they are and according to international law. The first Arms Embargo Act was passed in 1935 and was amended and passed again in 1937. At that time it was passed almost unanimously in both the House and Senate and was approved by the people of the country. It has been the law of the land for 4 years and is the law of the land today. For some reason the President and others now want the law repealed. They now tell us that the law is very unneutral and will draw us into war unless repealed at this time. Draw us into the war with whom? Surely England and France will not go to war with us if the act is not repealed. Nor will Russia, Germany, or Italy go to war with us if it is not repealed. Neither the President nor any of the proponents of repeal can name a single country that will attack us if we allow the arms embargo to remain as is. We are at peace with all of the world, and by leaving the arms embargo as it is will not change our present situation. We know that if we leave the arms embargo as it is we will not be drawn into the European war, so why repeal it? Do we know what affect the repeal of the law will have? We do not. Then why gamble? Why do something that may draw us into war? As I said before, the arms embargo has been the law of the land for 4 years and is the law of the land today and was the law on September 1 when war broke out in Europe. Can we now change the law and still be on the safe side? International law says no. Secretary Bryan in 1915, with the approval of President Wilson, said:

> This Government is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of the war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions.

Senator KEY PITTMAN said in 1937:

> It is held by high authority that it is unneutral for a neutral, after war has commenced, to so change its financial and commercial relations with the belligerent so as to take the belligerent by surprise.

Eminent authorities on international law hold and have publicly expressed their opinion that the repeal of the arms embargo at this time would be an unfriendly and unneutral act toward Germany. Under our own interpretation of the law it would be an unfriendly and unneutral act toward Germany and would be a technical declaration of war. As Congressman ENGEL said the other day, "How can we expect Germany or any other nation to continue to observe the rules of international law in the protection of our rights, and how can we condemn them for violating such rules of law, if we, under our own accepted definition of international law, have been the first to violate them?" How can we insist upon our rights when we, in the repeal of the arms embargo—should it be repealed—have been guilty in our own language of an "unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality" and of an unneutral act under the present indisputable doctrine of international law. To my mind the real threat of war today lies in the repeal of the arms embargo, which under every rule of international law and under our own interpretation of the law, is an unneutral and

unfriendly act. What Germany will do if the arms embargo is repealed I do not know, nor does anyone else, so far as I can learn. I do know that if we repeal the arms embargo we will, under international law, be giving Germany a legal excuse to do whatever she may deem necessary under that circumstance. When she starts to retaliate then there will be a demand that we also retaliate and if we do then we will be in the war. As I said before if we keep the embargo we know that we will remain at peace. If we repeal it now it has every appearance of the first step toward war. The question is, Should we take the chance? I say no, take no chances. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, before a cause can be tried in a court of law the parties to the controversy, through their pleadings, are required first of all to join issue, and then the cause is tried and determined upon the issues joined.

The long debate on the neutrality bill, both in the House last June and in the Senate during the past several weeks, has served to perfect what we might call the pleadings in this case. The extraneous, the irrelevant, and the immaterial matters in the controversy have been discovered and eliminated, and as the bill comes back from the Senate to the house of its origin there remains only the main question in controversy, and that is, Shall the arms-embargo provision of our present neutrality law be repealed or retained?

All other controversial matters have been eliminated. The so-called cash-and-carry or title-and-take provisions of the bill before us are no longer matters in dispute. Whether the arms embargo is repealed or retained, we all agree that the cash-and-carry sections of the bill will remain essentially as the Senate has written them, and few of us would want it otherwise.

Likewise there is no dispute here as to any other provisions of the bill. We may not agree with them all in detail but they are all such as to permit the conference committee to adjust the minor differences in a way which will be generally satisfactory to all of us.

As the proposal to repeal the arms embargo now presents itself, we are able to discuss it here almost entirely upon agreed facts. Briefly, those facts are these: Four years ago the United States, in order to help preserve its neutrality in event of future foreign wars and in order to make easier the difficult task of keeping out of those wars, declared by a law intended at the time to be permanent, and gave notice to all the nations of the world, that if at any time in the future any of those nations, or combination of nations, should go to war, the United States would refuse under any conditions whatever to sell them any arms, ammunition, or implements with which to carry on that war. We did that for the purpose of avoiding the occurrence of those incidents which experience has shown to be the principal cause of involving neutral nations in foreign wars.

Now, a major war has broken out in Europe and the individual sympathies of our people are generally on the side of one belligerent, or combination of belligerents, and against the other. And many of these people feel that we should help Britain and France win the war, notwithstanding our established and announced policy of official neutrality, if we can do this without incurring the risk of becoming involved in the war ourselves. And the real question we have here to decide is, first, whether it is possible to do this and, second, whether it is in the best interest of the United States to do it.

Let no one doubt that the desire to help Britain and France and to crush Nazi aggression is the compelling reason underlying the President's proposal to repeal the Arms Embargo Act. To believe otherwise is merely to delude ourselves. And, as the reason underlying any important legislative proposal is just as important as the proposal itself in aiding us to pass intelligently upon the merits of it, let us examine briefly the views of the President upon it. Because the President's numerous public utterances upon this subject contain the entire argument for repeal. A careful search of the RECORD, page by page, will disclose no single argument in debate which the President himself has not already made.

The first announcement by the President of his desire to change our established neutrality policy was made in his Chicago speech of August 5, 1937, only 5 months after he had approved the second Arms Embargo Act, and his views upon this question were further amplified in his message to the Seventy-sixth Congress on January 4, 1939. In the Chicago speech the President announced that it was incumbent upon us as a democracy to take parallel action with the other democracies in stopping the aggressor nations, that our neutrality policy was no longer an effective policy for the United States to pursue in view of the spreading epidemic of world lawlessness, and that the nations which are responsible for spreading this epidemic ought to be quarantined.

In his message to the Congress the President did not deny that our neutrality law, including the arms embargo, would, if maintained, tend to keep us out of war. In fact, his statement on approval of the first Arms Embargo Act that our neutrality policy would be extremely helpful in this regard has never been changed. He did say in his message, however, that our neutrality law, particularly the arms-embargo portion of it, may operate to give aid to an aggressor and deny it to a victim.

Self-preservation, the President said, should warn us that we should not let that happen. He did not go so far as to say that the eastern frontier of the United States was on the Rhine, but he did remind us in that message that distant points at which these aggressors might launch an attack against us are completely different from what they were 20 years ago and that we should take no chances, by any act or omission of our own, to let the aggressors strengthen their position. He admonished us that while we may properly decline to intervene with arms against the aggressors we could not forever let pass these acts of aggression against our sister nations, and he concluded with his now famous declaration that there were methods short of war but stronger and more effective than mere words of bringing home to the aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people.

The method he selected for accomplishment of this was the bill which shortly thereafter he sent to Congress providing for the repeal of the arms embargo provisions of the 1937 Neutrality Act and the retention of the so-called cash-and-carry provisions of that act. By repealing the arms embargo and retaining the cash and carry we were to be put in a position to help France and Britain by furnishing them arms with which to carry on the war which then threatened between those nations and Germany. We would also be in position to deny these arms to Germany because Germany could not possibly avail herself, under the cash-and-carry provisions of the act, of the privilege of purchasing arms in this country and carrying them away.

Lest anyone should be inclined to disagree, in spite of the President's statements, that this, and this alone, is the purpose of the proposal to repeal the arms embargo, let me inquire of him what would be his position on the proposal to repeal if the situation of France and Britain on one side and the Nazi Government on the other were reversed. Suppose it were the Nazi Government which had the greatest navy in the world and the largest fleet of merchant vessels. Suppose it were France and Britain which had no fleet or whose small fleet, both naval and merchant, was bottled up by blockade in their harbors. Would anyone then advocate repeal of the Arms Embargo Act so that the Nazi Government, instead of France and Britain, might avail itself of the opportunity of buying arms in this country and carrying them back to Germany in its convoyed vessels? Obviously

such a thing would be absurd, and if a proposal were made to repeal the arms embargo under those conditions the proposal would not receive a single vote in either the House or Senate.

Now, naturally, as individuals, we are all sympathetic toward Britain and France in this war, even though few actually believe that these nations are fighting that war for the preservation of democracy or civilization or for the preservation of anything else except the balance of power which they now hold in Europe. Nevertheless, we are sympathetic toward them. As an individual, I am not only sympathetic toward France and Britain, I am prejudiced in their favor and I am prejudiced against the Nazi Government, its rulers, and its program.

But I am not acting in my capacity as an individual citizen here. I am acting in my capacity as a representative of the people in the lawmaking body of our Nation, and in that capacity I have no right, either legal or moral, to allow my individual sympathies or prejudices to influence the considered judgment at which I have arrived in view of all the material facts in this case.

I am convinced now, as I always have been convinced, that if we repeal the arms embargo for the purpose which it is proposed that we should repeal it, we will have taken the first step in a course of conduct which, if the European war continues, may inevitably lead to our complete involvement in it. If we abandon this part of our neutrality policy for the purpose of giving material aid to one of the belligerents in this foreign war, thereby alining ourselves officially and irrevocably upon the side of that belligerent and against the other, we cannot retreat from that position but must go on and continue to give the favored belligerents whatever further aid they may need, even to the extent of repealing all of our neutrality law. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is logically inevitable.

It is absurd to contend that the mere repeal of the arms embargo will be the limit of our aid to France and Britain, once we have taken this step. We say, do we not, that France and Britain are fighting this war to preserve democracy to save civilization from destruction? We even say they are fighting our war, and that unless we are willing to help them by furnishing them with arms and ammunition, that we ourselves may be the next victim of the Nazi dictator. I do not, of course, believe that, but that is the premise from which the argument for repeal proceeds.

The trouble with that argument, Mr. Speaker, is that by it we place our motive on an exalted plane and then proceed to make it ridiculous by providing in the same bill that when we furnish to France and Britain this essential contribution of arms to save civilization, those countries must pay us cash for them, and that if they do not pay cash, we will withhold from them the very help which we have declared it our duty to give them. That proposition is obviously absurd and I feel that those who make it have not seriously thought the matter through.

France and Britain cannot pay cash, at least not for long. And when they cease to be able to pay cash are you then going to deny them the American arms and implements of war which you say they are so vitally in need of? Of course not. When that time comes you will repeal the cash requirement, if you are logical and sincere, and will extend them any credit they may need. When credit will no longer suffice you will take the next logical step. You will repeal the Johnson Act and loan them money with which to carry on war, which, you say, is being fought partly, at least, for our own national preservation. And then, if the time comes, as it did in 1917, when our money and arms alone will not suffice to make the world safe for democracy, will you deny then your Army also? Perhaps you may, but I do not think so. For if you do, then, upon your own premise and your own argument you will have done not only an inconceivably illogical and unconscionable thing but you will have committed a breach of faith such as will shame you forever.

Our safest course, Mr. Speaker, is not to take this first step but to insist upon the declaration and the notice which we gave 4 years ago to all the nations now engaged in the present war; that the United States intends to remain officially neutral in any foreign war not affecting the defense of the United States, no matter what the individual sympathies of her citizens may be; that we will use every means in our power to prevent the occurrence of war involving incidents; that when, if we must, we do engage in war, it will be a war not to maintain or to upset any European balance of power, which is what this war really is, not to remake any distorted maps of the Old World, and not to assist in restoring or creating territorial boundaries for the benefit of any nation, whether it be a democracy or a dictatorship.

No, Mr. Speaker; these must not be the reasons for the United States engaging in war. If, which God forbid, we are ever again called upon to marshal the resources of this Nation and to send forth the armed might of America to battle, let us be sure that battle is to be fought and the sacrifice made in the defense and for the preservation of our own Nation, our own institutions, and our own people. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include at the end of my remarks six tables that have been compiled in connection with my comments on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we are all very strongly opposed to war and that should cause great satisfaction on both sides of the aisle.

We have various reasons for taking such a position in opposition to war and I trust that they are sincere on both sides. I have a particular reason, myself, for being very strongly opposed to war. Over in Honolulu the Thirty-fifth Infantry observes Loftus Day. It happened to be my fate to give Lieutenant Loftus the last command he received from mortal man down on the Mexican border. Lieutenant Loftus and I shared the same tent for more than a year and I knew him as one of the finest boys from the State of Texas. We shipped his body back to Laredo, Tex., 21 years ago.

As I see this problem of war and peace, we must prepare for the worst, and then try with all of our might and main to avoid becoming involved in war. That leads me to confine my remarks here at this time to the problem of adequate national defense. I think if I have any criticism to make of the debate, and I will say in passing that I attended every day of the debate in the Senate except one when my committee went to Aberdeen Proving Ground, and I have listened here carefully to the debate—my criticism would be that we have not paid enough attention to the problem of national defense.

The United States is not prepared for war. It is not prepared for a war of any kind. You will recall, all of you, who have read the reports from the maneuvers in New England last summer, that General Drum has told you strongly that we are not prepared for war. We do not have adequate supplies. We talk about preparing for a mechanized war, and still we have only one brigade mechanized. I shall make further reference to that later on. We have a long road to travel, and it is a slow road to travel, to get adequate defense. The War Department tells me that it would take from 1½ to 3 years to bring our defenses up to date after appropriations are made.

We do not know, we cannot tell now, what lies ahead. I say we owe it to the Nation today to do everything that we possibly can to prepare for and to avoid the worst.

I am very much opposed to the sale of arms and ammunition to our detriment, that is, to the detriment of our own national defense. I think we should stay home and mind our own business and build up our own defenses, and use them for defense purposes only. [Applause.] The biggest problem we have facing us in preparing adequately for defense is to do so without precipitating a recession and collapse following the emergency, and every dollar's worth of supplies that you send abroad will emphasize and aggravate that situation.

NEUTRALITY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed by the fact that very little time and discussion has been given to the effect of our foreign policy on our national defense. It has been my good fortune to be assigned to service on the Committee on Military Affairs and, because of that service, I have become quite aware of the problem of national defense. I have taken no little pride in the record of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress in that field. Service on the Committee on Military Affairs has not only been interesting and most pleasing, but has been as devoid of partisanship as is possible under the system governing congressional procedure. What I say here today with reference to the relationship between our foreign policy and national defense is stated only as my personal view. Many individual members of the committee have been studying problems of national defense and some members have regularly attended the debates of the Senate on our foreign policy, but thus far no work as a committee has been done in this session.

Just as soon as our foreign policy is finally determined, I am sure that every Member of Congress, and the Committee on Military Affairs in particular, will be desirous of giving most careful attention to the bringing of our defenses up to the standard needed for the international situation now confronting us. This work will be of such magnitude and importance as to emphasize the folly of further needless delay of the Committee on Military Affairs in approaching the study of the defense problem. In my own personal opinion, there is a very close relationship between our foreign policy and our national defense policy.

Next to a cordial relationship between our Nation and all foreign nations, our national defense is or should be our first consideration when world affairs are in turmoil. The purpose of our armed forces may be viewed differently by different individuals. In the final test, their function is to protect the vital interests of the Nation and our vital interests shift with the times. Most generally, however, they include the defense of the Nation's territory, the preservation of a maximum of democracy, and the preservation of peace at least of our own Nation. Many other purposes may be enumerated, but most of them are more controversial than the ones named.

National defense may be likened to insurance against the hazard of world conflagration. The wealth of our Nation, which includes the best raw-material supply of the world, and a heavy percentage of the gold, copper, oil, and food supply, is too great to leave wholly to the mercy of aggressor foreign nations, especially in time of turmoil.

The United States is not prepared for a war of any kind. The United States is not even prepared to defend itself. If we were attacked today by a relatively small force, we might succeed in mobilizing a million men overnight, but any skirmish that they might be engaged in within the next year would find them armed with relics of the World War, some of which arms were found obsolete in 1918. Just as in 1917 and 1918 they would have to fight with a motley array of rifles, artillery, and airplanes. Regardless of the outcome of this debate, on the bill now before us, we are called upon by all America to make America strong enough to meet any invasion before it arrives. The ability to turn back an invader before he could reach this country would prevent desolation of any part of it. We should immediately begin gathering a supply of raw and manufactured materials in order to equip, supply, maintain, and subsist an adequate force of men for that purpose.

We do not have adequate supplies of machine guns, automatic and semiautomatic arms, modern artillery, aircraft, and tanks to be sure of successful defense of our Nation. This is not a new experience for America. It has unfortunately been our experience in every emergency we have encountered throughout our national history. We are all equally familiar with the record of unpreparedness as outlined in our history books for each war in which we have been involved. But nothing written in history books has ever impressed me on that point as effectively as my own experience in 1918 of having all Springfield rifles taken from the Thirty-fifth Infantry and Lee-Enfield rifles substituted in their place. These rifles were made by firms "educated" to fill orders for the British. In our characteristic haste in 1918, we could not possibly tool-up our factories to make Springfield rifles, so Lee-Enfields were adapted to use our ammunition and were issued to us.

Probably the civilians thought we were fully armed as infantrymen when we carried those rifles in drill. But any American soldier who attempted in 1918 to go through the record course on the target range with a Lee-Enfield rifle, including its defective extractor, firing pin, and poor sight equipment, knows that we were armed with little more than clubs. In spite of all our war-munitions trade as a neutral during the early years of the World War, Secretary of War Baker stated after the war that "when we began the actual mobilization of the matériel for our participation in the World War there simply were no munitions makers." The American factories were building supplies that were filling the gaps for the Allies, not those which the United States was to need for itself. We not only bought obsolete Ross rifles from Canada, but some troops even used left-overs from the Spanish-American War as well as Lee-Enfields. Had the Government not been able to buy the British-owned Enfield rifle, built in the United States after the war began, we would not have been able to provide even Lee-Enfield rifles for the American troops. We certainly were not prepared for the World War in April 1917, and we still were not prepared when our boys engaged in active fighting some 15 months after war was declared.

Prior to the World War, we had remained deliberately on a peace basis, as Mr. Wilson wanted to take no step which could justify the accusation that the United States had provoked hostilities. Mr. Wilson completely overlooked the fact that the sale of munitions to nations at war might precipitate retaliation by those unable to secure them.

America has never favored a large standing army, but I believe that America today is wholeheartedly in accord with our efforts to bring our Regular Army, National Guard, and Reserve Corps up to full peacetime strength with some moderate increases.

It will take from 1½ to 2 years to adequately equip this force, most of which will be provided by funds voted at the last session of Congress. The present world turmoil has led many to favor the acquisition of adequate supplies for a protective mobilization force of 1,000,000 men under a plan calling for 700,000 active in the Regular Army and National Guard and 300,000 in the Reserve. Even though adequate funds were authorized for this purpose it will take from 2 to 2¼ years to make the matériel after funds therefor have been provided. There are some who see the possible need of a field force of 4,000,000 men and I am informed that such a force cannot possibly be fully and adequately equipped in less than 3 years from the time the funds are made available. Let those who feel that we should sell our munitions abroad ponder carefully whether they really wish to delay our own defense preparation beyond the above time limits.

We know that Great Britain appropriated the sum of $7,500,000,000 for national defense purposes in 1935, 2 years before they made any increase in manpower, and it has taken them about 3 years to get into production on that scale. We know that we must look ahead and anticipate our needs and conserve our own manufactures of munitions. Whether we decide upon a force equal to present authorized peacetime strength or a force of 1,000,000 men or more, almost wholly unequipped with modern weapons, it may be of interest to note that on July 31 an article appeared in News Week, setting out that Poland had then built up the fourth largest standing army in Europe with a peacetime strength of 300,000 and with 2,000,000 trained reserves, their chief asset being the quality of their men as they lacked modern weapons, planes, and tanks. Who are we to talk of selling armament abroad when at present our Army has only one brigade that is mechanized? To leave the Army where it is, is to invite aggression by countries that know full well we cannot successfully defend ourselves against modern mechanized war.

I am told that it will cost us approximately $1,000,000,000 in 2 years to provide adequate equipment for a force of 1,000,000 men. This will be the bill for equipment only. Our total exports of munitions since 1920 equal only about $200,000,000, and our total exports of aircraft for that period equal about $340,000,000, the bulk of the exports of aircraft coming in the last 2 years.

Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum has stated that "recent maneuvers reveal our forces to be lacking in almost every essential except energy, aggressiveness, and intelligence" and that "we are not ready for war—we are not even ready for defense."

We can hardly justify the export of munitions, thereby leaving us unprotected and dependent upon some foreign nation for our defense. The volume of our exports of munitions will increase as the war goes on. For example, it increased from less than $10,000,000 in 1914 to as high as $898,000,000 for the year 1917. Now is the time to give every consideration to the building up of our defenses rather than sell a single rifle or the material to make such rifle to any foreign power. So long as we have shortages in our requirements of armament and equipment for a protective force of 1,000,000 men, we should call upon our munition makers to cooperate with us in supplying our needs of critical items, such as semiautomatic rifles, modern artillery, tanks, and so forth, that are not made commercially and cannot be gotten into shape rapidly after outbreak of war. The beginning of the present European war has found both Britain and France well equipped for a war lasting 6 months or more without being dependent upon foreign purchases of munitions, but there is no information available at this time on which we can estimate what Britain and France will really need in the way of munitions in event the war is prolonged. All that we know at this time is that just now their anxiety apparently extends to aircraft only.

At the outbreak of the present European war our airplane factories had on hand orders from foreign countries in the sum of approximately $80,000,000 for military use and less than $10,000,000 for commercial business, and it has been reported in the press that the French and British Governments are ready to place additional orders for 5,750 additional war planes if and when Congress repeals the arms embargo. That Great Britain and France are extremely desirous of securing our aircraft is evidenced by the fact that they have asked our American aircraft manufacturers to complete the unfinished portion of their orders for aircraft despite the embargo.

This situation leads us to speculate as to the purpose of the passage of the bill now under consideration. We know that it must be for one of two purposes—either to sell our munitions and aircraft to England and France and thereby actually engage in the present European war or to make a gesture only for psychological purposes and hope to stop short of war. To me, the sale of armament to one side, when the other cannot possibly take advantage of our offer, is an overt act far different than conserving our supplies for our own use would be. In my judgment, such sale of arms is actual, active participation and is not a method short of war. I have always looked upon the supply of matériel as an integral and essential part of war. If the sale of our munitions is once more undertaken for the purpose of "educating" our munitions makers, it is my belief that we should "educate" our munition makers through bringing our own defenses up to date.

The history of our export trade in munitions and aircraft shows conclusively that it will take twice as much in new munitions and aircraft to supply a force of 1,000,000 men as we have sold abroad during the entire period since 1920.

I have had prepared and have permission to insert in the RECORD six tables that should be of assistance to those of you who desire concrete and authoritative information regarding the history of our export trade to selected nations during various periods up to 30 years. My purpose in having this material compiled is to afford those of you who may be interested therein a convenient reference to such matters as the comparative amount of our total exports of munitions, aircraft, and materials to all countries and especially the break-down of our exports of these items to selected countries of importance in this debate.

In view of some of the remarks made on this floor, it should be enlightening to call attention for instance to the fact that our total exports of munitions to Germany over the entire period from the World War down to July 31 of this year, amount to the amazingly small total of $421,000.

Some of you will no doubt be interested in comparing the exports of heavy iron and steel products to Germany and to the United Kingdom during the period that rearmament of Europe has been in progress. Others of you will be interested to note the extent of our export of heavy iron and steel products to Canada during that period and I am sure that some of you will be particularly interested in such exports to Japan.

You will recognize that table B is only a convenient summary of our total exports of munitions and aircraft during the past 6 years.

I am sure that many of you will be interested to examine table C, setting out the United States Air Corps appropriations for new aircraft, and table D, which sets out the percentage of the United States War Department appropriations used for ordnance.

Tables E and F, setting out the exports of heavy iron and steel products, and cotton, will be of interest in view of the comment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] in the debate on October 31.

In closing, I would like to appeal to you to consider our problem one of building up an adequate defense on such a plan as to avoid, insofar as possible, the post-war recession and collapse of our economic structure that we experienced in the years following the World War. We have on one hand the duty to conserve our munitions and aircraft for our own defense and we have the obligation to make our defenses adequate in the least possible time that we can build them and not risk a post-war recession. A sudden increase of our exports of munitions to foreign nations as we experienced in the World War years to nearly $1,000,000,000 per year will not only rob us of our own defense but will aggravate the post-war problem and we are not in condition as a Nation to absorb a post-war crash. Let us avoid another recession from over-expansion and yet build adequate armament for our own use without an unsafe increase in our manufactures of munitions and aircraft. It seems to me that every dollar's worth of munitions and aircraft that we export to foreign countries at this time serves to increase our problem both as to our own

national defense and as to our own actual economic stability after hostilities have ceased. Let us plan our production of armament carefully, conserve our supplies, mind our own business, and preserve our own independent defense. Keeping the embargo while we have it is the safest path to that end.

To my way of thinking that is the only method that will avoid dependence on other nations for defense followed by impoverishment and loss of liberty in the economic chaos of recession following war. Let us guard well that our war boom will not prove to be a war bomb. [Applause.]

The tables are as follows:

Values of domestic exports of munitions and aircraft from the United States to selected foreign countries, 1909–39

[All figures in thousands of dollars]

Year	Value of domestic exports to—											
	Canada		Austria-Hungary [1]		France		Germany		Italy		Russia in Europe	
	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft
Fiscal:												
1909	517		1		49		168		14		8	
1910	543		1		54		105		11		7	
1911	798		1		30		147		24		3	
1912	1,169	39	2		47	8	219	5	12		8	10
1913	1,363	22	3		63	12	239	9	285		8	19
1914	1,156	19	1		31	8	267	16	20		180	66
1915	3,174	97			15,325		15		33	60	1,910	4
1916	12,938	322			83,149	18			9,118	34	48,321	69
1917	44,913	1,519			120,682	132			19,906	16	300,271	38
1918	9,869	3,243			102,804	1,118			53,236	87	55,844	13
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1918	1,900	1,441			72,132	415			20,776	60	122	
Calendar:												
1919	1,274	61			1,011	15			1,102		12,062	
1920	1,895	48			37,666	43	7		211		6,017	
1921	711	53			99		6		8			
1922	810	38			25	28	5		45			
1923	715	25			9	1	26		7	15		
1924	885	23	2		8	14	103	11	6	23		9
1925	833	80			5		13	71	7	1	1	1
1926	348	50	2		22		21		5		1	
1927	742	445	2		2	6	33	81	2	3	1	175
1928	805	1,404			10	7	57	210	3	100	22	155
1929	972	1,773			4	68	24	418	3	135	18	207
1930	567	1,220	6	1	5	22	25	262	5	45	102	542
1931	430	395			4	11	22	29	3	83		506
1932	200	178			5	54	5	192	3	4	20	406
1933	152	64			3	17	9	349	3	21		380
1934	282	189		75	4	197	9	1,762	4	107		3,277
1935	303	399		2	2	155	12	195		790	2	1,020
1936	379	794		64	4	521	9	411		631	1	269
1937	429	1,857		51	24	201	18	1,027		470	23	3,213
1938	484	2,687		11		6,447	15	175		13	48	2,315
1939 through July 31	401	1,561			214	71,453	2	13		23		911
Total	91,957	20,046	21	204	433,492	80,971	1,581	5,236	104,852	2,721	425,000	13,605

Year	Value of domestic exports to—											
	Spain		United Kingdom [2]		Other European countries		China (proper)		Japan		All foreign countries	
	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft
Fiscal:												
1909	4		146		68		5		22		5,162	
1910	6		153		78		7		20		7,727	
1911	9		195		102		14		14		7,679	
1912	6		348		132		38		22	7	8,409	106
1913	4		175	3	394		40	1	30	4	9,240	108
1914	1		198	27	206		8		15	11	9,714	226
1915	104		17,860	725	520	12	3		5	3	50,951	1,541
1916	3,721	108	266,698	6,343	1,290	9	171		526	16	485,146	7,002
1917	4,375		324,131	1,834	927	67	54	13	632	58	898,260	4,136
1918	239		161,432	4,391	1,052	120	94		406	39	454,630	9,084
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1918	67		15,706	7,592	135		219	5	280	41	123,495	9,703
Calendar:												
1919	173		8,305	36	2,821	35	160		214		46,144	3,464
1920	172		327		696	10	142	20	208	6	62,547	1,152
1921	121		201	10	318	21	49		135	15	6,995	473
1922	199		134	2	428	51	10	18	123		8,521	230
1923	7		137	1	639	45	9		41		9,268	434
1924	9		200	79	234	93	16	5	42	47	9,895	798
1925	13		216	87	826	25	45		65	2	10,677	784
1926	9		171		549		30		25		10,505	
1927	12	4	166	43	784	138	21	48	17	78	9,476	1,904
1928	3	19	165	156	1,704	161	15	228	43	136	10,724	3,665
1929	8	50	134	140	303	350	117	718	58	348	10,735	9,126
1930	3	17	132	149	235	256	562	1,134	27	441	6,445	8,818
1931	3	33	169	333	108	484	204	917	13	153	3,897	4,868
1932	4	40	50	57	47	805	53	157	6	366	2,948	7,946
1933	3	7	45	84	88	641	97	1,763	7	339	4,180	9,179

[1] Export figures for Austria and Hungary are combined after 1920.

[2] Figures for the United Kingdom include England, Scotland, and Ireland for the years 1909–37, "Great Britain and Northern Ireland" and "Ireland" for 1938, and "Great Britain" and "Ireland" for 1939 (through July 31).

Values of domestic exports of munitions and aircraft from the United States to selected foreign countries, 1909–39—Continued

[All figures in thousands of dollars]

Year	Value of domestic exports to—											
	Spain		United Kingdom		Other European countries		China (proper)		Japan		All foreign countries	
	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft	Munitions	Aircraft
Calendar—Continued.												
1934	3	14	103	137	171	1,431	200	3,826	7	320	6,290	17,663
1935	7	211	165	461	206	2,837	104	2,523	6	950	5,652	14,291
1936		119	37	461	270	3,167	15	7,186	4	989	7,255	23,142
1937		443	491	1,729	251	5,790	672	3,962	47	2,484	9,539	39,405
1938			777	28,909	369	5,587	605	8,576	259	8,992	6,338	87,868
1939 through July 31			243	14,413	1,466	6,487	148	523		757	3,262	108,760
Total	9,285	1,065	799,410	68,207	17,417	28,622	3,927	31,623	3,359	16,602	2,311,606	375,876

NOTE.—All the above figures have been computed. For each country, in each category, under the two general headings "munitions" and "aircraft," figures to the nearest thousand dollars were taken from the sources used; thus export figures of less than $500 in each category were not taken into account.

The headings "munitions" and "aircraft" as used in the table for the years 1909–37 include the following categories separately listed in Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States:

Munitions—

Firearms: Revolvers, pistols, rifles, shotguns, machine and heavy guns and carriages, parts of guns.

Explosives: Dynamite, nitrocellulose, blasting powder, smokeless and other gunpowder, primers, fuzes, mercury and other fulminates, blasting and percussion caps, cartridges, shells, projectiles empty, projectiles loaded, other explosives including fireworks.

Aircraft—

Land planes, seaplanes, amphibians, gliders, other aircraft and parts, engines, parachutes and parts.

Values of exports given for 1938 and 1939 (since data for these years are unavailable from the source used for former years) are based upon the values of arms which the National Munitions Control Board authorized for export to each country listed during the periods Dec. 1, 1937–Nov. 30, 1938, inclusive, and Jan. 1–July 31, 1939, inclusive. The headings "munitions" and "aircraft" as used in the table for these years include the following categories:

Munitions—

Category I:

(1) Rifles and carbines using ammunition in excess of caliber .22, and barrels for those weapons;
(2) Machine guns, automatic or autoloading rifles, and machine pistols using ammunition in excess of caliber .22, and barrels for those weapons;
(3) Guns, howitzers, and mortars of all calibers, their mountings and barrels;
(4) Ammunition in excess of caliber .22 for the arms enumerated under (1) and (2) above, and cartridge cases or bullets for such ammunition; filled and unfilled projectiles for the arms enumerated under (3) above;
(5) Grenades, bombs, torpedoes, mines and depth charges, filled or unfilled, and apparatus for their use or discharge;
(6) Tanks, military armored vehicles, and armored trains.

Category II:

Vessels of war of all kinds, including aircraft carriers and submarines, and armor plate for such vessels.

Category IV:

(1) Revolvers and automatic pistols using ammunition in excess of caliber .22;
(2) Ammunition in excess of caliber .22 for the arms enumerated under (1) above, and cartridge cases or bullets for such ammunition.

Category VI:

(1) Livens projectors and flame throwers;
(2) (a) Mustard gas (dichlorethyl sulphide); (b) lewisite (chlorvinyldichlorarsine and dichlordivinyl-chlorarsine; (c) methyldichlorarsine; (d) diphenylchlorarsine; (e) diphenylcyanarsine; (f) diphenylaminechlorarsine; (g) phenyldichlorarsine; (h) ethyldichlorarsine; (i) phenyldibromarsine; (j) ethyldichlorarsine; (k) phosgene; (l) monochlormethylchlorformate; (m) trichlormethylchlorformate (diphosgene); (n) dichlordimethyl ether; (o) dibromdimethyl ether; (p) cyanogen chloride; (q) ethylbromacetate; (r) ethyliodoacetate; (s) brombenzylcyanide; (t) bromacetone; (u) brommethylethyl ketone.

Category VII:

(1) Propellant powders;
(2) High explosives as follows:
(a) Nitrocellulose having a nitrogen content of more than 12%; (b) trinitrotoluene; (c) trinitroxylene; (d) tetryl (trinitrophenol methyl nitramine or tetranitro methylaniline); (e) picric acid; (f) ammonium picrate; (g) trinitroanisol; (h) trinitronaphthalene; (i) tetranitronaphthalene; (j) hexanitrodiphenylamine; (k) pentaerythritetetranitrate (penthrite or pentrite); (l) trimethylenetrinitramine (hexogen or T4); (m) potassium nitrate powders (black saltpeter powder); (n) sodium nitrate powders (black soda powder); (o) amatol (mixture of ammonium nitrate and trinitrotoluene); (p) ammonal (mixture of ammonium nitrate, trinitrotoluene, and powdered aluminum, with or without other ingredients); (q) schneiderite (mixture of ammonium nitrate and dinitronaphthalene, with or without other ingredients).

Aircraft—

Category III:

(1) Aircraft, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled, both heavier and lighter than air, which are designed, adapted, and intended for aerial combat by the use of machine guns or of artillery or for the carrying and dropping of bombs, or which are equipped with, or which by reason of design or construction are prepared for, any of the appliances referred to in paragraph (2) below;
(2) Aerial gun mounts and frames, bomb racks, torpedo carriers, and bomb or torpedo release mechanisms.

Category V:

(1) Aircraft, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled, both heavier and lighter than air, other than those included in Category III;
(2) Propellers or air screws, fuselages, hulls, wings, tail units, and undercarriage units;
(3) Aircraft engines, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States—1909–13, pp. 375–376, 432–434, 496 (figures for years 1909–11); 1910–14, pp. 364–365, 425–427, 489 (figures for years 1912–14); 1914–18, pp. 360, 382, 383, 478–481, 554–556, 611 (figures for years 1915–18); 1921, pp. 310–311, 328–329, 416–419, 486–487, 538 (figures for years 1919–21); 1922, pp. 303–304, 309–312, 319–320, 329, 362–363, 381–384; 1923, pp. 296–297, 314, 344–346, 361–362; 1924, pp. 117–118, 132, 161–163, 175–177; 1925, pp. 115–117, 131, 159–160, 172–174; 1926, pp. 169–170, 179–181; 1927, pp. 164, 176–178, 186–188; 1928, pp. 72–73, 189–190, 199–201; 1929, pp. 174–175, 194–196, 204–206; 1930, pp. 176–177, 197–198, 208–211; 1931, pp. 177–178, 197–198, 209–210; 1932, pp. 172–173, 192, 203–205; 1933, pp. 160–161, 179, 189–191; 1934, pp. 162–164, 182–183, 195–196; 1935, pp. 515–516, 535–536, 546–548; 1936, pp. 138, 177–178, 181–182, 201–202, 215–217; 1937, pp. 389–391, 567, 590, 603–604. U. S. Department of State—Third Annual Report of the National Munitions Control Board (76th Cong., 1st sess., H. Doc. No. 92.) Washington, Government Printing Office, 1939, pp. 58–66; Press Release No. 326, Aug. 11, 1939 (mimeographed), pp. 1–15.

(C. A. Quattlebaum, M. M. Bennett, K. Metz, Oct. 17, 1939.)

Values of domestic exports of munitions and aircraft from the United States to selected foreign countries for the period of European rearmament, Jan. 1, 1934, to July 31, 1939, inclusive

Country	Munitions	Aircraft
Canada	$2,278,000	$7,487,000
Austria-Hungary		203,000
France	248,000	78,974,000
Germany	65,000	3,583,000
Italy	4,000	2,034,000
Russia in Europe	74,000	11,005,000
Spain	10,000	787,000
United Kingdom	1,816,000	46,110,000
Other European countries	2,733,000	25,299,000
China, proper	1,744,000	26,596,000
Japan	323,000	14,492,000
All foreign countries (total United States exports)	38,336,000	291,129,000

United States Air Corps appropriations for new aircraft—Amount appropriated

1920	$3,487,384
1921	7,442,191
1922	5,328,377
1923	3,007,839
1924	2,997,350
1925	4,625,404
1926	4,400,000
1927	6,754,000
1928	9,492,550
1929	11,837,445
1930	18,439,280
1931	17,573,723
1932	15,296,231
1933	11,525,728
1934	8,257,807
1935	10,295,579
1936	22,999,233
1937	33,371,248
1938	34,054,311
1939	32,185,903
1940	149,305,750

War Department, Finance Division, Oct. 25, 1939.

Total appropriations for the U. S. Ordnance Department, compared with total appropriations for the military activities of the War Department, fiscal years 1910 to 1939, inclusive

Fiscal year	Ordnance	War Department	Percent
1910	$10,093,856.00	$115,696,518.61	8.72
1911	9,210,554.60	109,971,367.17	8.37
1912	8,794,475.00	104,845,810.52	8.38
1913	9,001,733.30	115,561,920.10	7.78
1914	9,503,641.00	112,859,212.59	8.42
1915	12,353,432.00	125,514,560.95	9.84
1916	14,947,110.00	113,505,383.29	13.1
1917	324,629,574.50	2,810,397,141.76	11.5
1918	3,103,599,681.86	5,667,356,136.29	54.7
1919	4,199,903,211.67	16,316,503,199.32	25.7
1920	20,805,634.79	813,304,262.20	2.55
1921	22,880,186.06	495,122,339.55	4.62
1922	13,425,960.00	373,019,831.22	3.59
1923	6,859,030.00	270,184,805.19	2.52
1924	5,812,180.00	256,669,118.00	2.26
1925	7,751,272.00	260,246,731.67	2.97
1926	7,543,802.00	260,757,250.00	2.89
1927	9,549,827.00	270,872,055.16	3.52
1928	12,179,856.00	300,781,710.93	4.04
1929	12,549,877.00	317,378,294.00	3.95
1930	11,858,981.00	331,748,443.50	3.57
1931	12,422,466.00	347,379,178.61	3.57
1932	11,121,567.00	335,505,965.00	3.31
1933	11,588,737.00	299,993,920.00	3.86
1934	7,048,455.00	277,126,281.00	2.54
1935	11,049,829.00	263,640,736.00	4.19
1936	17,110,301.00	312,235,811.00	5.47
1937	19,305,977.00	382,787,267.00	5.04
1938	25,373,235.00	409,712,987.00	6.19
1939	158,386,124.00	616,506,771.00	25.68

Source: Ordnance fiscal bulletin No. 2, supplemented by Ordnance Office, War Department, Oct. 25, 1939.

United States exports of heavy iron and steel products[1] to selected foreign countries, 1929–38

[Long tons]

Year	France	Germany	United Kingdom	Canada	Japan	China	Total United States (all countries)
1929	18,104	21,991	66,371	1,234,861	426,974	69,246	3,037,857
1930	7,153	8,325	44,878	820,116	276,740	38,879	1,982,546
1931	8,931	1,094	40,476	420,599	98,886	38,324	968,645
1932	3,703	703	4,700	163,900	191,193	20,885	594,581
1933	6,424	15,469	9,148	139,507	593,207	36,885	1,341,183
1934	2,744	11,964	141,877	254,565	1,249,248	82,401	2,812,847
1935	3,577	4,578	286,461	338,808	1,201,391	75,048	3,063,659
1936	3,836	7,407	380,836	356,119	1,111,722	79,968	3,157,405
1937	30,959	110,012	1,224,144	642,165	2,784,420	157,965	7,580,626
1938[2]	21,045	17,414	497,486	340,011	1,542,563	55,362	4,085,466

[1] Products included: pig iron, not including ferro-alloys; ferromanganese and spiegeleisen; other ferro-alloys; scrap; ingots, blooms, sheet bars, skelp, etc.; iron and steel bars; alloy steel bars; wire rods; galvanized sheets; plates, iron and steel; black steel sheets; black iron sheets; hoop, band, and strip steel; tin plate, terneplate, etc.; structural shapes, plain material; structural materials, fabricated; tanks, complete and knocked down; metal lath; steel rails; rail fastenings, switches, frogs, etc.; boiler tubes; casing and oil-line pipe; seamless black pipe, except casing and oil line; black and galvanized welded pipe; riveted pipe and fittings; cast-iron pipe and fittings; malleable-iron screwed pipe fittings; barbed-wire and woven-wire fencing; plain and galvanized wire; woven-wire screen cloth; wire rope and wire strand; insulated wire and cable; wire, other, and manufactures thereof; wire nails; nails other than wire, tacks, staples; horseshoes; bolts, nuts, rivets, and washers (except track); car wheels and axles; iron castings; steel castings; forgings.

[2] 1938 figure includes iron and steel scrap and all finished and semi-finished iron and steel exports as listed by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Sources: United States Statistical Abstract, 1932, p. 702; 1934, p. 670; 1937, p. 711; 1938, p. 721. 1938 figures by telephone from Foreign Trade Statistics Division, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

United States exports of cotton[1] to selected foreign countries, 1929–38

[Thousands of bales]

Year	France	Germany	United Kingdom	Canada	China	Japan	Total, all countries
1929	775	1,797	1,831	254	236	1,309	8,044
1930	812	1,687	1,256	182	226	1,020	6,990
1931	914	1,640	1,054	190	429	1,228	6,760
1932	463	1,570	1,344	187	1,112	2,294	8,708
1933	864	1,849	1,492	176	301	1,743	8,419
1934	709	1,318	1,278	270	375	1,846	7,534
1935	373	342	738	225	108	1,524	4,799
1936	681	765	1,410	248	36	1,479	5,973
1937	655	650	1,144	307	14	1,550	5,440
1938	716	654	1,552	246	23	691	5,598

[1] Includes linters.

Source: United States Statistical Abstract, 1938, p. 679.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the seriousness with which some of the Members of the House approach this issue and their comments about the attendance at this session. I appreciate full well that some people who get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have about as much respect for it as they have for a Sears, Roebuck catalog. [Laughter.]

However, I believe there are some people who are concerned about how their Representatives feel on these important issues.

Representing as I do the great State of Ohio, being one of the two Congressmen at Large, I have received well over 40,000 letters and telegrams advising me as to how to vote on this issue. Naturally I am interested in having our constituents know how we feel regarding this matter.

Incidentally I received a telegram that I appreciate more than I can say, and for your information I will read it. This comes from Cleveland, Ohio:

Everybody I know has been after me to wire you about the embargo, but after thinking it over I don't know what to tell you. The best thing I can say is to go ahead and use your own judgment. That is what we are paying you for.

[Laughter.]

Signed: "Michael Volin."

In using my own judgment, this is the way I feel about this situation:

Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 months I have given a great deal of time to a study of all phases of our neutrality legislation. It is my conviction today that neither retention nor repeal of our present arms embargo will guarantee American peace. I sincerely believe that we can keep out of this war if the people of America are determined to keep out. But legislation enacted by Congress in this critical moment of world history will reflect our public opinion. It will not form it. I feel that both the advocates of changes in our neutrality laws and those who wish to keep them in their present form are motivated by a sincere desire to keep us out of war. Our differences are differences of method. Neither side can foresee the future.

No one else on either side of the House of Representatives more thoroughly detests the aims and techniques of Hitler or Stalin than do I. I am as eager for their downfall as any other man in Congress, and I should subscribe to any step which would, in my opinion, hasten the collapse of their program.

Yet, despite my views on dictatorships, I do not believe that the lifting of the arms embargo at the present time will make any material contribution to the objective of ultimate world peace. If there is any lesson which history demonstrates, it must be that the making of war and the encouragement of war leads to no peace. So far as the American people can determine at the moment, the repeal of our arms embargo seems likely to lead to a tremendous slaughter of innocent civilians as well as combatants. No matter upon which nation bombing planes may drop their cargo of death, those who assist the process contribute to that wrong. If for no other reason, the principles of human morality should deter any civilized nation which remembers the horror of war from shipping arms to any other nation.

Retention of the present arms embargo will furnish additional time for our people to determine their ultimate views. Repeal is a definite step in one unretraceable direction. With the war in Europe standing momentarily still, there is no need for any immediate action on our part. It is basically a problem of weighing factors. The arms embargo has become synonymous with American neutrality in fact; repeal has been linked with military and economic participation in the war. Repeal may set in motion a chain of forces which will force our hand. Retention will keep America available as a potential source of mediation or negotiation. I am not willing to shut that door. For me the course which America should pursue at this moment is difficult to determine. Yet I have attempted to frame a program along the lines I have suggested.

First. Congress should remain in session in order to be ready for any emergency in the European conflict.

Second. America should sell no arms to any belligerent nation.

Third. All other goods sold to belligerents should be sold for cash and transported in the ships of the purchasing nation only.

Fourth. American shipping of any kind should be prohibited in the zones of conflict.

Fifth. Private American citizens should be barred from travel in any area of conflict.

I submit this program in the knowledge that no formula can guarantee peace today. But we can and must seek some approach which will minimize our risk. Repeal of the arms embargo ends neutrality. Once that is gone, I believe the path to our intervention in the war will be too clearly charted. I recognize that in this emergency the situation may change overnight. To prepare for danger, I urge Congress to remain continuously in session. But in our preparations for danger I am convinced that we must do nothing to invite it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the paramount concern in the minds of all Members of Congress is for the preservation of the peace and security of our Nation and its people. I am just as certain that, when the roll is called on this measure, every Member will be motivated in his vote exclusively by his fixed conviction as to the manner in which this objective can best be served. There can be no doubt in the mind of anyone that it is the desire of the American people, by an overwhelming preponderance, to avoid any steps that may tend to lead us into war and that it is their fervent hope and prayer that nothing may occur to disrupt the sovereign peace of our Nation.

In considering the issue now before us, I feel it to be essential that the paramount objective—the maintenance of peace—should be kept clearly in mind and carefully distinguished from any other considerations that may spring from sympathy or antipathy toward one or the other of the belligerent causes. For it would be only through the sheerest coincidence that we could serve both purposes at one and the same time. Rather is it likely that, in seeking to serve both, we shall serve neither.

The course of American neutrality history clearly demonstrates the danger that results from confusing a neutrality policy designed to promote peace with one designed to serve as an instrument for influencing the conduct of other nations. As examples, we may cite the embargo declared by George Washington during his second term as President of the United States and the embargo policy preceding our entry into the War of 1812. In the former case, the embargo was motivated by a single objective, the maintenance of peace in order that our young and still insecure Nation might not be destroyed in its very inception by a disastrous war. Then, as now, there were active partisans of both belligerents who objected to phases of the embargo which adversely affected the respective nations at war. But because the single objective of peace was unswervingly followed, the embargo succeeded in keeping us free from involvement, despite the fact that at that time we were in the precarious situation of having colonies of both belligerents on both flanks. This policy, of course, involved severe restrictions upon our commerce and a sacrifice of the profits and gains of trade. But it saved this Nation from the inevitable disaster that would have resulted from participation in war at that critical stage of our national existence.

In contrast we may cite the neutrality policy prior to the War of 1812 and the Embargo Act of 1808. Our neutrality policy then involved adherence to the doctrine of freedom of the seas, and when an embargo was adopted its purpose was not for the preservation of peace but to serve as an instrument of economic coercion in an effort to influence the conduct of the belligerents. As such it was an abject failure, culminating in the wavering and vacillating policy that led us into war. These experiences, I believe, shed a great deal of light on the issue that is now before us and demonstrate the danger of a neutrality policy designed to influence and affect the warring nations.

The crux of the controversy now before us rests in whether or not we shall repeal the present embargo on arms and munitions to nations at war. I do not believe that anyone seriously disputes the fact that the lifting of the embargo will favorably affect the Allied Powers and adversely affect Germany. Proponents of this measure, in fact, admit that this is at least one of the objectives of the proposed repeal of the embargo and some state their desire to help the Allied Powers "by means short of war." If this is so, it can hardly be contended that the policy is one of true neutrality. On the contrary, it would appear to be very unneutral and might well be considered by the nations adversely affected as a hostile act. In this view they would have the support and authority of the opinion of President Wilson to Germany, expressed in response to her protest. I quote at this juncture brief excerpts from that letter:

> This Government holds and is constrained to hold, in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war, which would unequally affect the relations of the United States with the nations at war, would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality.

The scholarly attainments of Woodrow Wilson in the field of international law entitle his words to great weight. They are particularly entitled to our consideration at this time because they serve as precedent of fixed American neutrality policy on which other nations are entitled to rely.

The present embargo on shipments of arms and munitions was adopted by Congress in 1935. There is no doubt that underlying the passage of this measure was a great feeling of revulsion toward war and its incidents on the part of the American people and a determination that we would have no part in the terrible carnage and destruction that war entails. It was undoubtedly motivated by the great idealism and altruism that is characteristic of the American people, and it was enacted at a time when no nation could contend that it was adversely affected. However, even though it formulated an abstract policy of neutrality, it can hardly be said that this legislation was adopted in an idealistic vacuum. It was evident, even at that time, that there existed abroad many conflicting interests of increasing acuteness and that there was a great likelihood that the growing tension might lead to an early outbreak of hostilities.

It was under those circumstances that the Congress, with a full knowledge of imminent crises abroad, adopted the arms embargo as the best and safest means of guaranteeing us against involvement. It was not a hasty and ill-considered step, but carefully debated on the basis of past history and precedents and with a full realization of its importance. It represents the fixed determination of the American people to remain at peace and their utter abhorrence of the carnage and disaster that are the consequences of war.

It is my belief that there is no midpoint between participation and nonparticipation, nor do I believe that there is any safety in a policy of participation by "measures short of war." History reveals that such a policy, by imperceptible steps and uncontrollable events, is very likely to lead directly to war and armed participation. Moreover, because of the innumerable and complex factors that bear on the successful conduct of war, it cannot be safely said that any type of participation is a "measure short of war." Experience has too often shown that any measures favoring one belligerent against another are likely to provoke an incident that will catapult us into the conflict. There is only one type of true neutrality—that is one which is entirely impartial toward the belligerents and is founded exclusively on considerations of our own peace and security. Once we depart from this firm basis we may well find ourselves caught in a swirl on uncharted seas that will impel us into war. As long as we adhere

to strict neutrality we shall be on relatively stable ground and will be in a far better position to remain aloof from the struggle abroad.

It is contended by advocates of repeal of the embargo that, under the present existing statute, contraband may be carried to belligerents in American ships, and that therefore we are now exposed to the danger of involvement resulting from incidents occurring to our vessels in dangerous waters. I am in the fullest agreement that this is a serious weakness of our present neutrality policy, and I am heartily in favor of the restrictions imposed on American commerce by the Senate bill which will safeguard us against this danger. I fully concur with the view that all trade with belligerents should be subject to the restrictions that the belligerents shall pay in cash, take title here, and, with respect to prescribed zones, carry the cargo in their own vessels.

However, it does not follow as a corollary that, in order to avail ourselves of these safeguards, we should abandon the protection that is furnished to us by the embargo on arms and munitions. We may well adopt these precautions, in addition to those already provided by the present neutrality law.

Of course, this will involve some sacrifice on the part of the American people. It will require them to forego the profits and gains that would result from a lucrative trade in arms and ammunition with the belligerents. However, we are faced with the choice of this sacrifice or the possibility of a far greater sacrifice. The importance of these safeguards is demonstrated by the events which led up to American participation in the World War.

At the outbreak of hostilities in 1914 the United States had no neutrality statute. After proclaiming American neutrality, President Wilson could only plead with the Nation to be neutral "in fact as well as in name * * * in thought as well as in action." It soon appeared that such neutrality was impossible. Because the flag followed them wherever they went, American citizens were free to risk, not only their own safety, but also that of their Nation by trade with belligerent nations. England blocked American trade with Germany and, attempting to meet blockade with blockade, Germany resorted to submarine warfare. This resulted in the loss of American lives and property and had an important bearing on our involvement into a costly and disastrous war. If we are to avoid a repetition of these events, it is essential that we adopt the restrictions on American shipping that are provided in the Senate amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the American people are not only passionately opposed to bloodshed but desire to implement their abhorrence of armed conflict by refusing to furnish to belligerent nations any of the destructive instruments of modern warfare. They do not want to see America converted into an immense arsenal for supplying other nations with the means of creating death and destruction.

The people of this Nation desire to remain free from any involvement in the war abroad. However, even if it were possible to profit from the traffic in arms and lethal weapons with safety, I am sure that they would not desire to prosper from the havoc and desolation that is certain to result from a prolonged conflict. Like war itself, the profits of war breed dangers of an insidious kind. The only safe policy we can pursue is to remain free from any involvement in any of the incidents of war, whether they be on the profit or debit side of the ledger. In so doing we shall not only safeguard the peace and security of America but we shall serve as an inspiring example of democracy at its best in a disillusioned and dispirited world and, by this example, may promote the cause of world peace in its finest and most altruistic sense. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should indeed feel remiss in my duty if I did not in this most critical hour of our history rise to amplify some thoughts I have already expressed to the House with respect to the monstrous proposal that is now before Congress. This measure proposes to repeal the arms embargo, and at the same time abandon our maritime rights. We are told these things are necessary to keep us out of war. Aside from the question of the effects of repealing the embargo, this bill proposes nothing less than self-destruction, by our own legislation, the sovereignty of our Nation.

Think of it. In 1917 we went to war, ostensibly to protect and defend our sovereign rights on the high seas. Man after man, in both the Senate and the House, who is on the side of repeal, has emphasized that that was the purpose of our entering the World War. Now, after all the sacrifice we made we are asked to do the unbelievable, give up those rights as a necessary means to keep from going to war. Is it really possible that the American people are expected to give sanction to this?

Can it be that our Government, if this bill passes, has announced to the world that it could not remain neutral without destroying the sovereignty of our Nation?

I am convinced the Congress has not grasped the full meaning of this proposal. I am sure its significance is not appreciated by the people in general. I am just as certain, however, that the thoughtful men and women of this Nation will, in due time, see through this and expose this, to me, the most shameful and unpatriotic act ever undertaken by any government.

Members of Congress, I plead with each and every one of you—let us stop long enough to think of what we are really doing before we vote on this measure.

May it be the will of God that we, as their Representatives in Congress, shall not fail our people and our country in this crucial moment. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON].

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, based upon the diplomatic correspondence between the United States and belligerent governments, relating to neutral rights in commerce, in a special supplement to the American Journal of International Law, 1917.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman requesting to put that book in the RECORD?

Mr. THORKELSON. No, no.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, you were reading from the book.

Mr. THORKELSON. No. It is based on this book.

Mr. BLOOM. How much of the book do you want to put in?

Mr. THORKELSON. It is these remarks based on international law.

Mr. BLOOM. But how much of the book do you want to put in?

Mr. THORKELSON. It is just these remarks here; about 12 pages.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, section 2 (c) makes it impossible for an American citizen to collect for merchandise sold to a foreign government, by presenting the claim through the Government of the United States. Subsection (d) makes it impossible for an American citizen to collect insurance, if insured with a foreign company, through the Government of the United States.

Subsection (f), in eliminating (a) of section 2, allows American vessels to carry all merchandise over lakes, rivers, and inland waters. At the end of this same subsection it is permissible for American vessels to carry war materials, when used exclusively by American vessels, aircraft, and other vehicles in any foreign country.

Subsection (g) makes it possible for American vessels to carry contraband of war south of 35° north latitude and north of 35° north latitude, to any port in the Western Hemisphere.

Inasmuch as the sixty-sixth meridian extends from the North Pole to the South Pole, this will include all the Western Hemisphere to the coast of Somaliland in Africa, because the Neutrality Act sets aside the Arabian Sea.

The bill further provides that cargoes may be carried to the Pacific or Indian Ocean, the China Sea, the Bay of Bengal, and the Tasman Sea—the latter to be found between New Zealand and Australia.

Subsection (h) extends the same rights to aircraft, except articles proclaimed in section 12 (i).

Section 2, subsection (i), confirms this because—

Every American vessel to which the provisions of subsections (g) and (h) apply shall, before departing from a port or from the jurisdiction of the United States, file with the collector of customs a declaration of its cargo.

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

Mr. THORKELSON. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman tell us how it affects Antarctica?

Mr. THORKELSON. To the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] I wish to say that inasmuch as this language is used, "South of 35° north latitude * * * and north of 35° north latitude," it naturally takes in all of the Western Hemisphere, from the sixty-sixth meridian west, between the North Pole and the South Pole.

Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to say that this is a most deceptive piece of legislation, which I ask every Member to study and give serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues may be informed what Great Britain considered contraband during the World War, I quote a list of such materials and articles from diplomatic correspondence between the United States and belligerent governments relating to neutral rights and commerce.

Proclamation, December 23, 1914, revising the list of articles to be treated as contraband of war

George R. I.:

Whereas on the 4th day of August 1914, we did issue our royal proclamation specifying the articles which it was our intention to treat as contraband of war during the war between us and the German Emperor; and

Whereas on the 12th day of August 1914, we did by our royal proclamation of that date extend our proclamation aforementioned to the war between us and the Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary; and

Whereas on the 21st day of September 1914, we did by our royal proclamation of that date make certain additions to the list of articles to be treated as contraband of war; and

Whereas on the 29th day of October 1914, we did by our royal proclamation of that date withdraw the said lists of contraband and substitute therefor the lists contained in the schedules to the said proclamation; and

Whereas it is expedient to make certain alterations in and additions to the said lists:

Now, therefore, we do hereby declare by and with the advice of our Privy Council, that the lists of contraband contained in the schedules to our royal proclamation of the 29th day of October aforementioned are hereby withdrawn, and that in lieu thereof during the continuance of the war or until we do give further public notice the articles enumerated in schedule I hereto will be treated as absolute contraband, and the articles enumerated in schedule II hereto will be treated as conditional contraband.

SCHEDULE I

1. Arms of all kinds, including arms for sporting purposes, and their distinctive component parts.
2. Projectiles, charges, and cartridges of all kinds and their distinctive component parts.
3. Power and explosives specially prepared for use in war.
4. Ingredients of explosives, viz, nitric acid, sulfuric acid, glycerin, acetone, calcium acetate, and all other metallic acetates, sulfur, potassium nitrate, the fractions of the distillation products of coal tar between benzol and cresol, inclusive, aniline, methylaniline, dimethylaniline, ammonium perchlorate, sodium perchlorate, sodium chlorate, barium chlorate, ammonium nitrate, cyanamid, potassium chlorate, calcium nitrate, mercury.
5. Resinous products, camphor, and turpentine (oil and spirit).
6. Gun mountings, limber boxes, military wagons, field forges, and their distinctive component parts.
7. Range finders and their distinctive component parts.
8. Clothing and equipment of a distinctively military character.
9. Saddle, draft, and pack animals suitable for use in war.
10. All kinds of harness of a distinctively military character.
11. Articles of camp equipment and their distinctive component parts.
12. Armor plates.
13. Ferro alloys, including ferrotungsten, ferromolybdenum, ferromanganese, ferrovanadium, ferrochrome.
14. The following metals: Tungsten, molybdenum, vanadium, nickel, selenium, cobalt, haematic pig iron, manganese.
15. The following ores: Wolframite, scheelite, molybdenite, manganese ore, nickel ore, chrome ore, haemitate iron ore, zinc ore, lead ore, bauxite.
16. Aluminum, alumina, and salts of aluminum.
17. Antimony, together with the sulfides and oxides of antimony.
18. Copper, unwrought and part wrought, and copper wire.
19. Lead, pig, sheet, or pipe.
20. Warships, including boats and their distinctive component parts of such a nature that they can only be used on a vessel of war.
21. Barbed wire, and implements for fixing and cutting the same.
22. Submarine sound-signaling apparatus.
23. Airplanes, airships, balloons, and aircraft of all kinds, and their component parts, together with accessories and articles recognizable as intended for use in connection with balloons and aircraft.
24. Motor vehicles of all kinds and their component parts.
25. Tires for motor vehicles and for cycles, together with articles or materials especially adapted for use in the manufacture or repair of tires.
26. Rubber (including raw, waste, and reclaimed rubber), and goods made wholly of rubber.
27. Iron pyrites.
28. Mineral oils and motor spirit, except lubricating oils.
29. Implements and apparatus designed exclusively for the manufacture of munitions of war, for the manufacture or repair of arms, or war material for use on land and sea.

SCHEDULE II

1. Foodstuffs.
2. Forage and feeding stuffs for animals.
3. Clothing, fabrics for clothing, and boots and shoes suitable for use in war.
4. Gold and silver in coin or bullion; paper money.
5. Vehicles of all kinds, other than motor vehicles, available for use in war, and their component parts.
6. Vessels, craft, and boats of all kinds; floating docks, parts of docks, and their component parts.
7. Railway materials, both fixed and rolling stock, and materials for telegraphs, wireless telegraphs, and telephones.
8. Fuel, other than mineral oils. Lubricants.
9. Powder and explosives not specially prepared for use in war.
10. Horseshoes and shoeing materials.
11. Harness and saddlery.
12. Hides of all kinds, dry or wet; pigskins, raw or dressed; leather, undressed or dressed, suitable for saddlery, harness, or military boots.
13. Field glasses, telescopes, chronometers, and all kinds of nautical instruments.

Given at our court at Buckingham Palace, this 23d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1914, etc.

[Consul General Skinner to the Secretary of State]
(Telegram)

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
London, January 16, 1915.

Official announcement made by British Government that France adopts lists of absolute and conditional contraband identical with latest British list.

SKINNER.

[Ambassador W. H. Page to the Secretary of State]
(Telegram)

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
London, January 22, 1915.

British Government now informs me that the heading "Copper unwrought" was intended to include all copper in such form as to render it usable for manufacturing purposes. This description being vague, the former heading will be changed in new lists to read: "Copper unwrought and part wrought and copper wire." This is intended to include copper sheets, circles, slabs, bars, pipes, ingots, scrap, rods, plates, solid drawn, tubes, etc., and all grades of copper wire. The word "copper" is deemed to include alloys in which copper is the main ingredient.

PAGE.

[Consul General Skinner to the Secretary of State]
(Telegram)

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
London, March 9, 1915.

British Government announces that "All cotton for which contracts of sale and freight engagements had already been made before March 2 to be allowed free or bought at contract price if stopped, provided the ship sails not later than March 31; similar treatment to be accorded to all cotton insured before March 2, provided the cotton is put on board not later than March 16. All shipments of cotton claiming the above protection to be declared before sailing and documents produced to and certificates obtained from consular officers or other authority fixed by the Government."

SKINNER.

[The British Ambassador to the Secretary of State]

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, March 10, 1915.

The British Ambassador presents his compliments to the Secretary of State, and has the honor to transmit herewith 20 copies of a list enumerating certain oils and substances included under the heading "Lubricants" in the British list of articles to be treated as conditional contraband.

CECIL SPRING-RICE.

[Enclosure]

OILS AND SUBSTANCES INCLUDED UNDER THE HEADING "LUBRICANTS IN THE BRITISH LIST OF ARTICLES TO BE TREATED AS CONDITIONAL CONTRABAND"

I. Principal oils used as lubricants:
- Tallow oil.
- Lard oil.
- Neat's-foot oil (including sheep's foot oil, horse's foot oil, and fatty bone oil).
- Olive oil.
- Rape oil (including Colza oil, Ravisson oil, or Black Sea rape oil, and Jamba oil).
- Castor oil.
- Particularly for fine mechanisms—
  - Hazelnut oil.
  - Ben oil.
  - Porpoise oil (including body oil and jaw oil).
  - Sperm oil.
  - Arctic sperm oil.
- Whale oil.
- Rosin oil.

II. Solid lubricants:
1. Graphite (including natural graphite, artificial graphite, Atcheson's graphite, colloidal graphite, deflocculated graphite, "Oildag," "Aquadag," or "Waterdag").
2. Mineral jellies.
3. Tallow (including mutton tallow, beef tallow, and goat and buck tallow).
4. All unctuous bodies which do not flow (or flow extremely slowly) at ordinary temperatures containing—
   a. Tallow mixed with any other oil, fat, or mineral jelly.
   b. Any oil, fat, or mineral jelly containing aluminum soap, lead soap, lime soap, or rosin soap.
   c. Commercial forms of lead soap, lime soap, and aluminum soap.
   d. Any oil, fat, or mineral jelly containing water and an alkali, or containing potash or soda soap (but not including "superfatted soaps" of various kinds).
5. Rosin greases or rosin soaps.

Aluminum soap in oleginous solution is also known as oil pulp, thickener, gelatin, and viscom.

[Ambassador W. H. Page to the Secretary of State. No. 1061]

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
London, March 16, 1915.

SIR: In accordance with the instructions of the Department, and confirming my cablegram No. 1780 of the 13th instant, I have the honor to transmit herewith copies, in duplicate, of a proclamation adding to the list of articles to be treated as contraband of war, dated March 11, 1915.

I have, etc.

WALTER HINES PAGE.

[Proclamation, March 11, 1915, adding to the list of articles to be treated as contraband of war]

GEORGE R. I.:

Whereas on the 23d day of December 1914 we did issue our royal proclamation specifying the articles which it was our intention to treat as contraband during the continuance of hostilities or until we did give further public notice; and

Whereas it is expedient to make certain additions to the lists contained in the said proclamation:

Now, therefore, we do hereby declare, by and with the advice of our Privy Council, that during the continuance of the war or until we do give further public notice the following articles will be treated as absolute contraband in addition to those set out in our royal proclamation aforementioned: Raw wool; wool tops and noils and woolen and worsted yarns; tin; chloride of tin; tin ore; castor oil; paraffin wax; copper iodide; lubricants.

Hides of cattle, buffaloes, and horses; skins of calves, pigs, sheep, goats, and deer; leather, undressed or dressed, suitable for saddlery, harness, military boots, or military clothing.

Ammonia and its salts whether simple or compound; ammonia liquor, urea, aniline, and their compounds.

And we do hereby declare that the following articles will be treated as conditional contraband in addition to those set out in our royal proclamation afore-mentioned.

Tanning substances of all kinds (including extracts for use in tanning).

And we do hereby further declare that the terms "foodstuffs" and "feeding stuffs for animals" in the list of conditional contraband contained in our royal proclamation afore-mentioned shall be deemed to include oleaginous seeds, nuts, and kernels; animal and vegetable oils and fats (other than linseed oil) suitable for use in the manufacture of margarine; and cakes and meals made from oleaginous seeds, nuts, and kernels.

Given at our court at Buckingham Palace, this 11th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1915, etc., etc.

[The British Ambassador to the Secretary of State]

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, March 23, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your informal letter of March 20 in which you are good enough to submit certain observations on the British contraband list.

I have not in my possession any further information than that which I have communicated to you, but I expect before long to receive a uniform printed list as revised up to date and I shall take pleasure in sending you a copy so soon as it arrives.

In the list sent to you on March 10 which reached me by post the term "castor oil" was mentioned under the heading of "Principal oils used as lubricants," which were at that time treated as conditional contraband. According to the telegram, of which a copy was sent to you on March 13, "lubricants" were transferred to the list of absolute contraband and castor oil was mentioned separately. Apart from this and in the absence of information to the contrary I understand that the memorandum interpreting the term "lubricants" formerly listed as conditional contraband is to be considered as still interpreting this term as listed under absolute contraband.

The materials enumerated in articles 11 and 12 of the conditional contraband list appear, as you suggest, to have been transferred to the absolute list, but I am unable at the present moment to state definitely that this is so.

I am taking steps to obtain a clear ruling on these points.

CECIL SPRING-RICE.

[The British Ambassador to the Secretary of State]

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, April 10, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: With further reference to your letter of the 20th of March I am informed that the interpretation of lubricants, now absolute contraband, is as follows:

Mineral. Including mineral oils, jellies, or greases of all kinds, pure or compounded; graphite, natural or artificial.

Vegetable. Including vegetable lubricating oils and fats of all kinds, and resin greases, and their mixtures.

Animal. Including all animal oils and fats for use as lubricants, and their mixtures.

Fish. Including whale oil (train, blubber, sperm), seal, or shark oil, and fish oil generally.

Mixtures or compounds of any of the foregoing.

It will be observed that the above definition covers all the articles mentioned in the earlier list of lubricants sent to your Department on March 10, and that it is even more comprehensive inasmuch as it includes mixtures and compounds of these articles.

The whole of the "hides" heading (article 12) in the conditional list of December 23, 1914, may be regarded as transferred to the list of absolute contraband. Harness and saddlery (article 11) remain conditional contraband, unless it falls within article 10 of the absolute list of December 23.

I am, etc.

CECIL SPRING-RICE.

Mr. Speaker, I have inserted a list of articles and materials declared to be contraband by Great Britain and France. Other nations that were engaged in the World War formulated a similar list.

There are three volumes of diplomatic correspondence between the United States and the powers engaged in the World War in which information may be had about controversies that finally involved the United States in that strife.

Many of the ships that were lost were sunk by mines that had broken adrift, and there is one table alone that names 146 vessels destroyed by torpedoes and unknown objects.

I am particularly interested in this because we lost four ships which, after reading the report of the officers, I am compelled to believe was carelessness, in that they did not follow direction laid down by German authorities, the country to which these ships were bound.

I shall now insert a short paragraph which is testimony given by the first officer of the steamship *Carib*, and after having quoted him I shall quote a letter by J. Bernstorff. This will explain to a certain point how accidents may happen and for which those who are innocent may be blamed.

We were in the boats about 1 or 1½ hours and were picked up about 12:45 by the German scout boat *Annie Busse* and kept there 48 hours on account of the fog, when we were taken to Wilhelmshaven. The German officers and crew treated us most courteously and even gave up their beds for us. We reached Wilhelmshaven at noon of the 24th and arrived in Bremerhaven at 10 o'clock that night.

G. H. GIFFORD,
First Officer, Steamship "Carib."

[The German Ambassador to the Secretary of State]
[Translation]

GERMAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1915.

(J. Nr. B 4884.)

Mr. SECRETARY OF STATE: Referring to Your Excellency's kind note of the 5th instant about the sinking of the American steamer *Evelyn*, I have the honor to make to Your Excellency the following communication:

The investigation of the *Evelyn* and *Carib* casualties brought to light the fact that the vessels had on board Dutch, not German, pilots. Those pilots appear to have been furnished by the Rotterdam branch of the English Furness Steamship Co. Those pilots, according to the inquiries made, are not competent to navigate German waters. It was found, for instance, that H. Benne, the pilot taken by the steamer *Osmulgu*, who was formerly a Dutch district pilot but is already on the pension list, declared he knew nothing of a certain sailing direction for the German coast, which is enough to show that he is not fit to steer a vessel to Germany. As a matter of fact, he did not ever observe the sailing directions issued by the German Admiralty for the German coast, and it was just luck that saved the *Osmulgu* from the fate of the *Evelyn*.

The master of the *Evelyn* declared that he sailed through the Channel and had a mine pilot along the English coast. It seems that the English officer who came on board with the pilot told him that he should steer not the northern course, but the southerly course below the East Friesian Islands, which was the course taken by the other steamers. Whereupon he steamed for Rotterdam and there took a pilot. On being asked why he had not steered for Listertief, he replied that he had left everything to the pilot.

According to his chart, the casualty occurred 53°52′ N. 6°7′ E. The pilot, who had the looks of an old Dutch fisherman and made a rather unfavorable impression, declared that he had steered that course because he had heard that other ships had taken it. In reply to a question, he said that he had never come with a ship into the German Bay since the war began.

In order to avert further casualties as much as possible I have the honor to leave it to Your Excellency kindly to consider whether it may not be advisable to warn in such manner as may seem appropriate the American steamship companies concerned against applying to the above-mentioned firms for pilots. I make this recommendation all the stronger as there is reason to suspect that the enemy will spare no efforts to expose ships bound for Germany to danger and that influence is possibly brought to bear on the pilot service. I would in this connection again repeat that the course recommended in Nachrichten für Seefahrer, No. 3161/14 North around Scotland to the guiding buoys of Listertief offers the least danger.

Accept, etc.,

J. BERNSTORFF.

Mr. Speaker, this report clearly shows that there was no cooperation on the part of Great Britain to aid in the safe passage of our ships. These ships were bound to Germany with cotton which was allowable during the early part of the war. Had Great Britain been fair and just, such ships would have been advised to proceed north of Scotland, as requested by Germany. What did England do in these cases? She advised the ships to proceed on the southern route to Holland, where pilot was taken aboard with little interest of safe passage of these ships. He steered them through mine fields where all of them were lost but one. No one could be blamed for this except England.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now quote from the London Declaration in order to show that these articles were not adhered to by Great Britain, but changed to suit her convenience.

[Ambassador Sharp to the Secretary of State]
(Telegram)

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Paris, October 26, 1915.

Following decree published in Journal Officiel today:

Article 1. The provisions of article 57, paragraph 1, of the declaration signed at London, February 26, 1909, relating to naval warfare, shall be applied during the present war, with the following modification to it: Whenever it is established that a ship flying an enemy flag belongs in fact to the nationals of a neutral or an allied country, or conversely that a ship flying a neutral or allied flag belongs in fact to nationals of an enemy country, or to parties residing in an enemy country, the ship shall accordingly be considered neutral, allied, or enemy.

SHARP.

The article 2 was changed in the following manner, to suit the convenience to Great Britain with no regard for neutral rights:

[No. 29338. 10491. Second supplement to the London Gazette of Friday, the 22d of October 1915]

ORDER IN COUNCIL

At the Court at Buckingham Palace, the 20th day of October 1915.

Present, the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.

Whereas by the Declaration of London Order in Council No. 2, 1914, His Majesty was pleased to declare that, during the present hostilities, the provisions of the said Declaration of London should, subject to certain exceptions and modifications therein specified, be adopted and put in force by His Majesty's Government; and

Whereas by article 57 of the said declaration, it is provided that the neutral or enemy character of a vessel is determined by the flag which she is entitled to fly; and

Whereas it is no longer expedient to adopt the said article:

Now, therefore, His Majesty, by and with the advice of His Privy Council, is pleased to order, and it is hereby ordered, that from and after this date article 57 of the Declaration of London shall cease to be adopted and put in force.

In lieu of the said article, British prize courts shall apply the rules and principles formerly observed in such courts.

This order may be cited as "The Declaration of London Order in Council, 1915."

And the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's treasury, the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, and each of His Majesty's principal secretaries of state, the president of the probate, divorce, and admiralty division of the high court of justice, all other judges of His Majesty's prize courts, and all governors, officers, and authorities whom it may concern, are to give the necessary directions herein as to them may respectively appertain.

J. C. LEDLIE.

[Consul General Skinner to the Secretary of State]

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
London, March 31, 1916.

Order in Council, March 30, proclaims important modifications to declaration of London Order in Council No. 2, of October 29, 1914, providing:

First. British possess right to capture goods as conditional contraband whether carriage to destination "be direct or entail transshipment or a subsequent transport by land."

Second. Presumption of enemy destination if goods are consigned to agent of enemy state, or to order, or if ship's papers do not show who is consignee applies to both absolute contraband and conditional contraband.

Third. Enemy destination presumed to exist if goods are consigned—

"To or from a person who during the present hostilities has forwarded imported contraband goods to territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy."

Fourth. In cases covered by second and third regulations it shall lie upon the owner of the goods to prove innocent destination.

Fifth. And from after March 30, article 19 Declaration London ceases to be in force, neither vessel nor cargo shall be immune from capture for breach of blockade upon sole ground that she is destined to nonblockaded port.

SKINNER.

Now, therefore, His Majesty, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, is pleased to order, and it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. The provisions of the Declaration of London Order in Council No. 2, 1914, shall not be deemed to limit or to have limited in any way the right of His Majesty, in accordance with the law of nations, to capture goods upon the grounds that they were conditional contraband, nor to affect or to have affected the liability of conditional contraband to capture, whether the carriage of the goods to their destination be direct or entail transshipment or a subsequent transport by land.

2. The provisions of article 1 (ii) and (iii) of the said Order in Council shall apply to absolute contraband as well as to conditional contraband.

3. The destinations referred to in article 30 and in article 33 of the said declaration shall (in addition to any presumptions laid down in the said order in council) be presumed to exist, if the goods are consigned to or for a person who, during the present hostilities, has forwarded imported contraband goods to territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy.

4. In the cases covered by articles 2 and 3 of this order it shall lie upon the owner of the goods to prove that their destination was innocent.

5. From and after the date of this order article 19 of the declaration of London shall cease to be adopted and put in force. Neither a vessel nor her cargo shall be immune from capture for breach of blockade upon the sole grounds that she is at the moment on her way to a nonblockaded port.

6. This order may be cited as "The Declaration of London Order in Council, 1916." Almeric Fitzroy. * * * It is hereby ordered that the following provisions shall be observed:

(a) The hostile destination required for the condemnation of contraband articles shall be presumed to exist until the contrary is shown if the goods are consigned to or for an enemy authority, or an agent of the enemy state, or to or for a person in territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy, or to or for a person who, during the present hostilities, has forwarded contraband goods to an enemy authority, or an agent of the enemy state, or to or for a person in territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy, or if the goods are consigned "to order," or if the ship's papers do not show who is the real consignee of the goods.

(b) The principle of continuous voyage or ultimate destination shall be applicable both in cases of contraband and of blockade.

(c) A neutral vessel carrying contraband with papers indicating a neutral destination, which, notwithstanding the destination shown on the papers, proceeds to an enemy port, shall be liable to capture and condemnation if she is encountered before the end of her next voyage.

(d) A vessel carrying contraband shall be liable to capture and condemnation if the contraband, reckoned either by value, weight, volume, or freight, forms more than half the cargo.

And it is hereby further ordered as follows:

(i) Nothing herein shall be deemed to affect the Order in Council of the 11th March 1915, for restricting further the commerce of the enemy or any of His Majesty's proclamation declaring the present hostilities.

(ii) Nothing herein shall affect the validity of anything done under the Orders in Council hereby withdrawn.

(iii) Any cause or proceeding commenced in any prize court before the making of this order may, if the court thinks just, be heard and decided under the provisions of the orders hereby withdrawn so far as they were in force at the date when such cause or proceeding was commenced, or would have been applicable in such cause or proceeding if this order had not been made.

This order may be cited as "The Maritime Rights Order in Council, 1916."—Almeric Fitzroy.

Mr. Speaker, it can readily be seen from this that Great Britain did not confine herself to the Declaration of London, but instituted her own declarations instead, with utter disregard for neutral rights. Great Britain even reserved the right to use neutral flags and to arm her merchant ships, both of these in conflict with the Declaration of London. It was this arming of merchant ships and the use of neutral flags that made it dangerous for underwater craft and finally ended in unrestricted warfare. Had England observed a rightful use of neutral flags this vicious submarine warfare could have been avoided, but England did not do so and her reason probably to utilize losses in ships, as a reason for our entry in the World War on the side of Great Britain and France.

This worked in 1917 but I do not believe it will be successful this time because we are better informed. It is also well to bear in mind in the restriction of trade to neutrals, Great Britain issued the black list on trading houses or business in foreign countries, and when a ship was consigned to one of these black-listed firms, she and the cargo was subject to seizure. Let us not forget the British Chamber of Commerce has already issued a black list on several hundred firms located in South America and other neutral countries. This is for no other purpose except to jeopardize American trade to neutrals, and knowing this, why should we aid the perfidity of Albion?

There are 10 pages of these volumes, naming ships that were bound to Scandinavian countries but captured by the English Navy and taken into English ports where cargoes were seized. It was this that led to reprisals and unrestricted warfare by Germany.

I shall now quote a report of what actually happened when German submarines hailed ships flying a neutral flag or ships that did not fly a flag. Time and space will not permit me to name all the instances in which merchant ships when challenged by German submarines, fired on the undersea craft. I shall, however, cite one case, so that the Members may have a better understanding of this warfare.

Date: January 17, 1915.
Place: Middle Mediterranean.
Nationality and name of the ship: English steamship *Melanie*.

PARTICULARS OF SURROUNDING CIRCUMSTANCES

U — signaled a flush-decked freight steamer with raised forecastle and cabin of about 3,000 tons, sailing under the Dutch flag, to send a boat and have the ship's papers examined. This was done after a while. As *U* —, which for safety's sake had gone under, came to the surface about 1,000 meters away from the steamer near the ship's boat, the steamer opened fire with two guns of medium caliber and machine guns so briskly that the *U* — barely saved herself by speedily submerging. Throughout the action, the steamer displayed the Dutch flag; she bore the name of *Melanie* which is found not in the Dutch, but in the English marine list.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not an act which comes within the law of war as agreed to in the London Proclamation. This ship was flying the flag of Holland, or a neutral flag. She was an armed English merchant ship under a neutral flag. She was hailed by a German submarine who asked to examine the papers, which is strictly within international law, but it was not within international law for this English ship to be camouflaged under a neutral flag and, in addition to that, armed. It was incidents of this sort that led to unrestricted warfare, for many of the undersea craft when challenging what appeared to be a neutral merchant ship were sunk by such ship.

There was no belligerent that violated international rules more than Great Britain; as a matter of fact, it is a habit of Great Britain not to obey or to conform to any international rules, as this correspondence clearly shows.

I shall now cite a case of a Danish ship that was followed by a British warship for 200 miles within the territorial water of the United States:

I, the undersigned, Capt. Charles Moller, master of the Danish steamship *Vinland*, herewith beg to make the following report to the American authorities concerned:

I left New York with my ship on the 10th day of November 1915 at 5 a. m., in ballast, for Norfolk, Va., to load a cargo of coal for South America. At 7:15 a. m. dropped pilot at *Scotland Lightship;* about 8:45 a. m. we sighted what later appeared to be a British warship, name unknown, steering a northerly course toward us. We changed our course immediately in order to get close under land and within the 3-mile limit. When abreast of Sea Girt Light, the warship was bearing down on us, and closing in on us rapidly, and were presently hoisting signals for us to stop. We ignored his signals but proceeded on our course, now only 2 miles off land and still getting closer. We, however, dipped our flag in salutation, which was answered by war vessel, at the same time pulling down his signal, but he did not give up following us. We approached the coast within 1 mile all the way.

At 11:30 a. m., passed Barnegat, 1 mile distant.
At 1:15 p. m., passed Brigantine L. V., on port bow.
At 5:35 p. m., passed Hereford light, 3 miles distant.
At 6:35 p. m., passed McCries gas buoy, close inside.

Near 5-fathom-bank light vessel the darkness and haze setting in forced the British ship to get farther out, whereas we took the channel, keeping close to the American coast. Between Hereford light and McCries gas buoy we again sighted the British warship coming around the light vessel, steering toward us. As it was impossible at this spot to keep within the 3-mile limit, we took the Cape May Channel and anchored inside the breakwater for the night. We left the breakwater for Norfolk at 4 a. m. on the 12th, following the coast within the 3-mile limit all the way. As it was hazy, nothing further was seen of the British warship. We arrived at Norfolk at 8:15 p. m., November 12, 1915.

I have marked out our course on the accompanying chart and also the route of the warship, which was inside the 3-mile limit when ordering us to stop.

My ship is in legitimate trade and was in transit from one American port to another American port, and I hereby make record of the occurrence as it happened within American territory, while at the same time I have asked my Government to protest against what is a violation of the international rules governing the seas.

CHAS. MOLLER, *Master, S. S. "Vinland."*

Mr. Speaker, this will give my colleagues an idea to the extent in which the British Navy interferred with our own coastwise shipping and the further interference with neutral shipping from American to other neutral ports. This unwarrantable interference with our shipping became so obnoxious that this letter was addressed to the British Ambassador by the Department of State.

NO. 1016

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 16, 1915.

EXCELLENCY: With reference to Your Excellency's note of the 11th instant in regard to the case of the steamship *Vinland*, in which it is stated that while His Majesty's cruiser did not enter territorial waters of the United States, he "followed the *Vinland* down the coast" from Barnegat Lighthouse to off McCries Shoal Buoy, Cape May, where the commander received orders to return to his "beat," which he did, I have the honor to refer to my informal notes of October 5 and December 22, 1914, and April 16,

1915, calling Your Excellency's attention to the annoyance which His Majesty's cruisers lying off the principal commercial ports of the United States and stopping and searching vessels immediately beyond American waters have given to shipping, both overseas and coastwise, and to the seriousness with which the Government of the United States regarded the hovering of belligerent warships about American coasts and ports.

In reply to my informal notes Your Excellency was good enough to assure me that His Majesty's Government had issued instructions which would prevent further molestation of American commerce in the trade lanes approximate to American waters and to the great ports of the United States. I cannot forbear, therefore, from calling the recent incident in which His Majesty's cruiser practically pursued a neutral vessel bound from one American port to another in ballast for the purpose of loading a cargo of coal for South America, to your Excellency's attention. As His Majesty's Government is aware, this Government has always regarded the practice of belligerent cruisers patrolling American coasts in close proximity to the territorial waters of the United States and making the neighborhood a station for their observations as inconsistent with the treatment to be expected from the naval vessels of a friendly power in time of war, and has maintained that the consequent menace of such proceedings to the freedom of American commerce is vexatious and uncourteous to the United States.

I am constrained, therefore, to request that you lay this matter before His Majesty's Government with the earnest request that instructions be issued to His Majesty's ships to desist from a practice which this Government is convinced has been maintained for long periods at a time and which is peculiarly disagreeable to it and to American traders concerned.

Accept, etc.

ROBERT LANSING.

This diplomatic correspondence should be very enlightening not only to Members of Congress but to the public at large. It is in accordance with past information that has been published since the World War and is, therefore, pertinent at this time because history is now repeating itself.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there is one more speaker this evening, and we reserve the best until the last. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and to include in the extension brief excerpts from a number of publications and documents in order to expedite adjournment here this evening.

Mr. BLOOM. Reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman be a little more specific about what he is going to put in the RECORD?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. A few brief excerpts from publications and documents. I may say that the publications will include several verses from the New Testament of Holy Writ. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does any of it deal with Mordecai Ezekiel?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I do not intend to discuss Mordecai Ezekiel, the real Secretary of Agriculture, at this time, the same Mordecai Ezekiel of the planned economy that destroyed the cotton business of the South.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken the floor at this late hour if it were not for the warlike speech delivered by our New Deal leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. He implied that anyone who opposed the repeal of the arms embargo of our existing neutrality law was lined up with the ungodly, bloody, "red" Communist butchers in Moscow.

For years in and out of Congress I have actively opposed and exposed Communist activities in America and I have not changed my position as has the gentleman from Massachusetts, who now favors repealing the arms embargo. I have consistently opposed repeal of the arms embargo in the past and now oppose its repeal as provided in the pending Bloom-Baruch credit-and-carry war promotion bill which our New Deal brethren have disguised in the robes of cash-and-carry neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Democratic colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], cited the language contained in section 7, subsections (a) and (b).

Under this language foreign nations can, prior to the President's proclamation, issue their obligations in America with the sky the limit, and refinance them under the provisions of subsection (b) after the President proclaims that a state of war exists. Two New Deal leaders, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], admitted that under section 7 financial transactions and extension of credit after the President's proclamation was prohibited insofar as belligerent nations, their political subdivisions, and agents were concerned, but permitted in the case of all persons who are residents of said belligerent nations and their political subdivisions. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has also pointed out that various Government agencies of our Federal Government could raid the Federal Treasury and give hand-outs and credit to belligerent nations engaged in war. Mr. Speaker, this is not a cash-and-carry measure, but a pure, unadulterated credit-and-carry proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill because it repeals the arms embargo of our existing neutrality law, because it is a credit-and-carry proposition, and because it gives the President too much authority and power.

I do not intend to vote our New Deal fuehrer in the White House the vast discretionary authority vested under this fake neutrality bill. Let us look at the first section of the bill which reads:

> That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states.

Now, can we expect our New Deal President to find when a state of war exists? A bloody war has been raging in China for many months. The Communist forces of "red" Russia have moved in and taken possession of about half of Poland, and our New Deal President has not been able to find that a state of war exists in China or Poland, for he has failed to apply the arms embargo to Japan and Russia as required under our existing law.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to vote any more authority to President Roosevelt because I have no confidence in him. When we examine the record, we find that he repeatedly talks one way and acts another. The President promised to cut the cost of government 25 percent, and the records indicate he has increased the annual cost of our Federal Government more than 100 percent. For a number of years he has boasted that our existing arms embargo was a great instrument of peace which would help keep America out of war. He has about-faced again and now demands the embargo repeal in the name of keeping America out of war. Our New Deal President talks one way and acts another. He changes his position like the wind. He reminds me of the man on the flying trapeze. Whenever I study the record of our New Deal President, I am reminded of a speech delivered on January 12, 1848, in the House of Representatives by Abraham Lincoln, then a Representative in Congress. In referring to the President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln said:

> The President is in nowise satisfied with his own positions. First, he takes up one, and in attempting to argue us into it he argues himself out of it, then seizes another and goes through the same process, and then, confused at being able to think of nothing new, he snatches up the old one again, which he has some time before cast off. His mind, taxed beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which it can settle down and be at ease.

Mr. Speaker, this pending Bloom-Baruch bill is a pure unadulterated credit-and-carry war-promotion measure which our New Deal brethren have disguised in robes of cash-and-carry neutrality. It would repeal the arms, munitions, and war-implement embargo of our present neutrality law, and its enactment would be a long step in the direction of dragging our country into another European war.

I am opposed to Uncle Sam's financing, aiding, or abetting wars of foreign nations and supplying them with sinews of war under a cash and carry or any other system.

Foreign governments which are now engaged in war owe our Government more than $11,000,000,000, most of which was handed to them during the last World War Democratic administration, and many billions even after the armistice. This report from the Secretary of the Treasury indicates that on March 1, 1939, Great Britain owed our American taxpayers' Treasury $5,419,388,374.72; Soviet Russia owed $385,372,179.65; France owed $4,160,824,820.69; and Germany owed $1,251,417,749.70.

Mr. Speaker, in view of our national debt which has now passed $41,000,000,000, in addition to many more billions of obligations which Uncle Sam has guaranteed, it is about time that we move to collect the billions of dollars which foreign governments owe us instead of continuing to play Santa Claus to them in a big way.

Mr. Speaker, a great Democratic President, Andrew Jackson, told a foreign debt-defaulting nation to pay its honest debt. He sent a message to Congress asking for the enactment of legislation to collect a French debt by levying on the assets in the United States of the French Government and her nationals. France then paid without any further quibbling.

Mr. Speaker, since our foreign debtor nations have the cash to finance their present and future wars, they should use it to pay their honest debts, which they owe our country. If they do not, we should follow the principle enunciated by President Jackson and foreclose on their holdings in America and the holdings of their nationals, and collect as the New Deal has been collecting from distressed American citizens who, through no fault of their own, are unable to meet their tax, home loan, farm loan, and other payments due our Government.

Let us have a moratorium on the New Deal foreclosures on the homes and farms of our distressed American farmers and home owners, and let the New Deal devote its foreclosure and collection energies and activities to collecting the many billions of dollars which foreign nations now owe our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury, and on which debt they have refused to pay even one penny of the interest.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to giving any President of the United States the vast discretionary authority contained in the pending bill. I am particularly opposed to giving such authority to President Roosevelt, who is a former international banker of wide experience and a member of whose family has recently married a member of the war-munitions family of Du Pont, and whose son has been in the business of selling military airplanes to foreign nations.

History reveals that international bankers and munitions makers promote, propagandize and profit by war, while the great rank and file of the people pay, fight, suffer, and die.

When we examine the record, we find that President Roosevelt is far from being a man of peace as he claimed to be when asking for the enactment of the pending bill. His Chicago quarantine speech and his loose talk about aiding one side in every way short of war is certainly not peaceful or neutral. I cannot vote to give an ex-international banker President the vast discretionary authority as proposed in the pending bill. President Roosevelt wrote the foreword of the prospectus for the Federal International Banking Corporation and was hooked up in it with Robert Rowland Appleby, president of the British Empire Chamber of Commerce in the United States. This corporation, according to the prospectus which I have in my hand was organized for the selling of foreign bonds and securities to the American people.

I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of page 31 of the New York Times of September 14, 1922, in which appears an advertisement of a new issue of 600,000,000 German marks floated by United European Investors, Ltd., Franklin D. Roosevelt, president.

This advertisement states—

> The company's facilities and connections enable it to secure attractive and sound investments; the directors will take advantage of the present money stringency in Germany, and of the purchasing power of the mark, which is far greater than is reflected by exchange quotations.

Mr. Speaker, I hold here in my hand a photostatic copy of page 1480 of Poor's Register of Directors, 1929, wherein Franklin Delano Roosevelt is shown as a director of the International Germanic Trust Co.

I now hold in my hand a photostatic copy of a page from the Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory, of January 1933, volume 1, page 754, showing a legal advertisement of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, an investment banker-attorney.

Mr. Speaker, if we give our ex-international banker New Deal President the authority provided in this bill, we can expect to find that it is a long step on the road to war.

I have no more faith in the President's being sincere in his loud protestations that he desires to keep America out of the new European conflict than I had when he claimed to have driven the money changers from the temple of our Government. The records conclusively show that he did not drive the money changers from the temple of our Government, but drove them into it with the help of his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, the son of an international banker who married the favorite niece of the Lehman brothers, who are among the most powerful international bankers in America.

Mr. Speaker, under New Deal international policies, the interests of our American people are sacrificed for the benefit of internationalists in other lands.

Under the Roosevelt New Deal gold-and-silver policies, the international bankers, foreign owners of and speculators in gold waxed fat when Mr. Roosevelt forced Americans to turn in their gold for $20.67 an ounce or go to jail for 5 years and then imported $10,469,100,000 worth of gold from foreign owners at $35 an ounce, according to the Treasury Department letter of October 26, 1939, which I have in my hand.

In many respects, such as being an apostle of peace, reducing the cost of Government 25 percent, and driving the money changers from the temple, when we examine the facts and the record of President Roosevelt, we find, like Isaac of old, "the voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

Mr. Speaker, I approach the pending bill from an American standpoint. I am a native-born American citizen, and I owe my first allegiance to our American Government and our American people. I have no personal sympathies for either side of the present European conflict. One of my grandparents came from England, another came from Alsace-Loraine, and two came from Germany. I do not want any carping critic to tell me I am pro this or pro that or anti this or anti that. The only pro that is in me is pro-Americanism, and I do not apologize for it. [Applause.]

It was brought out on the floor of the House today that Mr. Goldenweiser, a Government official, indicated that England and France had almost $2,000,000,000 worth of gold and about $7,000,000,000 worth of securities in the United States which they could use for purchases if the pending bill is enacted.

Since England and France on March 1, 1939, owed Uncle Sam's almost bankrupt Federal Treasury a total of $9,580,213,195.41, they should be called upon to pay what they owe us and use the assets mentioned by Mr. Goldenweiser to do so. I favor a cash-and-carry policy, to wit: Let England and France use those billions which Mr. Goldenweiser says they now have in the United States to repay the billions which they carried away during the last World War.

Mr. Speaker, in view of our national debt, which is now more than $40,000,000,000, in addition to many more billions of obligations which Uncle Sam has guaranteed, is it not time that Uncle Sam moves to collect the billions of dollars which foreign governments owe him instead of continuing to play Santa Claus to them, as he has under the New Deal, and as proposed in the pending war-promotion bill, which has been dressed up as a neutrality measure?

Mr. Speaker, since our foreign debtor nations have the cash to finance new wars, they should be called upon to use it to repay the billions which they owe our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury and which they carried from America

during and after their last World War, when another Democrat-liberal administration was in power. You and I know what a Democrat-liberal is—liberal with other people's money, even though the second, third, fourth, and fifth generations have to sweat and toil to produce it. Uncle Sam should make a demand that our foreign debt-defaulting nations pay their honest debts to him. If they do not, we should follow the advice of Andrew Jackson, that great Democratic President, and foreclose on their holdings and the holdings of their nationals, and collect as the New Deal is collecting from distressed American citizens who, through no fault of their own, are unable to meet their tax, home-loan, farm-loan, and other payments due our Government.

Let us have a moratorium on the New Deal foreclosures on the homes and farms of our distressed American farmers and home owners, and let the New Deal devote its foreclosure-collection energies and activities to collecting the many billions of dollars which foreign nations owe our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury and refuse to even pay one penny interest on.

The New Deal would be rendering a splendid service to our country and our countrymen if they would do so.

Mr. Speaker, our country should not directly or indirectly help either side in the new European conflict. Some say that we should aid the democracies in every possible manner short of war. This war is not a war of democracies. It is a war of power politics which we should keep out of.

France, England, Russia, and Germany are not democracies. The British Empire was built on bloody wars of conquest and oppression. So was the so-called Republic of France. Only a few years ago, the French Government was in the control of a Communist-Socialist coalition under Blum, and the present Premier and Dictator of France, Daladier, was the right-hand man in the Communist-Socialist coalition government of Blum. At that time they made an offensive and defensive alliance with the ungodly, un-Christian Communist butchers in Moscow.

Only a very few weeks ago the British were trying to make a triple offensive and defensive alliance between Russia, France, and England. Only 30 seconds before the Russian bear jumped in bed with Hitler the French frog was in bed with the Russian bear and Johnny Bull was trying to jump in bed with them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. That was the record before the purge in Moscow of Finkelstein, the former Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, who changed his name to Litvinoff. The front-page headline of the July 3, 1939, Washington Post reads, "Russia accepts triple alliance, London reports."

Mr. Speaker, can it be said that Russia was a democracy on July 3, 1939, before the fall of Finkelstein, alias Litvinoff? Why does England and France, who claim to be fighting to preserve democracy, take the position that after the war is over the Russian bear can keep one-half of Poland, which she has taken?

Mr. Speaker, the American people are about fed up with the propaganda which a few months ago was trying to line us up with France, England, and Communist Russia in the name of democracies, and since the fall of Finkelstein has been trying to line us up with France and England against Russia in the name of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who has supported the arms embargo in the past, has changed his position and by inference at least now claims that those who still support the embargo are giving aid and comfort to the Communists in Moscow.

His change of front and his alibi will scare and fool no one. I have fought communism in and out of the Halls of Congress. The Communists have actively opposed me in political campaigns and have supported my New Deal opponents. They have picketed my home and threatened my life on numerous occasions because of my opposition to them. I was certainly surprised at the position taken by the New Deal leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. For his particular benefit let us look at a portion of the record which reveals that the New Deal forces which are behind the pending bill have been coddling the "red" Communist bear. We know that the Communist "reds" in Russia have effaced in blood every trace of justice, liberty, morality, and individual human and private property rights. They have not only repealed the Ten Commandments of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe but have confiscated private and church property, destroyed sacred rights and liberties and lives of millions of people including the clergy and sisters of mercy in order to shackle the people of Russia in bonds of regimented political slavery. Among the leaders in the butchery was Mr. Samuel Ginsberg, alias General Krivitsky, who the New Deal permitted to enter and remain in the United States although he testified before the Dies committee that for 17 years he was a big shot in the Communist intelligence service abroad. Another notable leader in the Russian "red" revolution was Mr. Finkelstein, alias Litvinoff, who until very recently was the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs. This same Mr. Litvinoff came to America shortly after the New Deal got control of our Federal Government and made the arrangements for our New Deal President to recognize Soviet Russia on November 16, 1933.

The New Deal administration in Washington was so impressed with communism as preached and practiced in Moscow that shortly thereafter it commenced to advocate, effectuate, and emulate the planned economy of the Soviet conception of regimented bureaucracy. Shortly thereafter, in early 1934, according to the sworn testimony of the aviation expert, Mr. Anthony H. S. Fokker, before the special Senate committee investigating the munitions industry and the October 1936 issue of the Aero Digest, Mr. Elliott Roosevelt made a deal with Fokker to sell the Communist Russian Government 50 Douglas military airplanes of Lockheed make. Mr. Fokker's testimony revealed that the agreement which he signed with Mr. Elliott Roosevelt was a special agreement for the sale of these planes to Russia, and when questioned concerning why he had signed an agreement for such a large commission of $500,000 to Mr. Roosevelt and $500,000 to himself, Mr. Fokker explained that he had not felt that the prices which it was proposed to charge the Russians for these 50 military planes were at all reasonable and, in fact, he had thought them notably excessive but that he had been persuaded by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Roosevelt's associate, Mr. Stratton, that Mr. Roosevelt had enough influence with the Export-Import Bank and the Russian Purchasing Commission, then in this country, to swing the deal at that excessive price.

According to an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, President Roosevelt, on November 7, 1938 (the twenty-first "birthday" of Soviet Russia) sent the following cable to President Mikhail Kalinin, of Russia:

His Excellency MIKHAIL KALININ,
President, All-Union Central Executive Committee,
Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Upon this national anniversary please accept my felicitations and sincere good wishes for the well-being of the people of your country.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a Communist Party campaign document circulated in Wisconsin during the 1938 political campaign. I quote from this campaign document as follows:

A smashing victory for the New Deal nationally and for the Progressive administration in Wisconsin will consolidate the gains of the New Deal and make possible a new push forward.

Every new dealer and supporter of Roosevelt should vote to reelect the Progressive administration in the State, to reelect a Progressive legislature and elect supporters of Roosevelt to Congress and the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this remarkable campaign document was authorized, paid for, and circulated by the Communist Party of

Wisconsin, 744 North Fourth Street, room 329, Milwaukee, Wis., as shown on the document.

Mr. Speaker, Associated Press reports for Tuesday, September 19, 1939, indicate that Mr. Sam Carp, the self-described brother-in-law of Vyacheslav Molotov, Soviet Premier, in testifying before the Dies committee, said that in 1936 he had $100,000,000 of Soviet money to buy two 35,000-ton battleships in the United States, and that he had employed Mr. Preston McGoodwin, a former assistant to Mr. Charles Michelson, the New Deal propaganda commissar of the Democratic National Committee, as a contact man. Mr. Sam Carp also testified that he had employed Mr. Scott Ferris, who was the Democratic national committeeman from Oklahoma, as a lawyer with a $32,000 fee.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the records which indicate that prior to Mr. Litvinoff's demotion as Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs the New Deal administration was not very unfriendly to the bloody "red" Communist butchers in Moscow. In view of the record, I for one, resent the attempt of the New Deal spokesman to directly or by innuendo accuse those of us who are opposing the repeal of the arms embargo and the enactment of the pending Bloom bill of giving aid and comfort to the Communists in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I resent that implication. I fought these ungodly Communists and I intend to fight them in the future as I have in the past. I do not intend to be swerved from my duty by any false accusations, be they direct or by innuendo. I am just as much of a Christian as the Member who boasted of his Christianity while he denounced us as supporting ungodly Communist forces because we are opposed to the repeal of the embargo. I was born a Christian American, I was raised a Christian American, I still am a Christian American, and when I die I will die a Christian American. I then want the red, white, and blue wrapped around me, the flag which the Government of the United States will furnish because of my 22 months' overseas service in 1917, 1918, and 1919 under that flag when I was doing my bit to help "make the world safe for democracy." [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, when we examine the record we find that we made the world safe for dictatorships and made America safe for Old Man Depression.

Mr. Speaker, let us take care of our interests at home. Our American interests are in America and not in foreign lands. Let us not take sides with foreign belligerent nations.

I am opposed to foreign entanglements and alliances, engaging in wars in other lands, meddling in the affairs of foreign nations, and taking sides in their controversies. I shall oppose sending our boys to fight on foreign battlefields for the benefit of international bankers, munition makers, war profiteers, and foreign countries. The place for American manhood is on top of American soil and not under foreign mud.

I respectfully suggest to my colleague from Massachusetts, who has changed his position on the arms embargo and has defended his change in defense of Christianity as opposed to communism, that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Father, said, "Thou shalt not kill." I am opposed to repealing the arms embargo of our existing neutrality law so that America can furnish arms, munitions, and implements of war with which to slaughter people in other lands in violation of the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said, "Thou shalt not kill."

I ask my colleague from Massachusetts to also remember that our Lord Jesus Christ also said: "No man can serve two masters," and "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

Mr. Speaker, I choose to oppose the repeal of the arms embargo as I believe such opposition to conform to the works and faith of Christianity, the contention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to the contrary notwithstanding. I take this position notwithstanding the highly organized and widely disseminated propaganda of international war monger Sadducees, Scribes, and Pharisees in favor of its repeal and the enactment of the pending Bloom bill.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the Wolcott amendment which replaces some of the credit-and-carry features of this bill with cash-and-carry provisions. I shall vote for the pending Shanley amendment which retains our existing embargo on arms, munitions, and implements of war and shall vote against the pending Vorys amendment to the Shanley amendment, as this amendment will permit the shipment of many implements of war which are included in the arms embargo of our existing Neutrality Act. I know the heat has been turned on and that many Members who a few months ago voted to retain the arms embargo will change their position and that the Wolcott, Vorys, and Shanley amendments will be defeated. I shall then vote against the bill as it is clearly a credit-and-carry war-promotion measure which our New Deal brethren have disguised in robes of cash-and-carry neutrality. I am opposed to making America an arsenal and base of war supplies for any foreign belligerent nation engaged in war. I am particularly opposed to furnishing sinews of war to foreign nations who now owe our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury many billions of dollars and refuse to even pay a penny interest on their honest debt.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I shall vote against an early adjournment of this special session of Congress as I am of the firm opinion that Congress should remain in continuous session in order to help in the solution of many highly important domestic and foreign problems which vitally affect our country and our countrymen. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of copper in connection with the proposed trade agreement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech by the Honorable Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War.

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

There was no objection.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state for the RECORD that the time used tonight by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] will have nothing to do with the allotment of time tomorrow. We will start even as to time at that time. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used considerable more time than I have, but that is not to be deducted from his time tomorrow.

Mr. FISH. That was a mutual agreement, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 2, 1939, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution calling for the continuous session of Congress until January 3, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIES:

H. Res. 321. Resolution for the continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. FITZPATRICK introduced a bill (H. R. 7614) for the relief of George Schlessinger, also known as H. George Westpfal, which was referred 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:

5851. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of J. J. Handsaker, of Portland, Oreg., and others, requesting the retention of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5852. Also, petition of Helen Casati, of Riddle, Oreg., and others, petitioning the retention of the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5853. Also, petition of F. A. Schumann, of Portland, Oreg., and others, petitioning the retention of the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5854. Also, petition of Edward A. Williams, of Portland, Oreg., and others, petitioning the retention of the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5855. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 2,000 members of the Council of Women Opposed to Participation in Foreign Wars, of Newark and Licking County, Ohio, protesting against the taking of any step whatsoever on the part of our Government which would tend to send American sons to another war on foreign soil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5856. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the College Point (Long Island) Taxpayers Association, opposing any change in the Embargo Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1939

Dr. George W. Truett, pastor of the First Baptist Church, of Dallas, Tex., offered the following prayer:

We make our appeal to Thee, our gracious Heavenly Father, because we understand better and better all the while that every mercy and blessing of life comes directly from Thy gracious hand. Thou art worthy of all gratitude and praise. Rightly has Thy name been called "Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." We would glorify Thee as Lord over all and blessed forevermore. We would hallow Thy name, holy and great, in all the relations and experiences of life. We would make our most grateful acknowledgment unto Thee because of Thy mercies, which fail not unto us, and we have found them to be all-sufficient for us. What shall we render unto the Lord for all his benefits toward us? We would not only take His proffered cup of salvation and call upon His name as long as we live but we would put our trust in Him, remembering his promise that "whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe"; and we would make proof of our friendship for the great Master by faithfully doing what He bids us to do. We pray, above every other prayer, that Thy kingdom may come and that Thy will may be done in earth as it is in heaven.

In these poignantly troubled days, our Father, we have been made again to drink the wine of astonishment because of the trying conditions, turbulent and terrible, throughout the earth. Clouds and darkness are around about us oftentimes, but we would remember that righteousness and judgment are the habitations of Thy throne and that Thy throne shall not be disturbed. Our prayer is that God shall so rule and overrule in the affairs of our troubled world as that everywhere righteousness shall be vindicated and the holy name of God glorified and somehow our humanity be lifted upward and carried forward.

We pray for our own dear land for which Thou hast been a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. We pray for the President of this country and all who are joined with him in authority. Give wisdom and strength all-sufficient from Thine own infinite self to all those who rule and administer in the affairs of civil government. May they and all the people the land over understand more acutely every day that it is righteousness that exalteth a nation and that sin is not only a reproach but, in the end, wasting and destruction in every instance.

We pray for this great body of men and give deep and devout thanks for them all. May their interests be precious in God's sight.

We are minded now to pray especially for the honored Member of this body who has been called away by the sorrow of the homegoing of his dear wife. May all needed comfort from God be given him and the household, and may all the interests of all these men and their households be precious today and ever in the sight of God. Our prayer is offered in the Great Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, October 31, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CLAIM OF ANASTASIO A. YLAGAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Anastasio A. Ylagan (postal employee), San Francisco, Calif., relative to a claim against the United States in connection with his removal from the Postal Service in alleged violation of section 43 of the Postal Rules and Regulations, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

REVIVAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTAIN LETTERS PATENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Bernard C. Whitman, of New York City, N. Y., enclosing complaint and exhibits pertaining to the matter of Bernard C. Whitman (plaintiff) against Hon. William I. Sirovich, chairman of the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives (defendant), in re Irving A. Whitman, as trustee of Vincent I. Whitman, for the revival of his four applications for United States letters patent through verified petitions for redress of grievances before the Committees on Patents of the Congress, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Patents.

MEMORIAL

Mr. HOLT presented a resolution of the Woman's Club of Hurricane, W. Va., protesting against the enactment of any legislation that might directly or indirectly involve the United States in war, which was ordered to lie on the table.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENT WITH ARGENTINA—AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Mr. WILEY presented a letter addressed by him to Mr. John P. Gregg, Committee for Reciprocity Information, Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
October 18, 1939.

Mr. JOHN P. GREGG,
Committee for Reciprocity Information, Old Land Office Building, Eighth and E Streets, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREGG: Please incorporate in the records of the current hearings on the proposed reciprocal-trade agreement with Argentina, the following statement as an expression of my views:

I realize that the negotiations with Argentina may offer an opportunity for the United States to garner some of the Argentine trade which in times of peace went normally to Europe.

I realize further that an agreement with this progressive country might strengthen our commercial ties in a manner that might serve as an example throughout the entire Western Hemisphere. In fact, it is apparent that the idea of expanding the Argentine market for our industrial exports is wholly constructive.

It is equally apparent, however, that in order to create this expanded market, it is necessary that we take a larger volume of Argentine exports. These exports unfortunately are largely competitive with our farm products. This is a serious objection unless it can be demonstrated that the resultant increase in domestic industrial activity would be sufficient to expand our domestic agricultural market sufficiently to absorb both this new