9216. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Transport Workers' Union of America, Local No. 182, Boston, Mass., urging that all labor employed under the terms of all contracts with corporations or individuals be employed in strict accordance with the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

9217. Also, petition of the Transport Workers' Union of America, Local No. 182, Boston, Mass., urging that the Government should call upon the Nation's youth to enlist voluntarily; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9218. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution submitted by R. T. Fairey, department adjutant, American Legion, Columbia, S. C., and passed by the Twenty-second Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C., July 23, 1940, endorsing and recommending prompt action on various important matters connected with the building of our defense program and the taking of vigorous action to stamp out all "fifth columnists," etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9219. Also, petition of E. Dobson Still, of Barnwell, S. C., and signed by sundry people of Barnwell, S. C., stating that they are 100 percent for the sending of aid to England without delay and requesting that as many destroyers as this country can afford to let England have without weakening our defense be made available; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9220. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Sam Livingston, president, Paducah Junior Chamber of Commerce, Paducah, Ky., concerning compulsory military training bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9221. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Beaver County Particular Council of the St. Vincent DePaul Society, representing parishes from Aliquippa, West Aliquippa, Ambridge, Baden, Beaver, Beaver Falls, and Midland, opposing any and all provisions which do not exempt ministers of religion, seminarians, divinity students, and brothers in the Burke-Wadsworth Selective Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9222. By Mr. THOMASON: Resolution of the Davis-Seamon Post, No. 812, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, endorsing the President's plan for the formation of a home-defense unit of former service men and tendering its service and the services of its membership to the President for service in any capacity when and wherever called upon to serve; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9223. Also, petition of residents of Royalty, Tex., expressing advocacy of preparedness and a conscription act that should exempt no person within the age limits imposed because of occupation or profession; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9224. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Barbour, Garnett, Pickett & Keith, of Fairfax, Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9225. Also, petition of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the record of Gen. William Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9226. Also, petition of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 4164, the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9227. Also, petition of J. D. Mahoney, M. D., of Norristown, Pa., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the compulsory conscription bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9228. Also, petition of the San Francisco Coordinating Council for Peace, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, August 5, 1940)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, the King eternal, who dividest the day from the darkness, and turnest the shadow of death into the morning: Drive far from us all wrong desires, incline our hearts to keep Thy law, and guide our feet into the way of peace; that, having done Thy will with cheerfulness while it was day, we may, when the night draweth nigh, rejoice to give Thee thanks. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KING, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, August 26, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KING. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lee	Schwartz
Andrews	Donahey	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Downey	Lucas	Sheppard
Austin	Ellender	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bailey	George	McCarran	Slattery
Bankhead	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Barbour	Gibson	Maloney	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Mead	Taft
Bone	Green	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Tobey
Burke	Harrison	Norris	Truman
Byrd	Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	White
Connally	King	Reynolds	Wiley
Danaher	La Follette	Russell	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent on public business.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] are unavoidably absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT ON THE OPIUM AND NARCOTIC-DRUG TRAFFIC

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Bureau of Narcotics for the year ended December 31, 1939, on the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. HOLT presented the petition of members of the Wiley Ford, W. Va., Church of the Brethren, praying for peace and noninvolvement of the United States in war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the prompt enactment of pending selective compulsory military training legislation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of pending selective compulsory military-training legislation, the rendering of aid, short of war, to Great Britain, the transfer of 50 over-age or surplus American destroyers to the British Government, and speed-up of the national-defense program, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution of the Cumberland (Md.) Local of the Workers Alliance of America, protesting against the enactment in peacetime of selective compulsory military training legislation and also against involvement of the United States in war, which was ordered to lie on the table.

RELIEF OF JOHN TOMLINGSON—PETITION

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement. I have here a petition which is a rather remarkable and unusual one. It appears to be signed by about 200 persons, though I have not counted them. It comes from the One Hundred and Seventy-second Infantry of the Vermont National Guard, whose members are citizens of my State and who were in training at the First Army maneuvers in northern New York with the Eighty-sixth Infantry Brigade, Forty-third Division, North Stockholm, N. Y. It urges me, as a Senator from Vermont, to try to get the Senate to pass a certain bill—namely, Senate bill 3657 of the present Congress, introduced by Hon. Ernest W. Gibson, Sr., late a Senator from the State of Vermont—for the relief of John Tomlingson, of Rutland, Vt., who formerly was a sergeant instructor of the Vermont National Guard for over 15 years.

I announce that I shall do all I properly can do to have the Senate pass that bill.

I ask leave to file this petition, but do not ask to have it printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition presented by the Senator from Vermont will be received and lie on the table, as the bill referred to is now on the calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 299) authorizing certain governmental agencies to make a study of workmen's compensation with a view to its applicability to seamen, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 295) to pay a gratuity to Muriel Thompson (submitted by Mr. MEAD on the 13th instant), reported it without amendment.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on August 26, 1940, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 419. An act for the relief of Luke A. Westenberger; and

S. J. Res. 286. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to authorize the President to order members and units of reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into active military service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBSON:

S. 4305. A bill to provide for the common defense through the establishment and maintenance of military colleges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 4306 (by request). A bill relating to conveyances made by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

My Mr. MINTON:

S. 4307. A bill for the relief of Anchor Stove & Range Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 4308. A bill for the relief of Arvy A. Lothman; to the Committee on Claims.

CIVIL LIABILITIES OF PERSONS IN MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GURNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4270) to promote and strengthen the national defense by suspending enforcement of certain civil liabilities of certain persons serving in the Military and Naval Establishments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

AID FURNISHED BY W. P. A. TO SOUTHERN NEGROES—LETTER BY LAWRENCE M. PINCKNEY

[Mr. BYRNES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a reply by Lawrence M. Pinckney to an article written by Mr. Archibald Rutledge and published in the South Atlantic Monthly entitled "The Negro and the New Deal," which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—EDITORIALS FROM WALLACE'S FARMER

[Mr. LUNDEEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD five editorials from Wallace's Farmer on various aspects of the foreign policy of the United States, which appear in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD ON CONSCRIPTION

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of August 24, 1940, entitled "Blocking the Draft Is Blocking Defense," which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD ON WENDELL WILLKIE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of August 24, 1940, relative to Wendell Willkie, which appears in the Appendix.]

SELECTIVE COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4164) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, last evening the Senate adopted an amendment whereby the reemployment provisions of this bill were made the same as those of the National Guard bill. At this time I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate adopted subsection (c) of my amendment, which is printed on page 16660, in reference to insurance benefits. I ask to reconsider the vote on that subsection only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which that subsection of the amendment was adopted is reconsidered.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I offer as an amendment to subsection (c) the amendment offered by me which was adopted yesterday by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to; and, without objection, the amendment as amended is agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS' amendment was to insert the following in lieu of subsection (c) of Mr. GURNEY's amendment:

(c) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) shall be considered during the period of service in such forces as on furlough or leave of absence; and shall be so restored without loss of seniority; and shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer at the time of being inducted into such forces; and shall not be discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration.

Mr. SMATHERS obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLT. I want the Senator to know that what I am about to say will take 2 or 3 minutes. Does the Senator object to that?

Mr. SMATHERS. No; go ahead.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, the Boston Herald has editorially decided to take to task the Senator from Massa-

chusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and myself because of our discussion of the conscription bill.

I have no objection to the Boston Herald taking any Senator to task. It is its privilege to do so; but behind the Boston Herald is a story which I think the Senate should know. In other words, the Boston Herald is not disinterested in this bill. It may also interest the Senate to know that this is the same newspaper which has had filed against it charges of violation of the Wagner Act, charges of refusing to bargain with its employees, and its employees called it irresponsible, contemptible, and unscrupulous. That is not the statement of the Senator from West Virginia, but is the statement of some of its employees. It is tied up with the power interests of New England, and its directors are tied up with the firm of J. Pierpont Morgan & Co. Therefore, it is not at all without interest in this particular debate; and the directors of the Boston Herald are profiting personally as the result of this war. No wonder they want the conscription bill to go through without discussion.

I do not want to delay the Senator from New Jersey, who has so generously given me time to speak; but I ask that following my remarks there be placed in the RECORD a list of the directors of the Boston Herald, their directorships, and their connections with the war industries. Let the people have the facts, and they will find that the press in Boston is not as free as it pretends to be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Directors of Boston Herald: George R. Brown, John L. Hall, James Garfield, Horace A. Hildreth, Channing H. Cox, S. W. Winslow, Jr., and Casper Ranger.

Directorships of directors:

George R. Brown: United Shoe Machinery Corporation, vice president and director; Boston Herald Traveler Corporation, director; First National Bank of Boston, director; United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Corporation, director.

John L. Hall: Merchants National Bank, director; Boston Herald Travelers Corporation, director; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, director; Massachusetts Fire & Marine Insurance Co., director; New York, Ontario & Western Railway, director; New York, Westchester & Boston Railway, director; Boston Railway Holding Co., director; Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., director; Connecticut Co., director.

Channing H. Cox: Old Colony Trust Co., president and director; United Fruit Co., director; Boston Five Cent Saving Bank, trustee; Boston Herald Traveler Corporation, director; Union Safe Deposit Vaults, trustee; Boston Chamber of Commerce, director.

S. W. Winslow, Jr.: United Shoe Manufacturing Corporation, president and director; Boston Blacking Co., president and director; First National Bank of Boston, director; Island Creek Coal Co., director; United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., member of executive committee and director; United States Shoe Manufacturing Co. of Canada, Ltd., president and director; W. W. Cross & Co., Inc., president and director; S. A. Felton & Son Co., president and director; O. A. Miller Treeing Machine Co., president and director; United Awl and Needle Co., president and director; Turner Tanning Machine Co., president and director; United Last Co., president and director; Boston Herald Traveler Corporation, president and director; Boston Sand & Gravel Co., director; United Shoe Repair Machine Co., president and director; Campbell Bosworth Machine Co., president and director; Felton United Brush Co., president and director; Security Eyelet Co., president and director; John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., director; United Shoe Machinery Co. of Cuba, Mexico, and South America, director; United Last Co. (Canada) Ltd., director.

COMPANY GETS GOVERNMENT CONTRACT

In the bulletin of the Department of Labor, Division of Public Contracts, for August 24, 1940 (the last issue), the following contract is reported: United Shoe Machinery Corporation: Guns, $1,316,485.60.

It is also noted in the reports that other contracts have been let to the corporations of which the directors of Boston Herald are directors. These contracts run into millions in recent weeks.

Wall Street Journal states in its August 10, 1940, issue:

"WHAT WAR MEANS TO WESTINGHOUSE

"War, or even preparation to resist war, makes heavy demands upon the capital goods industries, and accordingly these industries make heavy demands on such companies as Westinghouse Electric to furnish them with the equipment to meet their requirements.

"To operate the machinery needed to produce munitions and other war material, power is needed, and electricity is now the generally accepted medium of securing such power. Westinghouse Electric has long been in the business of manufacturing electric generators of all sizes * * *.

"Another and equally important branch of the company's business is the manufacture of turbines to furnish the initial power to the generators to move ships and to supply energy for many other operations. The United States Navy and the mercantile marine are both equally good customers for Westinghouse turbines."

And, further, the article states that the earnings per share increased from $2.37 a share in the first 6 months of 1939 to $3.68 in the same period in 1940, and predicts an earning power of $8 or more per share for this year. The article shows the value of war and war preparations for this corporation.

Who is one of the directors? A director of the Boston Herald.

COMPANIES LOCATED IN BELLIGERENT COUNTRY

A check of the corporations listed above will show that some are located in a country that is now a belligerent.

It is also noted that two of the directors of the Herald are also directors in the United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Corporation. Those type corporations have larger profits and sales during and in preparation for war.

It is also interesting to note that this United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Corporation has been quite active in Canadian business, as evidenced by this report from Poor's Industrials Reports:

"United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co.:

"To handle Canadian ore concentrates—a 2-year contract for handling Canadian lead concentrates was announced July 31, by M. Wallace Wooley for company. The shipments will come from Western Exploration Co., of Silverton, British Columbia, which has been idle for 2 years."

It also takes a lot of shoes to outfit a conscript or a Regular Army of many millions. It is of great commercial value for a shoe-machinery company to sell shoe machinery in production of such shoes for the soldiers. These individuals who direct the Herald have the top places in the shoe-machinery industry of our country.

TIE-UP WITH J. P. MORGAN

It will also be noted that the Morgan interest is very evident in corporations, in which the directors of the Boston Herald, are also directors. The paper itself was noted in a report by Justice Brandeis some years ago as being tied up with corporate capital in which the J. P. Morgan firm was active.

A further survey of the Herald will be submitted to the Senate at a later date. The record of Government contracts as they affect these corporations are being studied and show an interesting story of why the Herald objects to a thorough or a free discussion of conscription.

War profits will be found behind many of these drives. I do not say all those who support the program are interested in war profits, but I do say that those who are getting the war profits are nearly all lined up in this program of involvement of the United States.

The profits of the corporations, of which the directors of the Herald are also directors, show a tremendous increase in profits since the beginning of the war.

LORDS OF THE PRESS

A very interesting discussion of the Herald is found in the book, Lords of the Press. It follows:

In 1929 the Boston Herald and the Boston Traveler were exposed as being part of that vast newspaper empire which the International Paper & Power Co. had built.

In fact, the Traveler and Herald are connected with many of the major banking interests of New England. Their president is S. W. Winslow, Jr., who, in addition to the shoe directorship, is director of the Morgan-affiliated First National Bank of Boston and the John Hancock Mutual Life, and U. S. Smelting. G. R. Brown, another director, also directs shoe companies and banks. J. L. Hall, vice president, directs Westinghouse, New York, New Haven & Hartford. Channing H. Cox is president of Old Colony Trust and director in United Fruit. The Boston Herald-Traveler Corporation is known as the wealthiest newspaper outfit in New England.

When the guild asked for an increase in wages in 1938, the management replied that business conditions made it impossible. The guild discovered that the corporation had a surplus of $5,035,401 in 1936 and paid $1,000,000 in dividends in 1937. Its net profits had been running from $600,000 to $900,000 in depression years. The guild vote of 105 to 19 to strike won them a contract which meant the corporation would have to pay its employees $100,000 a year more.

The editorial pages of the Herald and the Traveler are violently anti-C. I. O.; they deplore strikes; they denounce picketing; they believe the 1936 sit-down strikes were criminal actions; and they mask their big-business special pleading by pretending that all they say is in the interests of the general public—whatever that may be.

In the Boston paper labor is reviled, vigilantes are approved, strikers are charged with violence, the police and Legionnaires are praised. All this is done by changing a few words or purposeful editing. In the New York paper labor is not treated in too friendly a way, but in Boston it actually gets a raw deal.

But what is one to expect in a press largely owned by the United Shoe Machinery Corporation and the leading banks of New England—a social conscience?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I shall vote against the remaining amendments in the nature of substitutes for the pending bill, and then I shall vote for the conscription bill itself.

In my opinion, the last 2 months of speech making here have not changed the vote of one Senator. On the contrary, all that has been accomplished has been the loss of 2 months' time and the disgust of the American people. Therefore, I shall try to set a good example, and make the shortest speech that has been made on the floor of the Senate during the past 4 years, which is the period of my service here. The speech is this:

Let us stop serving the country with talk, with speeches. The people of the Nation, in this hour of world crisis, are demanding of the Senate action. Let us vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it has been my good fortune during the past 2 months to have heard the proponents of the peacetime compulsory conscription bill discuss it from every possible angle before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and afterward to have sat in executive session day after day with the able chairman and six or seven other distinguished members of the committee considering and revising its many provisions. During this period we rewrote this controversial measure seven times before finally a majority of the committee could agree upon its terms. Many of the amendments which I urged were agreed to by the committee; but one of the proposed changes—an amendment which would have eliminated its compulsory peacetime conscription feature—was rejected by a decisive vote. I understand that the very able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will offer an amendment along that line a little later in the day. I served notice upon the committee that I could not support the measure, and reserved the privilege of carrying my fight against compulsory peacetime conscription to the floor of the Senate.

I make this statement not only to express the profound respect and admiration in which I hold the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], and the other able members of the committee who differed with me, but also that you may know that I have given this revolutionary legislation long and diligent study.

I FAVOR A DEFENSE AGAINST EVERY EVENTUALITY

I need not say to the Senate Military Affairs Committee nor to the other Members of this body that I have long believed in a strong and watchful national-defense program. My record consistently favoring a sound foreign policy, coupled with a defense sufficiently invulnerable to withstand any combination of potential enemies, has been written in the Senate in black and white; and so long as I remain here I shall wholeheartedly support such policies. No one in this Chamber can be more convinced of the absolute necessity for a thoroughly mechanized, well-balanced, and well-coordinated modern war machine, manned by skilled operators, than am I; and no one in this Chamber is more completely convinced that such a machine will absolutely insure the peace of the United States. It is only good common sense to realize that because of international uncertainties and chaos we must be prepared for any and every eventuality within the realm of likely possibility. We have too much at stake to do otherwise, and we have too much potential military power which can be easily developed to assume any unnecessary risk whatever.

BURKE-WADSWORTH BILL NOT DEFENSE MEASURE

In my opinion, no bill coming before the Senate in recent years has been so badly misinterpreted and misjudged by the Members of the Senate, the press, and the country, as has the Burke-Wadsworth bill. I say this because I know what it proposes to do and what it does not propose to do. No pending measure in recent years has contained such serious revolutionary implications and changes in the Military Establishment of this Republic. The pending measure adds nothing to national defense. The pending measure subtracts much from a good, sound, sensible, modern national defense, and at the same time it makes an insidious attack upon the principles of the democracy which we cherish. It will not add to our security from abroad, and it does add to our insecurity here at home. It does not add to our liberties. It curtails our liberties. These are serious charges, which I shall make an earnest effort to prove before I take my seat.

COMPULSORY PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION DESTROYS DEMOCRACY

The philosophy upon which a democracy is founded is that the state exists for the people, and not the people for the state. Under such a system the individual has an opportunity almost without limitation for spiritual, intellectual, and physical development; exactly the opposite is true of a Fascist or totalitarian form of government. There the state is supreme; there the state is not a means to an end; there the state is the end, and the people exist for its exaltation, and for nothing else. God never created a state, he created people; and people created the state to serve them, and not to be served by them. Conscription in peacetime violates every tenet of a democracy, and is the first step toward the Fascist state.

There has been a constant fight from the beginning of this Republic to adopt a compulsory military-service system during peacetime. Time after time Congress has refused to make the change, and the people have sustained Congress in its refusal. Today the War Department, under recently acquired leadership, is pressing the matter again with a new boldness, and is taking advantage of the hysteria which it has promoted and encouraged to impose this dangerous and hated enemy of liberty upon a free people.

DICTATORSHIPS THRIVE ON CONSCRIPTION

The adoption of this arbitrary method would be very dangerous to the spirit and traditions and purposes of American democracy, which has always sought to extend more and more liberty, and never less and less liberty. The eagerness for liberty which we have always fostered in America is completely at variance with the autocratic club of compulsory military peacetime service, which the bill imposes. Conscription in peacetime is a most radical departure from American tradition and is the first step in making our Army our Nation. Our forebears established popular government and insisted upon the supremacy of civil law over military authority in fact and in principle. The founding fathers of this Republic saw clearly that compulsory military service meant the ultimate supremacy of the military over the civil authorities, and we should be slow to undo their magnificent work. Dictatorships thrive on the assumption that the individual citizen be conscripted since he is the pawn of the state. That conception is abhorrent to free men, and that philosophy has always been repugnant to the citizens of this Republic. Germany, on the other hand, has long boasted that her Army is her nation and that her nation is her Army. Shall we cling to American traditions in this hour of conjured trouble, or shall we now, in a spirit of reaction and abandon, revert to the European system, which has driven liberty and free enterprise from that other continent? Beware, Senators, of the "camel's nose in the tent" of democracy.

CONSCRIPTION PART OF STIMSON LUGGAGE

The day the United States of America selected the Honorable Henry L. Stimson to be Secretary of War, the Burke-Wadsworth peacetime conscription proposal became a menace to our liberties. It was a part and parcel of that bad bargain. It was an essential part of the Stimson official luggage. The former Secretary of War, Harry Woodring, a wise and courageous statesman, a greatly respected leader of the American Legion, a patriotic American, and a loyal and liberal Democrat, bitterly opposed peacetime conscription, and he was, therefore, at the instigation of the Plattsburg crowd, removed and supplanted by a reactionary interventionist from Wall Street, who has been on record for 23 years as favoring conscription in the United States.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BURKE. It is my understanding that the difficulty which Secretary Woodring had in the retention of his position was not because of any difficulty over selective training, but because he did not approve of steps which were under contemplation for the extension of aid short of war to the Allies. Am I mistaken about that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; that is all part of the same scheme. It is only a small part of a general program, just one other step.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that in talking with Sir George Paish, who was knighted by the British Government, and who came to the United States, as he confessed both to me and in his newspaper article for the purpose of trying to get us into war, he stated that a part of his program was, as he outlined it: First, he wanted conscription; second, he wanted 50 destroyers, and he wanted as his program before we got into the war, as he called it, "aid short of war." His program was exactly the program we are following at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not surprised to learn that.

Mr. BURKE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I think anyone in the Senate or outside who knows the senior Senator from Montana would agree with the statement I now make that if Sir George Paish, or whatever his name is—I have never seen the gentleman—sat down with the senior Senator from Montana with the idea of convincing him that he should support selective training in time of peace, or possible adequate service in time of war, Sir George Paish should be, as someone suggested yesterday, examined as to his mentality. I think we could put aside all his arguments if he sat down and seriously argued with the senior Senator from Montana as to the merits of selective training.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will yield in a moment. I am convinced that Sir George would be an optimist to do that sort of thing. But as I understand the program, Sir George intends to go out before the country, and perhaps desires to toughen himself up a little bit by going up against the very able Senator from Montana.

I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. I only wish to say to the Senator that I was not in the Chamber yesterday when the Senator from Montana was discussing the gentlemen to whom he has just referred. That gentleman telephoned me at my hotel, and I would not see him. He came to my office. I thought at the time that there are in this country several hundred economists who if they were in London would undoubtedly try to see members of Parliament to tell them what they should do about the affairs of Great Britain. They are unable to exercise any influence in the United States, and therefore would go to London. I thought this gentleman was in about the same class, and I would not even see him. But I think he was fortunate if he talked to the Senator from Montana and did not suffer the fate which the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has said he would have received in his office, that he was not thrown out of the office.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The only difference between Sir George Paish and other Englishmen who are in the United States carrying on propaganda is that he was more frank than the others. Men like Admiral Standley and some others are more frank than those who are merely advocating aid to the Allies short of war.

Let me call attention to a statement made by Elliott Roosevelt, according to the International News Service. I read:

Elliott Roosevelt, son of the President, tonight declared in a radio broadcast that "we have taken a very dishonest stand toward England.

"We cheer England and frankly admit we hope she wins the war," he stated, "but we haven't the courage to come out in the open and say:

"'Your battle is our battle. If you need 10,000 planes and 20,000 pilots, you can have them * * *.' Instead, we pass a lot of meaningless laws which we claim safeguard neutrality, and then use political subterfuge and trickery to evade these laws."

I say that Elliott Roosevelt is very frank about it, and I think his criticism is justified. If we want to go to war—and God knows I do not want the country to go to war; I want it to keep out of war—if we believe, as some of these persons do, that Mr. Hitler is going to attack us a month or 2 months or a year from now, in the event he licks England—and I doubt seriously if he will be able to do that—then I would come out and say that we should now make a declaration of war. We should be open; we should be frank; we should tell the American people exactly that. But, instead of that, we are creeping up step by step and step by step. We are going down the road to war.

I have forgotten what great French general it was who said during the last war that he wanted just one small regiment of Americans in France to build up the morale of the French people.

That is what he told us then. He afterwards said he knew that if we ever sent one regiment over there we would presently send all our armies and our whole Navy, as well as supplies and equipment of every kind. The British know that if they can get us to take one step in the direction of sending military or naval supplies over there—for example, if we send 50 destroyers over there—then they will not only want 50 destroyers but airplane pilots, and after we shall have taken that next step and have sent over pilots they will want some other form of assistance.

Mr. President, we are not fooling the British. They are smarter in their propaganda than we are.

Senators should see some of the propaganda pictures shown in the motion-picture houses. They should see the propaganda being put on the screen at the Trans-Lux Theater in Washington. Every radio facility, every motion-picture house, and practically every motion-picture company in this country are carrying on a determined propaganda to get the United States into war. If someone came to the United States and said we should help Mussolini, what would we do to him?

We hear much of "fifth columnists." I say, and I firmly believe, that if we should go into this war it would mean the end of democracy in the United States of America. It would impose such a tremendous, back-breaking, crushing indebtedness on the people of the United States that we would never be able to pay it off, and the result must be inflation and probably permanent dictatorship in the United States.

Those who are advocating our entrance into the war on the side of Germany, or on the side of Italy, or that we get into it on the side of Great Britain, are, in my judgment, real "fifth columnists," whatever nation they favor. It is as unpatriotic for Americans to advocate our entrance into the war on the side of Great Britain as it is to advocate our entrance into the war on the side of Italy, or on the side of Russia, or Germany, or any other country. When it comes to the destruction of American democracy it makes no difference whether the destruction is accomplished by Russians, Englishmen, Germans, or Italians.

Mr. President, I am neither pro-German, pro-Italian, pro-Russian, or pro-English. To me those who are other than pro-American are equally abhorrent. What we should do is to look after the interests of the United States of America.

Recently I read that someone said that Henry Ford was a "fifth columnist," and intimated that he was a traitor. I do not know Henry Ford, and I have disagreed with some of his views very decidedly, but anyone who even intimates that Henry Ford is a traitor or is unpatriotic is doing a disservice to the country. At the same time some persons intimated that Henry Ford was a traitor they were urging us to do what? Practically to get into the war on the side of the Allies. Such a man is unpatriotic, but the one who is trying to keep us out of war, who is trying to preserve democracy, is, in my opinion, patriotic.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one remark?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I rose at this point in the distinguished Senator's speech because I did not want to let go unchallenged the suggestion that there was a connection between the selective training for national defense and the other proposals to extend more aid to certain of the belligerents by sending destroyers, or planes, or men, or anything else. to them. The proponents of the measure can go along very fully with what the Senator from Montana said in objecting to our becoming involved in war.

The bill is a training bill to provide manpower to man the equipment for which we all voted, in order that we may have an adequate defense; not in order that we may participate in any foreign war, but that foreign war will not come to us, at least with any chance of success.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, but I cannot agree with him at all that the measure is a defense measure. If I thought for one moment that the pending bill was a defense measure—that is, that it contained any defense features in even the remotest degree—I would not now be on the Senate floor opposing it. But I do not look upon it as a defense measure. I look upon it as going in exactly the opposite direction.

Mr. President, peacetime conscription and the policy of intervention are as inseparable as are Siamese twins. While it is true that there are supporters in the Senate who are not interventionists, I do not know of a single interventionist or a solitary warmonger in the entire United States who does not favor peacetime conscription. That is to be expected.

MILITARISM ENEMY NO. 1

Militarism has ever been the curse of Europe. Militarism, coupled with power politics, has kept it drenched in blood for centuries. It has caused every little country of that continent to be an armed camp through countless generations, and has brought impoverishment and death to great masses of humanity. Compulsory peacetime conscription is, and always has been, the right arm of European militarism. No close observer will deny that the United States is developing a pronounced military complex. Political militarism is American democracy's enemy No. 1. It threatens its future even more than does the current crop of European dictators and the subversive agents within our gates violating our generous hospitality. Militarism in a republic will never develop under a volunteer system of enlistment, for the reason that men will not volunteer to fight unless the cause is righteous, while under the conscript plan the cause has no bearing upon the service. I believe in a democratic army—a powerful volunteer army—a well-paid and well-trained army of skilled men; but I fear a totalitarian army—a conscripted army; and especially do I fear a great political reservoir of partially trained conscripted men.

THE ARMY HATES DEMOCRACY

Military officers, because of their education and training, believe in and practice the philosophy of force and seldom give a kindly thought to the philosophy of reason. That is perfectly natural and perfectly understandable. They deal altogether with the element of force—it is their very life. Their duties are based upon it. They believe, with the Prussians, that the Nation is the Army and that the Army is the Nation. Few Army officers vote in our elections. They are not interested in the operations of a democracy. I am told that 75 percent of the commissioned officers in the United States Army have never voted. They know nothing about the workings of democracy and care even less. I hold in my hand the Army Training Manual No. 2000–25, issued for the instruction of officers and soldiers. In this manual the War Department describes democracy for the benefit of its men in training in these subversive terms:

Democracy: A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meetings or any other form of "direct" expression. Results in mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic—negating property rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy.

"The will of the majority shall regulate," and our military overlords charge that such a conception of government must result in "agitation, discontent, anarchy." One might think that was Mr. Hitler or Mr. Mussolini talking instead of the Army of the United States. For 5 years, from 1928 to 1932, this manual of "instruction" was used officially by the War Department.

CONSCRIPTS GRAVE POLITICAL MENACE

An Army officer's conception of the proper government evidently is that it should be a one-man government, and not a government wherein the majority shall rule. His whole training and experience has given him that attitude toward government. Military government, the only government with which he is conversant, is that kind of government. There are so relatively few military voters in this Republic now that they have no political influence whatsoever, but that will not be true under the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEE. The Senator said a few moments ago that there was not a warmonger or interventionist in the United States who did not favor conscription. I ask the Senator, Is it not equally true that there is not a Hitler sympathizer, or "fifth columnist," or Communist in the United States that does not oppose conscription?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I suppose that statement is true. I did not say that there was not a warmonger who did not favor conscription; I said that, so far as I knew, there were no warmongers who did not favor conscription. But I do not want to class myself or any of the Members of the Senate with Communists or "fifth columnists." I do not want to do that.

Mr. LEE. The Senator does not want to classify Senators either with warmongers or interventionists, I am sure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, indeed; I do not. I do not want to classify Senators at all in any capacity. I want them to do their own classifying.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. It might be added that the Methodist Episcopal Church, which certainly could not be classified as "fifth columnist," Communist, or pro-Hitler has gone on record against peacetime conscription. Likewise practically all the leaders of the Catholic Church have gone on record against peacetime conscription. Also the Lutheran Church, among the Norwegians and Swedes, has gone on record against it. The Farmers' Union, which is one of the strongest farm organizations in the Northwest—and even in the State of Oklahoma—has gone on record against peacetime conscription. The American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the C. I. O. have gone on record against peacetime conscription. I know of no church organization, no labor organization, and no farm organization in the United States which has not gone on record against peacetime conscription.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. There has been much talk to the effect that the organized churches of the country are opposed to the bill; and particular reference has been made to the Roman Catholic Church. In fact, in the early days of the debate the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] offered for the RECORD a telegram from Archbishop Beckman, of Dubuque, Iowa, whose territory includes Iowa, Nebraska, Wyoming, and other States, saying that the church is opposed to the bill. I call attention to the fact that in that respect the Archbishop was speaking only for himself.

I hold in my hand a telegram from Most Reverend James H. Ryan, Bishop of Omaha. Bishop Ryan is well known to many in Washington for his years of service at a great university here. This is what he says:

As a citizen I favor the principle of a selectiye military draft because I consider it the only fair, democratic, and, above all,

realistic method of preparing to meet the probability of an attack on our liberties and institutions. That the United States is faced by total warfare in the near future cannot be questioned. There is only one way to prevent total warfare and that is by total defense. Preparation for total defense cannot be fairly interpreted as an acceptance of the totalitarian philosophy, nor does it necessarily lead to totalitarianism. It goes without saying that, in common with practically all Americans, I do not approve compulsory military service beyond the present grave emergency.

I have also in my desk a letter from the Catholic bishop of Lincoln, Nebr., Bishop Kucera, and also a letter from the other Catholic bishop in Nebraska, Bishop Kona, of Grand Island, taking the identical view. One of them refers to the fact that he has communicated with the Catholic bishop in Wyoming, who shares his views. So it is not in accordance with the facts to say that those who speak with authority for the various churches of the country are opposed to the measure. Some are, because they do not believe in it. Many others believe it is the salvation of our country.

In my own time I shall offer excerpts from telegrams and letters from leaders in church activities in all denominations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to have the excerpts printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I make that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpts appear following the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, at this point I should like to read one further communication because the Methodist Church has been mentioned. This is from Rt. Rev. E. G. Richardson, Methodist bishop of Philadelphia:

While I deeply regret our Nation becoming military minded, I believe this is necessary because of world conditions. Democracy must be defended. The selective compulsory draft will provide armed forces much more quickly and democratically than any other plan. Adequate preparation will perhaps prevent war coming to us. It will certainly save many lives if war comes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to yield. I should like to proceed with my remarks, but I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLT. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that not only has the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is the official spokesman of the Catholic bishops, gone on record in opposition to the bill, but its representatives have appeared before the committee. Two or three bishops may be found in favor of the bill, but the organization which speaks for the Catholic bishops as a whole has gone on record against this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

I wish to come next to a very important matter. To me it seems all important in my opposition to the bill.

Under this obnoxious measure—the Burke-Wadsworth bill—it is planned to build up a reservoir of 6,000,000 conscripts. The number has been variously stated. Yesterday I heard the number 3,400,000 mentioned.

However, we have had considerable testimony from the Plattsburg people to the effect that they think 6,000,000 is the correct number. I do not know what the number is to be, but it is to be a very large reservoir of conscripts. Knowing as we do the attitude of military men toward democratic institutions, the ultimate effect of that proposal is staggering in its political consequences. It will not be a military reservoir alone. It will be a military-political reservoir which will take over the control of the country. When the conscripts become convinced that the will of the majority will result in agitation, discontent, and anarchy, as some officers of the Army believe, the conscripts should have no hesitation in conscripting the thing they desire, be it power or property.

The Plattsburg crowd are already reaching for more and more political power, and they will realize their ambition with millions of conscripts in every community in the country. The Plattsburg crowd have enough political strength at present to place men of their choice in the President's Cabinet as Secretary of War and Assistant Secretary of War. Furthermore, they are now carrying on a Nation-wide campaign, amply financed by the money bags of the country, to force through the Congress, under the guise of national defense, a measure which will in time give them complete political control of the Republic.

This Government is founded upon the principle that it derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. That is the keystone of the institution known as democracy. Ours is a government of reason, not a government of force; and that is the pillar of its strength. The volunteer system of military training and service is in keeping with that sacred principle and is a part of it. Compulsory conscription in peacetime is a vile, offensive repudiation of free choice.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. My understanding is that Benedict Crowell, who has just been brought to Washington by Secretary Stimson, is also a member of the same Plattsburg crowd.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and they are the ones who brought the bill to us. That fact cannot be disputed. They admit it themselves and are very proud of it.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ADAMS. If the United States indulges in the conscription of manpower in peacetime, is there any answer to the demand which has been made, and will be made, that if men are conscripted, industry and capital must be conscripted? If that follows, does it not then mean that the Government which conscripts men will conscript industry, and we shall have what is equivalent to a very large measure of state socialism?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is exactly my viewpoint. I think it is also Grenville Clark's viewpoint. It will be recalled that Grenville Clark is proud of the fact that he has had a large part in preparing the bill. In testifying before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, Grenville Clark did not use the word "conscript" or the word "regiment." I do not know just what term he used, but that is what he meant. I think the word he used was "mobilize." He said that if it were not necessary to mobilize industry for this emergency, if the emergency were not so great that it is necessary to mobilize industry, the bill would have no place before the Congress at this time. That is his viewpoint.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. For my own information I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado and others who share his point of view and who oppose conscription in time of peace, if we were to be drawn into a war, either by having war declared on us or by our declaring war on some other country, or if both those contingencies were to happen, in the opinion of the Senator, how long would it be, with conscription and other means, before we could obtain a sufficient army to defend the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I can only give the Senator my own opinion as my answer to that question.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me ask the Senator from Maryland to tell us who is going to attack us. The measure of defense necessarily depends on who is going to attack us.

Mr. TYDINGS. Allow me to put the question a little more specifically. I am assuming a certain state of facts. I am not saying that such a contingency will happen. However, let us suppose, as some Senators have prophesied on the floor of the Senate, that Great Britain should fall. I do not say it will fall. I am merely making the assumption. Assume, likewise, as some have said, that Mr. Hitler has designs on Latin America, and that we may be drawn into a war. My question is, How long a time would be required, if we should start when the war commenced, to obtain a sufficient army to defend ourselves?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator will read the testimony of General Marshall before the committee, when I think the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and perhaps other Senators interrogated him, the Senator will find that in answer to the question, "How much of an army do you need?" he said, "We want 375,000."

Mr. TYDINGS. I was at that hearing.

Mr. WHEELER. Then he said, "We want as a possible full-time war army 500,000; then we want," as I recall his testimony, "400,000 reserves."

The general said he felt that they could get them by enlistment, but he questioned whether they could get them fast enough.

The fact of the matter is that all the quotas, as has been said here, were filled; the Army obtained everything they asked for; the last week for which the figures were given showed 8,000 in a week, which was the largest number ever obtained.

Mr. TYDINGS. That does not answer my question. The question I asked was, in effect, whether we are in peace or in war, and particularly if we are in war, how long would it take to start the machinery to draft men, train and equip them, so that they would be able to defend the country? Could it be done, for example, in 3 months?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This bill will not relieve that situation in the slightest degree.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think those who say we ought not to have conscription until war comes should give us an answer to that question. That is perfectly fair. I can understand their viewpoint; they favor no conscription at all until we are drawn into war. I am assuming that we are drawn into war some time in the future—which I hope will not come to pass—and I should like to know, in the opinion of those who would then favor conscription, how long it would take before we got an army properly trained and equipped sufficient to defend this country in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In answer to the Senator, I will give him my opinion, which is based upon the opinions, I understand, of military experts. If we have a good, well-trained Army of the United States first, then we can get the necessary additional army in a very short time.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask the Senator, from what military expert he is quoting? Who is the military expert who says all we need is a small army and we can get the others in a short while?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am almost afraid to quote military experts, because when Secretary of War Woodring was in office they had one viewpoint, and when the head of the Department changed their viewpoint changed with the Secretary of War. Theirs is a fluctuating opinion.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is perfectly honest and candid, and I admire him as a man who has definite convictions on this subject. I am not quarreling with him; I am not arguing with him; but I think he could tell me how long, in his judgment, it would probably take to secure an adequate army if we were to declare war? Would it be 6 months or 9 months or a year?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. I think the answer to the Senator's question involves asking him a question. How long would it take Mr. Hitler or anybody else who might be in control in Europe to send an army over the sea adequate to attack the United States? I think the lowest estimate of the number of men which has been made is approximately a million. I read a very interesting article in Harpers magazine for August which stated that it would take, merely to supply an invading army of a million men, 13,000,000 tons of shipping. How much is 13,000,000 tons of shipping? The Navy of the United States, the Navy of Great Britain, the Navy of Japan, the Navy of France, the Navy of Italy, and the Navy of Germany—and those are all the navies of importance there are in the world—aggregate but six and a half million tons.

How could Germany or any other power or any combination of powers in Europe maintain for a month—let alone get here—an army of a million men? We have a million trained men in the United States today. It seems to me that it is fantastic to expect an invasion.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think it is fantastic at all. Mr. President, I will try, if the Senator from Colorado will yield to me for a moment further, to show what I am driving at.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like first to quote from a military expert whom I know the Senator recognizes. The Senator wants some testimony from a military expert. I have it here before me. I should like to answer the question, and then I will be very happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will wait until the Senator quotes the military expert.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I quote from the testimony of General Marshall in answer to questions by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]:

Senator HILL. General, I want to get these figures. You have today 255,000 men in the Regular Army; is that right?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator HILL. As I understood it, you said a little while ago you would step those up to 375,000; then you used the figure 500,000.

General MARSHALL. Five hundred thousand is war strength, sir.

Senator HILL. That is war strength?

General MARSHALL. Yes; everything up to 375,000 is purely peace strength, except the aviation allotment of 40,000.

Senator HILL. Forty thousand men?

General MARSHALL. In other words, the figure of 335,000 would carry our ground troops to authorized peace strength.

Senator HILL. The figure of 335,000?

General MARSHALL. Yes. We then have 40,000 men provided for by appropriations, who are to be trained as mechanics, bombardiers, and specialists of that sort for the production of airplanes which will begin to be delivered the middle of next summer.

Senator HILL. But you do not include them in the 335,000?

General MARSHALL. The 335,000 is the major priority.

Senator HILL. The 335,000 is the major priority now. That is Regulars, is it not?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Senator HILL. Three hundred and thirty-five thousand major priority is the Regulars and 40,000 can come along just as fast as they can?

Mr. TYDINGS. What does that prove, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. General Marshall was testifying as to the strength of the Army in peacetime, and when he talks about an army in peacetimes certainly that is the opinion of the War Department as to the Army they need in peacetime.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator I was present when General Marshall testified, and I was also present when he testified off the record. I can assure the Senator that one of the best evidences that General Marshall does not feel that such a force is now sufficient is that he advocates the very bill, or some form of it, which is before the Senate. Thus by taking the very witness the Senator himself exhibits I can prove that the Senator's position is not well taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As I said before, one can prove anything by these military experts because they change their minds every time there happens to be a new Secretary of War.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator I am no military expert, but it happens that I did put in three full years in the United States Army along about the last World War, and I remember quite vividly many of the experiences there. As I have said on the floor of the Senate, while I was assigned to a machine-gun unit, I never saw a machine gun, nor did my division see a machine gun of the heavy type, the kind we were going to use, until we got to France. Then our machine guns were furnished by the British. We had to train in the use of those guns and learn how to fire them under all sorts of conditions. The artillery with which the division I went over with was equipped was furnished by the French. That was a considerable while after we had declared war. I personally had in my own outfit men who had not served more than 3 months before they went into battle, men who had been drafted, sent abroad, and who were sent to join the front-line troops within 3 months after they were drafted.

While I am no military expert, I tell the Senator now that it is not possible to assemble an army of a million men, well trained and well equipped, in less than from 8 months to a year's time of intensive training; it simply cannot be done. If modern wars were like those which occurred in 1776, 1812, and even in 1861 to 1865, and to some extent like the war of 1898, an army could be made ready in less time, because in those days war was a question of giving a man a musket, with a certain amount of rudimentary training, and that was sufficient. But wars today are closely coordinated undertakings of all kinds of arms under the most difficult situations, requiring a high degree of skill, a high degree of training, and a high degree of cooperation.

I should feel that the Senator's remarks about not resorting to conscription until we actually declared war would be absolutely sound if it were not for the fact that the Senator knows as well as I do that, if war were to come tomorrow and the pending bill were to pass, it would take a month or 5 or 6 weeks to set up the machinery of conscription before any man could actually be drafted—from 5 or 6 weeks to 2 months would go by. Is not that true? Then, after they were called, they would have to be taken to a camp; they would have to be trained. The Senator knows that if war should come tomorrow morning it would be a long while before these new men would be familiar with the weapons with which they would have to fight. Furthermore, if the Regular Army personnel were utilized to train the new men, obviously that personnel could not be used for defensive purposes. It would necessarily have to be depleted if it were called upon to train a million men.

I am no lover of conscription; I do not like it any better than does anybody else. The only reason I am going to support it in some modified form, in accordance with the amendments I have voted for heretofore, is that out of abundant caution I would rather have it and not need it than to need it and not have it. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will yield in a moment. The Senator from Maryland is absolutely right, of course, if we are getting ready to provide an expeditionary force. If that is the purpose, and it is expected to do that very shortly, the Burke-Wadsworth bill is particularly in line with that kind of thought and with that kind of strategy, but it is not in line with the defense of our own continent.

Now I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ADAMS. I think the Senator from Maryland should separate two things. He illustrates the World War, the absence of machine guns, and the absence of artillery. The Senator knows that today General Marshall says he has 75,000 machine guns. He has over 3,000 75's. He says of those things he has enough equipment for 1,200,000 men. We do not start as we did in 1917.

I think some of us who do not like the conscription of men are entirely in accord with going ahead and providing the critical materials—those that take 2 years or more to prepare—so that they may be ready for a full force of men. As the Senator knows, we already have under contract tremendous sums of money. We have in storage today nearly 3,000,000 rifles. I think when the World War broke out we had but a handful, and we are going ahead with the critical materials.

I think those two things should be separated.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. ADAMS. All of the things that take time we should do; so that the time required for training men is a much shorter time. The men are here. That is a question of training. The critical materials are not here. They must be provided.

That is my only suggestion—that we must not confuse the war-time shortage of critical materials with the abundance which is coming at this time under tremendous appropriations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me point out to my good friend from Colorado that with much that he says I agree. Obviously, if we have weapons in this emergency—we did not have them in the last emergency—we have something to work with that much sooner. But the Senator was connected with the Army in that war, and nobody knows better than he does that just having weapons is not enough.

For example, if we were to bring in a 3-inch or 6-inch field piece, or perhaps a heavy machine gun, and set it up here, there is not a Senator in this Chamber who would know how to load it and shoot it, and Senators certainly are of average intelligence. A Senator could not take that gun apart and oil it and clean it and put it together again, and if a part broke down he would not know how to take the gun apart and put the repair part in it. Then, after he learned that, he would not know how to put the gun down behind a bush and shoot over the roofs of some of these houses and carry down, for example, to the National Press Building, which would be invisible to the gunner, but there is a way in which he could be pretty sure that he was going to hit that building, because he would know how to aim from his map. He would know how much to elevate his gun to make it carry that distance.

I mention those two or three things only because they are things which cannot be learned in 24 hours or 48 hours. I myself—again using a personal illustration, which is not a good illustration—went to one of the best machine-gun schools ever held. I spent there a month of intensive training; and, so that you may think I knew a little something about it, let me say that when I was graduated I had a corps instructor's certificate in machine-gun operation.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, on the walls of the Senator's office are two certificates granted to him for distinguished service and remarkable bravery under fire. I doubt if there is a man in the city of Washington, and few in the United States, who have the testimonials of gratitude for military service and military efficiency which hang upon the walls of the office of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate very much that statement from my friend from Colorado. As I say, I was just a little bit lucky in receiving those very extravagant references to very small acts on my part.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator was lucky to get back. So were we.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before I go on with this point, let me say that the Senate knows that I voted for every restrictive amendment on this conscription bill. I voted to cut it down. I voted to keep the National Guard in the United States. I voted to keep the conscripts in the United States, although I think I showed that it would lead to confusion because of the conflicting policies that we had written. I am no lover of conscription; but, just as surely as I am standing on this floor, it is impossible to take a green man and turn him out as a soldier in 48 hours. It takes from 6 to 8 to 12 months to do it.

The point I am making is that those who say they would be in favor of conscription after a declaration of war start out with the fact that it would be impossible even to set up the machinery of conscription in less than 4 or 6 months after war was declared, and a tremendously valuable amount of time would be lost. Second, we should have to take men, many of whom never shot a gun in their lives, and teach them not only familiarity with the gun but all of the manifold duties of a soldier, including first aid. Every soldier has to know something about first aid. He may be shot or his companion may be shot, and he has to know how to open his bandage kit and how to apply it and how to carry his wounded comrade, if he has broken a leg or has some injury, so that the man may live. That is only one little side light.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In just a moment I will yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am asking the Senator from Colorado if he will yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. He has already yielded to me, and I think he will allow me to complete my statement.

That is only one little side light. How many green men would know how to pick up an injured man, or how to bind his leg if his leg were broken, or how to carry him to some place of safety without doing more harm than good? There are many persons who have had that training, but the rank and file of the recruits have never had it; and that is something quite apart from handling the gun and the other incidental things that go along with it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Just a moment. I want to answer very briefly one or two thoughts which the Senator from Maryland has expressed.

I am glad to hear the Senator say that he voted for the restrictive amendments. He will have an opportunity later in the day to vote for another restrictive amendment which I hope will please him, and I hope he will be able to support it. That is an amendment to set up all the registration machinery, set up everything, have it all ready, but not to use conscription unless we have an emergency or unless we have a war.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why does not the Senator postpone setting up all the machinery until war comes? What is the point of doing that in peacetime?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator says it takes 2 or 3 months to set up the machinery. Why not set it up and have it ready?

Mr. TYDINGS. I know; but if we can do all these things after we get into war, why anticipate them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think that is a reasonable conclusion.

I wish to comment on the other thought which the Senator expressed, and then I will yield to the Senator from Ohio.

General Marshall stated before our committee that it takes 18 months to make a soldier. He said perhaps it could be done by intensive training in 15 months, but he said ordinarily it takes 18 months. The Senator spoke about expert machine-gun operators. The conscripts he is talking about will never see a machine gun. They will never see anything more than a Springfield rifle and a bayonet. That is all they will learn to use.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely wrong. All these men will be put in with the National Guard and the Regular Army. They will be part of machine-gun battalions or artillery. There will be all kinds of training for the men. They will not just get rifles and march around. The very plan is to distribute them among all the branches of the service.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I only want to suggest that the Senator from Maryland absolutely confuses two entirely different propositions. He identifies conscription with training. Training has nothing to do with conscription. The question whether or not we shall train men is one question. I am strongly in favor of training men; but the present Congress, up to date, has never authorized any man to be trained, and we have never had a training measure before us. We have in the Army as many men as we have authorized. We have not set up any training plan. That is not the question that arises here. The question is, Shall we draft men and compel them to go into the Army?

I say we can get just as many men as can possibly be handled without a draft; and the Senator's argument for training—with which I entirely agree—is no support for the present conscription bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, the Senator from Ohio is right.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I am obliged to the Senator.

I have heard the statement made a number of times that all we could train men with was the old Springfield rifle, and take a few pieces of gas pipe and make them simulate guns. While it is true that we have not all the weapons necessary to equip an army of 750,000 for the field, with the 400 tanks—let us say—that we have, we can train a great many men in driving tanks and the tactics of tanks, because we can take different sets of men and use the same tanks for the different groups. Consequently, we do not have to wait until we have all the equipment in order to start training.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course.

Mr. LODGE. We can start training with only a fraction of the equipment that would be needed with which to take the field.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Massachusetts is exactly right. Of course, if there are a few guns, they can be illustrated and explained and the men can be shown how to work them, whether they are pieces of artillery or other ordnance; and the same thing is true of first-aid kits and cooking utensils. They can be taught how to put up a tent, how to take care of a horse, and things of that kind. There are hundreds of men from the city who will have horse-drawn machines to handle. They will not know one piece of harness from another, they will not know the front end of a mule from the rear end, whether to feed it cracked corn or pancakes. [Laughter.] It takes time to teach those things. Many men who live on a farm, for example, know that a mule cannot be led by looking him in the face but that you have to turn your back on him. I have seen men in the Army look a mule in the face and nearly pull their arms out of the sockets while he stood there. [Laughter.] Those are all bits of a soldier's training.

As for training being separate from conscription, that is the most childish and puerile argument I ever heard. How in the name of common sense could men be trained if they could not be gotten into camp in sufficient numbers in any other way than that proposed?

Mr. TAFT. I say that it is a perfectly simple proposition to get a sufficient number of men.

Mr. TYDINGS. I remember very well during the World War there was a man in my town who went by my house every morning, and I remember his conversation. He was a Republican, and I was a Democrat. He would say, "Well, I see your President has written another note over there to France. If 'Teddy' Roosevelt were President, he would settle this thing in 5 minutes. He would merely serve notice on those fellows over there and there wouldn't be any war."

I said, "Well, war is a pretty serious thing. I think the President does not want to get in at all, if he can avoid it."

He said, "Oh, there is nothing to this note-writing business. All they have to do is to tell them that if it happens again we are going to war, and it will all be over."

I said, "How about getting up an army?"

He said, "Oh, that is easy. All you have to do is blow a whistle and two or three million men will respond."

War came, and it came at a time when the country was affronted on its ethical side, when it was affronted on its humane side, and they blew the whistle. How many men came? It was pitiful. They could not get enough volunteers in the country to carry water to the elephant. I say now that if this country goes to war the same condition will prevail, not because people lack patriotism, but because they have mothers and fathers, wives, and children dependent upon them.

Only yesterday I received a fine letter from a young man in my State, who said:

> I am not opposed to the Conscription Act. If my country feels that I should be trained, I am perfectly willing to take my chance and be drawn. However, there are just father and mother and myself. We have a mortgage on our house. My salary is twice as much as father's, and with my help we are able to keep up the payments and reduce the mortgage. If some way could be found so that I knew the home would not be taken from over their heads during my absence, I would be glad to go and to train so as to be ready in case of emergency, and if you can have fixed in the bill some clause or provision which will take care of that situation, I will be delighted to go out and receive this training, in case the country should call on it.

Those are the reasons why men do not volunteer more frequently.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator a question. He proposes, then, in this draft bill, to draft that man—he cannot be exempted—and the father and mother will lose the house.

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. TAFT. The Government does not make any provision, and there is no reason why they should.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is a provision in the bill to exempt such a man.

Mr. TAFT. There is no provision in the bill, if he is not the support of his father and mother.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, yes. If his mother and father are dependent upon him——

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but his father and mother are not dependent on him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; they are.

Mr. TAFT. His mother and father simply have to give up their house. Under the Internal Revenue Act or any other act I know of they are not dependents in the circumstances assumed. That is the kind of case this draft bill would affect by picking up 800,000 men, breaking up families, breaking up occupations, breaking up men's lives, their occupations in which they will make a success, and in which they have made a little headway. It is proposed to draft them into the Army, and in many cases destroy the entire chance of success those men may have. That is the draft bill. That is what the draft bill will do if it is enacted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot agree with the statement of the Senator from Ohio at all. In the first place, if the man referred to appears before the draft board and shows that his father and mother are dependent upon his earnings for a home over their heads, under the proposed act as we have written it that man would be exempt if he proved his case.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator——

Mr. TYDINGS. I listened to the Senator; now let him listen to me.

There are provisions in the bill which exempt men who have dependents, when there is real dependency.

I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio, Can he find a million or two million men who could be taken into the Army without any inconvenience from the standpoint of financial income at all?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator just produced a case. He says the reason why men do not volunteer, the reason why the volunteer system will not work, is that there is a man of the kind he has described who will not volunteer. Then he turns around and says we will not draft him, either. In other words, he produces this man as an argument for the draft system, and then he admits that, whether it is a draft or a volunteer system, he is not called anyway. The Senator will certainly have to produce another example of men who will not volunteer.

It seems to me the rankest lack of common sense to take 900,000 men, 80 percent of whom are employed, are already engaged in their life occupation, who have made headway in many cases, have taken positions of more or less responsibility, at least where they have the support and the confidence of their employers—to take them out for a year and let other men take their places. That is bound to happen. They may get jobs when they return, but they will not get the same positions. I say, it shows a lack of common sense to do that when there are in this country unemployed over 5,000,000 men, and when there are 250,000 men in the C. C. C. camps. I say that if an opportunity is given, if we pay these men, besides furnishing their clothing and their food and their lodging, $40 a month, and let them devote it, as much as they want, irrevocably, to the support of their fathers and mothers, there is hardly a boy in the C. C. C. camps who would not prefer to be in a training camp in the Army. We saw the figures of one poll taken in the South which showed that 60 percent said, "Yes; if you pay us $30, if you pay us in the Army as much as in the C. C. C. camps, we prefer the Army."

There is no difficulty. The situation is that we assume the Army is the most disagreeable and most unpleasant occupation in the United States. It is not. The chance of its being involved in war in my opinion is remote. The dangers involved in present enlistment in the Army are slight compared with the dangers involved in many other occupations, small compared to the dangers of men who are enlisting today in the Air Corps.

I see no trouble because of the danger element. If we make the Army an occupation which is just as desirable and just as healthy as any other occupation in the United States, I say there will not be any trouble getting men.

Suppose a man started a new industry tomorrow and said, "I want 400,000 unskilled men whom I am going to train for this industry, where they can stay." Is it not to be supposed he would be flooded with twice the number of applications he asked for? That is true of training in the Army of the United States. We should make conditions in the Army such that men will enlist. I think they should be paid $40, or even $50. I think they should be entitled to resign in 60 or 90 days, giving notice of resignation, after the first year. But they will not enter an occupation that is not comparable with other occupations. They will not give up their jobs. So I say that if we approach this problem properly, I do not think we will have the slightest difficulty in enlisting every man General Marshall says he can employ or train with the present available facilities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am in complete accord with the statement of the Senator from Ohio. I wish to say that I have been very generous with my time, and I will yield now for questions, but I do not wish to yield for speeches any longer.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator for all the questions he wishes to ask, but I do not desire to yield for speeches.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator tell me what, in his opinion—and I know it is a well considered and an honest opinion—would be the length of time necessary to train an army of 800,000 new men, from the time war was declared, until they were reasonably efficient soldiers?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My answer to that question is the answer which General Marshall gave.

Mr. TYDINGS. What was the estimate he gave?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Eighteen months. He said that he might do the job in 15 months.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator has answered my question. If it takes 15 months to take green men and make them soldiers, we had better not debate any further; we had better pass the bill immediately.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But the bill provides for only 12 months' training. The position of the senior Senator from Maryland is entirely correct and entirely right, if we are preparing for an expeditionary force to go across the water, but if we are preparing an army to defend the United States of America, then he is entirely wrong, and in complete error.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will not interrupt the Senator again, but lest the debate may be misinterpreted, let me make two short statements. First, I am not at all contending that this country is going to be invaded, or that this hemisphere is going to be invaded. My support of the bill in its present form is and in its final form will be bottomed on the fact that I would rather have a little more support than we need and not need it than to need it and not have it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yeld?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Montana; but I desire to get along with my remarks.

Mr. WHEELER. We have heard many statements by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Ohio. To me the question is, How many men do we need to defend Amer-

ica, to keep an enemy from invading our country? General Marshall answered that question. He said 500,000 for war strength. Then he said he wanted 400,000 men for a reserve. That is the testimony of General Marshall.

Mr. TYDINGS. Where?

Mr. WHEELER. I just read it to the Senate, and I quoted the general's statement in my speech on the floor sometime ago.

Mr. TYDINGS. That means the Regular Army strength, not the National Guard.

Mr. WHEELER. I beg the Senator's pardon——

Mr. TYDINGS. That is the general's statement.

Mr. WHEELER. I am making the statement now, and I say that General Marshall said that he wanted 500,000 men for war strength.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not have the floor. I should like to finish my statement, however. General Marshall said he wanted 400,000 more for a reserve. The Senator asked, "How long will it take to train a million men?" The Senator talks as if it were expected that an army would be sent out of the country. I placed in the RECORD yesterday an article by Gault MacGowan, who wrote:

> France mobilized 6,000,000 soldiers, but couldn't hold a few German Panzer divisions supported by large numbers of Stuka fighting planes.

We are speaking about the defense of the Nation. In our first line of defense—and I think the Senator from Maryland will agree with me—is our Navy, in the second line of defense is our air force, and in the third line of defense the Regular Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. For a long period I have been in favor of building up the air force. I have said that it was one of the most important elements we could have. I quoted General de Gaulle of the free French Army, and a Polish general, both of whom say that a great army is not needed and that the theories held during the last Great War were entirely different from those held today.

Mr. President, what we need is a small mechanized force. Much has been said about Hitler perhaps coming over to the United States and landing troops on our soil, and capturing and taking over our country. How will he land troops here? The Germans cannot land troops on Great Britain, 22 miles away, across the channel. Prime Minister Churchill and other Englishmen have said, "We hope the Germans will try it, because we feel that if they try to invade England we will annihilate them." Sir George Paish also said to me the other day, "We hope the Germans will try to come over to England. If they do we will annihilate them."

Mr. President, it is fine for men to get up and wave the flag and say we need this great army, and get the people worked up to a state of hysteria, but if we need the number of men it is alleged are necessary for our defense, how long will it take to train them? We now have an army of practically 375,000 men, and we shall have an additional 500,000 men, and a further 400,000 men in the Reserve. If that number of men is not sufficient to defend the United States, then General Marshall is wrong.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I am obliged to leave the Senate Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very well, I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to correct one statement the Senator from Montana made. I happened to be present at the committee meeting at which General Marshall testified, and indeed it was in response to a question which I directed to him that he made the statement he did.

What General Marshall said at that hearing, in my presence, and facing me directly across the Appropriations Committee's table was this. I said:

> General, why do you not ask for 500,000 men instead of the 375,000 men?

He said:

> We plan to have 9 or 10 divisions complete and fully equipped, ready to move on 24 hours' notice, to take care of any emergency that might arise, so we can call the men on the telephone and in 24 hours have them on the way. That will take a great many of the instructors and noncoms and officers and matériel away from recruiting and training purposes. If, in addition to the 200,000 reasonably new men who have just come into the Army, you compel me to take 200,000 more, I would have to dismember my entire plans.

Later I spoke on the radio and General Marshall furnished me with a complete break-down of that force, as well as the future plans of the Army, and with that information furnished by Major Smith, of General Marshall's office, I went on the radio 2 or 3 months ago and recited what General Marshall told me, and that speech has been printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But General Marshall at no time in that statement was speaking about anything except the Regular Army itself. He pointed out that to have a permanent set-up, far in excess of 500,000 men, would be a financial burden upon the country, and unnecessary even in such times of emergency as these, but that we did need a fully recruited National Guard, supplemented by some selective-service men, in order to have a force which in emergency would meet the needs of the country.

Mr. President, I do not feel that America is going to be invaded either. I am not greatly concerned about the imminence of an invasion. The pending measure to me is only additional insurance, for I know that the stronger America is the less likelihood there is that a single boy will be called out in defense of his country. There is no prize beneath the sun so inviting as the United States of America. If we leave the United States weak and undefended, we leave open to attack the richest country in the world, with three-quarters of the world's monetary gold, with more natural resources developed than in any other country—oil, lumber, and cotton.

Mr. President, I believe that preparedness will save human life, will prevent a war, but that without reasonable preparedness we invite attack and will cause the spilling of the blood of countless youths, whom a little foresight and a little sacrifice and a little training could have saved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to renew my statement made a few moments ago, that I shall yield only to questions from now on. I know my leader is becoming very impatient with me. He wants me to hurry along and reach a conclusion on the bill. He told me a little while ago that he would cooperate with me, and I want to cooperate with him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator is accurate in saying that I am impatient with him. I never become impatient with my friend the Senator from Colorado, but I am sure he appreciates, as I do, the importance of getting ahead with the pending legislation. I am not impatient with the Senator. I might become impatient with his interrupters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator. I recall very well that when the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] addressed the Senate some time ago he had charts hung on the walls of the Senate Chamber, the purpose of which was to point out the disaster which would result from not having a balanced Budget, and reducing the expenditure of Federal funds. I am surprised to hear him now advocating the expenditure of a billion dollars every year for a conscript army—a billion dollars every year from now on for that purpose.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield for a question.

Mr. MINTON. The Senator from Colorado was a little astonished that the Senator from Maryland, who is known for his views with respect to balancing the Budget, should be for conscription and a defense program which might cost a billion dollars a year. Was the Senator not also surprised when he found that the great isolationist the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who also has wanted to balance the Budget, and who presented a formula for balancing the Budget, came out and advocated a rate of pay to the men of the Army which would not only unbalance the Budget, but would make it forever unbalanced?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I think the statement made by the Senator from Ohio that the men should be paid $40 or possibly $50 a month was entirely constructive.

Mr. MINTON. It would not balance the Budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But it would give us the kind of men in the Army we need, trained, skilled men, and as many such men as we want, while the conscript provision will give us a million men who are only one-third trained, and will be worthless to us in time of need. We need experts. I am entirely in sympathy with the statement of the Senator from Ohio in regard to the pay of our soldiers, because I know that we must pay experts good money, and we ought to be willing to do so.

CONSCRIPTION OF PROPERTY WILL FOLLOW

American citizens generally look with horror upon conscription of property. They do not enthuse over State ownership. Conscription of lives and property is, in fact, the real basis for our hatred and fear of the totalitarian pagan philosophy now sweeping through the Old World, and we should be logical enough to realize that conscription, once started here, will grow until the economy of the whole Nation is enveloped in it. How short-sighted are industry and capital to be building such a Frankenstein. If we are justified in conscripting lives, how can we expect the conscripts to hesitate over conscripting property? The two eventually must go together, and the two will go together. The conscript, inwardly resenting the imposition of such drastic action upon his life, will have no compunction about conscripting property when he finds himself propertyless and discouraged with the struggle for a chance to live. Everyone who believes in a capitalistic democracy should oppose conscription of men with all of the power at his command. The Burke-Wadsworth bill marks the crossroads in the life of the Republic and is the beginning of the end. I would rather have a millstone tied about my neck and be obliterated in a thousand fathoms of ocean brine than have any responsibility in the passage of such a reactionary, liberty-destroying, revolutionary measure.

BILL PROVIDES ELIMINATION, NOT SELECTION

Total wars are not won alone by soldiers on the battlefield. The man behind the plow, the workman in the factory, the teacher, and the preacher who keep up the morale of the people, the capitalist with his money bags, industry with its labor, the physician who combats disease, the nurses who minister unto the sick, and almost every citizen of the Nation at war have their important parts to play. Probably less than 5 percent of our population will ever be needed at the front at any given time in any total war; and under modern war technique the number of soldiers is being drastically reduced day by day. It will never be a major problem in this Nation to find that relatively small percentage of men needed to be trained as soldiers. The real problem is to locate the men adapted by skill and inclination to serve in that capacity. Many erroneously think that the Burke-Wadsworth bill, since it is often referred to as a selective-draft bill, assigns men to the particular military service to which they are adapted. Unfortunately, it does nothing of the kind. It does not select soldiers on the basis of their qualifications to be soldiers. It selects them on the basis of their not being valuable for anything else. The only selective feature of the bill is contained in section 4:

(c) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to defer training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

It will be noticed that this provision calls for a process of elimination instead of selection. The best qualification of a soldier is that he wants to be a soldier, just as the first qualification of a scientist is an ambition and desire to be a scientist. That law is as immutable as is the law of gravity, yet it is entirely disregarded by the advocates of compulsory military service.

ROUND PLUGS IN SQUARE HOLES

Success in life comes from doing the task in society which one enjoys performing. If I be a doctor of medicine and hate medicine and everything connected with its use, then my life will be a failure, regardless of my acquired skill in the art of healing. Free enterprise and freedom of action are the basic principles of a democracy. Individual choice of action is the very soul of such a system of government. One would be a physician, another an attorney, still another a farmer, someone else a soldier; and in a democracy, each has his choice. Men should be selected by themselves according to their own inclination and temperament for a vocation.

They cannot be assigned to it arbitrarily in a democracy by the strong hand of government. Success in life comes from a recognition and application of that fundamental philosophy, and that is why the democratic way of life is so precious. Men who desire to be soldiers should have an opportunity to be soldiers if more soldiers are needed. Peacetime conscription arbitrarily would require every man physically fit to be a soldier, whether he has any such inclination or not, provided he is not considered valuable for something else. It is a process of attempting to fit round plugs into square holes, and it will never succeed. Many men are improved in mind and body by military service, while others are ruined by it. God did not create men alike in their physical aptitudes and natural reactions, and man cannot improve upon God's plan of personal choice. Totalitarian and Fascist governments ignore God's law and do not recognize the individual as being of any consequence. That is the source of the abhorrence in which dictators are held by free men who seek freedom of action.

EQUALITARIANISM IS NOT DEMOCRACY

Compulsory peacetime conscription has been constantly lauded in this debate as the democratic way to procure an army. It is nothing of the sort. No greater misstatement of fact has ever been peddled to the gullible than that hoax. Such a claim is ridiculous piffle. One is forced to believe that the spreaders of such a canard know very little about democratic processes. By such a yardstick Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan are democracies. If for any reason one is inclined to subscribe to conscription in peacetime as being desirable, he should be honest enough not to wrap this despised Prussian invention of forced service in the "lily white robes" of democracy. If we believe that we must fight fire with fire, let us be candid enough not to pretend that there is anything democratic about that fire, for compulsory peacetime military service is positively contrary to all democratic ideology and practice. It is said that it is democratic because it falls with equal force upon those who bear its burdens. I do not admit the false claim of the equality of its imposed burden; but for the sake of argument, I shall pass that point for the moment. When all black men were pressed into slavery, the burden of slavery fell upon all of them alike, and it was, in spite of all of its hated injustices, at least equal in its application. However, that did not make it democratic. When Herod, in his efforts to destroy the Christ Child, decreed that the first-born of every family must die, he levied upon all alike. He treated all families on equal terms. He did not discriminate. There was equality in his harsh and brutal proclamation, but it was dictatorship at its worst, and was not a democratic practice in any particular.

BURDEN NOT TO FALL ON RICH AND POOR ALIKE

However, the conscription provision of the bill does not fall with equal weight on all, as is claimed by its proponents. It falls only upon 4,000,000 persons out of a population of 130,000,000; and due to an amendment adopted yesterday will fall upon only 900,000 of them each year. The bill actually invites discrimination by authorizing the President to defer training and service in the case of anyone whose deferment will contribute to the national health, safety, or interest. Under that broad language, the President may exempt anyone and everyone whom he wishes to exempt for any reason suit-

able to his purpose. He has already hinted that college boys will not be conscripted, but he has not assured the widow's son or the boy too poor to go to college that they will be spared. The burden of consciption in peacetime will not fall on rich and poor alike. It will not fall on employed and unemployed alike. It will be borne by the boy too poor to attend college or lacking the pull to land a fat job. Suppose, however, for the sake of argument, that Johnnie Rich and Johnnie Poor were both conscripted. After completion of the imposed year of military service Johnnie Rich goes back to his coupon clipping without any inconvenience, but Johnnie Poor returns to find his little business demoralized, or his law practice ruined. The burden of a year of public service would not fall upon each of these young men with the same weight, and no act of Congress can make it so fall.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. When Johnnie Poor asks for a pension or a bonus he will be accused of being a patrioteer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very likely.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator realize that if a man has a job paying $120 a month, and he is selected for service under the bill, the result is in effect to impose a rate of 75 percent on his income?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is exactly what happens; and in that case his property is conscripted. I am coming to that point in a moment.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. When the boys come marching home, if conscription goes through and we become involved in war, we shall meet another bonus bill of $2,400,000,000, or more, and we shall meet the pension problem all over again.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think anyone can foresee all the difficulties we may get into.

There is no equity in the application of the bill and it is pure deception to claim otherwise. It is a bill for compulsory military training and service; and whatever selecting is contemplated will be done under rules and regulations promulgated by the War Department in whatever arbitrary manner it deems advisable. Under it poor boys—boys without jobs or influence—will be compelled to accept military training and service at a wage which Congress has outlawed as an unfair labor practice in respect to every industry engaged in interstate commerce.

LOW SOLDIER PAY THE MOTHER OF CONSCRIPTION

To pay soldiers a small wage is a tradition borrowed from Europe and is part and parcel of that other European tradition—compulsory conscription. The two go together. One is made necessary by the other. Low soldier pay is the mother of conscription. The day America pays her soldiers a wage comparable to what the cities of this country pay their policemen compulsory conscription will forever disappear and military service will be sought after by ambitious men as an honorable and dignified vocation into which they will be justified in extending their best effort. Patriotism cannot be purchased, but it can be driven from the hearts of men meanly treated.

SOLDIER MORATORIUMS A DISGRACE

An amendment to the compulsory conscription bill has been agreed to which provides a moratorium on the debts of conscripts. Because of the small pay of our military servants, that provision was perhaps advisable. However, the condition which made such a provision necessary is a disgrace to the United States. Shame on a rich Government which asks creditors needing their collections desperately to wait upon Federal employees because that wealthy Nation is paying a starvation wage to the defenders of the Republic.

In that connection I received a letter this morning which is quite interesting. The writer says:

As regional director of the National Automobile Dealers Association, past president of the Denver Automobile Dealers Association, and a motorcar dealer for many years, I sincerely ask that your committee seriously consider the equities of all concerned before passing the above bills.

He refers to the moratorium features of the conscription bill.

He further says:

The automobile dealers of the Rocky Mountain region are patriotic Americans with big investments and pay rolls. They are willing to do their share in our defense program by paying additional taxes and by releasing National Guard members and draftees in their employ, when called, in most cases holding jobs open.

However, the above bills as at present written would entail great hardships on these dealers and in many cases would mean bankruptcy.

Then he suggests an amendment. He closes with this statement, which is all-important:

Failure to take action can only result in a sharp restriction of credit in the draft-age groups and subsequent hardship to owners of property bought on credit, as well as to holders of paper. Department of Commerce figures indicate that outstanding installment paper now amounts to $4,000,000,000, which is increasing daily. In 1918 this form of selling was virtually nonexistent in most fields of business.

He mentions the fact that from now on businesses extending credit will have to curtail that credit. The boys within the draft-age limits will be blacklisted and will be unable to obtain credit. We are to select a few, but will register 4,000,000 men.

Something else will happen to them. The other day I was talking to a leading industrialist from Connecticut. He said that his company would not hire men subject to the draft; that they did not want them, could not use them, and could not afford to take the chance of having them drafted and taken away from them. So they would simply pass up the employment of such men. It will be seen that the men who are to be drafted will have their credit restricted, and their opportunity for jobs will be restricted because of this potential draft which has been placed upon them.

Shame on a great, powerful, and rich Nation that would pay a faithful servant a wage so niggardly and so much lower than he previously was earning in civil life before he was conscripted that he could not thereafter meet the obligations which he had incurred on the basis of his civil earnings! The laborer is worthy of his hire in any civilized land, and certainly the soldier is worthy of his hire in this wealthiest of all nations. What would be thought of a city that paid its policemen so low a wage that it was necessary to conscript men for that service? It would be a bad state of affairs for that city, the public, and the men in the police department; and I thank God that such an unfortunate condition does not exist in any American city. To the contrary, hundreds of ambitious and willing men are waiting to fill every police vacancy. As a result, cities are very choosy in selecting police officers, and only men specifically adapted to such duties receive the much-sought-for positions. The same condition prevails in the commissioned grades of the Army where men receive a decent salary. Millions of ambitious men would desire to join the Army if enlisted men were paid a decent wage, and they would not be fortune hunters, either, as has been stated in this debate.

Military service in peacetime is not especially hazardous. No employment is quite so healthful and so free from accidents as is peacetime military service, police service being far more hazardous and dangerous to life and limb. Every precautionary health measure known to science is thrown around the soldier. A different situation prevails during war. During the World War, when nearly 5,000,000 men served their country in a military uniform, 39,362 were killed in battle, 192,369 were wounded, and 76,757 died from other causes. In other words, 7 percent of the men called to the colors were either killed or seriously wounded in battle or died from disease. I here insert a brief table from statistics furnished by the Veterans' Administration covering World War casualties:

Total mobilization of forces	4,355,000
Wounded in action	192,369
Killed in action	39,362

Died of wounds	14,009
Died of disease	75,460
Died of accidents	1,109
Died of other causes	188
Total deaths	130,128
Total casualties (7 percent)	308,488

Mr. President, the normal death rate in civilian life of persons between the ages of 21 and 31 years of age is about 1½ percent. In peacetime the death rate of soldiers is far below that of civilians. Military service in peacetime positively is not a hazardous occupation, and men do not hesitate to join the Army because of fear of bodily injury. Army life appeals to many men, but they cannot afford to join because of the low wage paid.

THE SOLDIER'S PROPERTY IS CONSCRIPTED

When men are conscripted in peacetime, it is the earning power of the civilian, or the money due his creditors, that is conscripted. To get soldiers cheaply and far below their true value is the only excuse for contemplating such drastic action. If the Government is justified in taking the soldier's property, or the property which he is capable of earning in civil life, by conscription, why hesitate about conscripting anyone's property? Why stop with the soldier? It is said that the soldier owes his country something. The soldier has no monopoly on patriotism. The President owes his country something, but he is handsomely paid for his services, as are others in Government employ. Civil-service employees owe their country something, but they are paid for all the service they render their country. Why pay the soldier partly in cash and partly in patriotism, when everyone else in Federal employ is paid cash in full. Why are men in the military service singled out to work for a wage far below the civilian standard?

LOW SOLDIER PAY FOUNTAINHEAD OF IMPERIALISM

I have another reason for wanting the soldiers to be well paid. I want to make war a costly adventure. Nations that pay low wages to their soldiers and are able to keep their military ranks filled with conscripts place a very low monetary value on soldiers' lives. It makes wars profitable to them and is the fountainhead of imperialism. History, past and current, proves conclusively that cheap conscripted soldiers are sacrificed on the altar of imperialism without hesitation by dictators. Most wars are fought over territory and commerce. High labor costs stimulate the use of machinery in war as they do in industry. When soldiers cost real money, war machines—labor-saving war machines—will be used. The cheapest thing in the World War was human "cannon fodder," and that explains its reckless use. I want to make "cannon fodder" so costly that machinery will replace it. Perhaps some day wars will be fought by Frankenstein creations.

DISTINGUISHED WITNESSES

During this debate the testimony of many witnesses has been paraded before the Senate. I myself desire to read the testimony of a few important witnesses. I will call upon Msgr. Michael J. Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, to testify first.

As has been stated during this debate, the National Catholic Welfare Conference is a representative body of the bishops of that great church. I quote from Monsignor Ready's testimony:

> Military conscription is a matter of supreme importance to our present citizens and to future generations. This legislation is too important to be rushed through Congress until all other possible programs have been examined. The military professionals would convince us that necessary forces of men cannot be obtained by voluntary service. The newspapers tell us that a thousand men a day are enlisting in various branches of the service. It is certain that a proper, reasonable, Nation-wide appeal to the men of our country would be answered by volunteers in numbers greater than present resources to care for them. If the study and propaganda expended on this conscription bill had been applied to methods for getting voluntary enlistments, the Nation would have been better served. The possibility of a 1-year voluntary-enlistment program should be exhausted before resorting to a compulsory one. We are, after all, living at peace with the world, and our determination should lead us to the preservation of such peace.
>
> Every loyal American is in favor of a defense program which will make us so strong that no other nation or coalition of nations dare to attack us. In preparing such a defense, we should rely on the fine traditions which have made this Nation great.

Is this the statement of a "fifth columnist"? Is Monsignor Ready's voice the hypocritical and whining voice of appeasement? It is not. It is the voice of a great student of mankind. Not only is Monsignor Ready devoted, with understanding, to the ideals of his religion, but he is devoted, with understanding, to the Constitution of the United States of America and its noblest traditions. Monsignor Ready calls to our attention the well-established fact that volunteers are coming in at the rate of more than a thousand a day, and he pleads with Congress to give the volunteer system a fair trial before adopting conscription. Monsignor Ready's contention is supported by the facts as reported by Associated Press on August 19. I quote:

ARMY RECRUITING HITS WEEKLY PEAK OF 8,605

> Army recruiting, on the upgrade since late May, reached another weekly peak of 8,605 new enlistments between August 11 and 18. * * * Working toward an immediate goal of 332,922 for the total strength of the Army, to be obtained as rapidly as possible, the Army had an estimated enlisted strength today of 283,000, the largest number ever enlisted in peacetime and 3,000 more than the previous maximum statutory limit of the Army.

Next I shall call upon another great American, President of the American Federation of Labor William Green, a constant supporter of the administration and President Roosevelt. On August 5, in a much publicized statement, Mr. Green said, in part:

> The American Federation of Labor will give support to compulsory military training service legislation when such action becomes necessary in order to defend, protect, and preserve America. However, in providing an adequate army for defensive purposes, the American way should be followed first. A voluntary enlistment program should be launched by the Government designed to create an army of one million and a half men. This would be putting voluntary action before compulsion. American labor would respond to such a program wholeheartedly and enthusiastically.

It is not surprising to find this great leader, devoted as he is to the democratic processes, refusing to support the antithesis of democracy—conscription—before giving the voluntary system, the democratic way, an opportunity to function. William Green, great liberal that he is, could not and would not take any other position.

I now quote an old friend, Loren M. Edwards, D. D., minister, First Methodist Church, Colorado Springs, Colo. There is not a man or minister in all America more devoted to democracy and more loyal to the United States of America than is Loren M. Edwards. Hear him now:

> There may come an hour in our history when large-scale conscription will become a military necessity, but many of us believe that such an hour has not been reached. On the contrary, we fear that the measure now proposed in our national Congress is but another step toward war. Grave as is the situation in Europe at the moment, hysteria is not the proper mood for our national leaders. If 22 miles of the English Channel are proving a strong obstacle to Nazi invasion of England, the 3,000 miles of Atlantic Ocean might seem to be insurmountable to European attack. Our energies at the moment should be directed toward adequate naval and air defense, with wise attention to such spots in this Western Hemisphere as would offer bases for future enemy operations. Such a program should not involve the millions of men contemplated in a vast conscription scheme.

There is no answer to that profound logic. Dr. Edwards is correct. The pending conscription measure is a form of hysteria, and at the same moment a generator of more hysteria. Congress should not lend itself to that kind of promotion of evil.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Do not these exhibits which the Senator has read indicate that the real trouble lies, after all, in the fact that our leadership has failed to define for us its objectives, or where our national interests are said to lie, or even what they are, and that while our people would gladly volunteer to defend the United States they most certainly do not wish to be drafted to fight other people's wars?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the Senator has stated the case exactly. At least, that is one of the difficulties. There are some other difficulties, but that is at least one of them.

In characteristic, brusque manner the dynamic militant and bristling labor leader, John L. Lewis, disposes of compulsory conscription in peacetime in these words:

The Congress of Industrial Organizations has pledged its full support to a program for meeting the needs of national defense of this country. However, we are firmly of the opinion that national defense does not and must not be based upon the destruction or curtailment of our basic democratic institutions.

Compulsory conscription in time of peace, as provided for in the Burke-Wadsworth bill, involves a very definite departure from the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence. Compulsory conscription would necessarily result in tremendous dislocations among the lives of millions of individuals in industry and in communities throughout our country. Basic civil liberties, including freedom of speech and freedom of press and freedom of individual initiative and enterprise, would be seriously threatened.

Democracy, which we are seeking to defend and preserve, must offer its own way of life to combat the forces which imperil civilization today.

To this end, the Congress of Industrial Organizations suggests that if there is a need for larger personnel in our armed forces, the method of voluntary enlistments be continued and relied upon to meet the needs of the present emergency. We believe that a sufficient number of voluntary enlistments could be secured if the pay for enlisted men were increased and the minimum period of enlistment reduced. Such an enlisted army, highly trained in the use of mechanized arms, would, we submit, meet our military defense problems.

When John L. Lewis has had his say there remains little to be said. He knows how necessary it is for labor to cling to the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the United States and the democracy which is espouses. This fighting liberal does not favor a departure from the basic principles of liberty and democracy because the hosts of force challenge democracy as decadent. John L. Lewis says with great truth that democracy must offer its own way of life to combat the forces which imperil civilization today. He wants our democracy to resist in its own way, and not join in their way the totalitarian doctrines of force.

The Reverend Walter H. Hellman, pastor of Peninsular Lutheran Church, Portland, Oreg., says:

America has become aroused over the proposed legislation looking to peacetime conscription of our manpower. Such legislation, if enacted, can only be the first dangerous step that leads to the scuttling of all that we hold dear as Americans. This must not, need not, be.

And L. Herbert Reynolds, pastor, Friends Church, Amboy, Ind., adds:

By whatever name it may be called, compulsory military service is the essence of dictatorship, militarism, and totalitarianism.

His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII, said:

Robust young men are taken from agriculture, or ennobling studies or trade or the arts to be put under arms. Hence the treasures of the state are exhausted by the enormous expenditure, the national resources are frittered away, and private fortunes impaired; and this, as it were, armed peace, which now prevails, cannot last much longer. Can this be the normal condition of human society?

His Holiness, Pope Pius XI, said in regard to it:

It is scarcely better than war itself, a condition which tends to exhaust national finances, to waste the flower of youth, to muddy and poison the very fountain-heads of life, physical, intellectual, and moral.

Rev. E. Cahill, S. J., author of "The Framework of the Christian State," says that conscription laws tend to override man's personal rights.

Man's natural right to free choice of work and to personal liberty of action are suspended, and other rights still more sacred are violated and endangered. Besides, owing to the immense power which the conscription laws put into the hands of a bureaucracy, one can easily understand how almost every human right of the individual citizen is imperiled.

Laws that impose compulsory military service upon the men of the state are founded upon pagan precedent and are abhorrent to the spirit of Christianity.

I have more than a thousand letters from churchmen from every portion of the United States opposing compulsory peacetime military service as being contrary to the principles of democracy, but I cannot include their very sincere testimony here.

No organization stands higher in public esteem than do the railroad brotherhoods. Through the years Congress has learned that it can place implicit confidence in them. That they consistently advocate a sound policy in public affairs is known to everyone. Their position on the compulsory conscription bill is, therefore, of great importance. Listen, Senators, to the statement of the railroad brotherhoods:

We are in general agreement with the prevailing sentiment in the United States that every support should be given to adequate measures necessary to the protection of our democratic institutions against attack from the force of dictatorship, both within and without our country. However, grave doubt exists in many quarters with respect to the wisdom of enacting a peacetime conscription bill when it is believed other adequate measures are available.

Compulsory military service in time of peace is the very antithesis of freedom. It involves an infringement on the very principles of democracy which it is invoked to defend.

Democracy means that the state exists to serve the individual. The program at present contemplated will cause hundreds of thousands of our youth to become war-minded and will, if carried out, establish the fabric of a giant war machine which experience teaches us cannot and will not be permitted to rust in peace. "War games" inevitably lead to war.

The youth of our country who are inducted into the military and naval services under the principle of conscription and who are made to serve will quite naturally acquire the viewpoint that forceful means should be adopted in all the affairs of life as an avenue to achieve desired ends. Voluntary enlistment preserves the principle of democracy in its strictest sense.

That solemn statement is signed by A. Johnston, grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; D. B. Robertson, president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; J. A. Phillips, president, Order of Railway Conductors of America; A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; T. C. Cashen, president, Switchmen's Union of North America.

Such an emphatic indictment of the Burke-Wadsworth dictatorship bill should cause some of its advocates in Congress to give heed to the traditional railroad warning—Stop, Look, and Listen.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter from Mr. J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executives' Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

AUGUST 26, 1940.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The Railway Labor Executives' Association, representing more than 1,000,000 men, while in session in Washington gave serious deliberation to conscriptive legislation and in no uncertain terms voiced its opposition to peacetime conscription at this time for many reasons, among which some of the outstanding are:

We regard peacetime conscription as a serious menace to democracy.

There has been no demonstration that the voluntary method will not furnish the necessary manpower.

Adoption of conscription in peacetime will fasten an odious military system upon the American people for generations.

It will be a serious menace to civil and economic liberty and tend to completely destroy real American democracy.

There should be no discrimination as between manpower and big industry, and equality of treatment should control.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) J. G. LUHRSEN,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The majority in the Senate will not listen to the railroad brotherhoods. I am in thorough accord with the resolutions the able Senator has read, and some time ago I had telegrams from them on our foreign policy.

In line with the statement of the railroad brotherhoods and others as to how much preparedness we should have, I have here five short editorials on our foreign policy which I should like to have printed at the end of the Senator's remarks, so as not to interfere with his remarks. These are editorials from Wallace's Farmer of Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be very glad to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hearing none, it is granted. The editorials will be printed at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I call attention at this time also to the remarks yesterday of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] in which he quoted the Trohan article to the effect that it would be physically impossible to transport 1,000,000 men over here on short notice, that it cannot be done inside of 3 years, and also Villard's book Our Military Chaos, which absolutely confirms the able statement of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be very glad to have the contribution from the Senator from Minnesota.

LABOR OPPOSES FOR SOUND REASONS

No group in America has a monopoly on patriotism and deep concern for the welfare of our country, but no group in this fortunate country of ours loves the principles of democracy with a better understanding or with more fervor than do the men and women of organized labor. It must be apparent to everyone that there is something radically wrong with a measure which is so bitterly fought by every group of organized labor. Labor knows that peacetime conscription of men is a wicked precedent that must naturally lead in time to conscription of labor and industry. The conscription of these three is fascism, a hated ideology which has crushed organized labor everywhere. It is true that this bill takes only one of the fatal steps toward fascism, but the other two steps will be easier to take if the ice be broken in this initial step.

I am reminded of an observation by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] who now graces this body by presiding over it. This is what he said:

Men do not jump halfway down Niagara Falls.

Take one step down Niagara, and you go clear to the bottom. Take one step toward fascism, and you go all the way. There is no turning back.

The conclusions are my own. I am borrowing the statement of the Senator from Arizona that men do not jump halfway down Niagara.

It will matter little in the end whether we permit fascism to creep upon us like a thief in the night, through our own gradual departure from the principles of democracy, or whether we suffer it to be imposed upon us by Mr. Hitler. The result will be the same. It is disturbing to witness Members of Congress who have consistently fought a hard fight for liberalism all of their lives now abandoning that proud position because of the current wave of fear and hysteria. This is a time for strong men who are at heart devoted to democracy and liberalism to assert themselves. Whom fascism would destroy, it first makes afraid.

IMPOSED DISCIPLINE DESTROYS CHARACTER

I am skeptical of legislation which is so severely condemned by American labor and American religionists. Seldom do these two groups guess wrong. Seldom do they take such an uncompromising stand against legislation unless the matter is of vital and fundamental importance. One can hardly dispute the argument that the world needs discipline, and the religious leaders do not deny it. Humanity has always needed discipline. The demand of the times is for discipline, but the demand of the times is for self-discipline, not imposed discipline. If one will think the matter through, he will discover why imposed discipline is character destroying; and why self-discipline, on the other hand, is the greatest character-building process known to psychologists. Imposed discipline defeats its own purpose, for men who become accustomed to it become so weakened that they cannot get along without it.

CONSCRIPTS LEARN TO USE BAYONET

The records show that the recruiting officers turn down hundreds of would-be volunteers every day for trivial and inconsequential reasons, such as ingrown toenails, decayed teeth, or a few pounds underweight or overweight, and similar temporary physical defects which might be corrected easily. Many Negroes seeking military training and service are denied the opportunity because of their color. Certainly a sincere effort should be made by the recruiting officers to enlist volunteers before resorting to the drastic process of conscription. Army men do not like to depend upon volunteers. They prefer force and arbitrary action; but they should lower their standards from the present unreasonable heights, and really attempt to secure volunteers who will make good soldiers.

Good machinery requires good operators. Delicate machinery needs the experienced hand of the well-trained and well-paid technician. Effective and complicated war machinery must be manned and maintained by the skilled soldier.

A leading Washington daily has been carrying on a campaign for a million sergeant-mechanics, and, in addition, 100,000 pilots to operate the 50,000 planes urged by the President which at present seem to be somewhere in the distant future. That paper's program is sound and full of common sense, but I have been dismayed to notice that the author of that policy is now supporting the Burke-Wadsworth bill, under the misapprehension that the million mechanics will be forthcoming under its provisions. The Burke-Wadsworth bill will not give the United States one single solitary sergeant-mechanic and it will not supply one single pilot to a country extremely short in pilots. There is not one word, or line, or paragraph in this bill which by the widest stretch of the imagination could possibly lead one to believe that it will give us one sergeant-mechanic or any other kind of a mechanic, or pilot, or technician, or operator, or maintainer of any war machine whatsoever. It does not pretend to do any such thing, and it does not do it. It proposes to give millions of conscripts a year's training in elementary military drills, manual of arms, exercises, and bayonet practice, and afterward place them in a political military reservoir for 10 years, where they can work for a program of militarism in the United States. That is all it does. It will cost the Treasury a billion dollars a year, and it will not produce one man capable of operating a single implement of war other than a Springfield rifle and a bayonet. These men, trained in the science of war as it existed 50 years ago, will stand ready to serve their country as "minutemen," but minutemen have no more place in modern warfare than does ox-drawn artillery. Minutemen went out of style with the flintlock musket.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I am astounded to hear the statement made that the pending conscription bill will not produce any mechanics or any men for the Air Corps. I do not follow the Senator at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator will find out, if he will go into the matter, that my statement is absolutely true. I am sorry it is true. If it would provide mechanicians, and mechanics, and operators of these machines, I certainly would not be opposing it so strenuously as I am.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me it must provide them; it cannot help providing them. How can it fail to provide them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not follow the Senator's logic in that statement.

Mr. LODGE. I am sorry the Senator will not answer my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I answered the question to the best of my ability. I told the Senator the bill would not provide any mechanics of any kind.

Mr. LODGE. That is an assertion the Senator makes, but I do not see how he can possibly prove it. The bill calls for a registration and then a selection, and those in authority can select men they are going to use as mechanics, they can select men they are going to use as pilots, they can select men they are going to use for artillery, or in armories, or as blacksmiths, or as cooks, or as electric welders, or as radio operators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator believe that the bill provides a regimentation of labor?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly not. I say that the purpose of the bill is to get men for the Army; and if the bill is not going to get men for the Army, there is no use passing it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill does not provide for giving anyone any training in the mechanical arts at all or in the operation of any war machines.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator mean that a man who is taken under the bill will not receive as good training as is given a man who enlists in the Regular Army now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I say he will not get as good training under the proposed law as he would in the Regular Army. Of course, he will not get the same kind of training.

Mr. LODGE. Why not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A man who enlists in the Regular Army makes that his career; he goes in for 3 years, and they give him a considerable amount of training. But the man who enlists in the Army does not get any of that specialized training until after he has been in the Army a long time. He does not get it the first year.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator is mistaken. I took a tour of active duty about a month and a half ago, and it so happened I was in charge of 200 recruits, who had not been in the Army more than 10 days, but we were teaching them how to drive tanks, and we were running radio schools and motor maintenance schools and carrying on all the rest of the appropriate training.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not agree with the Senator at all that we will get any mechanics. We will not get one single mechanic under this bill.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator keeps asserting that, but how can he demonstrate that the Army is not going to take a man and make a mechanic out of him? How can the Senator possibly so contend?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I say there is nothing in the bill providing for that sort of thing at all; not one single line in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. It is not necessary to provide it in the bill. Cannot the Army be trusted to take a man and use him as a mechanic, or as an artillerist, or a sharpshooter, if they want to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; if they were going to use them for those things, but they are not going to use them for those purposes.

Mr. LODGE. What are they going to use the men for?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Army cannot afford to take a man who is going to be in the Army only 12 months and teach him to be the operator of a delicate piece of Army machinery. They cannot afford to do that.

I will tell the Senator what the Army is going to do with the men. They are going to teach them to handle bayonets, they are going to teach them the manual of arms, fatigue marching, camp life, and all of the fundamental things connected with Army life. They are not going to make specialists out of them. There is no chance for them to make specialists out of them.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator really believe that they are not going to take any of these 1-year men and teach them how to repair a truck?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I doubt whether they teach them very much about repairing trucks. Some of the men may know a little about handling a truck or repairing a truck; I do not know about that, but I am very certain that is not going to be part of the Army training.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. For the first time this morning I heard the suggestion that the pay of soldiers be increased to $40 or $50 a month under the volunteer system, for the purpose, I assume, of making it more attractive to volunteers. As I understand, the Senator from Colorado endorses that idea.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I endorse that idea. For a man who makes it his career, not for a 12-month man, but where a man is willing to enlist in the Army and learn to handle the intricate and complex machinery that is used in modern wars, if he will go in and learn how to operate that kind of machinery, I think he should receive more pay. But I want him to make it a career. That is the difference.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator does not advocate a large standing army in peacetime, I understand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; but I advocate an army sufficient to take care of our needs, and I want that army to be well trained.

Mr. STEWART. I am quite in accord with the Senator in that respect. I have had a great deal of difficulty, perhaps as much as anyone in this body, in making up my mind on this question of conscription and of enforced training, because it affects me in more ways than one. Particularly am I concerned with respect to the training, taking young men between the ages of 21 and 31 from their active participation in the affairs of life, a young man who has become established in business, one has made a business connection, perhaps has started on a business career, another with prospects of promotion and an increase of salary, and all those things. We can all understand that it would bring about a very serious interruption to take him for even 12 months from the ordinary pursuits of business life and place him in a training camp.

I say frankly to the Senator that I have had a great deal of difficulty in making up my mind about it, but I believe, and it is my deliberate judgment, that the only democratic way of raising an army, whether it be for the purpose of actually participating in war, which I hope will not come to the United States, or for training men for an army, is in the selective system. It gets men in all walks of life. It does not respect the poor or the rich, if properly administered, and we assume that it would be. On the other hand the volunteer system is one which in a sense—especially if we increase the soldier's pay to $40 or $50 a month, and thereby make it attractive to poor boys—will result in that we shall have a poor man's army.

A short time ago an effort was made in the Senate to provide by law that the boys in the C. C. C. camps be given military training, and the subject was discussed. Objection was made to that effort, because it was argued, and perhaps rightly, that the result would be that we would have a poor man's army, because most of the boys in the C. C. C. camps perhaps have not been so fortunate in life as others, and, of course, the C. C. C. itself is looked upon as a division or branch of the relief set-up. So the Senate refused to provide military training for boys in the C. C. C. camps.

Mr. President, if we should increase the pay of the private in the Army and retain the volunteer system and thereby attract many needy and poor boys, would that not have the same identical effect that it was argued would obtain if military training were introduced into the C. C. C. camps?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am sorry that the Senator from Tennessee—the "Volunteer State," by the way——

Mr. STEWART. Yes; and I want to say about the State of Tennessee—and I think the record will bear me out—that the State of Tennessee up to the present date has given more volunteers, so far as population is concerned, than most other States in the Union. My information is that that statement is correct, so we in Tennessee still believe in the voluntary system, and will volunteer when necessary.

As I understand, we have agreed that the country is facing a tremendous emergency, an emergency of a different kind than I have ever heard of or known of, an emergency different from any which any Senator has ever heard of or known of. During the present summer, the summer that is still with us, we have seen civilizations of Europe absolutely wiped from the face of the earth. Almost overnight a great German war machine pushed the population of Belgium and of France, as a snow plow would push the snow from the roadway, that great German war machine has pushed those populations into the ocean, as it were, and destroyed the civilizations of most of continental Europe, civilizations which have stood for centuries.

Now, an English-speaking people, on a small island, only 20 or 30 miles from the coast of the continent of Europe, are fighting the most desperate fight for their salvation. Mr. President, I admire their spunk. Thank God for fighters of that kind. I wish to God it were in our power, without committing an act of war, to help them, because they are fighting, after a manner of speaking, our fight. I am for them. God bless them, and more power to them. I should like to send them 50 destroyers—100 destroyers, airplanes, money, food. I do not want to commit an act of war, but my sympathy goes out to the British today. It goes out to them because of the fight they are making, and because I believe they are fighting our fight. I believe civilization is threatened by a bloodthirsty beast in central Europe, who would wipe America from the face of the earth and destroy our American way of living and the life we enjoy.

I believe that when we prepare to meet the emergency in the situation we should do so under the conscript system, a system whereby every boy, whether he be born in a rich family or a poor family, will bear an equal portion of the burden and, if necessary, fight like all the rest of us, without one dime of compensation.

Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator for that outburst, but I have listened to the debate and have had tremendous difficulty, as I said at the outset, in making up my mind about the question. I believe the time has come when we should act on this matter. In the last 2 or 3 days it has been urged that we act now on the matter. I think the time has come when we should vote, when we should pass the pending bill and quit debating.

Mr. President, we hear people talk about the red tape of the United States Government, about the red tape that has to be waded through in order to accomplish anything. The time has come when this deliberative body—in this instance I think we have been perhaps a little bit too deliberate—should act. The time has come when a certain measure of responsibility rests upon our shoulders. I do not want it to be said of me or any other Member of the Senate, that we have become the Chamberlains of America. We have seen the things happen which have been described in the Senate, and it is only by experience that we can profit from what has happened. I want the Senate to act. If it were a matter which simply involved me, if I personally were the only one involved, delay would not amount to so much, but I am not willing to take a chance, Mr. President, where my country is concerned. I think we ought to proceed and raise an army by the selective-service method, and I hope to God that before the sun rises in the morning the machinery will be in motion, so far as the United States Senate is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I observed a while ago that I did not wish to yield for a speech, but would yield for questions. I should like to proceed and finish my observations. I do not wish to be discourteous to any Senator, and shall be glad to yield for questions, but I do not wish to yield for a speech.

CITIZENS' ARMY POOR MODERN DEFENSE

Mr. President, weapons utilized in modern war cannot be effectively manned by a conscript army with 1 year's preliminary training in military drills and bayonet practice. Modern war has become a scientific combat between highly mechanized and armored forces. Instead of sketchy training of millions of raw recruits in the military drills and manual of arms, we should be providing for a moderate-sized, well-paid career army, fully equipped and thoroughly skilled in the use of the latest and most effective weapons known to science. Improvised and short-term military courses for millions of young men will prove of small value in a modern war. The bill will create in the minds of our citizens the illusion of military strength when there is actually no real military strength. Congress is proposing a form of training which might have been appropriate during the Civil War, but, Senators, this is 1940. Paul Revere and his patriotic minutemen with their trusty muskets have been dead almost two centuries. Congress ought to devote its efforts to raising the Army of the United States to its authorized strength, streamlining it and training its men in the career which they have chosen, and Congress ought not to be bringing in a million conscripts a year to be trained by an Army already badly confused and "bogged down" with its recent increments of green recruits. In time, the Army will be ready to train conscripts, but that day is many months away. The Army needs to consolidate and digest its newly added components before it is expanded further. To place upon it the training of hundreds of thousands of conscripts in its demoralized state is folly and worse. We are unwisely spreading our training far beyond the capacity of the Army to absorb its gigantic task. We are getting "the cart before the horse." We ought to concentrate on what the Army can do and do well before confusing the situation. The year 1940 calls for an Army of quality, not quantity, and it calls for an intense training of a few soldiers rather than a hit-and-miss, half-way training of millions.

NATIONAL GUARD THROUGH

The Burke-Wadsworth bill proposing a citizen army of poorly trained soldiers, has far-reaching effect upon our whole Military Establishment, and will be severely revolutionary in its military application. It is a return to the "horse and buggy" days of Paul Revere. It marks the end of a career army of well-trained and skilled soldiers. At the very time that modern warfare demands more skill in military technique, we abandon that method for a citizen army. At the very time that modern warfare begins the process of replacing men with war machines, we begin replacing war machines with great masses of men armed with bayonets. The world goes forward, and under the provisions of the bill the United States will go backward. The Burke-Wadsworth bill will mark the end, too, of the National Guard. The United States with 6,000,000 conscripts in a military reservoir will have no further need for a National Guard. The National Guard association officers realized that fact, and tried to write a saving clause into the bill, which at its best is only a wishful gesture. While the Federal Government will have no further need for a National Guard after the enactment of the pending measure, a State militia will continue to be needed by the States.

CITIZENS' ARMY OUTMODED

Twenty-three years ago, when Henry L. Stimson advocated a citizen army in magazine articles and lectures, it had some military merit, because in that day great masses of men still engaged in battle, but modern warfare technique has outmoded the system completely now. I fear that the good Secretary who is chief sponsor for this backward-looking system has not kept pace in his thinking with present-day military development. I fear that he is living in the military world of yesterday when quantity and not quality of soldiers governed. Old age is one of the natural tragedies of life, but the Congress is responsible for the military policies of the country and must remain alert and keep them up to date, and not permit outmoded military policies to be adopted by a War Department fully two decades behind the times. In Paul Revere's day, a citizen army was quite the thing, but this is the day of specialization and science. We cannot afford to turn our delicate, complicated war machines over to a citizen army knowing little about its operation and care. Modern soldiers must have expert knowledge, and they must keep up to date with rapidly changing improvements. Military service is becoming more and more a career service. Under the Stimson plan, citizen soldiers will receive a smattering of military technique of the military kindergarten variety and then they are transferred to a military reservoir awaiting call. Men in a military reservoir which is a paper reservoir have no opportunity to gain military knowledge or skill; and if they are ever called back into service their smattering of military science will be obsolete and practically worthless. This might not be true if the world would only stand still.

CAREER MEN REQUIRED

Recently I talked with an operator of an antiaircraft gun. He said that an antiaircraft gunner—I think he is called a "plotter"—must have a knowledge of higher mathematics, a

peculiar kind of reflex mind, and not less than 3 years' actual experience in firing that kind of a gun before he can be depended upon to be fairly accurate and effective. I do not doubt the correctness of that statement. We have not enough antiaircraft gunners now in our whole Army to defend one important objective. We need tens of thousands of expert antiaircraft operators and gunners. Congress is spending a billion dollars to develop experts with the bayonet, but not one vital antiaircraft gunner. The supporters of the bill are living in a "fool's paradise" if they think it provides any national defense whatsoever. Their heads are buried below their wishbones in the sands of antiquity, and they are fooling themselves and the people with the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill—a legislative illusion. The bill is a cruel delusion and does not provide the modern requirements of good national defense. It is not preparedness; it is an alibi. It is not financially sound; it is extravagant and wasteful of men and money. Anything that wastes men's time, their most precious asset, is criminal. The bill will not improve the Army of the United States; it will demoralize it. Instead of giving us career men it will give us a great mass of half-trained citizens, patriotic and earnest, but of little value from a modern military point of view. A half-trained soldier these days is very little better than no soldier at all.

BRITAIN SHORT ON PILOTS

Britain, with millions of men under arms, is desperately short of trained men to pilot her planes and man her guns. Almost daily radio commentators call our attention to the fact that Britain is working her pilots excessively long hours because of an extreme shortage of pilots. We also have an acute shortage of such men, and the conscription bill does nothing about it. Instead it supplies a great mass of men for whom we have no need and for whom we are likely to have no need, whether we be invaded or not. We shall never need them if we have enough intelligence to produce tens of thousands of war planes and tens of thousands of pilots and mechanics to operate the planes. The Burke-Wadsworth bill does not give the United States one soldier remotely familiar with the handling of a Garand rifle, a machine gun, either light or heavy artillery, an antiaircraft gun, an aeroplane, a tank, or any other complicated piece of modern war machinery. The conscripts will be taught military drills, the manual of arms, fatigue marches, and the use of the bayonet; and the military results from the annual expenditure of a billion dollars will be exactly nothing from a military standpoint.

MACHINE AGE IS HERE

This is the machine age, and machines change each year; but the War Department evidently does not recognize that truth. Wars are now actually won in the research laboratories; for the science of war is moving toward hell at a staggering pace. Today, nations successfully adopting the latest scientific technique win their wars against their less alert foes without much difficulty. Victory goes to the skillful operator of the latest war machine. The hell raging in Europe has proved that point over and over in campaign after campaign and in conquered country after conquered country during this hectic year. A mechanized Army, manned by skilled and expert operators, has proved invincible. The current Congress has voted $14,000,000,000 for an up-to-date war machine of our own; but the Congress is making no substantial effort to develop men to operate these vehicles of destruction. Instead, we are clamoring for a half-trained civilian army which can be of little practical value in modern war. The career soldier, trained and skilled to the superlative degree, cannot be supplanted by citizen soldiers with 12 months' experience. The United States must have men who have made soldiering their life's work, trained, skilled, and proficient, to operate its $14,000,000,000 machine. Anything else would be little short of treason.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I was very much interested in the Senator's statement that the trainees would be largely concerned with ordinary drill maneuvers, and would not be given training with modern army equipment. I believe the Senator was absent from the hearing at the time Lieut. Col. H. L. Twaddle, of the General Staff, testified. He appeared on behalf of General Andrews, the Assistant Chief of Staff G-3, Chief of the Operations and Training Division of the War Department General Staff. The question came up as to the 18 months' training period, or the 12 months' training period, and how it would be used. May I read Colonel Twaddle's statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Colonel Twaddle said:

> Coming back to the 18-month period, I would like to give a general idea as to how we would break down the training period. During the first 3 months the individual would be inducted into the service, processed, and given basic training. The basic training is necessary in order that the individual may become qualified for service in a unit. This would be followed by a 12-month period during which the individual would be given specialist training and unit training, in order that he may qualify as the member of a combat team.
>
> Right at this point I would like to give some emphasis to the matter of training of specialists. Modern armies are today, for a large part, made up of specialists, much more so than in the World War armies.
>
> It might be of interest to the committee to know the percentages of occupational specialists of the various arms and services which comprise our protective mobilization plan, a force of about 1,200,000 men.
>
> In the Infantry about 21 percent are specialists; Cavalry, 28 percent; Field Artillery, 48 percent; Coast Artillery, 38 percent; Engineers, 60 percent; Air Corps, 78 percent; Signal Corps, 69 percent; Chemical Warfare Service, 21 percent; Ordnance Department, 51 percent; Medical Department, 47 percent; Quartermaster Corps, 63 percent; Finance Department, 74 percent.
>
> Let us return to the 18-month period. I have explained 15 months of the 18 months. Of the 3 remaining months we feel that 2½ months at least should be devoted to the practical application of individual and unit training. In other words, we now have the individual in a team. We move him out as a part of that team into field exercises, actual work in the field, first with smaller units then with larger units up to the division, followed later by division, corps, and Army maneuvers. The latter training should culminate the trainee's service.

I merely wished to bring out the fact that it is contemplated to give the trainees 10 or 12 months of specialized training of one kind or another in handling the modern mechanized elements and in modern methods of warfare.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Wyoming is a practical man. He has lived under many different kinds of conditions, and he knows it is not possible to take a recruit and make a specialist out of him in 12 months. Everyone else knows it. He may be given a little training, of course, but what I am urging is something more than that.

I should like to point out that in the original Burke-Wadsworth bill I find this language:

> The training of men shall include such vocational and educational training as may be prescribed, and men in training and service shall have an opportunity to qualify for officer rank.

That language was in the original bill, but for some reason or other it disappeared. I wish to read what took its place. This is the sentence which takes the place of what I have just read:

> The men in such training and service shall have an opportunity to qualify for promotion.

That is all that is said about special training.

BIG POLITICAL DEMONSTRATION

The billion dollars annually which we shall waste on Stimson conscripts would give us 300,000 sergeant mechanics, airplane pilots, skilled antiaircraft gunners, and machine-gun and tank operators, trained and ready to operate intelligently and effectively the $14,000,000,000 worth of war machines now on order. With that number of well-paid career-men experts the United States would have an Army invincible against every foe.

Mr. Hitler, or anyone else with a little gumption, can take a mechanized army of a hundred thousand men and easily defeat millions of Stimson's conscripts equipped with Springfields and bayonets. I say that he can do so because he has

destroyed three such armies this year. This is no reflection on the patriotism and courage of our men, but it is a reflection on our Secretary of War. Men in the twilight of life have difficulty in realizing that this is the machine age in warfare as well as in industry, and that military tactics of 20 years ago are outmoded and obsolete. We need an army of enlisted men who will be willing to make the operation of war machinery a career. We should be spending the taxpayers' money with an intelligent conception of the needs of modern war; but in our hysteria and in our efforts to stage a big political demonstration we are wasting our precious funds on obsolete military schemes. We are turning back the pages of history instead of going forward with the times.

FEW MEN USED IN BATTLE OF BRITAIN

In the battle of Britain, which has been raging for weeks, fewer than 50,000 men are engaged on both sides. Is not that fact tremendously significant? Does it not prove my point that this is the day of skilled warriors and not the day of mass participation? Numbers mean nothing in modern warfare. Machines and skilled operators mean everything. Col. Frank Knox emphasized that thought in his speech on August 4 last when he said:

> What would be the use of a vast defensive machine operated by untrained and unskilled men? This would be nearly as dangerous as hurling brave but unarmed men against the Juggernauts of modern war. Either course would invite destruction. * * *

And Col. William J. Donovan, the eyes and ears and mouth of Colonel Knox, in his statement the other day made this illuminating statement:

> Adolf Hitler's "blitz" conquests of Poland, of Norway, of Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, and France are military masterpieces. In all secrecy and with incredible speed the Nazi leader built up a unique military machine, beside which all other armies in the world were obsolete. Basing his organization on experience acquired in Spain during the civil war, Hitler placed at the head of his mobilized masses a modern airplane plus tank spearhead. The German masses were not particularly impressive. They did not need to be. It was the spearhead of 50,000 men that beat France.

I am informed that in the campaign in Poland, where the total German troops were far outnumbered by the total number of Polish troops, 75 percent of the German troops never fired a gun. They did not have to do so. The spearhead that went in advance won the victory, just as it did in France.

PRUDENCE DEMANDS GOOD DEFENSE

Mr. President, while I do not subscribe to the theory that this is a time of peril rather than a time of peace, nor to the oft-repeated declaration in and out of Congress that the most serious crisis of all history is close at hand, nor that the future of the United States of America is threatened by a foreign power; yet, one must be realistic and take notice that the eastern world is in complete confusion. Hungry men are apt to become violent; and our bulging granaries may be very tempting to a starving Europe. Simple and ordinary prudence would demand that the United States prepare at once an effective defense against any eventuality. I therefore join wholeheartedly and enthusiastically those who would share our surplus food supplies with the starving hordes of Europe who are the victims of a cruel aggression; and I endorse an adequate national defense that will give us absolute protection against any potential foe or combination of potential foes. That does not mean that I join those who in the holy name of defense are secretly planning expeditionary campaigns in other continents. When I speak of our defenses, I mean defenses in this continent, and nowhere else. All sorts of international crimes have been and continue to be committed in the name of defense, and many a wolfish appetite has been and will be concealed in sheep's clothing. When men fight on their own soil it is self-evident that they are fighting a defensive war, but a so-called defensive war fought in some distant land is a very suspicious adventure. A navy well supplied with submarines and numerous small, modern, speedy destroyers and fighting craft, well balanced with heavier craft, and augmented by countless fighting planes and bombers and a relatively small, mechanized and thoroughly trained army with plenty of tanks and airplanes—both bombers and pursuit planes—has been advocated by the military experts of this country as essential and adequate. We should pay attention to men who have given the subject years of study, men who have revised their opinion in the light of the experiences of the current European war, and we should not be carried away by the hysterical politicians who are urging a huge conscript Army for its window-dressing effect.

AN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE ONLY OBJECTIVE

The President has said that no troops are to be sent to Europe, and yet the only possible justification for a large conscript army at this time is to provide an expeditionary force to be sent into the European inferno. If such an utterly reckless adventure is being contemplated by the administration, the Burke-Wadsworth bill is an excellent device for procuring the "cannon fodder" for such an unfortunate sacrifice; but if the purpose is to repel a potential invasion of our own territory, this measure makes no worth-while contribution to our defenses. If our purpose is to assist Britain with manpower, we had better get 10,000 pilots and 30,000 ground men ready at once. Her need for such a force is desperate right now, and will grow even more serious as the war continues. However, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall never vote to send one pilot or any other kind of American soldier to serve in the Eastern Hemisphere; and I am merely trying to point out to our friends who want to help England with men that a large conscript army will avail her nothing. She, too, needs skilled men and not "cannon fodder."

LET HITLER CHOOSE THE CONTEST

If we should make the attempt to conquer Hitler on the battlefields of Europe and fail, the result would be too terrible to contemplate. The cost of such an adventure in money and men would be stupendous, and the risk far more perilous than any sane nation should contemplate. Neither do I believe for one moment that Mr. Hitler can overcome us in the Western Hemisphere, nor do I believe that he will ever try to do so. It is a disgusting spectacle to observe from time to time our colleagues in this Chamber reading from Mein Kampf in fear and trembling, with eyes staring, voices choking, teeth chattering, and knees shaking. Such foolish hysteria has no place in America, much less in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I did not find much to enthuse me in Mr. Willkie's acceptance speech, but I liked what he said about Mr. Hitler. I quote:

> I promise to outdistance Hitler in any contest he chooses in 1940 or after. We shall beat him on our own terms, in our American way.

Mr. Willkie is correct. Let Mr. Hitler choose the contest. Be it economic penetration into South America, a "fifth column" sabotage campaign, or war; let him choose it, and we will meet him and beat him to his knees. I also like the sentiment expressed by another American patriot, who recently said:

> I am not afraid that Hitler will come to America. I am afraid that he will not come, because I know that when he does come he will be destroyed.

That is the American spirit. This American "puts it on the line," and no one realizes that fact more clearly than does Mr. Hitler. We should urge him to come here to his destruction, for the sooner he comes the sooner will the world be rid of him. Those are brave words, but if we will proceed with our defenses in a vigorous, sane, sensible manner, and not auction them off and peddle them to every Tom, Dick, and Harry, they need not be idle words.

A STAB IN THE BACK

Hitler will never conquer the United States by force of arms. Greedy and ambitious as he is, I doubt that he has ever dreamed of so reckless an undertaking. We will never be weak enough, and he will never be strong enough in his lifetime, to crush the United States with an invading army, but his pagan philosophy of despotism is making inroads into our hearts and is stealing upon us like a thief in the

night. That is America's real danger. America must be on guard against such a threat. We hesitate to adopt his modern war technique of a small perfectly coordinated and mechanized spearhead which has proved its efficacy on the field of battle, but we embrace his diabolical political methods with pious utterances. We think that we must fight fire with fire. We hate Mr. Hitler, but we are about to strike our precious liberty a death blow by adopting his Prussian ideology of conscription. I can see the smirk on his cold expressionless face as the Senate of the United States, because of him, stabs democracy in the back.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to enter one more protest on the floor of the Senate against the passage of a conscription bill in peacetime. I am strong for an adequate national defense. I believe in, and have supported, all authorizations and appropriations for a bigger navy; for a real air force, and for building up, equipping, and training an army adequate for the national defense. I shall continue to give this program my best support.

But I protest that to accomplish these things it is not necessary to saddle upon the youth of America, which means through the years upon the people of America, the militaristic spirit, the militaristic caste, that will follow in the wake of military conscription of manpower in peacetime. I say to those business interests which believe they will profit by having a conscript army to protect their holdings, that down the road they will face what property interests in the lands of Europe have come to know—conscription of property by the state as well as conscription of manpower. Making the individual the vassal of the state and the pawn of the ruler leads inevitably, though sometimes more slowly, to making all property, all finance, and all industry also the creature of the state. A conscript army, when it becomes large enough, in all history has proved to be a Frankenstein monster that turns upon and destroys its creators.

Mr. President, these views I have expressed are not the views of myself alone. I have received upward of 6,000 letters, telegrams, petitions, and memorials from my native State of Kansas protesting against the enactment of pending legislation to conscript an army in peacetime. These have come from individuals, from veterans' organizations, from farm organizations, from labor organizations, from church organizations, from businessmen, from cities, from towns, from farming communities, from isolated ranchmen, from fathers, from mothers, from young men.

I warn the Senate that the passage of this conscription bill in peacetime is more than a mistake; it may prove to be a tragedy. I will never vote for it, and I sincerely trust that a majority of the Senate will vote against its enactment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a few of the many protests I have received against this legislation, which are typical of the great number of protests which have reached me recently.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
CANEY POST, NO. 1358,
Caney, Kans., August 8, 1940.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER.
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you in connection with a conscription bill now under discussion in Congress, and we, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, do hereby most vigorously protest the enactment of a conscription law in peacetime. We do feel, however, that if such law is to be enacted that it be thoroughly studied, and we also recommend that the pay of these men to be conscripted should be not less than $30, which was paid to World War veterans.

We also feel that the enlisted men should be given an opportunity to ascertain what results can be obtained by voluntary enlistment, and we earnestly request you to use all of your power—which we believe you will—to reject any conscription bill at this time.

We wish to further call your attention to the plight of the disabled war veterans of the World War, who are now in terrible distress, who are unable to obtain work and have nothing to live on or support their dependents. We suggest you mention this in your discussion on the floor of the Senate when this bill reaches the floor of the Senate, because we have had a lot of experience in dealing with this serious problem.

Trusting you will give this matter your most serious attention, which we believe you will; we know that you have been a friend of the veteran in the past and we feel that you will be in the future.

Yours very sincerely,

SAM B. WOODS.

TOPEKA, KANS., *August 9, 1940.*

Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As secretary of the North Side Farm Bureau I am requested to write you commending you on your stand on the conscription bill. We are very proud to have you for our Senator.

Respectfully,

Mrs. O. D. WOODFORD.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *August 7, 1940.*

Senator CAPPER:

Urging you to vote against bill S. 4164.

LODGE 669, BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN.

GALENA LOCAL NO. 17,
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF MINE,
MILL, AND SMELTER WORKERS,
Galena, Kans., August 3, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We are writing you in regard to the Burke-Wadsworth bill (S. 4164). We wish to advise you that Galena Local No. 17 is opposed to this measure.

We feel that this action would be contrary to our views as to true Americanism. We are certain that in case of need the American people will rally to the defense of their homeland.

With best regards, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

GALENA LOCAL NO. 17,
RICHARD W. MURRAY, *Secretary.*

WICHITA, KANS., *August 9, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I am informed that the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill will be up for consideration soon. If you will vote against favorable consideration of this bill it will be appreciated by the transportation brotherhoods in Kansas.

E. L. BEARD.

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Stand firm against all efforts to send American youth to the Old World to fight the battles of foreign nations.

Permit no "loosening up" of the Neutrality Act merely for the benefit of warmongers and profiteers. Enact and enforce adequate legislation to take the profits out of war.

Set our own house in order and rush our program for national defense to completion at the earliest possible moment, but in an honest and business-like manner.

Stop playing politics, and place the welfare of our own beloved country and maintenance of peace within its borders as our first and highest objectives.

Miss Charlene Dixon, Columbus, Kans., route 2; Charles Dixon, Columbus, Kans., route 2; Mrs. Charles Dixon, Columbus, Kans., route 2; Clyde H. Dixon, Columbus, Kans., route 2; Mrs. F. E. Dixon, Columbus, Kans., route 2; Ellen Cruse, Galena, Kans., route 1; Bob Cruse, Galena, Kans., route 1; Mrs. Laura Dixon, Columbus, Kans., route 2; Mrs. Frank Hearrell, Flint, Mich., 6805 Branch; David H. Phillips, Galena, Kans., route 1; Mae Ellen Phillips, Galena, Kans., route 1; Mrs. Fannie Phillips, Galena, Kans., route 1; Harold Phillips, Galena, Kans., route 1; Miss Margie Dixon, Columbus, Kans., route 2.

STATE OF KANSAS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Leavenworth, Kans., August 20, 1940.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is my sincere belief that many of the younger men of Leavenworth are uninformed or misinformed about conscription, and I feel that you have presented the side of the opposition clearly and succinctly, logically, and honestly.

May I extend my individual and personal vote of thanks and confidence to you and may I state that I appreciate the stand that you have taken.

Respectfully,

EDWIN J. HOLMAN,
Member of Kansas House of Representatives.

SALINA, KANS., *August 10, 1940.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Entire membership Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen Lodge desires your support to defeat Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill now before Congress.

R. V. SNIDER,
Legislative Representative.

QUINTER, KANS., *August 20, 1940.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I am glad for your efforts in opposition to the passage of the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

Keep up the fight untiringly that our country may be spared the blighting effects of militarism. The price of our treasured liberties was the life and blood of our colonial forefathers. Let's not allow the jingo alarmists to mislead us into passing legislation that shall endanger these liberties.

Don't let the Burke-Wadsworth bill pass.

Yours in our country's best interest,

D. W. KESLER.

GALENA LOCAL NO. 17,
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF MINE,
MILL, AND SMELTER WORKERS,
Galena, Kans., July 30, 1940.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In regard to the Burke-Wadsworth bill. Our organization is on record as opposing said bill. We believe in property rights. But we also believe in the rights of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We do not believe the present situation justifies depriving one and one-half to two million young men of their liberty and the right to seek happiness. If at some future time it becomes necessary to draft our manpower to repel invasion, at the same time the entire financial and industrial power of the Nation should also be drafted to bring about a speedy and lasting peace. We wrote you early in the session urging you to favor such measures as in your opinion were best calculated to keep us out of Europe's wars.

Thanking you for past support of such measures, and thanking you for support of similar measures, we are very sincerely yours, officers and members of Galena Local No. 17, of I. U. of M., M., and S. W., per A. G. Black, chairman, publicity committee; George Wallace and Ross Shaw, other committeemen.

A. G. BLACK.

GREAT BEND, KANS., *August 20, 1940.*

Hon. Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: Townsend Club, No. 1, of Great Bend, of about 160 members, desires to put itself on record as being directly opposed to the proscription bill now pending in Congress, and we earnestly petition you to oppose the bill when it comes to the Senate floor.

We feel that an appeal to the honor and patriotism of the young manhood of our Nation will bring sufficient volunteers to meet all present demands, however great it might be. You have made one long stride in that direction in raising the wages to $30. Put a premium on the honor and patriotism of our youth and they will gladly fight, and even lay down their lives, for the flag of our country. Conscription is a disgrace to American manhood and a confession that we have failed in making patriots and American citizens of the youth of our Nation.

Yours sincerely,

W. A. MORRISON, *Secretary.*

EMPORIA, KANS., *August 19, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Last night I heard your talk over WIBW, and I must and do agree with you on every point.

Our destroyers going to Britain will only weaken our defense. If these destroyers would help Britain to hold off a while longer, when they break (if they do break) our boats are gone, and cannot be replaced in the short time we would have left to do it.

I do not favor the conscription bill. It is unneeded and entirely out of line at this time. This is not our war and we should keep our hands out of it.

Very truly yours,

C. L. SOULE.

REDFIELD, KANS., *August 20, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER.

HONORABLE SIR: We thank you for the stand you are taking on the compulsory military training and hope you continue to oppose its passage.

The more we think of its principles the more we are convinced it is both un-Christian and also un-American to compel our boys to take against their wills any compulsory training.

Praying you who oppose this may be successful, we remain,

Truly yours,

MAX HARTSOUGH,
Pastor, Paint Creek Church of the Brethren.

BELVUE, KANS., *July 29, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: The Tannerville 4-H Club is composed of 50 young people representing 30 families, and almost every member's family will be affected by the compulsory military training bill. Therefore the Tannerville 4-H Club, of Pottawatomie County, Kans., voted unanimously that I send this appeal to you requesting you to vote against the compulsory military training bill.

Sincerely yours,

PHYLLIS CLARK,
Secretary, Tannerville 4-H Club.

STATE OF KANSAS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Independence, Kans., July 30, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Despite the results of some polls showing that the public favors conscription, the reaction I get in going about among the public is that the present conscription bill is distasteful, unpopular, and a clumsy way of going about the defense program we urgently need and favor.

It seems to me that the most popular and at the same time the most practical solution is the 1-year voluntary-enlistment plan.

What the public seems to want is a defense force strong enough to discourage any attack upon us, and to repel successfully any attack that might come.

Yours very truly,

CLARENCE P. OAKES,
Representative Twenty-seventh District.

BAKER UNIVERSITY,
Baldwin, Kans., July 31, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I want to commend you most highly on the excellent address which you gave over the National Broadcasting System last night on the subject of compulsory military training. Perhaps the reason I liked it so much was the fact that you expressed my own point of view. I believe that there are a great majority of people here in the Middle West who will stand firmly back of you in the position which you are taking.

Cordially yours,

DR. NELSON P. HORN,
President, Baker University.

THE FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL AND
COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Salina, Kans., July 27, 1940.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Most farmers are with you in your fight against the conscription bill. Mr. Robert Handschin made a statement on behalf of our organizations in opposition to the passage of the Burke-Wadsworth military-training bill.

My own father gave opposition to the militarism of the old Austrian Empire Government as the principal reason for leaving old Bohemia and emigrating to the United States. I do not think the time is here when it is either necessary or expedient to compel our young men to spend one or more of the best years of their life in involuntary servitude.

I am sure that if the term of enlistment were shortened to 1 year, with inducements to reenlist to those who want to do so and are the right material for soldiers, we will get plenty of young men to enlist. The pay should also be at least in line with that given to the C. C. C. enrollees, with opportunity for study in useful industries, such as mechanics, etc.

With best personal regards I am,

Yours very truly,

JOHN VESECKY,
President, National Farmers' Union.

MINNEAPOLIS, KANS., *July 26, 1940.*

To the Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate:

We, the undersigned, are unalterably opposed to the Burke-Wadsworth military conscription bill (S. 4164) on the following grounds:

It is undemocratic, unconstitutional, and un-American.

It will tend to regiment the people, and is therefore a dangerous step toward fascism.

On eminent authority, it is not needed for defense but for propaganda purposes.

It would throw the country open to unnecessary economic dislocations.

It is no permanent solution to the unemployment problem; it is at best a temporary dole.

For many reasons it is a dangerous and highly undesirable measure.

Therefore we urge you to use all your influence against this measure and all similar measures.

(Signed) Mrs. Minnie Sherrill, Tescott, Kans.; Albert E. Johnston, Tescott, Kans.; Mrs. Mollinda Prior, Tescott, Kans.; Retta Johnston; Mrs. Chas. Percival, Tescott,

Kans.; Mrs. Lenah Percival, Tescott, Kans.; Mrs. Jennie Heckert, Tescott, Kans.; Mrs. Art Spencer, Tescott, Kans.; Mrs. Geo. Lee, Tescott, Kans.; Mrs. A. C. Chambers, Tescott, Kans.; J. C. Sherrill, Tescott, Kans.; Mrs. C. C. Hess, Tescott, Kans.; Mrs. Vinia C. Strait, Tescott, Kans.; Emma Mulber, Tescott, Kans.; C. C. Hess, Tescott, Kans.; Mrs. Iva Anderson, Tescott, Kans.; Glenn Moon, Culver, Kans.; Oda Eutsler, Tescott, Kans.; L. S. Ruggles; Jay J. Chambers, Tescott, Kans.; L. R. McClure, Tescott, Kans.

MINNEAPOLIS, KANS., *July 25, 1940.*

To the Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate:

We, the undersigned, are unalterably opposed to the Burke-Wadsworth military conscription bill (S. 4164) on the following grounds:

It is undemocratic, unconstitutional, and un-American.

It will tend to regiment the people, and is therefore a dangerous step toward fascism.

On eminent authority, it is not needed for defense but for propaganda purposes.

It would throw the country open to unnecessary economic dislocations.

It is no permanent solution to the unemployment problem; it is at best a temporary dole.

For many reasons it is a dangerous and highly undesirable measure.

Therefore we urge you to use all your influence against this measure and all similar measures.

(Signed) Mrs. Jennie W. Harley, Minneapolis, Kans.; A. R. Burger, Minneapolis, Kans.; Mrs. Clifford George, Terlton, Okla.; Clifford George, Terlton, Okla.; Georgia Davis, Minneapolis, Kans.; Ray George, Minneapolis, Kans.; Mrs. Ellga N. Zuker, Minneapolis, Kans.; Mrs. Myrtle Ward, Minneapolis, Kans.; W. A. Ward, Minneapolis, Kans.; Henry Ward, Minneapolis, Kans.; Mrs. Leona Ward, Minneapolis, Kans.; Mrs. Myrtle Davis, Minneapolis, Kans.; H. C. Davis, Minneapolis, Kans.; Mrs. Allen Juigel, Minneapolis, Kans.; Effie Sharp, Minneapolis, Kans.

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE,
HAYS, KANS., *July 30, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: Several of us here are considerably disturbed over the proposed bill for selective draft. So far as I can learn, our people are almost unanimously opposed to the measure. I hope you will use your efforts to defeat it.

I believe if the Federal Government would raise the pay for volunteers in service to the place where it would attract worthy and capable young men into that service that they will have all the men they need. This would have two effects: First, it would be just and fair for the men to have adequate pay if they serve in that capacity; second, it would relieve the stress and interruption on ordinary businesses and pursuits of one type or another that will certainly come and very gravely disturb them, if this selective draft becomes a law.

In general, I am opposed to following in the footsteps of the European Continent that has made such a miserable failure in producing a satisfactory way of living there. The American way of life is different. I want us to keep that way of life intact and to make it distinctive in the history of the world. We are now on the way to do this. If we continue to make service in the Army and Navy, as it has been during peacetimes, a voluntary service, we are maintaining American tradition.

I hope you and the other representatives in Congress will be successful in defeating this measure and putting in its place one that will give us a satisfactory and adequate defense program without violating the very thing America set out originally to achieve.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. C. E. RARICH, *President.*

CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT,
Salina, Kans., August 9, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: We are very much opposed to peacetime conscription, as we believe it is a great step in the direction of dictatorship for our country. Why not give voluntary enlistment a fair trial?

We are strong for the defense of our Nation against war and against dictatorship, both from within and from without, but we do not want to have our boys used to fight the battles of other nations, and we fear this is what will happen if they are conscripted.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD FORD.
FLORENCE FORD.

THE NEKOMA STATE BANK,
Nekoma, Kans., August 1, 1940.

Hon. Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a few lines in protest to conscription. I have lived in Kansas 60 years and have been in business here for 42 years, and this war proposition sounds so completely out of line that I feel that I must express my opinion.

We Americans do not believe in dictators—we do not feel that we need to imitate Hitler or Mussolini. Unless we take sides we have nothing to fear from Europe. It looks to me as though we intend to import all of England's population and replace them with our soldier boys to be slaughtered in the foreign war. I cannot understand why we do not take a short cut and annex ourselves to England in the first place and have the King move into our White House.

In case of aggression, I am sure that the volunteers would provide more soldiers than the United States would need, but not to fight on foreign soil. It is unreasonable to think that we should fear invasion by Germany or Italy when they cannot even cross the English Channel.

The people here are very much opposed to conscription. That would upset all of the young men's plans for an American life, and we would be following the steps of the dictators of Europe.

Hoping you will do what you can to keep this bill from passing, I remain,

Yours very truly,

M. T. MORAN.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Topeka, Kans., July 26, 1940.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Knowing your interest in maintaining the peace and promoting the highest welfare of our country, I am writing to register my opposition to peacetime registration or conscription, as is proposed by bills now pending.

The volunteer basis, I believe, can be made entirely adequate for peacetime defense preparation. I feel that any plan of conscription is a definite step toward war, is following the pattern of the countries with which we profess to disagree, and is a totally unnecessary interference with legitimate business and individual life.

On behalf of many of the constituency of this church, representing more than a thousand persons, and on my own behalf I trust you will oppose the bill.

Most sincerely yours,

M. RAY MCKAY.

CANEY VALLEY NATIONAL BANK,
Caney, Kans., July 24, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The morning papers carry the information that the Senate Military Committee has given its approval to compulsory military training legislation.

It is my opinion that the general public is very much in favor of necessary preparedness, and it is, also, my opinion that the public is not convinced of the necessity for the proposed compulsory training. There are no doubt other methods by which the Army and Navy can increase their forces to a sufficient size.

There are thousands of homes from which sons are attending colleges and universities. To many of these boys, a year's interruption in their school work would mean that their education would probably never be finished.

Yours very truly,

H. V. BOLINGER.

SALINA, KANS., *August 5, 1940.*

Hon. Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We hope you will do all in your power to oppose peacetime conscription. We believe in free speech, free press. We are not in favor of a dictator for these free United States; but under the present administration we are drifting too rapidly. We trust you will do all in your power by your voice and vote to prevent peacetime conscription.

Respectfully yours,

CHAS. E. GILLUM,
President, Gypsum Valley National Bank, Gypsum, Kans.

THE PLAINS STATE BANK,
Plains, Kans., August 1, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to add my protest to the principle of the conscription bill that is now pending before Congress and urge you to keep up your fight against it. I am certainly for you in your opposition.

Consider that I am as patriotic as the average man but at this time can see no reason for all the hysteria that is being manifested over the country. If we were in danger of invasion and were expecting to get into war soon there is no better way to raise an army than by draft. The Democrats even had to draft their candidate this time.

To me the registration and conscription of men at this time is too much like Hitlerism. No telling what it might lead to. Seems like all nations that have to have a large army or think they have to have it at all time have a way of getting into trouble.

Yours very truly,

WM. P. ELLIOTT.

FARMERS COOPERATIVE GRAIN & MERC. CO.,
Lehigh, Kans.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: I hereby register my protest against the enactment by Congress of any bill that calls for the conscription of men for military service in peacetime.

Conscription embodies the worst features of the totalitarian regimes and strikes at the heart of personal liberty—the very thing we try to safeguard.

It has not been proved, and I deny, that a conscript army is required in the present situation except for propaganda purposes.

Yours sincerely,

E. G. BARKENTIN.

CONWAY SPRINGS WATER CO.,
Conway Springs, Kans., July 29, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Am writing to you in regard to this idea of conscription of all males from say 19 to 64 or any other age for that matter.

To make a long story short, we people out in this section feel like it is a war hysteria coming over the legislature if they pass such a bill as that.

Let's try voluntary enlistments first and then if we do not secure sufficient response, then would be ample time to use conscription.

I believe in preparedness, but I think that we need not be too much excited all at once, in fact, I feel that if we resort to conscription, when we can get along with voluntary enlistments, that we have lost our freedom, both religious and civil, when we take away from the individual the right of choice in these matters, especially unless we are absolutely up against securing enough by enlistment.

I am proud of our freedom, and I know lots of boys would enlist from choice and others would not, and we need both kinds of citizens. I hope I have made myself clear, and that you will make a concerted effort to avoid conscription, unless absolutely necessary.

Sincerely your friend,

E. J. FRANTZ.

STATE OF KANSAS, SENATE CHAMBER,
Soldier, Kans., July 30, 1940.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I take this method of expressing my unalterable objection to peacetime conscription.

I am glad you are against it, and I hope that enough legislators join you to keep the compulsory military service bill from becoming a law.

To my mind, it is just another long step toward war and dictatorship.

With all good wishes,

Very sincerely,

MINNIE M. MICKEL
(Mrs. Ben L.)

THE METHODIST CHURCH, ATCHISON, KANS.,
Chicago, Ill., August 10, 1940.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I think we know your sentiments well enough to be sure of your antipathy to any participation of America in this European conflict, and to use all means to legitimately avoid it.

I wanted to write you and express my own personal disapproval of the Burke-Wadsworth bill on conscription. I do not think such a plan is conducive to peace, but instead will create more of a readiness to enter whenever we have a large standing army.

Neither can I believe it is a democratic proposal. Every totalitarian and dictatorial power has always used universal conscription as a first stronghold. Democracies as a rule have not, and I would be exceedingly chagrined to have America do it now.

With sincere regards, I am,

Truly yours,

ELMER E. TILLOTSON,
Pastor, Atchison Methodist Church.

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Hutchison, Kans., August 6, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is my sincere hope that you will vote against the pending conscription bill, no matter what form it may take. I do not believe that the draft should be used until voluntary enlistment has proved inadequate. I greatly fear the un-American and undemocratic implications of this bill. Likewise I hesitate to place so much power in the hands of an administration that has shown so much willingness to break one after another of our American traditions. Blessings on you as you work this long, hot session.

Sincerely,

REV. NELSON S. GARDNER.

KANSAS COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Baldwin, Kans., July 28, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Your fine record in holding the fine convictions that you have in regard to national conditions has been noted and appreciated in these quarters. This is said before voicing the firm and genuine hope that you and other men like you will be able to prevent the enactment of the Burke-Wadsworth bill, now before you. The clauses in this bill dealing with civil liberties are much too extreme; and the haste in regard to conscription, before a genuine voluntary system has been tried seems unwarranted. This is the usual conviction of men on the streets here. They do not like the bill and are sullenly hopeful that it will be defeated.

Cordially yours,

JAMES S. CHUBB,
President, Kansas Council of Churches.

MOUNDRIDGE, KANS., *August 5, 1940.*

SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER: The Eden Church, with 740 members having been in session on the 4th of August, has unanimously voted against the enactment into law of any conscription bill. However, should some form of conscription be enacted we sincerely urge your support of the conscientious objectors clause.

THE EDEN MENNONITE CHURCH.
E. W. GOERING, *Chairman.*
E. E. FLICKNER, *Secretary.*

PITTSBURG, KANS., *August 21, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Last night the Pittsburg Peace Club No. 1 held a meeting to protest the Burke-Wadsworth bill and also the proposed law to permit the President calling out the National Guard. This is only our second meeting but we had some 40 people and all opposed to war, conscription, and let the National Guard alone.

We are preparing for a great rally soon. We have determined to do all in our power to defeat anyone running for office that is in favor of either.

Mothers are rising in arms against this conscription bill. I believe that martial law would have to be declared if it became a law for the reason so many are against it. One mother said last night, "I lost a brother in the last war, another one in hospital, and if they take my boy I will fight. I'll do anything to defeat that munition bunch." Another said, "I'd rather my son would fight it out in the back yard than go to war overseas. I would at least know that he wasn't hanged and rolled in a ditch as my brothers said was done in the last war."

There was not a "no" vote to the above. We mothers are "doing things" against war now everywhere.

I am sending a copy of this to several others.

V. J. ROWE,
Corresponding Secretary.

TOPEKA, KANS., *August 4, 1940.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed petition is the sentiment of the Kansas Conference of the Evangelical Church against the peacetime military conscription bill.

We would appreciate very much your consideration of this petition when this bill is placed before you for your vote.

Yours very truly,

CHESTER O. BURGERT,
Conference Director of Christian Education.

Through the press and radio we, more than a thousand in attendence at the summer assembly of the Evangelical Church at Forest Park, Topeka, Kans., August 4, 1940, and representing a constituency of approximately 20,000 people of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, note that leaders of our Government are advocating peacetime military conscription;

Whereas never before in the history of our Nation has such a policy been recommended; and

Whereas the Honorable Harry H. Woodring, until recently Secretary of War, has declared: "How any fair-minded Member of Congress could say that we have given the voluntary system of enlistment for the United States Army a fair trial and that it has broken down, and, therefore, we need the compulsory service, is beyond my understanding"; and

Whereas other outstanding Congressmen and leaders of our Nation have declared publicly against peacetime military conscription; and

Whereas the policy of the Kansas conference and the general conference of the Evangelical Church has been opposed to war as a means of settling international disputes:

Therefore we petition the Members of Congress to defeat this peacetime military conscription bill, and we request the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, also to use his influence to this end.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *August 6, 1940.*

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator of Kansas, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a unit in one of the peace-loving churches of our country we earnestly protest the Burke-Wadsworth bill, now pending for passage, known as the universal peacetime conscription bill, and earnestly urge you to use your vote and influence in defeating this bill, fearing its passage would eventually lead our country into war, and for 200 years our churches have been teaching the principles of peace.

CHARLES A. MILLER,
Pastor.
J. F. SHOWALTER,
President, Official Board.
V. W. HORNBAKER,
Secretary, Official Board.
C. A. RUNDELL,
R. D. SHOWALTER,
Of Hornbaker.
E. C. HOLLINGER.
GLEN FINFROCK.

WASHINGTON, KANS., *August 2, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER:

We heartily approve of the way you are voting on the military conscription bill. We folks in Kansas certainly do not want our boys and young men drafted into the Army to be taught to fight. Far better use the money thus spent in some constructive work and not train them in the terrible work of destruction of life and property that war creates. We members and friends of the W. C. T. U. are pleased with the stand you have taken.

Mrs. Ben Evans, Mrs. Bert Bonesteel, Mrs. Ella Wilson, Mrs. J. J. Wohlgemuth, Mrs. Anna L. Gassert, Mrs. G. A. Westing, Mrs. Emma P. Brandt, Mrs. Estella Hatter, Mrs. Jennie Sackett, Mrs. Florence Nutter, Miss Josephine Evans, Miss Mabel Westing, Miss Neva Gassert, Miss Anna Gassert, C. Ben Evans.

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Harper, Kans., August 5, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you will find a petition opposing the compulsory draft bill. I know, as did the other signers, that you do not need to be urged along this line. But we wanted to make sure that you understand how solidly the people stand behind you on this matter.

In talking to the people of this community I have found some who are not openly opposed to this compulsory draft, but I have not found one who is in favor of it. The overwhelming majority seem to be against it. Pleast accept our thanks for what you have done and are doing in this matter.

Sincerely,

GLEN W. PALMER,
Pastor, First Methodist Episcopal Church.

HAVILAND, KANS., *August 15, 1940.*

Senator CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: We wish to congratulate you on the stand which you are taking on the conscription bill. We are opposed to conscription because it is a step toward war and it is contrary to democratic principles. We are also opposed to compulsory military training.

Signed by the following members of the Haviland W. C. T. U.:

Ethel Williams, Edna Elliott, Ethel Hinshaw, Lyda Smitherman, M. Olive Rush, Lois Hardesty, Erma R. Schooley, Zuella Griffin, Evelyn H. Dunbar, Etta Asher, Ina Dayton, Elva M. Woodward, Retta Woodward, Besse M. Bradley, Anna Pollock, Florence Elliott, Lucinda K. Toadvine, J. M. Toadvine, Tillie Fankhauser, George E. Fankhauser, Minnie E. Winslow, Madge W. Bevan, Myrtle E. Phillips, Day C. Williams, Nettie M. Hodgson, Martha E. Case, Grace M. Hargadine.

THE FARMERS EDUCATIONAL & COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA, SALINA, KANS.

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved, That we, the Kansas Farmers Union Juniors, now attending our Third Kansas Farmers Union Junior Camp at Eureka Park, Manhattan, Kans., oppose the Burke-Wadsworth bill now being considered by Congress.

We are unalterably opposed to the policy of conscription of our citizens for military training during peacetime and consider it to be a threat to our cherished American democracy and our free institutions. We do not want the Burke-Wadsworth bill passed. Please oppose it or any similar measures.

And be it resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to our congressional delegation in Washington, D. C., and also offered for publication in our State and National Farmers Union papers.

Julius T. Gibson, Jr., Local 1152, McPherson, Kans.; Victor Larson, Local 749, McPherson, Kans.; Maxine Zimmerman, Local 1624, Belle Plaine, Kans.; Zora Zimmerman, Local 1624, Belle Plaine, Kans.; Keith Peterson, Local 749, McPherson, Kans.; Orville Rawson, Local 671, Marquette, Kans.; Nelson Bradbury, Local 1558, Winfield, Kans.; Norma Hartke, Local 404, Lost Springs, Kans.; Mary Pat Immenschuh, St. Marys, Kans.; Inez Swanson, Local 749, McPherson, Kans.; Betty Peterson, Local 749, McPherson, Kans.; Mrs. Merle Tribbey, Local 1809, Winfield, Kans.; Mrs. Will Hysell, Local 2099, Ellsworth, Kans.; Frances Hope, Local 2099, Ellsworth, Kans.; Bonnie Peterson, Local 749, McPherson, Kans.; Maxine Bughman, Local 716, McPherson, Kans.; Helen Johnson, Local 716, McPherson, Kans.; Ruth Swanson, Local 749, McPherson, Kans.; Evelyn Heffron, Local 1558, Winfield, Kans.; Leonard Groene, Local 1809, Winfield, Kans.; Lanore Gottlob, Local 1558, Winfield, Kans.; Millard Kittelson, Local 1809, Winfield, Kans.; Leon Payne, Local 1809, Winfield, Kans.; Mrs. Bernard Immenschuh, Sandy Hook, St. Marys, Kans.; Wilfred Sock, Local 929, Seneca, Kans.; Velna Higgason, Local 1095, Quinter, Kans.; Elinor Reist, Local 929, Seneca, Kans.; Leola Reist, Local 929, Seneca, Kans.; Arlene Reist, Local 929, Seneca, Kans.; Leonard Osterhaus, Local 929, Seneca, Kans.; Albert Rilinger, Local 929, Seneca, Kans.; Dorothy Larson, Local 1152, McPherson, Kans.; Margaret Carlson, Local 971, Marquette, Kans.; Ruby Larson, Local 1152, McPherson, Kans.; Foster Kutz, Clay Center, Kans.; Meryl Volen, Clay Center, Kans.; Virgil Peterson, Clay Center, Kans.; Harold B. Swanberg, Clay Center, Kans.; Esther Ekblad, Leonardville, Kans.; Ida Mae Carlson, Marquette, Kans.; Norman Payne, Local 1809, Winfield, Kans.; Mary Wilson, Local 1809, Winfield, Kans.; Leah Schmidt, Local 1809, Winfield, Kans.; Ruth Cadwell, Local 1809, Winfield, Kans.; Bernard Gibson, Local 1152, McPherson, Kans.; Laura Schantz, Local 1558, Winfield, Kans.; Dorothy Clark, Local 1916, Topeka, Kans.; Doris Heffron, Local 1558, Winfield, Kans.; Frances Bernritter, Maple Hill, Kans.; Wilma Siefert, Maple Hill, Kans.; Burdette Larson, Local 1152, McPherson, Kans.; Niles B. Gibson, Local 1152, McPherson, Kans.; Jack Rathbun, Local 2099, Ellsworth, Kans.; Ralph Sjostrom, Local 882, Lindsborg, Kans.; Verner Johnson, Local 716, McPherson, Kans.; Paul Sundberg, Local 1061, Lindsborg, Kans.; Robert Heline, Local 1061, Lindsborg, Kans.; Landis Larson, Local 1061, Lindsborg, Kans.; John Boggs, Local 2099, Ellsworth, Kans.; Emerson H. Shields, Local 404, Lincolnville, Kans.; Lloyd Dolezal, Local 2099, Kanapolis, Kans.; and Henry Hjell, Local 2099, Ellsworth, Kans.

RESERVE, KANS., *August 20, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: We are writing you to let you know we appreciate your stand on the Burke-Wadsworth bill and are glad you are doing everything you can to keep this country out of the European war.

We also urge that no more powers are given to the President as we believe that each power given him is a step toward dictatorship.

We would like a copy of your speech against the Burke-Wadsworth bill. Thank you.

Sincerely,

CHARLOTTE NANCE.
MARY E. HOBBS.
WARD NANCE.
ROBERT NANCE.
LOIS KREITZER.
NETTIE E. NANCE.

SALINA, KANS., *August 18, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Your work in the Senate has strengthened my hope that there are still those who mean to keep the United States for its citizens in a country principled by democracy—not dictatorship.

This is to assure you that you must vote for no conscription in peacetime. The volunteer plan must first be tried if those of the administration insist—and tried to its capacity. At any rate, our priests, religious, and seminarians of recognized schools must not be included in the conscription. The United States is more needful now of moral guidance than ever before.

The humanitarianism of the United States is well displayed in the protection of the foreign children—but we must first protect our own. It is a gross risk to permit our ships to go into foreign waters to foreign lands and bring their children to our shore. We may care for the children, but in the name of all that is right and just, do not concede to our United States' ships doing the transportation. Let the foreign children—if they must—be brought in their ships at their risk.

I have great confidence in your judgment, Senator CAPPER. It is to inform you that I am one of those who believe you will vote in justice and common sense. I wish to assure you that the aforementioned are points I believe you should stand for in that light. Keep the United States free from entanglement and insist that

she mind her own business—not the business of Germany, England, and other lands. We have plenty to take care of at home.

Sincerely,

MARY WILHELMINA BRUNGARDT.

THE WICHITA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
In camp, Saugatuck, Mich., August 10, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I trust that you are opposing peacetime conscription. If it is going through please make an effort to safeguard civil liberties—as I understand it, it is proposed that any critic may be tried by court martial and given a very extreme sentence. Any such provisions are unwarranted and I hope that you will stand against them. I do not see why things should be turned over to the militarists just now. I do not oppose reasonable measures, but I think there is danger of going wild.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. MELOY,
Executive Secretary Wichita Council of Churches.

WOODBINE, KANS., *July 28, 1940.*

To Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned members of the Woodbine Methodist Sunday School, believe that war is sinful and does not settle the problems of nations; and we also believe that the drafting of men for military purposes and the building up of a huge military machine and putting our faith and trust in the same is wrong and will not help to promote the cause of peace and good will between nations but will rather help to bring war and strife and hatred; and we wish to go on record as being opposed to any bill in Congress that would call for any of these things or for our country to take part in any of the wars that are now being fought, and petition you to use your influence and vote against any such bills that have been introduced or will be introduced.

B. H. Oesterreich, superintendent; W. L. Brehm, Louise Ahrens, E. K. Schmidt, Mrs. Emma Tinner, Mrs. W. L. Brehm, Mrs. C. W. Hiebert, Mrs. James Bryan, Herman Brehm, Mrs. Anna Spellman, Louis C. Westrup, Mrs. L. C. Westrup, Mrs. E. L. Shank, Miss Agnes E. Smith, Edw. Brehm, Clifton W. Oesterreich, Mrs. Joe Langhofer, Mrs. Edw. Brehm, Mrs. F. O. Schmidt, Mrs. Mabel Schmidt, T. O. Schmidt, Henry Oesterreich, Mrs. Lizzie Hodel.

FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
Syracuse, Kans.

Hon. Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States and members of the First Christian Church, being interested in the peace of our Nation and the welfare of the youth of our land, do hereby ask and petition you, as our Senator, to do all within your power to defeat the Burke-Wadsworth conscription and compulsory-training bill for times of peace.

Very sincerely,

H. W. Nicholson, Mrs. Julia Coble, L. R. Carter, Mrs. John Marsh, Mrs. D. A. Millsap, Mrs. Glen McKee, Mrs. Floyd Puckett, J. F. Puckett, W. G. Monroe, Glen W. McKee, Mary F. Osborne, Viola Osborne, Virgil Fox, Hettie Morss, Mrs. S. S. McGill, Evelyn Mueller, Daniel D. Buck, Roy Buck, Marie Kinslow, Betty Browning, Ervin Laney, Goldie Carter, Bertha Nicholson.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *August 4, 1940.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have for years appreciated very much your work done in the United States Senate for the common people.

Of late, your opposition on our entry in the European mess. It's Europe's quarrel, not ours. The objective of their fight is not for an ideal but the supremacy of power. I am strictly against sending our boys to fight their battles.

If we had not entered their war 22 years ago this war might have been prevented.

Hearing people talk on the streets, Roosevelt will not be reelected because of his ridiculous meddling in European affairs instead of correcting depressing evils at home.

Enclosed please find a petition against conscription signed by a number of loyal citizens.

Cordially yours,

C. C. EPP.

FRIENDS UNIVERSITY,
Wichita, Kans., July 31, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I notice in the paper this morning a statement of your radio address in which you opposed a general conscription law.

I take pleasure in commending you for your stand because I feel that such a law is not only unnecessary, but that it is a step in the direction of fascism and militarism, which this country has been careful to avoid.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. W. A. YOUNG,
Acting President.

JEFFERSON COUNTY, KANS.

Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Sunday morning at the Jefferson Church our pastor made the suggestion we write to you about the conscription bill now before Congress, and as everyone present wanted to write you we decided to all put our names on the one petition and send it in one letter. No one here believes in conscription, a third term for a President, or the New Deal. Hope this will help some.

Mrs. VERONA MCDONALD,
Superintendent of Sunday School.

We, the undersigned, protest the passage of the conscription bill now pending in Congress.

Ethel E. Wilbur, Innes Champion, Mrs. Dan Smith, Mrs. H. C. Zock, Mrs. Arthur Ousdahl, Mrs. William Eberhard, Emma Eberhard, Mrs. Frank Parker, Verona McDonald, Elsa Wellman, H. C. Zook, W. A. Wellman, W. W. Wellman, Frank Champion, Frank Parker, Eva Smurr, Rev. and Mrs. Robert Alexander.

SYRACUSE, KANS., *August 5, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the evidence concerning conscription which came out in committee, we hope that you will do everything in your power to defeat the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. O. H. CARLISLE.
Mr. and Mrs. J. W. SHERWOOD.
Mr. and Mrs. FRED COBB.
Mr. and Mrs. JOE WOELFEL.
Miss VERNA DYCK.
Miss WINONA CARLISLE.
Miss WANETA CARLISLE.

GOESSEL, KANS., *August 18, 1940.*

DEAR SIR: I wish to make clear my opinion about the compulsory military training bill. This is another step toward war. We cannot train for war and still stay out of it. We should train for peace.

Yours truly,

IRVIN FAST.

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH AND
THE WESLEY FOUNDATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
Lawrence, Kans., August 3, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washngton, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I appreciate sincerely your championing of peace and truly democratic procedures. I wish not to bother you with unnecessary words, but in this critical hour as our country faces hysterical demands which are almost unbelievable denials of all for which democracy stands, I must again write to support your every effort in opposing the Burke-Wadsworth military conscription bill.

In my humble judgment this proposed legislation is the most insidious and serious affront to democracy that has threatened this free people in many a decade, and I know that this view is shared by untold numbers of patriotic youth and veterans of the World War.

I enclose a copy of a letter I am sending to Senator BURKE.

Please do not take your valuable time bothering to reply to me. I know you can be counted on in this hour, and you can count upon my sincere support in your efforts here and elsewhere.

Sincerely,

EDWIN F. PRICE.

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Greensburg, Kans., July 31, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

DEAR MR. CAPPER: I wish to register my opposition and that of Mrs. Brown to the conscription measure now before Congress. If there is to be any such measure passed by our Congress, it would indicate a cause for the same; hence all citizens should be taken into the confidence of their Government and told plainly why it is necessary for such action.

It will disrupt the business and industry of our Nation, and to my mind conditions should be very grave to warrant such overturn. On the other hand I should think we should be careful not to play into the hand of the propogandist.

Sincerely,

Rev. ALVA C. BROWN.

GARRISON, KANS., *August 17, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please stand firm against conscription. Do everything humanly possible to prevent our country becoming involved

in this hideous war. To my mind, the only excuse for war is in actual defense from invasion. Be prepared to defend our own country, but stay out of our neighbors' quarrels.

I know you are opposed to warmongering, and I hope you will stand firm against this pressure for war that is being put upon the people.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. G. H. ALLEN.

INDEPENDENCE, KANS., *August 19, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR A. CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CAPPER: As a patriotic American citizen, a Christian, and also a minister of the gospel, I am asking you to please do all within your power to defeat the Burke-Wadsworth bill now before Congress.

To my mind, it is un-American.

Very truly yours,

Rev. JOHN H. PARKER.

MANHATTAN, KANS., *August 19, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

I feel it my duty to express strongly my sentiments against conscription of our youth for military training. I believe this will tend to lead us to war. Our young manhood of 1917 and relatives suffered miserably, unnecessarily, with no thanks from England or France. I believe the common people who would have to do the fighting have a right to vote on this matter. I have talked to many people, and have my first one yet to say they favor conscription. I do hope and pray America will not pattern after Germany.

Sincerely,

Mrs. E. R. RUDY.

KANSAS Y. T. C. FEDERATION,
YOUTH'S TEMPERANCE COUNCIL,
Fort Scott, Kans., July 26, 1949.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: As president of the Kansas Youth Temperance Council Federation, I wish to express the sentiment of that organization toward the compulsory military training bill which will be before the Senate for debate in a few days.

We, the federated members of the Youth Temperance Council of the State of Kansas, are definitely opposed to such a measure, and ask your whole-hearted support of our sentiments.

Thanking you for your cooperation along this line, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT LEE WOLF,
President of the Kansas Y. T. C. Federation.

PITTSBURG, KANS., *August 2, 1940.*

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Please do all in your power to keep this country out of war and work against the conscription bill, as we poor mothers and fathers love our sons and do not want them to have to go to war, as we think it is useless and wicked, and we need our sons at home where we can take care of them.

Mrs. Robert Carr, Pittsburg, Kans., route 4; Mrs. Leta Redd, Pittsburg, Kans., route 4; Mr. William Redd, Pittsburg, Kans., route 4; A. H. Mails, Pittsburg, Kans., route 4; Mrs. W. B. White, Pittsburg, Kans., route 4; Mrs. Inez Maier, Pittsburg, Kans., route 4; Mrs. Raymond E. Lee, Pittsburg, Kans., route 4; Mrs. Ardell Coots, Pittsburg, Kans., route 4; Mrs. Rose Coots, Pittsburg, Kans., rural route 4; Mr. and Mrs. Fred Hugi, Pittsburg, Kans, rural route 4; Mr. and Mrs. Glenn Parker; Mr. and Mrs. Chester M. Carr, Weir, Kans., G. D.; Mr. Otis Carr, Pittsburg, Kans., rural route 4; Robert Carr, Pittsburg, Kans., rural route 4.

WICHITA, KANS., *August 26, 1940.*

Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I want to express my appreciation for your position on many of the questions arising for your consideration and decision, especially on the peace and war question which is uppermost in our minds just now.

As a citizen of voting age, I am writing to protest the bill that is now before Congress regarding conscription. To me this plan is unnecessary just now because the volunteer plan has not been given a chance. It is un-American because it is one phase of dictatorship. I can't see any future for our Nation if we begin using such undemocratic measures to carry out the war plans of a few who themselves, because of their age, would never have to face the guns. Democracy recognizes the right of the individual to choose his course of action. Conscription would be the first step in the direction of dictatorship, which does not recognize the individual.

I am asking you to continue to oppose the plan of conscription.

Respectfully,

LENA A. HADLEY.

INDEPENDENCE, KANS., *August 19, 1940.*

Hon. ARTHUR A. CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CAPPER: I want to register my voice against the proposed Conscription Act, which I believe to be the most undemocratic act which has thus far been attempted by this Government.

I am a woman and have no children who will be required for military service under this act, therefore my objections are not prejudice, but when a majority of the people are definitely against such a move I cannot see how the defenders of this bill can escape the fact that it is undemocratic. So I say, Mr. CAPPER, I hope you will use your voice and your vote against this measure when and if it comes to debate and vote.

Sincerely,

LUELLA MCCOLM.

TOPEKA, KANS., *July 30, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, express our thorough approval of your opposition to the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill.

Rev. Ormal Miller, Nelson Antrim Crawford, Carl Gustav Tillman, M. D., Karl A. Menninger, M. D., Grace Tillman, O. C. Zehner, Rev. W. C. Barclay, John R. Stone, Justin Hillyer, James Mower, C. C. Merillat, W. C. Cameron, M. D., Ernest Zielinski, W. D. Vincent, 3d, Clara Alexander, John Alexander, Rev. John R. Golden, Rev. J. E. Bartholomew, Earl Roy, Jane Blomquist, Rev. Robt. French, Margaret French, Grace Vincent, Gerald Wineger, Francis Miles, J. B. Norton, Marion Norton.

HILL CITY, KANS., *July 19, 1940.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Please keep up the fight against the draft bill. We know you too well to think that it is necessary to urge you to do this, but as an American citizen I think I would fall short of my duty and responsibility if I failed to express my opposition to this bill. A thing Americans have never had to have is military conscription.

Yours very truly,

MABEL TAYLOR.

KINSLEY, KANS., *August 17, 1940.*

Mr. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: Again I must write you to fight this conscription bill, or any measure that forces our people to become a militaristic, dictator-governed people. Also this idea of every boy and girl having to take military training. There seem to be so many issues up today, that are entirely un-Christian, undemocratic, and entirely foreign to our country and its founders' principles.

We people of Kansas can always depend on you to work for a Government of righteousness and decency. I am just one of our church people, and one of the mothers against these steps.

Your friend,

Dr. EDITH GERE.

MCPHERSON, KANS., *August 19, 1940.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for the splendid work which you have done against the proposed military-conscription bill. There are four registered voters in our family all opposed to this bill. Again I wish to thank you for your opposition and I hope that you will continue the fight.

Sincerely,

SHERMAN EISENBISE.

THE EPWORTH LEAGUE,
FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Concordia, Kans., July 31, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We, the Epworth League, of Concordia, Kans., consisting of approximately 50 young boys and girls, hereby quote our truthful opinion of the conscription and compulsory military-training bill.

All these years we have been taught to do everything to make this world better. Every week we give so much of our time, thought, and money to our community and to the world as a whole. We have, each one of us, considered this bill very thoroughly and can see no possible way that it can make the world what we want it to be.

America has never had peacetime compulsory training; Europe has tried it and has suffered immeasurably from it. Why should America suffer also from something which can be avoided if we would put Christianity first instead of hatred, greed, poverty, suffering—war?

It is true that the situation is pressing and that something should be done about it, but nothing other than the hearts of the people can make the world better. It has been proven a thousand times that might is not right. Why should we be fools enough to believe differently?

We will do everything to save America, but we do not believe that this type of bill will do anything but harm and ruin democracy.

We seriously object to the passing of this bill and anything you do to make such a law possible will be against Concordia's young people's wishes.

Very sincerely yours,

THE EPWORTH LEAGUE,
BLOSSOM SWENSON, *President.*
ROBERT HICKS, *Secretary.*

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, in accordance with the permission granted to me earlier in the day, I submit for printing in the RECORD at this point certain excerpts from letters and telegrams from church leaders in various denominations on the subject of peacetime conscription.

The excerpts are as follows:

William Church Osborn, president of the Temple of Religion, New York World's Fair: Although dealing with sin is the affair of the religious, they are inapt to impute sin to others. Hence, some of them ignore the sure inferences of facts. On the facts, four military nations are robbers with violence. Religion puts no ban on self-defense. Burglars are made unwelcome in the most pious homes. The most stern, unyielding fighters have been the religious, when their beliefs were threatened. We do not trust the fat Pollyanna promises of the sleepy warriors that all will be well. Such was the narcotic that drugged half Europe into slavery. Dreamers of peace must know that our peace can be secured only by our dangerousness. "Tender grasp the stinging nettle, and it will sting you for your pains. Seize it like a man of mettle, and quite harmless it remains." Some doubt that it should be everybody's defense and think defense may be left to those who thirst to die for their country. The answer is, this is everybody's country and everybody must defend it. I am for full selective conscription.

Most Rev. James H. Ryan, R. C. Bishop of Omaha: As a citizen, I favor the principle of a selective military draft because I consider it the only fair, democratic, and, above all, realistic method of preparing to meet the probability of an attack on our liberties and institutions. That the United States is faced by total warfare in the near future cannot be questioned. There is only one way to meet total warfare, and that is by total defense. Preparation for total defense cannot be fairly interpreted as an acceptance of the totalitarian philosophy, nor does it necessarily lead to totalitarianism. It goes without saying that, in common with practically all Americans, I do not approve compulsory military service beyond the present grave emergency.

Rt. Rev. Cammeron J. Davis, Episcopal Bishop of Western New York: I am heartily in favor of the bill in Congress providing for selective compulsory military training and service. The present emergency and the lessons to be read from the unpreparedness of France and England make this measure essential. Past experience proved that voluntary enlistment will not provide the force that is needed in time for thorough training. Without thorough training the risk to our soldiers and selves is greatly increased and the protection of our Nation is endangered. It is necessary in times like these to set aside temporarily the voluntary principle in the democratic process. But the discipline and the usefulness of military service will do much toward increasing the morale of our younger citizens who today are so often unable to find a job and will develop a better citizenship in them for the time when this emergency shall have passed. It is, of course, understood that the plan provides proper safeguard for heads of families and workers in essential industries.

Rt. Rev. E. G. Richardson, Methodist Bishop of Philadelphia: While I deeply regret our Nation becoming military-minded, I believe this is necessary because of world conditions. Democracy must be defended. The selective compulsory draft will provide armed forces much more quickly and democratically than any other plan. Adequate preparation will perhaps prevent war coming to us. It will certainly save many lives if war comes.

Theodore Fiske Savage, executive secretary, Presbytery of New York: I believe that in face of the hostile forces threatening this country, every proper means of defense should be employed, and that a greatly strengthened Army and Navy is needed. This is the responsibility of everyone who now enjoys our liberties. Compulsory service, with proper safeguards, is a far better method than any program of enlisting volunteers, with its inevitable propaganda of hate and bitterness. War is evil, but the alternative may be more evil.

Rt. Rev. William T. Manning, Episcopal Bishop of New York: In view of the present imminent threat to democracy and freedom everywhere, it is imperatively necessary for our Government to make the fullest possible provision for our own defense. Speaking both as an American and as Bishop of the Christian Church I urge upon our Congress the immediate passage of the bill for selective compulsory military training and service. Selective compulsory service is the only method which will provide adequate forces to protect our country from war and it is the only fair and democratic method. This method alone calls upon all alike for service without discrimination and with proper safeguarding for families and provision for the necessary workers in essential industries. The call is imperative. The world crisis now faces us. There is no time for delay. The bill for selective compulsory training and service should be passed immediately.

Rt. Rev. W. Bertrand Stevens, Bishop of Los Angeles: America faces grave danger and uncertainty. If military measures are taken, it must be with as complete a program as possible. Position of Scandinavia warning of futility of half measures. Conscription provides democratic way. Why is it more un-American than taxation? I am far from being a warmonger but since we face the possibility of war I believe the burden and opportunity of service should be evenly distributed. I am for immediate strengthening of forces on land, sea, and air.

The following editorials, presented by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] during the delivery of the speech of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], were ordered printed at this point in the RECORD:

[From Wallaces' Farmer of January 27, 1940]

HOW MUCH NEED WE SPEND FOR DEFENSE?

Before the present crisis in Europe developed the United States was spending close to $360,000,000 a year on its Army and around $500,000,000 a year on the Navy, or a total of $860,000,000.

Now, that is a lot of money. Yet at this session Congress may be asked to authorize expenditures of $3,000,000,000 a year for national defense. President Roosevelt admits, however, that if the budget were pared to the bone, it might be possible to get by on $1,800,000,000.

That is still quite an increase over $860,000,000.

Everybody wants the United States to be safe. Everybody wants an adequate Army and an adequate Navy. But do we need to spend one or two billion dollars more in order to get them?

It is very doubtful. Our Navy, as it stands at the present time, could meet in our own waters and defeat the combined fleets of Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia, if by some miracle all those nations agreed to attack this country.

They would have only 19 battleships against our 15, and only 8 of those 19 are strictly first-class ships on a level with our best 12. It takes about a 2-to-1 superiority to lick a fleet in its home waters when the attack must be launched across the Atlantic or the Pacific.

Every day the war lasts, our superiority to any possible attacker will be made more evident. Germany's pocket battleships are not likely to live long as commerce raiders. One, the Graf Spee, is already out of action. If Russia and Japan clash, the Russian submarines will probably whittle down the Japanese Fleet.

What about the Army? We need a mechanized, mobile, striking force that can be hurled at any possible invader who, by a succession of miracles, managed to defeat the Fleet and win a landing on our coast. The present Army is probably large enough, though perhaps some additions to the coast-defense force and to the Panama Canal defenses are needed. Certainly the Army needs to be better equipped and handled in larger units.

Our air force is superb and is now being supplied with reserves in men, through a big college-training program, and in machines, through the pushing of war orders in the airplane plants.

If the Army and Navy are to be used for defense, we need increase expenditures only a very little. If we are to build a Navy large enough to cross the Pacific and whip Japan, then we do need to spend more. If we are to create an expeditionary force of several hundred thousand men for service overseas, then we must add to the armament bill.

Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead believes that the American people want only an Army and Navy that are adequate for their own defense. That kind of an army and navy can be bought for less than a billion dollars a year. Then why start out in 1940 to spend between one and two billion dollars more?

[From Wallaces' Farmer of April 6, 1940]

THEY ARE BUYING GUNS—NOT PORK

Chances for heavy exports of pork and lard to Great Britain seem to be getting worse and worse. The British have just announced that there will be no import licenses for American ham and bacon for 2 months more and possibly longer.

But many farmers still cling to the hope that eventually, maybe in 1941, maybe in 1942, if the war goes on so long, the Allies will have to come to us for meat and grain.

Undoubtedly, Europe will need our products if the war goes on for a long time. But whether Europe will be able to buy them is another matter. The plan now seems to be to use their cash for munitions and put their people on short rations. "Guns instead of butter."

When the pressure of hunger gets more acute, the Allies may want to buy food, too. But will they have money? They're now buying from us more than they sell us, at the rate of one to two billion dollars a year. If they used all their resources and gold, they could probably buy at a $2,000,000,000 rate for 3 years. If they begin buying food as well as industrial products on a big scale, they will get to the bottom of the purse in 2 years or less.

And, of course, a lot of Allied funds will not be spent here at all. Some of these available billions will go to Turkey and the Balkans, to keep those countries friendly and to cut in on German supplies. A lot will be spent in the dominions and the colonies.

As things look now, therefore, there seems little chance of a big expansion in the exports of food products to the Allies unless the United States is willing to lend them money. Sooner or later, we will see a big drive in Congress to permit such loans and to

persuade the farmer that his only hope is in trading hogs and wheat for pieces of paper.

For the time being, the real market for our farm products is at home, not abroad. That's why a pick-up in pay rolls and the expansion of the food-stamp plan and the school-lunch plan are worth more to us than European prospects right now.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of December 16, 1939]

THEY WANT TO SPIT IN RUSSIA'S EYE

We wish both political parties could manage to keep their shirts on about the war in Europe. Early last fall President Roosevelt and most of the Democrats were boiling with indignation at Germany and almost ready to get us into the fight. Then Republicans did the sensible thing by insisting that it wasn't our war, and by even attempting to block the repeal of the embargo on arms.

Now some Republicans seem to be running wild in their turn. Neutral while China invaded China, Italy took Abyssinia and Albania, Germany took Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, they are full of fight over the Russian invasion of Finland.

Republicans, headed by VANDENBERG, of Michigan, are urging that the United States break off diplomatic relations with Russia. Breaking off diplomatic relations is the step that normally comes just before nations go to war.

The Russian invasion of Finland is a horrible crime. So was the Japanese invasion of China, the Italian invasion of Abyssinia and Albania, the German invasion of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

But are we going to go to war about any of them? Presumably, we all want to stay out of trouble. But to spit in anybody's eye—as some Republicans recommend—isn't the best way to stay out of a fight.

Perhaps we ought to be thankful that Republicans and Democrats don't get warlike at the same time. But we wish they could both learn to keep their shirts on.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of February 10, 1940]

IT IS HARD FOR AMERICANS TO BE NEUTRAL

Here is one comment on a loan to Finland, from Edwin Borchard, professor of law at Yale, member of the International Academy of Comparative Law at The Hague, and coauthor of Neutrality for the United States. He says:

"American sympathies for Finland may legitimately be expressed in private contributions to the Hoover committee or any other private donation. A governmental loan to Finland, whether through the Export-Import Bank or the R. F. C., is an act of intervention and of war, exposing the United States to legitimate reprisals, now or hereafter, on the part of Soviet Russia. It, therefore, seems to me illegal and dangerous, however tempting, to advance public funds to Finland."

Professor Borchard adds that extending governmental aid to any side in a war may or may not affect the outcome, but that such action would certainly accumulate enemies for the United States. It might also be added that since Finland and Russia are at war, the Neutrality Act should be invoked. That act forbids loans to warring nations.

[From Wallaces' Farmer of October 23, 1937]

THE PRESIDENT'S QUARANTINE SPEECH

The neutrality situation will be a hot spot as Congress meets. The Neutrality Act directed the President to shut down on exports of munitions of war as soon as a conflict started. According to number of deaths, men engaged, damage to property, and so on, China and Japan are at war. But they haven't said so. And the State Department of the United States is still acting as if war wasn't going on.

A number of Senators and Representatives don't like this. They turned down a proposition last session whereby the administration was given the power to lay embargoes at its own discretion, and they claim that President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull are using a technicality to avoid compliance with the law.

There is rumbling also about the President's Chicago speech, which sounded to some a little like President Wilson's old remark about "making the world safe for democracy." The friends of strict neutrality, led by such Senators as NYE, of North Dakota, will put on a fight to get the neutrality law into action and to block any attempt of the administration to put a quarantine on the outlaw nations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1379) granting the consent of Congress to the Mackinac Straits Bridge Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge, or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between Saint Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. KELLY, Mr. O'TOOLE, and Mr. HOLMES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 10004) to provide for the transfer of the duplicates of certain books in the Library of Congress to the Beaufort Library, of Beaufort, S. C., and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

SELECTIVE COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4164) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the time has arrived to make a decision on a momentous matter, a matter that will affect every citizen of the country. It is a question that taxes the innermost emotions and tries the intellect of patriotic minds.

My Creator knows that I abhor war. I have stated that through my vote no American boy will be sent to a war that is not ours. And I mean it. If the people of my State want a Senator who differs with this stand, they had better vote for someone else.

I have also stated that I am in favor of an adequate national defense, a defense so strong as to bring terror to those who would think of attacking us, a defense that will protect all that is sacred to those who believe in our liberties and ideals.

In the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of the Senate, I have voted for the moneys necessary to provide such a defense.

But aside from the appropriations to buy airships, naval vessels, antiaircraft guns, cannon, ammunition, rifles, tanks, airports, and what not, there is needed personnel to man those implements. Why airplanes if we have not pilots? Why coast artillery if we have not efficient manpower to handle it? Why warships if we have not sailors?

This is one country where liberties still exist. One can still express one's self without being thrown into jail. Many are the God-sent privileges enjoyed by the citizen, but rights and privileges carry with them duties and obligations. The American people are not afraid to assume those duties in order to protect the privileges of a free people.

In carrying that idea, the pending bill provides in explicit language that policy. On page 14, line 19, of the bill, that policy is expressed as follows:

> The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of military training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service.

The bill further goes on to state the fact that under the selective-draft plan no reason whatever could compel this Nation to go to war unless the Congress of the country should so decide. I am quoting now from page 16 of the bill, which announces that policy. The bill applies to those who may be selected during the emergency for training.

Quoting from the bill, subsection (b), on line 4 of page 16, I read as follows:

> Whenever the United States is not at war, each man so inducted shall serve for a training period of 12 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged.

Then there is a proviso, an important proviso for the American people, an important proviso for those who believe in constitutional government. It is as follows:

> *Provided*, That if during his training period the Congress—

Not the Army of the United States, or the executive department, but the Congress—

> shall declare that the national interest is imperiled, he may be required to remain in service until the Congress shall declare that the national interest permits his being relieved from such service.

In other words, it is only Congress which will have the say as to when and how the draftees shall be used.

I firmly believe in the two policies I have just quoted. If we need a million men Congress should have the duty of

providing them, and should provide them. No one dislikes conscription or the word "conscription" more than I do. I prefer the voluntary system. I believe the American people would prefer the voluntary system. I firmly believe that system should be tried first, before we try the selective draft. Being of that opinion, I shall vote for the Maloney amendment. I hope that amendment will be adopted. I should like to vote for the bill with such an amendment. I do not believe the defense program would be delayed, since it is stated that the War Department will not call anyone before January 1941.

Mr. President, because I want a defense so strong that no country dare attack us, because American ideals are worth defending, because I do not want war, because I do not want any more American boys buried in foreign fields, because I believe in the teachings of Washington and Lincoln and the ideals of Woodrow Wilson, I shall vote for the bill. That decision was not arrived at lightly. It represents my conscience and what appears to me to protect the interests—the human interests, if you please—of those who believe in the Stars and Stripes. I may add, Mrs. Chavez and I have a son who will be affected. I still think the bill is necessary and should become the law.

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lee	Schwartz
Andrews	Donahey	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Downey	Lucas	Sheppard
Austin	Ellender	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bailey	George	McCarran	Slattery
Bankhead	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Barbour	Gibson	Maloney	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Mead	Taft
Bone	Green	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Tobey
Burke	Harrison	Norris	Truman
Byrd	Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	White
Connally	King	Reynolds	Wiley
Danaher	La Follette	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask the privilege of the Senate that I may deliver without interruption the remarks I have to make. I do not care to take up the time of the Senate longer than I deem it absolutely necessary to express the thoughts which are mine on this momentous occasion. I shall therefore appreciate being permitted to proceed with my remarks without interruption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has, of course, taken notice of the request of the Senator from Nevada, and feels that it is the duty of the Chair, as a courteous man, to notify Senators that they will not be recognized for the purpose of interrupting the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I address the Senate today because I must be true to the conviction that is in me. I have searched my conscience, fearing that I might be wrong. Earnestly I have listened to the discussion of the pending conscription bill. Eagerly I have read the words of those whom I respect and whose judgment carries weight. Bluntly I have questioned the rich man, the poor man, the old, and the young; the "big" man, who will stand and watch the soldiers marching by, and the "little" man, upon whose shoulders will fall the brunt of what we may decide here upon the floor of Congress.

Without prejudice I have sought conviction; and my conviction remains as staunch and true within me as any truth I know. I must oppose involuntary servitude, military or otherwise, when we are not at war.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall have to ask, with all due respect to those who agree or disagree, that the rule of the Senate be invoked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The temporary occupant of the chair begs to observe that the occupants of the galleries are guests, and welcome guests, of the Senate but they must not in any circumstance manifest any approval or disapproval of what occurs on the floor of the Senate. This rule will be enforced. A repetition might lead to exclusion from the galleries of the persons thus breaking the rule.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I must oppose the method of conscription in this, a time of peace, because I feel it is being thrust upon us and carried through while our traditionally clear American minds are dimmed by an attitude of frenzy, frightened by the specter of a shadow from the sky. We are in a mood, a man-made mood of madness, built of war hysteria.

I oppose conscription thus imposed in time of peace because I feel it is a stepping stone toward the destruction of that very thing we would be fighting to preserve—a government that is not totalitarian.

I oppose conscription today because we are at peace. And, by the grace of God, we will remain at peace. We are not going to be "bull-d" into this war even by such as Bullitt. He did not need to tell you or me what happened in France. We all know what happened; and I am not loath to say we felt the screeching of the bombs which fell as keenly in our hearts as he heard them when they fell on Paris.

Mere recanting of these grim and bloody facts of war can lend no aid to wisdom and straight thinking. By such means we only make the frightened ones more panicked, the warmonger more triumphant, the hysterics that much louder.

Mr. Bullitt has had a great experience and knows the sight of war first-hand. We had hoped it might have left him wiser, more enlightened, less imbued with vengeance, and more inspired with vision. We might have hoped that the years since he left the State Department at the behest of a great administration would make him more truthful if not more diplomatic, and now more honestly equipped to give voice as the mouthpiece of the United States, when he stands as their Ambassador on some foreign soil. We would want to respect him and believe in his sound judgment because of his experience. We want to regard him as a diplomatic minister rather than a minister of propaganda.

But he makes that task a hard one. There are those in the Senate whom I would not call wishful thinkers, nor would I brand them as agents of dictators; and yet the honorable Ambassador to France leaves no other category open for those of us who seek as earnestly as he to prepare our country fully, wisely, and completely for the task of national defense. Perhaps our methods differ; but we who oppose conscription here today are not opposed to building our defenses or strengthening our forces against the threat of assault on America by dictators. Our votes show that more eloquently than words.

The Honorable Ambassador to France, I am sure, did not mean to imply that those of us who do not rush to force muskets in the arms of all Americans today, for fear of Hitler's war bombs over Washington, are necessarily either merely wishful thinkers or agents of dictators. The latter implication does not deserve the dignity of comment.

As to the kinds of thinkers who cling to belief in sane and steady logic, in cold, calm reasoning, in cautious, strong approaching of the problems here before us—I cannot call them wishful.

Of the late Senator Borah it was said upon this floor by one of our honored colleagues that he was courageous but not foolhardy; that he was liberal but not radical; that he was conservative but not reactionary; that he was progres-

sive, and yet was cautious—suspicious of the untried, and slow to relinquish the proven. No one ever questioned his sincerity, and few have matched his patriotism.

It is my deep conviction that if the beloved Lion of Idaho were here today, standing at his desk, he would plead with all of us to stem the tide of frightened fury that is heading us toward a futile war, and tearing down the very thing for which an American would fight—a democratic country, united in the strength of individuals who would be willing to die together for that precious thing that is America.

Mr. President, I have attempted to approach this entire question without bias and with an open mind, because the world situation will not allow us to err in our judgment. In all frankness and sincerity, I cannot do other than oppose the enactment of this dictatorial and autocratic legislation.

My objections to the proposed legislation are fundamental because the pending bill diametrically and fundamentally transgresses our democratic concept of freedom, liberty, and the Bill of Rights.

If I feel strongly about the issue presented to us, Mr. President, it is because I have an inherent repugnance to everything which threatens our democratic form of government. If we are willing to fight to prevent anyone else from destroying it, why do we not fight to prevent it being destroyed by ourselves?

I am prejudiced against anything that smacks of totalitarianism. I abhor Hitlerism and the principles which dominate Germany today. I abhor fascism and the fascistic form of government. I abhor communism and the principles that actuate the Soviet Government today.

On the contrary, I have every sympathy for the people who are waging, and will carry on the fight to banish tyranny and despotism from the earth. I hope with all my being that Hitler as a symbol of aggression will be banished from the earth. But, you cannot conquer Hitlerism if you let it conquer you in the process.

I abhor dictatorship, whether in a dictatorial form of government or a democracy, whether embodied in a colored shirt or clothed in constitutionality. The former has no place in my concept; the latter has no place where the people rule. Dictatorship to me would be abhorrent, whether in the Kremlin, on Unter den Linden, at 10 Downing Street, or at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

We cannot preserve American democracy by changing that democracy into totalitarianism, by resorting to totalitarian methods—and that is exactly what the bill embodies. Military conscription has ever been the first step toward dictatorship. Military conscription has always been the cornerstone of despotic rule.

It does not require argument to demonstrate that such is the basic philosophy of the bill. On page 194 of the hearings one of the witnesses before the committee, on July 11, 1940, pointed out that the bill was more dangerous than Hitler, and he was answered by this statement from a Member, I am sorry to say, of the Senate of the United States.

> We can beat Hitlerism with Hitlerism. I think that Hitlerism is the greatest threat to civilization we know today, and the way to meet Hitlerism is with Hitlerism.

Will not totalitarianism smile with glee when its bitter enemy lowers the drawbridge which kept it out, thinking thus to make the democratic stronghold more impregnable? Does one who fears the unclean leper in the street as destructive of everything fine and decent and pure, and surely to corrupt everything sacred in life, contract the grim malady in order that he may say that he has faced the problem squarely?

Mr. President, we are being told that we face a great emergency. We believe that statement. Therefore we have voted tremendous peacetime expansion of all our forces. We have cooperated in each measure to prepare for wise defense. We have voted to call out the National Guard. We have repeatedly rendered all possible aid to Great Britain while respecting our own neutrality decrees.

Next we are told that our traditional system of voluntary enlistment to augment the Army has completely broken down—and here we pause to give cool judgment to that statement. We are advised by proponents of the legislation before us that recruits in sufficient numbers can be secured only through compulsory military service, and the press and radio have been used as the tools of those who disseminate publicity to uphold that belief. Into every home has gone a flood of what we might call propaganda, shaping that greatest force of all—public opinion—as those behind the scenes would have it shaped. From the printshop and the broadcast room has gone a strangely studied program planned to guide the public thinking. We do not as yet, thank God, have a minister of propaganda, and I hope that day may never come, as we see too clearly how the press and the far-reaching voice of radio can carry the war cry into trusting hearts.

I have great respect for those who still can do their thinking for themselves. It is the steady and unemotional approach that we need here today. We go far, it seems, to win our points. I have been amazed at the statements I have heard upon the Senate floor. It has even been asserted consistently in this body that conscription is more democratic than voluntary enlistment.

I wonder, Mr. President, if we must believe that also? I wonder if anyone can seriously contend that forced militarism is the stuff of which democracy is made?

Under the terms of the bill as reported, who is called to the service to receive the so-called benefits of this great training? Is it the people as a whole, the great mass of Americans who are willing and ready to make any sacrifice to preserve their Government? There is no such provision in the bill. Is it all those male citizens who are physically and mentally capable of serving their country?

As a matter of fact, those engaged in industries regarded as inimical to public welfare are specifically deprived of the opportunity to render service. On page 15, section 2 of this bill we find that—

> It shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and of every male alien residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 21 and 31, on the day or days fixed for registration, to present himself for and submit to registration. * * *

And so forth. Thus we limit this privilege, as some would call it, to male citizens from 21 to 31 years of age. Out of the 11,000,000 available male citizens within that age limit today we will take only some two or three million for training over a period of 5 years, during which time over a million more young men each year will reach the age of 21.

Will it breed the best in attitude and moral outlook to conscript men ripe for the plucking, according to our judgment here, and leave the others, equally capable, to feel unwanted and unneeded by their Government or country?

Further analysis of the specific language employed in the bill, in that particular, will demonstrate what confusion must result. Section 3 (a) of the bill authorizes the President—

> Whether or not a state of war exists, to select for training and service in the manner herein provided, and to induct into the land and naval forces of the United States, such number of men between such ages as in his judgment is required for such forces in the national interest:

Section 4 (a) provides that:

> The selection of men for the training and service provided for in section 3 * * * shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from all the men between the ages of 21 and 31 who are liable for such training and service.

Please note at this point the definite distinction between conscription for training and service, and induction into the land and naval forces of the United States.

In other words, Mr. President, not only is the Executive given the power to "induct into the land and naval forces," but he is also jointly and separately given authority to "select for training and service" any number within his judgment, without regard to a contingent appropriation by Congress. In my judgment, such a power might easily embrace the authority to enforce compulsory labor in any munitions factory, navy yard, shipyard, automobile factory, aviation plant, or

other military facility, under the guise of "training and/or service."

I contend that by the language of sections 3 (a) and 4 (a) the President is given not one but two powers, separated by the conjunction "and," namely, "to select for training and service" and "to induct into the land and naval forces of the United States." This fact is further substantiated when compared with the so-called limiting section 6, which makes no reference to "training and service."

That is not all. Compulsory military training has been defended as being the ideal method of marshaling an armed force. It is argued that conscription is the ideal way to raise an army. If, for the sake of considering the argument, we say that conscription is ideal, does that make it right? Does that make it just? Does that mean that we should therefore accept conscription without question? I could devise what many would regard as an ideal tax system, but it might be the most unjust taxation plan ever created. As an example: Suppose a bill were proposed to secure all the taxes to support the Government from men between the ages of 21 and 31, and that no other persons were required to pay taxes. Let us further suppose that some agency of the Government were empowered to select at will, arbitrarily and without standard, any part of those between 21 and 31 and require them to pay all the taxes for all the people of the United States. Will any Senator tell me that this would be the most democratic method of raising revenue to support the Government? Yet it might truly be ideal in the opinion of those exempted. Then why, Mr. President, must we have our reason affronted with the argument that conscripting men between the ages of 21 and 31, leaving all others at liberty, is the most democratic and fair way to raise an army?

This is called a selective service bill, Mr. President. To my mind it is a misnomer. There has come to be a distinction between selective service and universal service. In practice, universal service means conscripting all the men within given age limits at a given time, for service on a date certain. However, this is not true of selective service. In selective service some agency, individual, or board is empowered to select from a given age bracket only men whom those in authority deem to be fit and desirable. Section 14 provides that the act shall be cited as the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

Who is to do the selecting? Section 10 provides that—

> The President is authorized to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations * * * (2) to create and establish a selective-service system * * * and to establish local boards and such other agencies * * * as he may deem necessary * * *; (3) to appoint * * * a director of selective service who shall be directly responsible to him. * * *

Subsection (b) of section 10 provides that—

> The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to delegate any authority vested in him under this act to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose.

Yes, Mr. President, this is called a selective-service bill, but the selection contemplated is no more democratic than any other form of involuntary servitude.

Need I remind the Senate that we are not at war, in spite of Mr. Bullitt's impassioned lullaby of death? Need I remind the Senate that we are a peace-loving Nation? Need I remind the Senate that we are a constitutional democracy?

There is a vast difference, Mr. President, between conscription in time of war and conscription in time of peace. I believe in providing an adequate national defense, and I do not believe we need to resort to the extreme of conscription to do it. I believe in expanding the armed forces of the United States, and I have voted in committee and on the floor for every appropriation bill looking to that end. But that did not and does not inevitably carry with it any need for such a step as some would have us take today. I believe—I know—we can put a force of real Americans on every ship as soon as ships are ready. I believe—I know—that we can have real Americans for every plane as soon as it is built. I believe—I know—that real Americans will be ready and willing to man every tank or other mechanism for defense when it is built.

Moreover, I say to the Senate and to the people of the country that the wars of the future will not be fought by great massed armies, but rather by skillful men in mechanized forces.

The Nazis did not take France by the power of marshalled millions. France could not save herself with all her massed conscripts. The Nazi did not overrun Belgium with goose-stepping hordes.

The conqueror in these instances overcame massed forces with small, highly trained, mechanized units. Science and speed did the work formerly accomplished by great hordes of men.

According to Winston Churchill, England has 2,000,000 men under arms. They are under arms, and that is all. The Royal Air Force, comparatively but a small unit, is holding the admiration of the civilized world and stopping the onslaught of a ruthless enemy.

Great armies will not win the wars of future years. Great skill, great training, and specialized education will be the forces which will defy invasion.

Never before in the entire history of this great Nation has peacetime conscription been seriously considered, although I am willing to concede that, as evidenced by Senate Document No. 134, better known as the M-plan, the pending measure was secretly conceived long before there was any thought of the present European war.

Our proud forefathers fought the Revolutionary War with volunteers. We fought the War of 1812 to solidify America and finally sever Old World ties, and we fought that war with volunteers. In 1848 we fought the Mexican War with volunteers.

Conscription was resorted to for the first time in our history during the Civil War, which brings an illuminating fact to mind. Of the more than 2,000,000 men in the Union Army, approximately 60,000, or less than 2½ percent, were conscripts. In other words, we fought that war with volunteers. We fought the Spanish-American War with volunteers.

Between 1914 and 1917 Great Britain used only volunteers in the World War and had 5,000,000 men to carry arms. Only after 3 long years of actual war did the British Parliament pass their conscription act in 1917, just before the United States declared war on the German Empire.

Two weeks after we entered the World War of 1917, without delay and in the chaotic spirit of that hour, we passed conscription, as England, after 3 long years of battle, had just done. We were then at war; we were not at peace, as we are today; and we did not test the volunteering method but acted quickly and decisively. Who knows if we did right?

Mr. President, those who advocate the philosophy that we must enact peacetime conscription to protect the rich heritage that is so rightfully ours are embarking on a strange inconsistency, a dangerous and untenable argument. As originally introduced, this was a bill "to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service."

Let us see what is embraced within that sweeping statement. Those who support this measure are informing us that they have the right to fill the ranks of the Army by compulsion. They assert they have the power to reach into every home in these United States and call forth the youth to involuntary military service at will!

We are informed, and the pending bill so provides, that persons thus inducted into the Service may be put to duty anywhere within the Western Hemisphere, either for invasion or for defense. We are informed, and the pending bill so provides, that this power is not dependent upon invasion of this country, or even upon a state of war, but rather that it belongs to the Government at all times, in peace as well as war, to be exercised in all circumstances, according to the discretion of the President. For what exercise of power do we condemn other governments which command the people in much this way?

Can such a philosophy be countenanced within the meaning of the Constitution? In what article or section of the Con-

stitution is there found the power to force an individual to sacrifice everything dear in life and even life itself, not to repel an invasion; not to execute the laws of the land; not to suppress insurrections, but merely because some officials in our Government departments, together with other interested parties—whose interest rests sometimes in strange tokens—believe in an Army of three or four million reserves?

It is true, Mr. President, that the Constitution gives Congress the power to "raise and support armies," and to "provide and maintain a Navy." It has been argued that Congress is empowered to enact all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and that compulsory military service, even though we be at peace, is both necessary and proper. Here, my honored colleagues would do well to pause with me and look with cold, hard reasoning on the implications herein made.

Let us assume that proponents of conscription are right for the sake of argument. Then let us look further. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, also gives to Congress the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States, the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, among many other powers. If people are unwilling to lend money to the Government, would it then be contended that Congress could resort to a forced loan in time of peace? Perhaps that would be just; perhaps a bill now pending on the Senate Calendar would do just that thing. The pending bill to which I refer may have the support of some. In this totalitarian hour, things otherwise seemingly impossible or incautious, may be looked upon with favor. But even such a bill, which would resort to forcing loans in time of peace, whatever its merits, does not specify that all loans must be made by a given small group; that those between the ages of 21 and 31 shall contribute their wealth because they are best equipped to earn more, or have not so long been used to money, or have stronger arms to sign the checks.

Moreover, a Congress with such power as some seem to visualize in promoting this conscription act could, by the same token, set up a selective borrowing agency, empowered to select arbitrarily 2,000,000 of the 11,000,000 males between 21 and 31, and in effect say to them:

> Because we are not certain of how many voluntary loans we may be able to secure, you must lend all of your money to the Government for 1 year, and you must hold yourself in readiness for the next 10 years to make any and all loans for the support of the Government.

Would that be constitutional? Would it be just? Would it be the course of true wisdom? Would it be democratic? Would it be American? I may say, in passing, that I wonder if those among us who believe one man can thus be ever right realize the implication of that subtle phrase which frames the picture of these measures we so dutifully pass—that phrase which says, "In the judgment of the President."

Democracy is a form of government based on the judgment of the people. When did the judgment of the people, the "demos," become so dead and dumb that it would not be called upon to carry out the will of the democracy or to speak for a form of government known as democracy?

Was it for this that the American Government was so carefully built? You who fight a war to quell dictators, do not forget that within the years to come, when you and I will not be here upon this floor, there may walk here one who will not with kindness nor with pity nor with unselfish love of country administer these laws which we have set in motion. Some lowly corporal in our drafted army of today may have different thoughts than ours some 20 years from now. He may find it simple so to guide this great machine of power which we have built today that America itself may writhe beneath an unknown terror greater than our human minds can picture.

Who can read the life and writings, and read the works of Jefferson, and not ponder on the events of current history? He struggled for a diffusion of power into the majority of the people, and a limitation of power at the disposal of the Executive..

"The government that governs least, governs best," was his slogan and his motto, and behind this thought, if we read his writings correctly, was the everlasting fear that some Executive, under our constitutional system, cognizant of his popularity, determined in his policies, surrounded by his chosen Cabinet, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, with the keys to the Treasury in his pocket, would declare to the world and to the people that a great emergency was present, which emergency demanded that he continue at the head of the Government.

Will the Army that we draft today in an hour of peace, will the organization that we set up with full wartime mandate, be so easily dissolved 5 or 10 years from now? Will the positions thus attained, the power acquired, be laid down without a struggle?

Will the generation at the portal of its majority, the generation that stands today on the threshold of our Nation's life, about to take its place in the Nation's affairs, find itself confronted with a creature which will be created by us here, but which it will live to curse?

Millions there are today who are watching our proceedings whose ancestors fled from clicking heels, tinsel and braid, and military dominance. Are we today to cast our votes to bring to the western world that which has been the curse of the countries of far more ancient civilizations?

Militarism stood by the side of the crowned heads, and saw them, one by one, pass out; and as those crowned heads passed out, militarism stepped in.

Were I to vote for this bill, I should consider myself unfaithful to the forefathers of my country and an incense bearer in the chamber of a dead democracy.

Oh, Mr. President, it is unwise in us not to heed the thinking of that statesman, Daniel Webster, when, in discussing a bill comparable to that now here before us, he made this statement:

> An attempt to maintain this doctrine upon the provisions of the Constitution is an exercise of perverse ingenuity to extract slavery from the substance of a free government.

Let us mull that over in our minds. Daniel Webster called it slavery; he labeled it "perverse ingenuity"; and Daniel Webster was not a wishful thinker nor an agent of dictators.

If we believe this conscription bill is right and just in this time of peace, in the face of our Constitution, which was enacted as a guide in times like this, then we have become convinced that we, the people, are not sovereign; that there are certain inalienable rights which the Government reserves unto itself; that ours is not a government of the people, by them, and for them, but rather a government of government.

We are being told that to perpetuate the great blessings of liberty and freedom and the constitutional rights of every American we must now surrender to the Government, "in the judgment of the President," an uncontrolled power of military conscription to be arbitrarily exercised by the Chief Executive, whether we are at peace or war. Is this America? Is this the voice of America speaking, when that Nation is the leading power in the civilized world? Can this be said to be the voice of the statesmen who founded this Government, and of the patriots who died for it? Or, rather, is this a far-flung cry from a power that sought to keep us tied to a crown when our forefathers hurled the cry "'Liberty or death"?

Is this, my colleagues, worthy as the work of those of us who have come here to represent the will and wishes of our people? Who is speaking for America today? Perhaps the letters coming to our desks are merely prattle. The press would have us think so. But I pause to consider the will, the grasping for the thing that is America, the strong belief in the rightness of our way of doing, that leads those many letters to be written.

Is it the millions who constitute the populace of this country who are today calling for conscription? Are the mothers of America calling for conscription of their sons and the sons of their neighbors? Is the youth of America calling for conscription? Are the toilers of America calling for conscription? Is that great conservative army of toilers, the American Federation of Labor, giving its support to this

bill? Published utterances answer "No," and I read from a letter of William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, under date of August 5, 1940, in which he says:

We do not regard the Burke-Wadsworth bill, which provides for compulsory military service, as a well-planned measure. We cannot, therefore, give it our approval and support. The American Federation of Labor will give support to compulsory military training service legislation when such action becomes necessary in order to defend, protect, and preserve America. However, in providing an adequate army for defensive purposes, the American way should be followed first. A voluntary enlistment program should be launched by the Government, designed to create an army of one million and a half men. This would be putting voluntary action before compulsion. American labor would respond to such a program wholeheartedly and enthusiastically.

Are the millions of the Congress of Industrial Organizations endorsing this program? I read from a letter of the United Construction Workers' Organizing Committee of the C. I. O., under date of August 8, 1940, in which the following statement is made:

The many millions of loyal and patriotic Americans in the ranks of organized labor do not believe that the raising of a huge conscript army in peacetime is necessary.

In common with the other unions of the C. I. O., we have pledged our support of all needed measures of national defense. We believe that national defense can best be advanced by firm adherence to American principles of democracy. It is not possible to make an effective defense of democracy while at the same time adopting totalitarian tactics.

Are the hundreds of thousands of members of the railroad brotherhood, whose membership extends from ocean to ocean, from State to State, and from border to border, supporting this conscription bill? I quote from a letter dated August 1, 1940, addressed to the chairmen of the Senate and House Military Affairs Committees, as follows:

We are in general agreement with the prevailing sentiment in the United States that every support should be given to adequate measures necessary to the protection of our democratic institutions against attack from the force of dictatorship, both within and without our country. However, grave doubt exists in many quarters with respect to the wisdom of enacting a peactime conscription bill when it is believed other adequate measures are available. Such proposal borders closely on the principle of dictatorship, and we hold the view that regimenting our people is un-American and unnecessary.

Compulsory military service in time of peace is the very antithesis of freedom. It involves an infringement on the very principles of democracy which it is invoked to defend. It imposes upon the individual a mandate to give service which he may not be in position to render without serious sacrifices on the part of himself or his family, or both; and this at a time when there are thousands of other individuals who would be glad to avail themselves of the opportunity to serve if such opportunity were not denied by the restrictive rules observed by the recruiting service.

(Signed) By RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS OF AMERICA.

Would anyone have the courage to say that these great elements of national life have no regard for the welfare of their country? Will anyone have the temerity to say that these great cross sections of the people of this country do not give, and give, and give to national welfare in time of peace and in time of war?

Mr. President, it has been contended that the proposed legislation is both compulsory and voluntary. I know that everything possible has been done to liberalize it in that respect, in the hope of strengthening any chance of passage, because however liberal may be a measure at its passage, the administration of that measure will do the rest. Need I draw the attention of my colleagues to this homely fact? Departmental rules and regulations fill in the chinks and crevasses when the seductive honey which induced a Congress to approve has seeped away.

Mr. President, for 20 years the law of this country has permitted voluntary enlistment in the Army for a period of 1 year or for a period of 3 years. Has that been made known to the people of this country? Have regulations or Army publications or Army pronouncements made it known to the youth of this country that they could enlist in the Army for 1 year? If so, why have only 166 men taken advantage of this privilege accorded them by law? Out of thin air have come the regulations clouding the provisions of this law which Congress passed, and thus a liberal measure has been handcuffed by departmental handling.

I know that in this bill, as originally introduced, no provision was allowed for volunteering. I know that as a result of pressure from the public, in an attempt to anticipate the ominous rumblings, subsection (d) was added to section 11, providing:

That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, amend, or suspend the laws now in force authorizing voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in the land and naval forces of the United States.

In that connection let me draw attention to the explanation of the dual compulsory and voluntary aspects of the bill, which appears at page 10098 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 9. The able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee made the following statement:

When the men are registered, they are asked to indicate whether they want to volunteer and they are allowed to do so if they want to volunteer.

In other words, "Will you come peacefully, or do I have to blackjack you?" According to that explanation, Mr. President, they still have voluntary elections in Germany. According to that explanation, the Germans are voluntarily fighting the present war. If we are to accept such a premise, we must be blind to concentration camps, and the Gestapo, and that slow starvation which faces anyone who does not "voluntarily" support the Nazi doctrine. It almost seems that we think of seeing how close we can approach the same quicksand without sinking in it.

I am exceedingly interested in the subject of volunteering. Much has been said about it. Facts have been strangely warped to court the public fancy, leaving confusion in most minds. We are told that volunteer enlistment will not bring a sufficient number of men to man our ships and to defend our country. Nothing could be further from the truth. I grant that voluntary enlistment will not bring a rapid rise of salaries and quick promotions to many officers and officials of the War and Navy staffs, but that is not the worry of Congress today.

None other than Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the War Department, on page 335 of the hearings on July 12, 1940, made a statement which I call to the attention of the Senate, as it has been done before, because in these closing hours, ere a vote is taken on this momentous subject, it is well that the Senate have it again brought to its attention. I call it also to the attention of the American people.

General Marshall said:

In June we went ahead with enlisting the force without all of the funds necessary and had to be a little cautious until the appropriation bill was passed and signed, but I think we secured 18,000 men in June. Our quota, which we assigned ourselves, was about 15,000 by the end of the month, and we had reached the 15,000 10 days before the end of the month. In other words, recruiting went ahead in good shape.

On being questioned by a member of the Senate committee present at the hearing as to whether or not that many men were actually accepted by the Army, General Marshall emphatically said "Yes."

When asked how many or what proportion were rejected because of physical and mental deficiencies, General Marshall's answer is eloquent:

About one-third of the applicants were rejected. I might say that we have been able to secure a remarkably fine lot of men from the viewpoint of high-school and college education.

In other words, Mr. President, not only did the Army secure 3,000 more recruits than its established quota of 15,000 and do that in two-thirds the time allotted, but more than one-third of the applicants, or some 6,000, were rejected for one reason or another. Such is the picture for June.

In July the recruiting offices received 34,058 applications for enlistment, of which 23,432 were accepted.

What is far more significant and illuminating on this whole question of volunteer enlistment is a table submitted on the 24th of July by Secretary of War Stimson, which appears at page 117 of the House hearings on the second national-defense appropriation bill. There, it is conclusively shown that the present authorized Army of 375,000 men will be com-

pleted by December 20, 1940, according to the War Department's own conservative estimate. Moreover, as late as August 5—that is this month, not last year—on page 11 of the Senate hearings on the same bill, General Marshall most emphatically announced that Secretary Stimson's estimate was correct. In other words, the War Department clearly realizes, and admits, that the recruits which they desire can and will be secured through voluntary enlistment, notwithstanding the dire predictions coming from the press and radio, which make us wonder once again why we should raise the roof of reason and inflict conscription on a democratic nation not at war.

That is not all. Rear Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, spokesman for the Navy Department, testified in response to direct questioning that, even with an enlistment period of 6 years, the Navy has not had difficulty in getting voluntary enlistments. Admiral Nimitz further testified that there are now some seven thousand men on the waiting list, ready to go into training stations.

Can it be possible that anyone would assert that the Navy needs the conscription bill when it has already on its waiting list, 7,000 accepted recruits in excess of facilities with which to train them?

Thus we see the vicious circle closing in: Appropriate for conscripts; appropriate for equipment to train the conscripts; appropriate to pay the officers promoted to handle the equipment to train the conscripts * * * and one day we will appropriate what is left, to fight an economic war in which our mammoth defense giant will be eating up our very hearts, and daily growing sluggish because he cannot be used to fight the kind of war which comes to us in bombs of bankruptcy and economic chaos.

Mr. President, I am neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, nor an expert economist, but my humble vision causes me to say that the future problem of the Western Hemisphere, and especially of our America, is an economic problem, far more than a military problem.

Our defense can be taken care of as it has been taken care of, by the loyalty and willingness of our citizens to serve voluntarily when the threat of war is upon us. Our national strength and substance should be devoted to building ourselves so strong economically as to be able to sustain our national plan and national system against any economy that may be set up as an aftermath of the present European conflict because, regardless of who may come out the winner from the unhappy maelstrom abroad, the whirlwind of a new economy arising in central Europe will be far reaching.

The military plan under the bill now pending, entailing a gigantic national debt, a massive national military force, as well as a departure from constitutional principles, may constitute the chains that will fetter our economic liberty and bring us to our knees without resort by our enemies to their armed forces.

Better a thousand times that we preserve intact the safeguards of our liberty, insuring freedom to a free people, denying inroads to the ambitious.

Better a thousand times that we secure the most humble citizen his independence and his right to sustain himself and his dependents.

Better that we build our Nation strong in these respects so that the love of country will constitute the impetus by which an army will voluntarily spring up in time of need, so powerful that no foreign foe will threaten.

Mr. President, what are we to do with those we conscript? General Marshall wants 400,000 by January and a like number in April, and so on until we reach 1945. However, on July 12, at page 328 of the hearings on the pending bill, General Marshall himself said:

> The training of young men in large training camps on the basis of compulsory training is something that we cannot manage at the present time. We do not have the trained officers and men—the instructors—to spare. Also we do not have the necessary material. We lack the special training set-up at the moment, and we cannot afford to create it.

This from the Chief of Staff of our own War Department.

Let us compare that statement to his testimony at page 333 while commenting on a proposal to expand the Regular Army of 750,000 men, which proposal was submitted by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. General Marshall said:

> We would have either to organize units from the ground up without any trained personnel to leaven the mass, which would require about a year, or we would have to emasculate existing units in the Regular Army in order to provide nuclei for new units. I do not think we should take such a hazard as that at the present time. Another and still more serious effect would be that we would have to emasculate the National Guard in order to find the necessary equipment for the new units.

Mr. President, let us look at cold facts. The War Department, in the face of such assertions from its Chief of Staff, still favors the bill demanding 1,200,000 men in the armed forces, not including the Navy or Air Corps.

If it be true that a proposal—coming from someone outside the War Department—for a Regular Army of 750,000 men is not feasible and is impossible because it would emasculate the Army personnel to secure instructors, and would emasculate the National Guard to secure the necessary equipment, how can it be said that we should place more than a million men in the service by April 1 next? If 750,000 enlisted men would disrupt the armed forces of the United States, then 1,200,000 trainees thrown into the Army would make the situation just 33⅓ percent worse.

The Washington Post of August 23 has this to say concerning an official interview with General Marshall:

> When questioned by newsmen on the alleged lack of army equipment, General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, said: "We have enough .30 caliber rifles in reserve for an army of 3,000,000 men now, and plenty of machine guns, artillery, automatic rifles, gas masks, and other essential materials for the program."

I ask, Mr. President, what has occurred between July 12, 1940, when equipping an army of 750,000 would emasculate the National Guard for equipment, and emasculate the Regular Army for instructors, and August 23, 1940—less than 40 days later—so that we are now told that the War Department has enough equipment for an army of 3,000,000 men? If we could not equip an army of 750,000 on July 12, how could it be asserted on August 23 that we can equip 3,000,000 men?

Mr. President, if conscription can be justified or excused in time of peace, it must be resorted to only for the purpose of executing the laws of the Union, suppressing insurrections, or repelling invasions, if I may be pardoned for quoting from the Constitution of the United States. The fact of an emergency does not change that premise. How forceful is the language of Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, in the case of *Home Building and Loan Association* v. *Blaisdell*, 290 U. S. 398, 425 (1934). I quote:

> Emergency does not create power. Emergency does not increase granted power or remove or diminish the restrictions imposed upon power granted or reserved. The Constitution was adopted in a period of grave emergency. Its grants of power to the Federal Government and its limitations of the power of the States were determined in the light of emergency and they are not altered by emergency.

Perfectly sincere, honest, and able Senators have solemnly declared their firm conviction that Hitler will attack the United States. They also say we must have four or five million reservists prepared for that attack, despite the fact that every fragment of evidence before the Senate and House Military and Naval Affairs Committees during the entire consideration of our national-defense program, as far back as 1938, conclusively shows that we do not need and could not use a mass army of partially trained infantrymen such as conscription would inevitably produce without facilities to handle them. It is clearly written in the record that we need a Navy second to none, to cooperate with a fast-moving mobilized force of highly trained technicians, coordinated to the *n*th degree.

Mr. President, what are the elements of emergency, either limited or otherwise, which call for hasty action, so ill-advised that even our Army experts and the Chief of Staff,

the highest authority on the subject, declared on July 12, 1940, at page 333 of the hearings, as I have previously mentioned:

> We would have to emasculate existing units in the Regular Army in order to provide nuclei for new units. I do not think we should take such a hazard as that at the present time. Another and more serious effect would be that we would have to emasculate the National Guard in order to find the necessary equipment for the new units.

Why are we lending ourselves to hysteria and promoting such hysteria in the country that the average man on the street believes we are actually at war? What is it that necessitates 400,000 trainees by October 1, 1940? Are we to be attacked before Christmas? Are we to be invaded by any foreign foe within the year? Has any aggressor nation sought to deprive us of so much as a square foot of our soil? Is there something that we have not been told which warrants the adoption of compulsory military service in time of peace for the first time in the history of this Nation, when we know that compulsory military service is the first milestone on the road to a totalitarian United States?

On March 4, 1939, we as a nation celebrated the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Constitution of the United States, the establishment of a constitutional democracy in the Western Hemisphere, where individual human liberty was the paramount thought. A century and a half ago we established our beloved government and announced to the world our intention to live at peace with the nations of the earth and to bring to our people the greatest quantum of contentment and prosperity. In that period of 150 years the nations abroad which called us to their side in the World War were in fact only passing through another of the prevailing conflicts which have engaged the attention of the European nations.

In the past 150 years, Great Britain has fought a total of 54 wars, lasting, in all, 102 years. In the past 150 years the British Empire has been at war 68 percent of the time. In the past century and a half France has engaged in 53 wars, lasting 99 years. In the past century and a half France has been at war 66 percent of the time.

The major of these conflicts abroad constituted a threat to our national existence. In the light of past example, why must we view this as the deluge? Just as the greatest military strategist of his time met his fate at Waterloo, so will there be an end to Hitler's march.

A vote for conscription is a momentous "aye." It is a vote toward war, war beyond our shores, for which preparation seems to point. These things of themselves are startling enough; but even more disheartening to me is the fact that a vote for this bill is the first farewell of the American people to their proud heritage of democratic freedom. Other farewells will follow fast and furiously, if this succeeds, because where militarism steps in, it becomes a ruthless master. It brooks no contradiction; it endures no pause.

The American democracy was not set up because of a threat from any forces. The American democracy was established from a background of poignant history and grim experience. The American democracy was set up out of a love of individual human liberty, after the Army that had established that liberty in a new world had been disbanded. The American democracy was set up to insure against a militaristic tyranny and insure against any reversion to such.

Moreover, it was set up to insure against human ambition that might, in the lust for power, forget its patriotism.

Following the World War, Germany set up democracy. But that democracy arose from the ashes of militarism, and the people who were to be governed by the new form of government were not on guard. They did not have a century and a half of democratic vigilance behind them. They knew the rhythm of the goose step, the glamour of the brass helmet. They knew and were used to coming to attention when uniforms passed by.

It was easy for an ambitious one to set himself up where starved and benighted millions, knowing not the course of free government nor its blessings, were easy to be shoved in line.

Thus out of Germany's democracy comes a Hitler with his blood and "blitzkrieg."

May God hold America safe to the moorings of our traditions, and our Constitution, forged with the flame of experience and wise guidance, and tried in the changing epochs of a century and a half of democracy.

It was not democracy that led the German people on the course toward what, in my judgment, is inevitable destruction. It was the fact that, steeped in militarism for centuries, with only it to use as gage and measure, they, in their desperation, bowed down again to its fast-moving, grim ferocity.

I impute nothing when I say that a dictator is not an isolated form of humanity. The madness or inspiration that gives rise to such men springs from obscurity or from greatness. It knows neither creed nor color, race nor condition. Once conceived, it draws to its aid every facility, even democracy itself.

Mr. President, in the history of this Government there was never a more momentous vote than that which will cause a peace-loving democracy to marshal its manpower for an undeclared and unanticipated war; thus to change its entire form; thus, as I have said, to take the first step toward threatening the world, toward arousing the jealousy and suspicions of our neighbor nations, by organizing military forces for a war that has not come and that, God helping, shall not come.

By a "yea" vote you will be summoning American youth to defend the very ideal which, by so voting, you destroy. Under selective military conscription the men doomed to servitude would be expected to work and fight for something they had already lost—the right to be free men and masters of their own destinies.

Moreover, you will be taking more drastic steps than have been taken in Australia, New Zealand, or Canada, all belligerents and now at war. In spite of this, not one of these British Dominions has enacted conscription which compels their conscripts to be sent outside their territorial waters.

Is this war more threatening to us than to the actual belligerents? Is the phantom of fear more bewildering to us than to these others? Australia, a British Dominion, enacted its conscription law last January but limited the application thereof to service within the continent and continental waters of Australia, at a time when their mother country was fighting for existence.

New Zealand, likewise flying the British Union Jack, limited its call to arms to service within its borders.

The Dominion of Canada, the most powerful of all Britain's possessions, passed its Draft Act June 20, 1940, but 2 months ago. I quote section 3 of that act:

> The powers conferred * * * may not be exercised for the purpose of requiring persons to serve in the military, naval, or air forces outside of Canada and the territorial waters thereof.

Mr. President, some there may be who harbor the mistaken idea that the United States is still a British colony. It is an unfortunate thought if it exists. By blood and brawn and brain we carved out an independent nation. Yet, with all that independence, and after all our history, we Americans set out, through the pending measure, to make it possible to draft American manhood when we are not at war. We would enact legislation more drastic than that of nations now at war. Is that Americanism?

We have watched Hitler build a great machine that had to roll somewhere. We saw Japan and Italy prepare for war, and then go out to find a war. Shall we build a war machine of unbridled power? Shall we fill our streets with bands and uniforms? Shall we disrupt homes with military routines? Shall we confuse the industrial stability of our Nation by creating a whirlpool of suspended action? Shall we transplant young America, full of youth and so easily molded, from normal life and intelligent education for the tests that lie ahead? Shall we create a Frankenstein, an army of conscripts led by untried officers, which will contain within its ranks a bursting power that must be used for something? When we have such a monster, then truly, in the words of benighted Bill Bullitt, "War will come to America."

With all due respect to America's No. 1 prophet, erstwhile Ambassador to Paris, who now emulates the technique of Herr Goebbels, German Minister of Propaganda, we have then ourselves transformed a possibility of war, which wisdom might have avoided, into an actuality.

American youth is not foreign to a gun. We have begun to learn the rudiments of defense; let us develop all these programs to their utmost.

I have faith in a sturdy patriotism which will come from the man aroused to action of his own free will, rather than conscription in a time of peace for a mockery of war which has not come. I have faith that great American minds which aim and strive to keep us out of war can do so, and still intelligently give aid and succor to the nations whose destiny has been to battle for their right to live.

Somewhere, democracy must be preserved. God grant that the sun keep shining always on democratic soil; but let us not throw our gift of the American way of life into the boiling sea of war hysteria, lest it become forever lost in the chaos of just such madness as we face today. No one can tell how frequently the cheek of democracy may blush during this, her trying hour. It is my fervent prayer, it is the prayer of millions who believe as I do, that if we can but throw about her the arms of protection, and walk with her through this fire, we may then see her fair form fortified by a new strength, and the spirit of the martyrs who died for her enshrined forever in the western world.

Mr. President, I could not in all conscience cast my vote against the pending conscription bill without expressing the deep convictions which I hold in my heart. No one realizes better than I the gravity of the hour and the exigencies of the crisis confronting the Congress; and, what is more, no one realizes better than I that the pending measure has been under discussion from many angles, doubtless with far more eloquence than I could command. Therefore it has been my privilege to refrain from interrupting Senators during their able discussion on the floor. I have waited until the last hour, but waited with a pent-up feeling, a feeling of responsibility, a feeling of love for my country, of respect for my God, and of thought for every youth in the land, so that we may marshal here in America a voluntary army that is in heart and soul and body imbued with American spirit, and say to the world at large, "One hundred and thirty million Americans fear no power on earth, because we have within us the defense of our principles in which we believe." [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

THE DRIFT IS ON

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have read at the desk an editorial from the Boston Post, the leading independent newspaper of New England, with Democratic leanings and with the largest circulation of any morning newspaper in New England.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the editorial will be read.

The legislative clerk read the editorial, as follows:

THE DRIFT IS ON

It must be apparent to most Americans that our ship of state is setting its sails toward war.

The movement is accelerating day by day.

We are beginning to accept propositions which a few months ago would be unthinkable. We are girding our minds for a struggle.

It was only a short while ago that we were discussing with obvious timidity the provisions of the Neutrality Act.

Now we are boldly talking about taking over British bases, the protection of Canada, and sending destroyers to England.

The things which seemed so important yesterday in keeping out of war are trivial today.

It was not long ago that Senators WALSH and LODGE warned that export of arms would be followed by fuller and more belligerent aid.

They were shouted down by persons who ridiculed any further help.

But, as we look back, it was indeed the entering wedge.

And we may be certain that the next step will be followed by another one, until we finally cross the final, vital, tragic line of demarcation between peace of a sort and war of grim reality.

We seem to have forgotten the lessons of the World War.

We have thrown overboard our ability to view this conflict in its broad lights of imperial struggle.

We have forgotten that this Nation, to even greater measure than England, is alone and friendless among the great powers of the earth and that our wealth, our gold, and our flabby military power are a lure which will call down eventually the thunder of invading guns.

The President appears to be translating our active sympathy for the British cause into inevitable participation in the war. We say this advisedly with a large measure of concern, for it is the most adroit, secretive, and decisive campaign in the history of America.

He and a powerful array of national leaders have already linked us up with what will probably be the losing side.

If the testimony of the war experts is worth anything, England will have to launch the mightiest offensive of all time to come out even.

It is one thing for her to defend herself, but another to win back the Continent of Europe from the greatest military power, and perhaps combination of powers, on earth.

If our national existence depends upon England, then we had better enter the war now while there is still an England.

If we accept our destiny as not British, not European, and not Asiatic, but as American, we will arm ourselves as no nation has ever armed, and will again raise the ancient cry of our ancestors—"Don't tread on me!"

SELECTIVE COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4164) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to make another effort to reach an agreement about limitation of debate on amendments and substitutes. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of this bill and during the pendency of substitutes and amendments to substitutes and to the bill, no Senator shall speak in the aggregate more than 15 minutes. That places no limitation on debate on the bill itself. It applies only to amendments to the bill, to amendments to substitutes, and to substitutes.

I have conferred with those who are planning, so far as I can ascertain, to offer substitutes, and that arrangement is agreeable to them. I hope it may be entered into.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it the purpose of the Senator to hold a night session tonight?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel that I ought to advise the Senate that we shall undertake to hold the session as far as possible into the night.

Mr. ANDREWS obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. ANDREWS. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lee	Schwartz
Andrews	Donahey	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Downey	Lucas	Sheppard
Austin	Ellender	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bailey	George	McCarran	Slattery
Bankhead	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Barbour	Gibson	Maloney	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Mead	Taft
Bone	Green	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Tobey
Burke	Harrison	Norris	Truman
Byrd	Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	White
Connally	King	Reynolds	Wiley
Danaher	La Follette	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there have been so many speeches discussing practically every phase, pro and con, of the pending measure, it had been my purpose not to have anything to say. There are a few observations, however, which I should like to make regarding the purpose and scope of this bill in the hope that it may be better understood.

After analyzing the bill and hearing the many discussions upon it, I have come to the conclusion that it is not in any true sense a conscript or draft measure. On the other hand, I feel that it is what may properly be termed a selective military service measure.

It has always been my conviction, and more so now than ever, that every American boy with a sound body and mind should have at least some military training, either in high school, college, or university, and if not there, then in the National Guard or some other organization, which would make up, in part at least, for his lack of such training earlier in life.

On this point my views are based more on experience than theory. Having been trained in a military institute and having later served as captain in the National Guard, I had a chance from first-hand observation and experience to reach the definite conclusion that the training I received had more to do with shaping whatever future usefulness I may have attained than any other training I ever received.

It is also my belief that at no time in our history would military training be more important and useful than during the present distressed world situation. We have learned that even great democracies such as our own cannot wait and feel safe from foreign attack so long as dictators are rising in the great nations of Europe to threaten world peace and every democracy in the world. Those within the prescribed age who have not received military training should certainly receive it, not only as a matter of self-preservation and protection but as a duty to this great Nation. It is my belief that we should have R. O. T. C. military training units in every high school in the United States above the tenth grade. Such training creates in our youth respect for constituted authority. The tendency in recent years and months by certain groups has too often been in the opposite direction, as evidenced recently even on the White House grounds.

The most important educational training a male youth can have in a democracy such as ours is a proper regard and respect for constituted authority. A great general once said that he who has never learned to respect and obey authority should never undertake to command others.

Recently on the Senate floor the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] offered an amendment which would have permitted the members of the C. C. C. units to receive military training, and that amendment was voted down. It is inconceivable to me that such training would be detrimental in any manner to our C. C. C. boys. I think it would be time well spent. It would require perhaps an hour each day other than Saturdays and Sundays and would prepare these young men for an eventuality which we now feel has infinitely greater probability of occurring if the situation in Europe continues to menace the democracies of the world. It is difficult to imagine what might be the destiny of the people of the United States if our male citizens should refuse to take military training. If our forbears who established this Government had taken the same view we would no doubt still belong to some dominating country of Europe.

Mr. President, during the World War experience made manifest many shortcomings in our preparedness, and it will be recalled that the same opinion prevailed prior to that war that now prevails in the minds of many, namely, that it is not necessary in this democratic country for our youth to take military training, upon the theory that we are so constituted that millions of soldiers will rise up overnight, if America is threatened, to repel any invasion or uprising from any source whatever. Our experience during the World War shows that it was 12 long months after war was declared by Congress before the 2,000,000 citizen soldiers who were sent to France received sufficient military training and equipment to participate in a battle in Europe. We had neither guns, tanks, airplanes, nor other indispensable modern equipment. We had mainly to use those manufactured and furnished by our Allies.

In view of the distressed world conditions, we would be unworthy of the trust placed in us as Senators if we allowed such a deplorable situation to arise again in this emergency. Perhaps I am more mindful than some others of this situation by reason of the fact that in the past few months I have traveled over my State and conferred with many of our people who compose the rank and file of our citizens.

I have come to the definite conclusion that the people of my State, with very few exceptions, are ready to lend, within their resources and ability, such financial aid and trained manpower to their Government, as will guarantee that they and their children and their children's children shall continue to enjoy the blessings of democratic freedom, which have been handed down to us untarnished by our forebears from the days of Washington.

Frequently in my recent campaign I found it necessary to refer to the unsettled conditions of the world. Based on our experience in entering the World War in 1917 "to make the world safe for democracy," I would not be willing again to send American boys across the Atlantic Ocean to fight in the human cockpits of Europe in another World War.

Our forebears established on this continent a government which has lasted longer than any other democracy of its kind in the history of man. In our Constitution, in plain terms, and particularly in our Bill of Rights, there are set forth those canons of freedom which we, as Americans, are pledged to protect and defend with our fortunes, our lives, and our sacred honor. The rights of freedom of the press, freedom of speech, trial by jury, freedom of religion, and prohibition against taking property without due process of law, have been described by preponderant opinion of civilized, liberty-loving men as the rights of every human being, rights necessary to safeguard his happiness and prosperity. We will defend those rights at all costs, at any time and at all times, regardless of the conscientious objector, or any of those who are willing to sacrifice all these rights for any reason. There are some things worse than death itself, and among them would be to have to live under a government dominated by the outstanding European dictator who would make every citizen a political and military slave.

Like many others, I have a fixed opinion that we should by no means be drawn into another carnage of blood such as that now raging in Europe. We must realize, now more than ever before, that we accomplished little for the betterment of the human race, less for the democracies, and nothing for our own welfare, by being drawn into the World War in 1917. We entered the war not alone to avenge the ruthless destruction of American citizens in the sinking by the Germans of the *Lusitania* and similar outrages, but to try to preserve and secure the blessings of democracy for ourselves and the citizens of democracies similar to our own.

The World War experience cost America not only the lives of 50,000 of the best blood and brain in this country, who died in a foreign land, but the maiming and crippling of more than three times that number. Furthermore, we incurred a national debt of more than $35,000,000,000 as a direct result of that conflict.

The opinion has been often expressed that had the American people been prepared for the World War with an adequately trained Army and Navy and with ample equipment Germany would not have drawn us into that conflict. We were drawn into it because they knew we were not prepared and could not be prepared within at least a year. They expected to win the war in Europe before America could arm and train her soldiers and take an effective part. Therefore, by the expending of a very few billion dollars on preparedness we would have no doubt saved to the American people not only the horror of loss of our men on the battlefield but

more than $35,000,000,000 which that experience has unhappily taxed this country. Another unfortunate feature is that we advanced over $10,000,000,000 to rehabilitate the same nations which had been trying to destroy each other on practically the same battlefields for nearly 2,000 years, and for causes very similar to those involved in the present conflict.

We all know how America was drawn into the World War. We asked for no territory or prizes from that war, and received none, either in territory or reparation payments. Some well-informed people have felt that the World War was won as much on Woodrow Wilson's proposed 14 points of settlement, which were printed and distributed from airplanes by the Allies over the territory of the enemy in Europe, as by the military and naval strategy of the Allies in the days immediately preceding the armistice. Unbiased history of that era will bear out the fact that the only unselfish white hand laid on the conference table at Versailles was that of Woodrow Wilson, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. He asked for nothing except the most important pledge that would, so far as humanly possible, safeguard the future peace and happiness of the world.

Notwithstanding all this effort, the treaty finally formulated was never ratified by the Congress of the United States. Those who declared at the time that the League of Nations could not succeed if the greatest world democracy did not ratify it may not have been prophets, but subsequent events are now known to all of us. We were warned at the time that the division of Europe by the treaty would perhaps be the cause of future bloody conflicts. That very thing has happened, although it took 23 years for that prophecy to prove itself. No fact has been more clearly established than that America is not the keeper of the political or civic conscience and the guarantor of the form of government of the countries of Europe.

Most of the 12 decisive battles of the world have been fought near or on the same ground over a period of 2,000 years. Nothing that America could have done would have prevented the present war in Europe, nor the World War, nor can we prevent any European war in the future. It is time for America to learn that fact and act accordingly.

We should make no more useless human sacrifices on European soil. When our first contingent of volunteers was embarking for Europe a spectator could have witnessed from one of the tall hotel buildings in New York the great leviathans of the ocean, carrying thousands of the best blood, brain, and brawn of our Nation, passing down East River in the gray dawn of the morning, and out to sea under the shadow of the Goddess of Liberty, that, with lighted torch held high, seemed to pronounce the only benediction, cold but silent, upon the bravest and best of America, many of whom were never permitted to see their native land again.

Some Senators will recall that in 2 or 3 days they received little postcards with a very simple inscription evidencing that their loved ones had embarked on a voyage through a sea infested by the most dangerous and deathly instruments of destruction ever devised by the inventive genius of man. There was no great crowd to bid them a farewell. To paraphrase the beautiful couplet in Lord Tennyson's poem—

> There was no moaning of the bar
> When they put out to sea.

I am convinced that the billions of dollars Congress has appropriated for material, bases, and armaments will be almost a useless expenditure if we fail at this hour to train our young men for a service which they may have to perform whether they are prepared or not. Can it possibly be doubted that the better prepared we are for war, the greater the probability that we shall have to encounter it, and the greater the probability we shall win if we do have to face it?

In our country we have not deemed it necessary to follow a policy of universal military service. The world situation has entirely changed in 2 relatively short years. Could it possibly be error at this time to provide that within the age limits of 21 and 31 men shall be selected, regardless of whether rich or poor, high or low, to assume an obligation which every patriotic citizen ought to feel it is his duty to assume in order to perpetuate our Government, which has been not only an example but a blessing to mankind?

I shall support the pending bill, among others, for the following reasons:

First. Because it is a long step toward ample preparedness.

Second. Because it discriminates against no one and proposes to train each for his particular place in the scheme of national defense.

Third. Because the discipline necessarily resulting from the training received will be good for the morale of all our people, and particularly for youth.

Fourth. Because it will not only inspire a greater consciousness for basic American ideals, but a patriotic respect for constituted authority.

Mr. President, many of us feel that the Government of the United States should consider establishing student training corps in each coeducational and men's college and university in America, and thus give our college men military training while they are continuing their education, and at a time when the expense would be infinitely less and the opportunities much better than at any other time in life. Students who specialize in chemistry, physics, aeronautics, engineering, and all kinds of premedical and predental work, and other specialties, could thus receive their military training coextensive with their other education. It would not only be more economical for the Government, but would cause less break in the normal lives and educational pursuits of our young men.

We should not postpone proper military training until the need for a large Army is actually present, and then resort to volunteers, as was done in 1917. We must not forget that casualties in an untrained and undisciplined army are inordinately heavy, and that casualties in war decrease in proportion to the degree that an army is disciplined and trained. We must not forget that an untrained and undisciplined army is an inefficient army, and we must not overlook the fact that the volunteer plan, while assuring the service of the red-blooded, patriotic youth of our country, would no doubt leave behind the "fifth columnists" and radical groups, of which all will admit we have too many.

The volunteer method likewise leaves behind those who care little for the welfare and perpetuation of our country and are usually the very ones who cannot safely be left behind to inherit the jobs of those who are willing to serve. The burdens of war should be borne equally and impartially. Selective compulsory military service is not only just but it is essential to the successful prosecution of any war in which we may have to engage.

Opponents of selective compulsory military service seem to overlook the fundamental principle that if America is worth defending all men should be required to do their part. If all are to enjoy the benefits of citizenship, all should live up to the responsibilities of that citizenship.

If this could be accomplished by the volunteer system, all would be in favor of it. But everyone who knows human nature is aware that if the Army and Navy had to depend on volunteers to build up a strong and well-trained force to meet a national emergency there would be no such force ready in time. There would be no question about volunteers once a foreign power landed its soldiers on American shores, but that would be too late. Such volunteers would be untrained and unfit for the task required of them. It would be infinitely unfair to them and thus they would be easy targets for the trained invaders.

We must have selective compulsory military service. It is the only democratic way. In that way we can find the slackers and the "fifth columnists." They will naturally say or do something to show their colors and their lack of sympathy for the basic ideals of our free American Government.

Less than two decades ago the Washington conference of the leading nations of the world was convened in our Capital

City. As a result a solemn agreement was entered into to reduce armaments in order that economic and friendly intercourse between nations might be fostered. In compliance with that agreement the United States conveyed thousands of tons of our naval vessels out to sea and scuttled them. The indications are that from that day on certain nations began secretly to build up not only their own navies but other instruments of destruction.

Ten years ago none of us would have dreamed of appropriating several billion dollars to rebuild our Army and Navy. Our greatest statesmen could not visualize that within a short decade or two the democracies of the world, and even our own, would be seriously threatened. We have seen dictators rise in Europe, and we have seen democracies crumble, one after another—democracies which have committed no offense, either by aggression or otherwise, on the territory or the people of any other nation.

If the people of the United States were not partially made up of immigrants from practically every civilized nation on earth, but consisted only of descendants of Colonial ancestors, it might not be necessary even at this hour to adopt compulsory military selection and service. But if the American melting pot is to remain, we must let those who become citizens of our country understand that not only must they give up their allegiance to the countries whence they came but that it is civic treason to belong to any organization in this country whose policies are dictated by the heads of foreign countries, and whose objective is to overthrow our constitutional form of government.

Those are the facts which we must face, whether we like it or not; and, so far as I and my people are concerned, we shall face them with the assurance that we shall do everything possible to secure ample and effective national defense.

FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY-ONE EUROPEAN WARS SINCE COLUMBUS

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, for a few moments I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the map on the wall depicting the wars of Europe since the discovery of America. It is entitled "The Minerva Survey of Wars of Europe; a Selected List of Over 450 Major and Minor European Wars and Armed Conflicts Since the Discovery of America, With Over 160 Resultant Treaties, Location of Many Combat Areas, and Reading Lists of 165 Titles," by Keyes Porter.

This list of wars and treaties has been compiled by very learned research students in conjunction with the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress. Harvard scholars—if that means anything more than any other scholars—have been engaged in the compilation of this list of wars and treaties.

The title shows 450 wars, but we have added 1 since. According to the latest list, the number is 451, the last war being the Russian-Finnish War.

A WAR A YEAR IN EUROPE FOR 400 YEARS

Since the discovery of America, Europe has had three wars and minor conflicts more than one a year. There has been an average of slightly more than one war a year every year since the discovery of America by Columbus. I suggest to those who are interventionists that if we are to follow their doctrine we had better go over to Europe and build stone barracks so that we may remain permanently, if we are to save Europe and save democracy—if there is any democracy over there. I see no difference between the so-called democracy of the British Empire and that of the German Empire. They are both aggressors. They have both conquered, and they have both built their empires, so far as they have been able to build them, by fire and sword. Here is a list of their wars.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate and the country a list of the 451 wars which have been fought in Europe since the discovery of America. I include also a reading list on which the research was based, together with the names of those who made the research, and the names of the publishers, showing where the information may be obtained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Minerva Survey of the Wars of Europe—selected list of 451 major and minor European wars and armed conflicts since the discovery of America, with over 160 resultant treaties of many combat areas and reading list of 165 titles—by Keyes Porter]

WARS AND TREATIES

NOTE.—This list covers only the modern era. But let no one suppose that wars suddenly started up out of nothing 450 years ago.

No.	Year	
1	1488–95	Swabian League of Esslingen Wars vs. German anarchy.
		Perpetual Public Peace of Diet of Worms.
2	1491–92	English war for Breton independence.
		Treaty of Etaples.
3	1492	Conquest of Granada.
4	1492	Peasant revolt in Kempten.
5	1492	Spain expels Jews.
6	1492–1503	Turco-Hungarian war.
7	1493	Burgundian dispute (Austria vs. France).
		Treaty of Senlis.
8	1493	Risings of peasants in Alsace.
9	1494	Savonarola drives Medici from Florence.
		Treaty of Florence.
10	1494–95	French invade Italy, take Naples.
		Treaty of Vercelli.
11	1495–7	Revolts of Warbeck.
12	1497–1500	Swedes revolt vs. Denmark-Norway.
13	1499	Grisons war of Swiss independence vs. Austria.
		Treaty of Basel.
14	1499–1500	French overthrow Ludovico Sforza in Milan.
		Sforza, Swiss, Germans fight back.
		Treaty of Granada.
15	1499–1503	Turco-Venetian war.
		Treaty of Constantinople.
16	1500	Bundschuh (Peasant Association of the Shoe) revolts against German nobles.
17	1500–01	Second French invasion of Italy; France, Spain reconquer Naples.
		Treaty of Granada.
18	1500–01	Caesar Borgia conquers Romagna.
		Papal creation of Duchy of Romagna.
19	1501–02	Peasant risings in Franconia.
20	1502	Russia overthrows Mongol (Golden Horde) rule.
21	1502	Turks take Albania.
22	1502–04	Franco-Spanish war.
		First treaty of Blois.
23	1503	Venice takes Faenza, Rimini.
24	1504	Landshut Succession war.
25	1506	Spanish civil war over regency.
		Treaty of Villafafilia.
26	1507	French take Genoa.
27	1508–09	War of League of Cambray (France, Spain, Empire, Papacy) vs. Venice.
		Treaty of Rome—1510.
28	1509	Cardinal Ximinez, Regent of Castile, takes Oran.
29	1510	Allies dispute in Italy: Papacy, Spain, Empire, Swiss against France.
30	1511–14	War of the Holy League. Spain, England, Empire, Papacy, Venice against France.
31	1512	Aragon takes Navarre.
	1512–20	Wars of Ottoman Sultan, Selim the Grim.
32		1512–13 Accession with aid of Janissaries.
33		1514 Vs. Persia; conquest of Georgia, Armenia, Kurdistan, massacre of Shiites.
34		1516 Conquest of Syria.
35		1517 Conquest of Egypt, Palestine, and Hedjaz.
36		1518 Conquest of upper Mesopotamia; aided by pirates, Khair Eddin Barbarossa and Dragut, Selim establishes Barbary States.
37	1513–14	Scottish war of French alliance against England.
		Treaty of London.
38	1515	Franco-Swiss war.
		Treaties of Geneva, Freiburg.
39	1520–21	Communeros rebel in Spain.
40	1520–23	Dalecarlian revolt. Swedes seek independence under Gustavus Vasa.
41	1521–25	First war of France against Charles V (Holy Roman emperor), Italy, England in Netherlands.
		Treaties of London—1525; Madrid—1526.
	1521–32	Ottoman conquests under Suleyman.
42		1521 Belgrade.
43		1522 Rhodes.
44		1526 Wallachia and Moldavia.
45		1526–29 Hungary.

No.	Year	
46		1529 Austria invaded.
47		1532 Ottomans checked.
48	1522–23	Knight's war in Germany against archbishopric of Trier.
49	1524–25	Second war of France against Charles V.
		Treaty of Madrid.
50	1525	Grand master of Teutonic order (duke of Prussia) invades lower Germany.
51	1526–38	Turks back John Zàpolya in Hungarian civil war.
		Truce of Nice.
52	1527–29	Third war of France against Charles V. (War of the Holy League of Cognac.)
		Treaty of Cambray (Peace of the Ladies).
53	1529	Swiss civil war.
		First treaty of Kappel.
54	1529–45	Austro-Turkish wars.
		Treaties of 1533, 1547.
55	1530	Knights of Malta war on pirates.
56	1531	Swiss civil war (Parsons' war).
		Second treaty of Kappel.
57	1534	Revolt of Anabaptists in Münster.
58	1534	Lutheran duke restored in Würtemberg.
		Treaty of Cadan.
59	1534–35	Barbarossa takes Tunis.
60	1534–35	Revolt of Geraldines in Ireland.
61	1535	Charles V takes Tunis.
62	1536–38	Fourth war of France against Charles V.
		Treaty of Nice.
63	1538–47	League of Pope, Emperior, Hungary, Venice against Turks.
		Treaty of Constantinople.
64	1539	Bill of Blood (English persecute Catholics).
65	1539–40	Ghent revolts against Charles V.
66	1540	Massacre of Waldenses.
67	1541	Expedition of Charles V against Barbarossa at Algiers.
68	1542	English war against Scots.
		Treaty of Greenwich—1543.
69	1542	Pope Paul III establishes Inquisition in Rome.
70	1542–44	Fifth war of France against Charles V.
		Treaty of Crespy.
71	1544–47	English invade Scotland.
		Treaty of 1550.
72	1544–50	English invade France.
		Treaty of 1550.
73	1545	Massacre of Waldenses.
74	1546–47	Schmalkaldic war of Lutheran princes against Emperor.
		Interim of Augsburg—1548.
75	1547–49	Religious war in England.
76	1548–53	Turco-Persian war.
77	1549	Western religious revolt in England.
78	1550	Russia takes Kazan.
79	1551	Dragut takes Tripoli from Knights of Malta.
80	1552	Turks invade Hungary.
81	1552	Religious war in Germany.
		Treaty of Passau.
82	1552–59	Sixth French war against Charles V.
		Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis.
83	1553–55	Saxon war and other religious wars in Germany.
		Treaty of Augsburg.
84	1554	Revolt of Sir Thomas Wyatt in England.
85	1554	Russia takes Astrakhan.
86	1555	Turks invade Papal States.
87	1555–58	Queen Mary (Tudor) of England suppresses Protestants.
88	1556–59	War of Papacy and France against Spain in Italy.
		Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis.
89	1558–62	Turco-Spanish War and Turkish intervention in Hungarian civil war.
		Treaty of Prague.
90	1560	Waldenses war against Savoy.
91	1560	English intervene in Scottish reformation.
		Treaty of Edinburgh.
92	1561	Lithuania takes Kurland, part of Livonia.
93	1561	Irish revolt of Shane O'Neill.
94	1562	English acquire Havre de Grace from Huguenots.
		Treaty of Hampton Court.
95	1562–63	First Huguenot war.
		Treaty of Amboise.
96	1563–64	Anglo-Frence war of Calais.
		Treaty of Troyes.
97	1563–70	Northern 7 years' war.
98	1564–67	Anglo-Spanish war.
99	1565	Turks attack Malta.
100	1566	Turks invade Austria and Hungary.
		Treaty of 1567.
101	1566–76	Civil war of League of the Gueux in Netherlands.
		Treaty of Ghent.
102	1567	Saxony takes Gotha.
103	1567	Second Huguenot war.
		Treaty of Longjumeau.
104	1567–68	Revolt of Mary, Queen of Scots.
105	1568–70	Revolt of Moors in Spain.
106	1568–1648	Wars of liberation of Netherlands.
		Treaty of Westphalia.
107	1569	Revolt of Geraldines in Ireland.
108	1569–70	Third Huguenot war.
		Treaty of St. Germain-en-Laye.
109	1570	English invade Scotland (civil war).
110	1570–72	Revolts of Catholics in England.
111	1570–73	Turco-Venetian war.
		Treaty of Constantinople.
112	1570–83	Thirteen years' war (Russia against Sweden).
		Treaty of Pliusa.
113	1572	Massacre of St. Bartholomew.
114	1572	Fourth Huguenot war.
		Treaty of La Rochelle, 1573.
115	1574	Turks take Tunis.
116	1574–76	Fifth Huguenot war.
		Peace of Monsieur.
117	1575–76	Spanish take Duiveland, Schouwen.
118	1577	Sixth Huguenot war.
		Peace of Bergerac.
119	1577	Polish-Danzig war.
120	1578–90	Turco-Persian war.
121	1579	Turks war in Cyprus.
122	1579	Desmond's revolt in Ireland.
123	1580	Seventh Huguenot war (war of Sowers).
		Peace of Fleix.
124	1580	Spanish take Portugal.
125	1581	French take Cambray.
126	1582	Russia yields Wielicz, Plock, Livonia to Poland.
127	1582–84	Russia takes Siberia.
128	1583	French sack Antwerp.
129	1585–89	Eighth Huguenot war (War of the Three Henries).
		Treaty of Nemours.
130	1585–1604	Anglo-Spanish War.
		Treaty of London.
131	1586	English aid Dutch Republic.
132	1589–98	Ninth Huguenot War.
		Edict of Nantes.
133	1590–95	Russo-Swedish War.
		Treaty of Teusin—1598.
134	1593–1606	Austro-Turkish War.
		Treaty of Sitvatorok.
135	1594–99	Tyrone's revolt in Ireland.
		Treaty of Dublin.
136	1595	Peasants' revole in upper Austria.
137	1595–98	Franco-Spanish War.
		Treaty of Vervins.
138	1596	Religious persecutions in Styria.
139	1596	English Fleets enter Tagus, sack Cadiz.
140	1597–1602	Revolt of Tyrone in Ireland. England takes Ulster.
		Treaty of Munster.
141	1600	War of Swedish succession.
142	1600	France invades Savoy.
		Treaty of Lyons—1601.
143	1600	Revolt of Essex against Elizabeth.
144	1601	Spanish, Italians invade Algiers.
145	1603	Revolt in Transylvania against Emperor.
		Treaty of Sitvatorok—1606.
146	1604	Swedo-Polish War.
147	1605	Turco-Persian War.
148	1608	Revolt in Ireland.
149	1609–10	Spain expels Moors.
150	1609–17	Russo-Swedish War.
		Treaty of Stolbova.
151	1610	Revival of Huguenot conflict.
152	1610	Archduke Leopold takes Jülich, devastates upper Austria.
153	1611–13	Swedo-Danish War.
		Treaty of Knaerod.
154	1614	Civil war in France.
		Treaty of St. Ménehould.
155	1614–17	War of Austria against Venice, Savoy.
156	1615	Civil war in France.
		Treaty of Loudun.
157	1617–29	Swedo-Polish War.
		Treaty of Stuhmsdorf.
	1618–48	Thirty Years' War.
158		1618–23 Bohemian, Palatinate period.
159		1625–29 Danish period.
		Treaty of Lübeck.
160		1630–35 Swedish period.
		Treaty of Prague.
161		1635–48 Swedo-French period.
		Treaty of Westphalia—1648.
162	1620	Revolt of French nobles.
		Treaty of Angers.
163	1620	Turco-Polish War.
164	1620–26	Austro-Spanish War.
		Treaty of Monzon.
165	1620–29	War of Huguenots.
		Treaties of Montpellier—1622; La Rochelle—1626; Alais—1629.
166	1624–30	Anglo-Spanish war.
		Treaty of Madrid.

No.	Year	
167	1626–27	Revolt in upper Austria.
168	1627–28	Huguenot and English war vs. French monarchy.
		Treaty of Susa—1629.
169	1629–31	Franco-Spanish war of Mantuan succession.
		Treaty of Cherasco.
170	1632	Revolt of Orleans, Montmorency in France.
171	1632	Russo-Polish war.
		Treaty of Polianovka—1634.
172	1633	Revolt of Spanish Netherlands.
173	1633	French take duchy of Lorraine.
174	1635–59	Franco-Spanish war.
		Treaty of Pyrenees.
175	1637	Revolt in Edinburgh.
176	1637	Revolt of Croquants in Guienne.
177	1637–40	French take Artois.
178	1638–39	Revolt of Covenanters in Scotland.
179	1639	First Bishops' war.
		Treaty of Berwyck.
180	1639	Revolt of Nupieds in Normandy.
181	1640	Second Bishops' war.
		Treaty of Ripon.
182	1640	Portugal revolts from Spain.
		Treaty of Lisbon—1668.
183	1640	Catalonia revolts from Spain.
184	1641	Revolt in Ireland.
185	1641–44	War of Castro (Pope Urban VIII vs. Italian princes).
		Treaty of Ferrara.
186	1642–47	Civil war in England, Scotland.
		Treaty of Uxbridge—1645.
187	1643–45	War of Denmark, Norway vs. Sweden.
		Treaty of Brömsbro.
188	1645–69	Turco-Venetian war over Candia.
		Treaty of Candia.
189	1647	Revolt of Naples, Sicily vs. Spain.
190	1648	Swiss civil war.
191	1648	Great riot in Moscow.
192	1648–49	First war of the Fronde.
		Treaty of Rueil.
193	1648–51	Cossacks revolt in Poland.
194	1648–52	Second civil war in England, Scotland.
195	1649–50	Cromwellian wars in Ireland.
196	1650–54	Second war of the Fronde.
197	1652–54	Anglo-Dutch war.
		Treaty of Westminster.
198	1654–67	Russo-Polish war.
		Treaties of Vilno—1656; Andrussov—1667.
199	1655	English bombard Algiers, Tunis, Tripoli.
200	1655–56	Swedo-Polish war.
		Treaty of Königsberg.
201	1656–60	Russia, Denmark, Brandenburg, Emperor war vs. Sweden.
		Treaties of Oliva, Copenhagen—1660; Kardis—1661.
202	1657–60	Turco-German war.
203	1657–61	Dutch-Portuguese war.
204	1661	Revolt of Fifth Monarchy in London.
205	1661–62	Pirates attack coast of France.
206	1661–65	Portuguese revolt vs. Spain.
		Treaty of Lisbon—1668.
207	1663–64	Turco-German war in Hungary.
		Treaty of Vasvar.
208	1665	French fight pirates at Tunis, Algiers.
209	1665–67	Second Anglo-Dutch war.
		Treaty of Breda.
210	1666	Covenanters revolt in Scotland.
211	1667	Revolt in Portugal.
212	1667–68	War of Devolution (France vs. Spain in Netherlands).
		Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.
213	1670	French take Lorraine.
214	1670–71	Volga Cossacks revolt.
215	1671	Turco-Polish war.
		Treaty of Buczàcz, 1672.
216	1672–78	Dutch war.
		Treaties of Nimwegen, 1678–79.
217	1673–76	Turco-Polish war.
		Treaty of Zaravno.
218	1674	Revolt in Sicily.
219	1675–79	Dano-Swedish war.
		Treaty of Lund.
220	1676	English attack Barbary States.
221	1678–82	Russo-Turkish war.
		Treaty of Bakchi-serai, 1680.
222	1679–80	Revolt of Covenanters in Scotland.
223	1681	French take Strassburg.
224	1681–83	French bombard Algiers, Tunis, Tripoli.
225	1682	Hungary revolts vs. Austria.
226	1682	Revolt of the Strieltzi.
227	1682–99	War of Holy League vs. Turkey.
		Treaty of Carlowitz.
228	1683–84	Franco-Spanish war.
		Treaty of Ratisbon.
229	1684–85	French bombard Tunis, Tripoli, Genoa.
230	1685	Revolt of Argyle, Monmouth in England.
	1685	Revocation of Edict of Nantes.
231	1686–87	Russo-Turkish war.
232	1688	Revolt in England, Scotland.
233	1688	French bombard Algiers.
234	1688–91	War of William III in Ireland.
		Treaty of Limerick.
235	1688–97	War of League of Augsburg against France.
		Treaty of Ryswick.
236	1689	Revolt of the Strieltzi.
237	1692	Massacre of the Macdonalds at Glencoe.
238	1697–98	Revolt of the Strieltzi.
	1700–21	Northern war.
239		1700–09 War of First Coalition (Denmark, Russia, Poland, Saxony) against Sweden.
		Treaties of Travendal—1700; Altranstadt—1706.
240		1709–14 War of Second Coalition (Denmark, Poland, Russia) against Sweden, Turkey.
		Treaties of Pruth—1711; Adrianople—1713.
241		1715–21 War of Third Coalition (Denmark, Russia, Prussia, Poland, Hanover) against Sweden.
		Treaties of Stockholm—1719–20; Nystad—1721.
242	1701–14	War of the Spanish succession (England, Holland, Empire, Portugal: Grand Alliance against France, Spain).
		Treaties of Utrecht—1713; Baden—1714; Rastadt—1714.
243	1702–05	War of the Commisards in France.
244	1703–11	Revolt in Hungary.
245	1705–09	Cossack revolts in Russia.
246	1714–18	Turco-Venetian war.
		Treaty of Passarowitz.
247	1715–16	Jacobite riots in Scotland.
248	1717–18	Spain takes Sardinia, Sicily.
249	1718–20	War of the Quadruple Alliance.
		Treaty of London.
250	1722	Russo-Persian war.
		Treaty of St. Petersburg.
251	1723	Turco-Persian war.
252	1727	Anglo-Spanish war.
		Treaty of El Pardo.
253	1730–69	Corsica revolts from Genoa.
254	1733–35	War of the Polish succession.
		Treaty of Vienna—1738.
255	1734	Turco-Persian war.
256	1736–39	War of Russia, Austria against Turkey.
		Treaty of Belgrade.
257	1740–48	War of Austrian succession.
		Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.
258	1741	Revolt in Russia.
259	1741–43	Russo-Swedish war.
		Treaty of Abo.
260	1745–46	Second Jacobite revolt.
261	1756–63	Seven Years' War.
		Treaties of Paris, Hubertsburg.
262	1768–72	Civil war of confederation of bar in Poland.
263	1768–74	Russo-Turkish War.
		Treaty of Kutchuk Kainarji.
264	1770	Greeks revolt in Morea.
265	1771–75	Revolts in Russia.
266	1772	Revolt in Sweden.
267	1772	First partition of Poland by Russia, Prussia, Austria.
268	1775	Spanish attack Algiers.
269	1775–83	War of American Independence.
		Treaty of Versailles.
270	1778–79	War of the Bavarian Succession.
		Treaty of Teschen.
271	1783	Russia annexes the Crimea.
		Treaty of Constantinople.
272	1784–85	Austro-Dutch War.
		Treaty of Fontainebleau.
273	1787	Prusso-Dutch War.
274	1787–92	War of Russia, Austria against Turkey, Sweden.
		Treaties of Verela, 1790; Sistova, 1791; Jassy, 1792.
275	1788–90	Revolt of Austrian Netherlands.
276	1789	Revolt in Sweden.
277	1789–96	French Revolution.
278	1792	Russo-Polish War.
279	1792–95	First war of coalition against France.
		Treaty of Basel.
	1793	Napoleon made a general.
280	1793	Second partition of Poland.
281	1794	Revolt of Kosciusko in Poland.
282	1795	Third partition of Poland.
	1795–1815	Napoleonic campaigns.
283		1795 Revolt of 13 Vandémiare (Whiff of grapeshot).
		General amnesty.
284		1796–97 Franco-Austrian War; Italian campaign.
		Treaties of Tolentino, Campo Formio.

No.	Year	
285	1796–99	France establishes Cisalpine, Ligurian, Roman, Helvetian, Parthenopean Republics.
286	1796–1801	War of France, Spain against England, Turkey.
287	1799	Coup d'état of 18 Brumaire. Constitution of the Year VIII.
288	1799–1801	War of second coalition (Russia, Austria, England, Portugal, Turkey) in Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, Copenhagen (at sea). Treaties of Lunéville, Florence, Badajoz, 1801; Amiens, 1802.
289	1803–05	War of third coalition (England, Russia, Austria, Sweden). Treaty of Pressburg.
290	1804	Conspiracy against First Consul. Napoleon proclaimed emperor of French.
	1806	Napoleon ends Holy Roman Empire. Act of Confederation of Rhine.
291	1806–07	Franco-Prussian War. Treaty of Tilsit.
292	1807	War of France, Denmark against England, Sweden.
293	1807	Franco-Portuguese War.
294	1908	Napoleon takes Papal States. Concordat of Fontainebleau—1813.
295	1808–14	Anglo-French Peninsular War, in Spain, Portugal.
296	1809	Franco-Austrian War in Austria, Tyrol, Germany, Poland. Treaty of Vienna.
297	1812	Franco-Russian War.
298	1813–14	War of Liberation. First Treaty of Paris.
299	1815	The Hundred Days—Waterloo campaign (March 1–June 18). Second Treaty of Paris.
300	1796	Russo-Persian War.
301	1796–1803	Revolts in Ireland.
302	1804	Serbs revolt against Turkey.
303	1808–09	Russia takes Finland from Sweden. Treaty of Frederikshamm.
304	1809	Revolt in Sweden.
305	1809–12	Russo-Turkish War. Treaty of Bucharest.
306	1812–15	War of 1812 between England and United States. Treaty of Ghent—1814.
307	1817	Serbs gain autonomy.
308	1819	The Manchester massacre.
309	1820–21	Carbonari revolt in Naples, Piedmont.
310	1820–22	Revolt of Ali Pasha of Albania against sultan.
311	1820–23	Revolt of liberals in Spain.
312	1820–47	Intermittent revolts in Portugal. Treaty of Gramido.
	1821–29	War for Greek independence.
313	1821	Greeks revolt against Turkey in Danubian provinces.
314	1821	Turks massacre Greeks.
315	1821–24	Greeks succeed against Turks.
316	1824–27	Egypt intervenes against Greeks.
317	1826	Massacre of Janissaries.
318	1827	English, French, Russian intervention.
319	1828–29	Russo-Turkish War. Treaty of Adrianople—1829.
320	1825	Revolt in Russia.
321	1826–28	Russo-Persian War. Treaty of Turkmanchay.
322	1828	Revolt in Naples.
323	1830–33	Revolts in France, Italy, Papal States, Belgium, Poland, Germany, Switzerland.
324	1830–39	Civil war in Portugal, Spain.
325	1830–39	Belgo-Dutch War. Treaty of London.
326	1830–47	Franco-Algerian war.
327	1831–33	Revolt of Mehemet Ali. Treaty of Kutaya.
328	1834	Revolts in France.
329	1836	Louis Napoleon revolts in Strassburg.
330	1836	Revolt in Vendôme.
331	1839	Revolt in France.
332	1839	Chartist revolt in Newport.
333	1839–41	Turko-Egyptian war.
334	1840	Louis Napoleon revolts.
335	1841–43	Revolts in Spain.
336	1843	Revolts in Greece.
337	1844	Franco-Moroccan war. Treaty of Tangier.
338	1844–47	Swiss civil war. Swiss Federal constitution.
339	1847–50	Revolts in Austria, Denmark, England, France, Germany, Holstein, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Sicily, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey.
340	1851	Revolt in Portugal.
341	1851–52	Revolt in France. Second French Empire.
342	1852	Revolt of Montenegro, Herzegovina vs. Turkey.
343	1853	Russo-Turkish war.
344	1854	Austrians take Danubian principalities from Russia.
345	1854–56	Crimean war (France, Britain, Turkey, Sardinia vs. Russia). Treaty of Paris.
346	1856–57	Anglo-Persian war. Treaty of Teheran.
347	1858	War of Turkey vs. Montenegro.
348	1858	Turks massacre Christians at Jedda.
349	1859	War of Austria vs. France, Piedmont. Treaty of Zurich.
350	1859–60	Spanish war in Morocco. Treaty of Madrid.
351	1860–62	Revolt in Sicily and wars of Garibaldi for unification of Italy.
352	1861–62	Serbs revolt vs. Turks.
353	1862	Revolt in Greece.
354	1863–64	Revolt in Poland.
355	1864	War of Austria, Prussia vs. Denmark. Treaty of Vienna.
356	1866	Revolt in Spain.
357	1866	Seven weeks' war (Austria vs. Prussia, Italy). Treaty of Vienna.
358	1866–69	Cretans revolt vs. Turks.
359	1868	Revolt in Spain. Constitution of 1869.
360	1870	Italy takes Rome.
361	1870–71	Franco-Prussian war. Treaty of Frankfort-on-Main.
362	1871	Paris Commune.
363	1873–76	Revolt in Spain. Constitution of 1876.
364	1875	Palace revolts in Constantinople. Constitution of 1876.
365	1875	Revolts vs. Turks in Herzegovina, Bosnia.
366	1876	Revolt of Bulgars.
367	1876–77	War of Servia, Montenegro vs. Turks. Treaty of Constantinople.
368	1877–78	Russo-Turkish war. Treaty of San Stefano.
369	1878	Revolt in Armenia.
370	1879	Austrians take Novibazar.
371	1879–81	Nihilists revolt in Russia.
372	1881	France takes Tunis. Treaty of Kassar—Saïd.
373	1882	Anti-Jewish revolts in Russia.
374	1882	Anglo-Egyptian war.
375	1882	Revolts in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dalmatia.
376	1885	Serbo-Bulgarian war. Treaty of Bucharest—1886.
377	1885	Revolt in East Rumelia.
378	1889–97	Revolts in Crete.
379	1894–96	Kurds, Turks massacre Armenians. General amnesty of December 22, 1896.
380	1897	Turko-Greek war. Treaty of Constantinople.
381	1901–03	Macedonians revolt vs. Turks. Scheme of reform.
382	1905	Revolt in Russia.
383	1905	Nationalist revolt in Crete.
384	1907	French occupy Morocco.
385	1908	Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia, Herzegovina. Protocol of February 1909.
386	1908–09	Young Turk revolt. Restoration of constitution of 1876.
387	1910	Portuguese revolt. Constitution of 1911.
388	1911	Second Moroccan crisis. Treaty of Berlin.
389	1911–12	Italo-Turkish war. Treaty of Lausanne.
390	1912–13	First Balkan war (Turks vs. Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Montenegro). Treaty of London.
391	1913	Second Balkan war (Bulgaria vs. Serbia, Greece, Rumania, Turkey). Treaties of Bucharest, Constantinople.
392	1913	Young Turk revolt in Constantinople.
393	1914	Revolt in Albania; intervention of Italy, Greece, Montenegro.
394	1914–18	World War. Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, Bulgaria vs. Russia, France, British Empire, Serbia, Belgium, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Rumania, Greece, United States, Cuba, Panama, Siam, Liberia, China, Brazil, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Haiti, Honduras. Treaties of Brest-Litovsk—1918; Versailles, St. Germain-en-Laye, Neuilly-sur-Seine—1919; Trianon, Sèvres—1920; Berlin, Vienna, Budapest—1921.
395	1916	Revolt in Ireland.
	1917–21	Russian revolution.
396	1917	Democratic revolution.

No.	Year		
397		1917	Kornilov counter-revolution.
398		1917	Communist revolution.
399		1917–21	Polish, Finnish, Cossack, Tartar, Bessarabian, Siberian, Georgian, Azerbaijanian, Armenian, Ukrainian, Esthonian, Lithuanian, Latvian revolts. Treaties of Dorpat—1920; Riga, Moscow—1921.
400		1918–20	Allied intervention and counter-revolutions.
401		1920–21	Russo-Polish War. Treaty of Riga.
402	1918		Revolt in Austria.
403	1918		Revolt in Hungary.
404	1918–20		Revolt in Germany.
405	1918–21		Sinn Fein revolt in Ireland. Treaty of London.
406	1919		War of Hungary vs. Rumania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia.
407	1919		Communist revolt in Austria.
408	1919		Communist revolt in Hungary.
409	1919		Revolt in Fiume.
410	1919		Italy invades Asia Minor.
411	1919		Revolts in Egypt.
412	1919–21		Revolts in Spain.
413	1919–23		Greco-Turkish War. Treaty of Lausanne.
414	1920		Italy invades Albania.
415	1920		Poles take Vilna.
416	1920		Italy takes Fiume.
417	1921		Hapsburg revolts in Hungary.
418	1921		Revolts in Egypt. Constitution of 1923.
419	1922		Fascist revolt in Italy; Mussolini dictator.
420	1922–23		Civil war in Ireland.
421	1923		Beer-cellar putsch in Munich (Hitler-Ludendorff).
422	1923		Italians occupy Corfu.
423	1923		Coup d'état in Spain.
424	1923		Revolts in Bulgaria (Democratic, Communistic).
425	1923		Lithuania takes Memel.
426	1923–24		Revolts in Greece.
427	1924		Revolt in Albania.
428	1925		Communist revolt in Bulgaria.
429	1925		Greco-Bulgarian clash.
430	1926		Revolt in Croatia.
431	1926		Franco-Riffian War in Morocco.
432	1927		Revolt in Vienna.
433	1930–31		Revolt in Spain (republic established). Constitution of 1931.
434	1933		National Socialist coup d'état in Germany: Hitler dictator.
435	1933–36		Revolts in Greece.
436	1934		Chancelor Dollfuss of Austria massacres Socialists in Vienna.
437	1934		Nazi putsch in Austria; assassination of Dollfuss.
438	1934		Coup d'état in Bulgaria.
439	1934		Revolt in Spain.
440	1936–39		Civil war in Spain.
441	1938		Germany takes Austria.
442	1938		Partition of Czechoslovakia by Germany, Hungary, Poland.
443	1939		Germany takes Bohemia, Moravia.
444	1939		Revolt in Slovakia. Treaty of Vienna.
445	1939		Germany takes Memel.
446	1939		Italy takes Albania.
447	1939		Germany takes Slovakia.
448	1939		Germany takes Danzig.
449	1939		German-Polish War. Fourth partition of Poland.
450	1939		War of France, England vs. Germany.
451	1939		Russo-Finnish War.

[Minerva Survey of the Wars of Europe: Selected list of over 450 major and minor European wars and armed conflicts since the discovery of America, with over 160 resultant treaties of many combat areas and reading list of 165 titles, by Keyes Porter]

READING LIST

Bibliographies

Adams, Charles K. Manual of Historical Literature. 3d ed., rev. and enl. New York, Harper, 1903. 720 p.

The Cambridge Modern History, ed. by A. W. Ward, and others. New York, Macmillan, 1907–1931. 13 v., and atlas.
Excellent bibliographies at end of each volume.

Coulter, Edith M., and Melanie Gerstenfeld. Historical bibliographies; a systematic and annotated guide. Berkeley, Univ. of California, 1935. 206 p.

Guide to Historical Literature, ed. by G. M. Dutcher, and others. New York, Macmillan, 1931. 1222 p.

Langer, William L., and Hamilton F. Alexander. Foreign Affairs Bibliography; a selected and annotated list of books on international relations, 1919–1932. New York, Harper, 1933. 551 p.
See especially: Pt. I, General International Relations, p. 1–86; pt. II, The World War, p. 87–162; pt. III, The World, p. 163–164; pt. V, Europe, p. 221–421.

Myers, Denys P. Manual of collections of treaties and of collections relating to treaties. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University, 1922. 685 p. (Harvard bibliographies. Library series. Vol. II.)

World History

Davies, Herbert A. An Outline History of the World. New ed., rev. to 1937. London, Oxford University, 1937. 575 p., 18 maps.
Time charts: p. 559–565; important dates: p. 557–558.

Duruy, Victor. General History of the World. Rev. and supplemented by E. A. Grosvenor, and others. New York, Crowell, 1929. 967 p., 33 maps.
Progress of Industries, Arts, and Sciences (1848–1925), p. 877–892; Summary of Events (1925–1929), p. 893–928.

Elson, Henry W. Modern Times and the Living Past. New York, American Book Co., 1938. 747 p., maps.
References at end of most of the chapters.
World chronology, p. ix–xiv.

Flenley, Ralph and William N. Weech. World History; the Growth of Western Civilization. London, Dent., 1936. 757 p., 77 maps.
Includes bibliographies.

Flick, Alexander C. Modern World History Since 1775; a survey of the origins and development of contemporary civilization. Rev. by Witt Bowden. New York, Crofts, 1935. 667 p., 18 maps.
References at end of each chapter.

Fueter, Eduard. World History, 1815–1920. Translated by Sidney B. Fay. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1922. 490 p.

Hammerton, Sir John A., and Harry E. Barnes, eds. The Illustrated World History; a record of world events from earliest historical times to the present day; nearly 1,000 historical documents and scores of maps. New York, Wise, 1938. 1,160 p.

Hart, Albert B. A reference history of the world from the earliest times to the present. Pt. I, World History; pt. II, National Histories. Springfield, Mass., Merriam, 1921. 256 p., 6 maps.
Webster's New International Dictionary with reference history.
Includes chronologies of the periods of history.

Myers, Philip V. Medieval and Modern History. 2d rev. ed. Boston, Ginn, 1923. 687 p., 45 maps.
References at end of most of the chapters.

Pahlow, Edwin W. Man's Great Adventure; an Introduction to World History. Rev. ed. Boston, Ginn, 1938. 766 p., 57 maps.
List of books: p. 737–745.

Parsons, Geoffrey. Stream of History. Rev. ed. New York, Scribner, 1933. 611 p.

Ploetz, Karl J. Ploetz's Manual of Universal History; translated and enl. by W. H. Tillinghast; rev. and ed. by Harry E. Barnes. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1933. 766, lxxxix p.

Robinson, James H. Medieval and Modern Times; an introduction to the history of western civilization from the dissolution of the Roman Empire to the present time. 2d rev. ed. Boston, Ginn, 1934. 825, xliii p., 26 maps.
Bibliography: p. i-xxi at end.

Tyler, Mrs. Alice Felt. The Modern World. New York, Farrar & Rinehart, 1939. 930 p., 19 maps. (The civilization of the western world. Vol. 3.)
Bibliography: p. 903–904.
European rulers since 1500: p. 905–907.

West, Willis M., and Ruth West. The Story of Modern Progress; with a preliminary survey of earlier progress. New ed. Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1938. 730, 54 p., 54 maps.
Select book lists: Appendix, p. 1–10.

Williams, Henry S., ed. Historians' History of the World; a comprehensive narrative of the rise and development of nations as recorded by over 2,000 of the great writers of all ages. New York, Encyclopedia Britannica, 1926. 27 v. in 15, maps.
Contains bibliographies.

European History

General

Achorn, Erik. European Civilization and Politics, Since 1815. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1934. 879 p., 25 maps.
Bibliography: p. 785–833.
Chronological table: p. 733–752; European states-system (area and population): p. 753–754; Colonial empires (area and population): p. 755–757; British empire (area and population): p. 758–763.

Benns, Frank L. European History Since 1870. New York, Crofts, 1938. 925 p., 36 maps and charts.
Bibliography: p. 863–903.

Ergang, Robert R. Europe, From the Renaissance to Waterloo. Boston, Heath, 1939. 752, lxxxvi p., 19 maps.
Select bibliography: p. i-lxvi at end.
Rulers of European States: p. lxvii-lxx at end.

Ferguson, Wallace K., and Geoffrey Brunn. A survey of European civilization, ancient times to the present; ed. by Carl L. Becker. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1939. 1118, xcviii p., 44 maps.
Bibliography: p. xv-lxx at end.
Genealogical tables: p. iii-vi at end; List of rulers: p. ix-xii at end.

Fisher, Herbert A. L. History of Europe. New rev. and enl. ed. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1939. 1306 p., 12 maps.
References at end of most of the chapters.
Chronological tables: p. 1283–1285.

Gillespie, James E. A history of Europe, 1500–1815. New York, Norton, 1928. 602 p., 14 maps.
References at end of each chapter.

Grant, Arthur J., and Harold Temperley. Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (1789–1938). 5th ed. New York, Longmans, Green, 1939. 700 p.
Guedalla, Philip. The hundred years. Garden City, N. Y., Garden City Publishing Co., 1939. 400 p.
Authorities: p. 383–391.
Atlas: p. 360–381.
Hayes, Carlton J. H. A political and cultural history of modern Europe. New York, Macmillan, 1932, 1939. 2 v., 62 maps.
Vol. I. Three centuries of predominately agricultural society, 1500–1830.
Vol. II. (rev. ed.) A century of predominately industrial society since 1830.
Bibliography: v. 1, p. 812–840; v. 2, p. 848.
14 genealogical charts; rulers of European states, 1500–1930: v. 1, p. 801–811; states of world in 1939 ranked according to area and population: v. 2, p. 846–847.
Hazen, Charles D. Modern European history. 4th ed., rev. New York, Holt, 1937. 908 p., 36 maps.
References at end of each chapter.
Hyma, Albert. Europe from the Renaissance to 1815. New York, Crofts, 1931. 586 p., 30 maps.
Suggested readings at end of each chapter.
Langsam, Walter C. Documents and readings in the history of Europe since 1918. Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1939. 865 p.
Bibliographical footnotes.
Marriott, Sir John A. R. The evolution of modern Europe, 1453–1932. New York, Putnam, 1933. 431 p., 16 maps.
References at end of most of the chapters; general books: p. 421.
Includes genealogical tables.
Perkins, Clarence. A history of European peoples. Chicago, Rand, McNally, 1927. 932 p., 73 maps.
Bibliography: p. 921–932.
Riker, Thad W. A short history of modern Europe. New York, Macmillan, 1935. 890 p., 14 maps.
References at end of each chapter.
Robinson, James H., and Charles A. Beard. The development of modern Europe. Rev. and enl. ed. Boston, Ginn, 1929. 2 v., 48 maps.
Vol. I. Background of our present civilization.
Vol. II. Merging of European into world history.
References: v. 1, p. i–x; v. 2, p. i–xii.
—— ——. History of Europe, our own times; the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the opening of the twentieth century, the World War and recent events. Rev. ed. Boston, Ginn, 1934. 657 p.
Schapiro, Jacob S., and Richard B. Morris. Civilization in Europe. Pt. I, Ancient and medieval times; pt. II, Modern times in Europe. Rev. and enl. ed. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1937. 751, 1 p., 47 maps.
Bibliography: p. i–viii at end.
Table of events and dates: p. xviii–xx at end; rulers of Europe since 1648: p. xx–xxv at end.
Schevill, Ferdinand. A history of Europe from the Reformation to the present day. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1938. 819 p., 28 maps.
Bibliography: p. 781–799.
Slosson, Preston W. Europe since 1870. Ed. by J. T. Shotwell. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1935. 810 p., 26 maps and charts.
Bibliographical notes: p. 759–786.

France

Adams, George B. The growth of the French nation. New York, Macmillan, 1937. 350 p., 2 maps.
Bainville, Jacques. History of France; translated by Alice Gauss and Christian Gauss. New York, Appleton-Century, 1937. 483 p.
Davis, William S. A history of France, from the earliest times to the Treaty of Versailles. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1919. 642 p., 12 maps.
Select bibliography: p. 617–632.
Outline chronology of French history: p. 605–610; the States-General (1302–1789), comp. by G. A. Jacobsen: p. 611–615.
Duruy, Victor. A history of France. 4th ed., rev. and continued to 1929, by M. S. C. Smith. New York, Crowell, 1929. 809 p., 18 maps.
App. I. Summary of events, 1815–1895; App. II. Summary of events, 1895–1919; App. III. Summary of events, 1919–1929.
Guignebert, Charles A. H. A short history of the French people; translated by F. G. Richmond. New York, Macmillan, 1930. 2 v.
Bibliography at end of each chapter.
Hassall, Arthur. France, mediaeval and modern, a history. Oxford, Clarendon, 1918. 319 p., 7 maps.
Genealogical tables, p. 294–297.
Huddleston, Sisley. France. New York, Scribner, 1927. 613 p. (The modern world. [A survey of historical forces.]) References at end of most of the chapters.
Hudson, William H. France, the nation and its development from earliest times to the establishment of the Third Republic. New York, Stokes, 1917. 631 p., 5 maps.
Important dates: p. 583–585; 7 genealogical tables.
Sedgwick, Henry D. France, a short history of its politics, literature and art from earliest times to the present. Boston, Little, Brown, 1929. 418 p.
Seignobos, Charles. History of the French people; translated from the French by C. A. Phillips. London, Cape, 1938. 413 p. (Bedford historical series.)
Tilley, Arthur A., ed. Modern France: a companion to French studies. Cambridge, Eng., the University, 1922. 850 p.
Bibliography at end of each chapter.
Van Dyke, Paul. The story of France from Julius Caesar to Napoleon III. New York, Scribner, 1928. 539 p.

Germany (Including Austria)

Bithell, Jethro, ed. Germany: a companion to German studies. 2d ed. London, Methuen, 1937. xii, 450 p., 2 maps.
Bibliographical note: p. ix–x; bibliographies at end of most chapters; note on literature, 1931–37, p. 427.
Bryce, James Viscount. The Holy Roman Empire. New ed. New York, Macmillan, 1932. 575 p., 3 maps.
Bibliography: p. 543–544.
Contains a chronology.
Daniels, Harold G. The rise of the German Republic. London, Nisbet, 1927. 292 p.
Bibliography: p. 287–288.
Gayda, Virginio. Modern Austria; her racial and social problems. London, Unwin, 1915. 350 p.
Germany Speaks, by 21 leading members of party and state. London, Butterworth, 1938. 407 p.
Henderson, Ernest F. A short history of Germany. New ed. New York, Macmillan, 1937. 2 v. in 1., 8 maps.
Bibliography at beginning of most chapters.
Chronological table: v. 1, p. 499–507; v. 2, p. 579–589.
Hitler, Adolf. Mein Kampf; complete and unabridged, fully annotated. Editorial sponsors; John Chamberlain, Sidney B. Fay, and others. New York, Reynal & Hitchcock, 1939. 993 p., 1 map.
Löwenstein-Schärffeneck, Hubertus, Graf von. The Tragedy of a Nation: Germany, 1918–1934. New York, Macmillan, 1934. 373 p.
Luehr, Elmer. The New German Republic; the Reich in Transition. New York, Minton, Balch, 1929. 442 p. Bibliography: p. 429–436.
Marriott, Sir John A. R., and Charles G. Robertson. Evolution of Prussia; the Making on an Empire. New ed. Oxford, Clarendon, 1937. 469 p. General works of reference: p. 448–450; bibliography at end of each chapter except 1st and 2d.
Mowrer, Edgar A. Germany Puts the Clock Back. New ed. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, Penguin, 1937. 278 p.
Pinnow, Hermann. History of Germany; People and State Through a Thousand Years; translated by M. R. Brailsford. New York, Macmillan, 1933. 473 p.
Rosenberg, Arthur. The Birth of the German Republic, 1871–1918; translated by Ian F. D. Morrow. New York, Oxford University, 1931. viii, 286 p. Bibliography: p. viii.
——— The History of the German Republic; translated by Ian F. D. Morrow, and L. Marie Sieveking. London, Methuen, 1936. 350 p. Notes and documents: p. 323–341.
Schuschnigg, Kurt. My Austria. New York, Knopf, 1938. 308 p.
Villard, Oswald G. The German Phoenix; the Story of the Republic. New York, Smith & Haas, 1933. 358 p. Bibliography: p. 341–343.
Ward, Sir Adolphus W. Germany, 1815–1890. Cambridge, The University, 1916–18. 3 vols., 22 maps and plans. (Cambridge historical series 8.) Bibliography: vol. 1, p. 549–576; vol. 2, p. 562–578; vol. 3, p. 402–421.

Great Britain

The Cambridge History of the British Empire; general editors, J. Holland Rose, A. P. Newton, E. A. Benians. New York, Macmillan, 1929–36. 6 vols. Volumes are numbered Volume 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Bibliography: vol. 1, p. 823–888; vol. 4, p. 609–653; vol. 5, p. 605–634; vol. 6, p. 813–885; vol. 7, pt. 1, p. 645–718; vol. 7, pt. 2, p. 259–290; vol. 8, p. 875–965.
Cross, Arthur L. A shorter History of England and Greater Britain. 3d ed. New York, Macmillan, 1939. 1,004 p., maps. References at end of most of the chapters.
Dietz, Frederick C. A Political and Social History of England. 3d ed. New York, Macmillan, 1937, xxii, 813 p., 32 maps. Bibliographical notes: p. xxi–xxii; references at end of each chapter.
Eliott, William Y. The New British Empire. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1932. 519 p., maps. Appendixes, II–VI include documents.
Green, John R. A Short History of the English people. New York, Dutton, 1934. 2 vols., 9 maps. (Everyman's Library, edited by Ernest Rhys. Hist. No. 727–728.) Authorities at head of each section. Bibliography: vol. 1, p. ix. Chronology: vol. 1, p. xvii–xxvii; genealogical tables: vol. 1, p. xxxi–xliii.
Hancock, William K. Survey of British commonwealth. Vol. I. Problems of nationality, 1918–1936. London, Oxford University, 1937. 673 p., 3 maps.
Laprade, William T. British history for American students. New York, Macmillan, 1926. 913 p., 28 maps.
References at end of each chapter.
Important dates: p. 853–863.
Lavell, Cecil F., and Charles E. Payne. Imperial England. New York, Macmillan, 1919. 395 p., 6 maps.
Bibliography: p. 387–389.
Lee, Guy C. Source book of English history; leading documents, together with illustrative material from contemporary writers and a bibliography of sources. 2d rev. ed. New York, Holt, 1909. 609 p.
Bibliography of sources: p. 3–61.

Lunt, William E. History of England. Rev. ed. New York, Harper, 1938. 920 p., 18 maps. (Harper's historical series, under the editorship of D. G. S. Ford.)
Suggestions for further reading: p. 827–891.
Chronological tables: Kings, p. 824–825; Heads of Cabinets: p. 825–826.
Marcham, Frederick G. A history of England. New York, Macmillan, 1937. 975 p.
Bibliography: p. 938–949.
Kings of England: p. 931–935; British prime ministers: p. 936.
Oman, Sir Charles W. C., ed. A history of England, v. 1–8, London, Methuen, 1905–1934. 8 v.
See especially volumes IV–VIII.
Vol. 4. England under the Tudors, by A. D. Innes. 8th ed. 1926. 481 p., maps.
Vol. 5. England under the Stuarts, by G. M. Trevelyan. 16th ed. 1933. 566 p., maps.
Vol. 6. England under the Hanoverians, by C. G. Robertson. 11th ed. 1934. 575 p., maps.
Vol. 7. England since Waterloo, by Sir J. A. R. Marriott. 7th ed. 1925. 558 p., 11 maps.
Vol. 8. Modern England, 1885–1932, by Sir J. A. R. Marriott. 1934. 551 p., 7 maps.
Bibliography in each volume.
The Oxford History of England, edited by G. N. Clark. Oxford, Clarendon, 1934–1939. 5 v.
The Reign of Elizabeth, 1558–1603, by John B. Black. 1937. 448 p., 7 maps.
The early Stuarts, 1603–1660, by Godfrey Davies. 1938. 452 p., 8 maps.
The later Stuarts, 1660–1714, by George N. Clark. 1934. 461 p., 21 maps.
The age of reform, 1815–1870, by Ernest L. Woodward. 1939. 656 p., 6 maps.
England, 1870–1914, by R. C. K. Ensor. 1936. 634 p., 7 maps.
Bibliography in each volume.
Robinson, Cyril E. England, a history of British progress from the early ages to the present day. New York, Crowell, 1938. 892 p., 63 maps and plans.
Bibliography: p. 854–862.
Summaries and chronological tables: p. 773–850; Rulers of England since the Norman conquest: p. 863; Prime ministers of England: p. 864.
Seeley, Sir John R. The growth of British policy. Cambridge, The University, 1922. 403 p.
Ward, Sir Adolphus W., and George P. Gooch, eds. The Cambridge history of British foreign policy, 1783–1919. Cambridge, The University, 1922–1923. 3 v.
Vol. 1. 1783–1815. 628 p.
Vol. 2. 1815–1866. 688 p.
Vol. 3. 1866–1919. 664 p.
Bibliography in each volume.
Wingfield-Stratford, Esmé C. The history of British civilization. 2d ed., rev. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1933. 1332 p.

Italy

Croce, Benedetto. A history of Italy, 1871–1915; translated by C. M. Ady. Oxford, Clarendon, 1929. 333 p.
Gardner, Edmund G., ed. Italy; a companion to Italian studies. London, Methuen, 1934. x, 274 p., 1 map.
Bibliographical note: p. viii; Bibliographies at end of each chapter.
Jamison, Evelyn M., and others. Italy, mediaeval and modern, a history. Oxford, Clarendon, 1919. 567 p.
Bibliography: p. 512–520.
List of kings and genealogical tables: p. 523–527; List of Popes: p. 538–543.
McClellan, George B. Modern Italy, a short history. Princeton, Princeton university, 1933. 319 p.
Bibliography: p. 283–298.
Chronological table: p. 299–314.
Marriott, Sir John A. R. Makers of modern Italy; Napoleon-Mussolini. Oxford, Clarendon, 1931. 228 p.
Authorities: p. 223–224.
Sedgwick, Henry D. A short history of Italy (476–1900). Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1905. 443 p.
Books for general reading: p. 430–431.
Chronological table of popes and emperors: p. 421–437; Genealogy of the Medici: p. 428; Tables of Kings of two Sicilies: p. 429.
Trevelyan, Mrs. Janet P. (Ward). A short history of the Italian people, from the barbarian invasions to the present day. 3d ed. New York, Putnam, 1929. 595 p., maps.
Bibliography: p. 565–573.
Villari, Luigi, Italy. New York, Scribner, 1929. 391 p., 1 map.

Poland

Brandes, Georg M. C. Poland: A study of the land, people, and literature. New York, Macmillan, 1903. 310 p.
Buell, Raymond L. Poland: Key to Europe. New York, Knopf, 1939. 364 p.
Corwin, Edward Henry Lewinski. The Political History of Poland. New York, Polish book importing, 1917. 628 p.
Lord, Robert H. The second partition of Poland; a study in diplomatic history. Cambridge, Harvard university, 1915. 586 p. (Harvard Historical Studies, vol. X–XIII.)
Bibliography, p. 557–572.
Machray, Robert. The Poland of Pilsudski; incorporating Poland, 1914–1931, much condensed and carrying on the history of Poland till mid-July 1936. New York, Dutton, 1937. 508 p. maps.
Bibliography, p. 487–489.
Morfill, W. R. The Story of Poland. New York, Putnam, 1893. 389 p., 2 maps.
Authorities, p. 366–375.
Landmarks of Polish History, p. 359–363.
Orvis, Julia S. A Brief History of Poland. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1916. 359 p., 4 maps.
Bibliography, p. 335–336.
Includes a genealogical table.
Phillips, Charles J. M. The New Poland. New York, Macmillan, 1923. 383 p.

Russia

Headstrom, Birger R. The Story of Russia. New York, Stokes, 1933. 539 p.
Chronological tables of Russian rulers and their contemporaries, p. 519–530; maps on lining pages.
Kornilov, Aleksander. Modern Russian History, being a detailed history of Russia from the age of Catherine the Great to the revolution of 1917; translated and extended by A. S. Kaun, with an introduction and classified bibliography by G. T. Robinson. New York, Knopf, 1924, liii, 310 p., 370 p., 2 maps.
Bibliography, p. xxxvii–liii.
Malevskii-Malevich, Peter N., ed. Russia—U. S. S. R., a complete handbook. New York, Payson, 1933. 712 p., 8 maps.
Bound with this [at end]: The Soviet Union Today; being a supplement to Russia—U. S. S. R. 1936. 102 p.
Mavor, James. The Ressian Revolution. London, Allen & Unwin, 1928. 470 p.
Bibliography, p. 441–445.
Pares, Sir Bernard. A History of Russia. 3d rev. ed. New York, Knopf, 1937. 570 p., 8 maps.
Bibliography, p. 529–540.
Rulers of Russia and Their Contemporaries, p. 506–517; Population of Russia, 1800–1914, p. 525.
Platonov, Sergiei F. History of Russia, translated by E. Aronsberg, ed. by F. A. Golder. New York, Macmillan, 1925. 435 p., maps.
Bibliography, p. 417–420.
Includes genealogical tables.
Pokrovskii, Mikhail N. Brief History of Russia, translated by D. S. Mirsky. New York, International Publishers, 1933. 2 v.
Chronological tables, v. 1, p. 252–280; v. 2, p. 330–338.
Skrine, Francis H. B. The Expansion of Russia, 1815–1900. 3d ed. Cambridge, The University, 1915. 386 p., 3 maps. (Cambridge historical series, ed. by G. W. Prothero.)
Bibliography, p. 349–358.
Stewart, George. The White Armies of Russia; a chronicle of counter-revolution and allied intervention. New York, Macmillan, 1933. 469 p., maps.
Bibliography, p. 437–449.
Vernadskii, Georgii V. A history of Russia. Rev. ed. New Haven, Yale university, 1935. 413 p., 3 maps.
Bibliography, p. 358–385.
——Political and Diplomatic History of Russia. Students' ed. Boston, Little, Brown, 1936. 499 p., 17 maps.
Bibliography, p. 467–470.
Chronological lists of rulers, p. 452–457; Genealogical tables, p. 458–465.
Walsh, Edmund A. The Fall of the Russian Empire; the story of the last of the Romanovs and the coming of the Bolsheviki. Boston, Little, Brown, 1928. 357 p.
Bibliography, p. 319–331.

Spain

Brandt, Joseph A. Toward the new Spain. Chicago, University of Chicago, 1933. 435 p., 2 maps.
Bibliography: p. 403–411.
Chapman, Charles E. A history of Spain. New York, Macmillan, 1937. 559 p., 2 maps.
Bibliographical notes: p. 527–540.
Clarke, Henry B. Modern Spain, 1815–1898. Cambridge, The University, 1906. 510 p., 1 map. (Cambridge historical series, ed. by G. W. Prothero.)
Bibliography: p. 471–481.
George, Robert E. G. Spanish crown, 1808–1931; an intimate chronicle of a hundred years. New York, Scribner, 1932. 399 p.
Sources: p. 388–394.
Chronology: p. 386–387; includes genealogical table.
Hume, Martin A. S. Spain: its greatness and decay, 1479–1788. 3d ed., rev. by Edward Armstrong. Cambridge, The University, 1931. 464 p. (Cambridge historical series, ed. by G. W. Prothero.)
Bibliography of Spanish history, 1479–1788: p. 412–427.
Madariaga, Salvador de. Spain. New York, Scribner, 1930. 507 p.
Bibliography: p. 483–492.
Mendizabal Villalba, Alfredo. The martyrdom of Spain; origins of a civil war. New York, Scribner, 1938. 276 p.
Translated from the French by Charles Hope Lumley.
Merriman, Roger B. The rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and the New. New York, Macmillan, 1918–1936. 5 v.
Note on the general authorities on Spanish history: v. 1, p. 42–47. A bibliographical note at the end of each chapter describes the most important authorities on which it is based.

Padelford, Norman J. International law and diplomacy in the Spanish civil strife. New York, Macmillan, 1939. 710 p., 1 map.
Peers, Edgar A. Spain: a companion to Spanish studies. 3d ed. London, Methuen, 1938, xii, 302 p., 3 maps.
Bibliographical note: p. x; bibliographies at end of most of the chapters.
Sedgwick, Henry D. Spain; a short history of its politics, literature, and art from the earliest times to the present. Boston, Little, Brown, 1925. 400 p., 1 map.

Balkan States

Armstrong, Hamilton F. The new Balkans. New York, London, Harper, 1926. 179 p., 12 maps.
—— Where the east begins. New York, London, Harper, 1929, 139 p., 5 maps.
Helmreich, Ernst C. The diplomacy of the Balkan wars, 1912–1913. Cambridge, Harvard University, 1938. 523 p., 3 maps. (Harvard historical studies. Pub. under direction of Dept. of history . . . vol. XLII.)
Bibliography: p. 471–495.
Austro-Hungarian military measures, 1912–1913: p. 461–462.
Miller, William. The Balkans; Roumania, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Montenegro. 3d ed. New York, Putnam; London, Unwin, 1923. 538 p., 3 maps. (The story of the nations, 44.)
Roucek, Joseph S. The politics of the Balkans . . . New York, McGraw-Hill, 1939. 168 p. (McGraw-Hill studies in political science.)
Bibliographical notes at end of each chapter.
Schevill, Ferdinand. The history of the Balkan Peninsula, from the earliest times to the present day. Rev. ed., New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1933. 614 p., 15 maps.
Contains bibliographies.
Appendix A-G contains list of sovereigns of each Balkan country.
Seton-Watson, Robert W. The rise of nationality in the Balkans. London, Constable, 1917. 308 p.
Bibliography: p. 285–295.

Military and naval history

Creasy, Sir Edward S. The Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World From Marathon to Waterloo. New and enl. ed., to which are added Quebec, Yorktown, Vicksburg, Gettysburg, Sedan, Manila Bay, Santiago, Tsu-shima (the Sea of Japan), and the Battle of the Marne, with some of the chief events of the Great War. New York and London, Harper, 1918. 535 p., 25 maps and plans.
Liddell Hart, Basil H. The Decisive Wars of History; a Study in Strategy. Boston, Little, Brown, 1929. 242 p., maps. Part II. The World War of 1914–18; pp. 159–231.
Mahan, Alfred T. The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, 1660–1783. Boston, Little, Brown, 1890. 557 p., 4 maps.
Mitchell, William A. Outlines of the World's Military History. Harrisburg, Pa., Military Service Publishing Co., 1937. 752 p.
Military Reading Course: pp. 741–745.
Ponsonby, Arthur Ponsonby, Baron. Wars and Treaties, 1815 to 1914. 3d ed., rev. and enl. New York, Macmillan; London, Allen & Unwin, 1919. 193 p.
Bibliography: 1 p. at end.
Shaw, Roger. One Hundred and Seventy-five Battles by Land, Sea, and Air, From Marathon to the Marne and After * * * ed. by S. C. Vestal. Harrisburg, Pa., Military Service Publishing Co., 1937. 270 p.

International law and diplomacy

Hill, David J. A History of Diplomacy in International Development of Europe. New York, etc., Longmans, Green, 1905–14. 3 v.
Vol. I. The Struggle for Universal Empire. 1905. 481 p., 5 maps, 6 tables.
Vol. II. The Establishment of Territorial Sovereignty. 1906. 663 p., 4 maps, 5 tables.
Vol. III. The Diplomacy of the Age of Absolutism. 1914. 706 p., 5 maps, 7 tables.
Authorities at end of each chapter in each volume.
Moore, John Bassett, ed. International Adjudications, Ancient and Modern; History and Documents, Together With Mediatorial Reports, Advisory Opinions, and the Decisions of Domestic Commissions on International Claims. New York, Oxford University, 1929–33. 6 v., maps. (Publications of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Division of International Law.)
Includes references.
Mowat, Robert B. A History of European Diplomacy, 1451–1789. New York, Longmans, Green; London, Arnold, 1928. 311 p.
Footnote references.
—— The Diplomacy of Napoleon. New York, Longmans, Green; London, Arnold, 1924. 315 p.
Footnote references.
—— A History of European Diplomacy, 1815–1914. London, Arnold, 1933. 308 p.
Footnote references.
—— A History of European Diplomacy, 1914–25. New York, Longman's, Green; London, Arnold, 1931. 343 p.
Footnote references.
Satow, Sir Ernest M. Guide to Diplomatic Practice. 3d ed., rev. by H. Ritchie. London, New York, Longmans, Green, 1932. 519 p. (Contribution to international law and diplomacy.)
List of works referred to, pp. 496–501.
Saucerman, Mrs. Sophia (Becker). International Transfers of Territory in Europe With Names of the Affected Political Subdivisions As of 1910–14 and the Present. Washington, U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1937. 244 p. (U. S. Dept. of State. Publication No. 1003.)

Anthropology

Boas, Franz, ed. General anthropology, with contributions by Ruth Benedict, Franz Boaz, and others. Boston, New York, Heath, 1938. 718 p.
Bibliography at end of each chapter.
Dixon, Roland B. The racial history of man. New York, London, Scribner, 1923. 583 p., maps.
Bibliography: p. 527–570.
Kroeber, Alfred L. Anthropology. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1923. 523 p., 17 maps.
Bibliography: p. 507–508.
—— A supplement, 1923–1933. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1933. 32 p.
Bibliography: p. 31–32.
—— and Thomas T. Waterman, eds. Source book in anthropology. Rev. ed. New York, Harcourt, Brace 1931. 571 p., 5 maps.
Ripley, William Z. Races of Europe; a sociological study, accompanied by a supplementary bibliography of the anthropology and ethnology of Europe. London, Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1913. 624 p., 87 maps and diagrams.
Foot-note references.
Special list of authorities on acclimatization: p. 589–590.

Atlases

Goode, John P. Goode's school atlas; physical, political, and economic. New York, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1939. 286 p., 431 maps.
A pronouncing index of over 30,000 geographical names: p. 177–286.
Philip, George. Philip's atlas of ancient, mediaeval, and modern history. London, George Philip, 1938. 230 p., 333 maps.
Shepherd, William R. Historical atlas. 7th ed., rev. and enl. New York, Holt, 1929. 115 p., 338 maps. (American historical series.)
Stieler, Adolf. Stieler's atlas of modern geography. 10th ed. Gotha, Justus Perthes, 1934–.
Issued in parts; 36 parts have appeared to date, Oct., 1939.
The Times, London. The Times survey atlas of the world. London, The Times, 1920–1922. 2 v., 112 maps.

Miscellaneous

American Historical Review, v. 1, Oct. 1895, to date. New York, London, Macmillan, 1896 to date.
Issued quarterly.
Contains references and reviews of books on European history.
—— General index to volumes 1–[30]. New York, London, Macmillan, 1906, 1916, 1926. 3 v.
Current History; a monthly magazine, v. 1, 1914 to date. New York, New York Times, 1915 to date.
Semi-monthly, Dec. 1914–Jan. 1915.
The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th, 12th, 13th, and 14th editions and supplements, contains articles of the highest value both on Europe as a whole and on the several states of the world.
Bibliographical references at end of each article.
English Historical Review, v. 1. Jan. 1886 to date. London, New York, Longmans, Green, 1886 to date.
Issued quarterly.
Contains references and reviews of books on European history.
—— General index to volumes 1–[40]. London, New York, Longmans, Green, 1906, 1916, 1927. 3 v.
Foreign Affairs: an American quarterly review, v. 1, 1922 to date. New York, 1922 to date.
Includes a briefly annotated classified list of recent books on political science and international relations.
—— Index volumes 1–10. Sept. 1922–July 1932. New York, Foreign affairs, 1934. 182 p.
The Journal of Modern History, v. 1, 1929 to date. Chicago, The University of Chicago, 1929 to date.
Each quarterly issue contains a "Bibliography" of recent books concerned with modern history since the 16th century, arranged by countries.
Statesman's Yearbook, statistical and historical annual of the states of the world for the year 1939. London, Macmillan, 1939. 1507 p., 2 maps.
"Books for reference" at end of article on each country.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful recognition of valuable service is due to Thomas J. Cave, Charles Ellis, Donald A. Thompson in historical research; to Wesley C. Whitmer in cartography and in the preparation of the index; to the Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish, and his staff including Lawrence Martin, Chief of the Division of Maps, who made helpful suggestions; to two unnamed, most efficient bibliographers; and above all to Herbert Putnam. Librarian Emeritus, and Martin A. Roberts, Chief Assistant Librarian, both of whom have for over 20 years repeatedly and in a most friendly way promoted my various studies.

Cordial thanks are also given to the typographer, John C. Harlowe, and to the lithographer, William W. Heintz, for their aid at all stages of the work.

KEYES PORTER.

[Mr. Charles Ellis herein mentioned is a graduate of Harvard University and Mr. Thompson is a doctor of philosophy, having obtained his degree from Harvard also.]

MINERVA PRESS, INC., PUBLISHERS,
WASHINGTON LOAN & TRUST BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.
Date_____194__

Please send me _____ copies, at 50 cents each, of Minerva Survey of Wars of Europe, by Keyes Porter.

Enclosed is check [ ]. Postal money order [ ].

Name_____ Street_____

City_____ State_____

Mr. LUNDEEN. I appreciate the fact that the Minerva Press, Inc., located in the Washington Loan & Trust Building in Washington, called this matter to my attention; and I am very glad that I can give this detailed information on the number of wars in Europe, so that our interventionist friends and world savers may have something to think about for a few moments if they will give the matter a little attention.

WORLD WAR HYSTERIA IN 1917

I remember, as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1917, the fervid oratory and the Websterian eloquence which burst upon that Chamber from the interventionists in European affairs and those whose purpose it was to save the world and save democracy. Now the same persons are wringing their hands and bemoaning the fact that the world is worse than it was in 1917. I submit that they did not do so well.

In those days I voted against the entry of America into the World War. I voted against conscription for foreign service in 1917, and I shall vote against it again in 1940.

I am against not only peacetime conscription but wartime conscription, except for defense. As clearly stated by Daniel Webster, generally regarded as the greatest constitutional lawyer we have ever had, wartime conscription for service beyond the borders of America and its possessions is unconstitutional.

Some Senator complained the other day that Webster's speech had been read into the RECORD 4 times. I fear we shall have to read it into the RECORD 40 times before some distinguished Senators will pay a little attention to it. This great constitutional lawyer said that it was not only unconstitutional but that it was an absurdity and absolutely contrary to the whole spirit of the American Constitution. I shall not go into the question of constitutionality at this time.

This simple map of Europe and the list of wars might well be a subject for study during the next few hours and days by distinguished Senators who are opposing us in this fight on peacetime conscription. They believe that we can reform the world by war.

THE NORTH STAR OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

I took occasion as far back as 1919 to include in the RECORD statements by Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Jackson, Madison, Monroe, and other great statesmen including Henry Clay, who clearly laid down a foreign policy which is the "very North Star of American foreign affairs." That policy held fast to the doctrine that we should never intervene in foreign wars but should protect ourselves at home. That does not mean that we should be pacifists and provide no defense. Of course not. George Washington, who first laid down the policy of nonintervention, was a believer in preparedness. If I may be permitted to speak for Senators who oppose the pending peacetime conscription bill let me say we all believe in preparedness; we believe in defense; we believe in sufficient preparedness and defense so that no foreign foe can invade the Western Hemisphere. We are believers in the Monroe Doctrine, as I understand Senators who have spoken on this floor.

One of tonight's newspapers—I think it is the Times-Herald—contains a statement that there are now in the armed forces of the United States more than 900,000 men under the immediate call of the President. I ask unanimous consent to put that statement, which is here on my desk, in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, August 27, 1940]

UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES NEAR MILLION MARK

Land, sea, and air forces, active and reserve, have reached a new peacetime total of 919,807.

A survey today indicated the impetus of intensified recruiting drives would soon put them across the 1,000,000 mark.

F. D. CAN CALL GUARD

Under the pending conscription measure, the Army proposes to draft 400,000 men between 21 and 31 years into the Army by January 1, 1941, and another 300,000 in April. The President is expected momentarily to sign legislation empowering him to order out the National Guard and Reserve officers. These men are included already in the totals above.

Latest statistics on strength of the services show:

	Enlisted men	Officers	Total
Navy	143,747	10,769	154,516
Marines	29,985	1,394	31,379
Navy Reserves [1]	40,336		40,336
Marine Reserves [1]	15,076		15,076
Army	289,000	14,000	303,000
National Guard	223,000	15,000	237,000
Army Reserve officers		120,000	120,000
Enlisted Reserves	17,500		17,500
Totals	758,644	161,163	919,807

[1] Includes officers on which specific figures unavailable.

Although all are at peacetime level, the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and National Guard are below authorized strengths. The Army's goal is 375,000 men and is receiving more than 30,000 new recruits each month. The National Guard's authorized strength is 235,000 men.

The Navy, which accepted 9,089 recruits during July, has an authorized strength of 170,000 men. It is planning to expand training centers at Great Lakes, Ill., Norfolk, Va., Newport, R. I., and San Diego, Calif., to meet expansion for a two-ocean Navy. These stations have been training about 5,000 men per month but will be expanded to handle 7,000 by October 1 and 10,000 by January 1, 1940.

TO COST OVER A BILLION

The Marines have nearly reached their authorized strength of 32,000 men. They recruited 7,198 men during July.

War Department officials are working on details of the costs of the projected National Guard mobilization and conscription programs. It was estimated that Congress probably would be asked to appropriate about $1,365,000,000 for the 935,000 guardsmen, Reserve officers, and draftees, who would see service during the current fiscal year ending July 1, 1941, if present plans are approved.

It is estimated it will cost about $1,460 for each person drafted on the basis of the $21 monthly basic pay of enlisted men.

THE CITIZENS MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS

Mr. LUNDEEN. In the statement I do not find any reference to the C. M. T. C., the Citizens Military Training Camps. Our son is a member of that corps, and, at Camp Meade, in Maryland, received training in the use of machine guns and other military equipment in 1938 and 1939. Enrollees in the C. M. T. C. number some 200,000 men and they are well trained for war. Those who have gone through military instruction such as is furnished, for instance, by the Valley Forge Military Academy, where our own son received his military training for 2 full years, and then the R. O. T. C., and the C. M. T. C. should really be added to the number of men available for national defense. That would bring the number far above 1,000,000. Some time ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement showing that the total number of men available for immediate national defense as of January 31, 1940, was 1,015,957, and I now append at this point the table from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to which I have just referred.

Armed strength of the United States, 1940

Army:	
Total Army strength as given by Secretary of War Woodring as of Jan. 31, 1940	624,200
R. O. T. C. figures given for September 1939 (latest available) by Colonel Thompson, War Department	186,750

Army—Continued.

C. M. T. C., July enrollment (does not include men that have been trained over a period of years)	35,579
Total Army strength	836,529
Navy:	
Officers	10,454
Enlisted personnel	129,575
Coast Guard	12,928
Marine Corps, officers	1,419
Marine Corps, enlisted personnel	25,065
Total Navy strength	179,441
Total combined strength (Army and Navy):	
Total Army strength	836,529
Total Navy strength	179,441
United States armed strength, Army and Navy	1,015,970

(NOTE.—These figures include air-force personnel.)

Source: These statistics have been compiled from various statistics given by the Navy and War Departments, Mar. 2, 1940.

MARCH 18, 1940.

Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LUNDEEN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated March 13, 1940, in which you inquire whether the R. O. T. C. and the C. M. T. C. are considered a part of our armed forces, thus increasing the total estimated strength of the Army furnished you in response to your letter of February 27, 1940.

The strength of 624,200 men furnished you in answer to your letter of February 27 was the total strength of the Army of the United States on January 31, 1940.

The R. O. T. C., established under section 40, National Defense Act, as amended, and the C. M. T. C., established under section 47 (d) of the same act, are agencies to provide military instruction and training to civilians and are not components of the Army of the United States as contemplated under section 1, National Defense Act, as amended.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY H. WOODRING,
Secretary of War.

MORE THAN A MILLION

Mr. LUNDEEN. Why tell our people we have no Army, Navy, and air force, when more than a million trained men are available today—air, Army, and Navy?

I ask the Senate to examine this table and to read the letter from the Secretary of War.

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE

The American taxpayer has poured out nearly seven billions in 7 years for defense only to be told he has no defense; he has poured out nearly $37,000,000,000 in 50 years only to be told by hysterical and ignorant people that we have no defense, and perhaps a few have a good-sized profit motive in mind.

*Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and aviation, 1890–1941**

Year	Army		Navy		Combined services	
	Aviation [1]	Total [2]	Aviation [3]	Total [4]	Aviation	Grand total
1890		$24,316,616		$21,675,375		$45,991,991
1891		24,206,472		23,136,036		47,342,508
1892		24,613,529		31,541,646		56,155,175
1893		24,308,500		23,543,267		47,851,767
1894		24,225,640		22,104,061		46,329,701
1895		23,592,885		25,366,827		48,959,712
1896		23,252,608		29,416,077		52,668,685
1897		23,278,403		30,562,661		53,841,064
1898		23,129,344		33,003,234		56,132,578
1899		23,193,392		56,098,784		79,292,176
1900		80,430,204		48,099,970		128,530,174
1901		114,220,096		61,140,917		175,361,013
1902		115,734,049		78,101,791		193,835,840
1903		91,730,136		78,856,363		170,586,499
1904		77,888,753		81,876,791		159,765,544
1905		77,070,301		97,505,141		174,575,442
1906		70,396,632		100,336,680		170,733,312
1907		102,071,670		71,817,165		173,888,835
1908		98,958,508		78,634,583		177,593,091
1909		95,382,248		122,662,485		218,044,733
1910		101,195,883		136,935,199		238,131,082
1911		95,440,568		131,410,568		226,851,136
1912	$125,000	93,374,756	$25,000	126,405,509	$150,000	219,780,265
1913	100,000	90,958,713	30,000	123,151,539	130,000	214,110,252
1914	125,000	94,266,146	10,000	140,718,435	135,000	234,984,581
1915	275,494	101,019,213	10,000	144,868,717	285,494	245,887,930
1916	300,000	101,959,196	1,000,000	149,661,865	1,300,000	251,621,061
1917	60,331,666	267,596,530	14,585,000	313,298,072	74,916,666	580,894,600
1918	10,800,000	273,046,323	[5] 51,133,000	517,273,802	61,933,000	790,320,125
1919	952,304,758	10,225,478,313	220,383,119	1,573,468,416	1,172,687,877	11,798,946,720
1920	25,000,000	772,324,878	25,000,000	616,096,839	50,000,000	1,388,421,717
1921	33,000,000	292,558,365	20,000,000	433,279,574	53,000,000	825,837,939
1922	19,200,000	328,013,530	13,413,431	410,673,289	32,613,431	738,686,819
1923	12,895,000	270,563,264	14,803,560	289,336,577	27,698,560	559,899,841
1924	12,626,200	257,274,768	14,793,560	294,456,528	27,419,760	551,731,296
1925	12,798,576	256,515,279	15,328,500	275,105,067	28,127,076	531,620,346
1926	14,911,191	260,757,250	14,981,000	287,402,328	29,892,191	548,159,578
1927	15,256,694	269,339,246	19,256,288	319,650,075	34,512,982	588,989,321
1928	20,602,594	282,118,885	20,300,000	316,215,107	40,902,594	598,333,992
1929	24,630,268	311,167,469	31,956,000	362,145,812	56,586,268	673,313,281
1930	34,690,785	332,404,342	31,430,000	360,236,697	66,120,785	692,641,039
1931	35,823,473	339,106,459	32,033,211	380,573,111	67,856,684	719,679,570
1932	31,479,635	334,705,965	31,145,000	358,253,952	62,624,635	692,959,917
1933	25,439,131	289,500,024	25,245,420	317,583,591	50,684,551	607,083,615
1934	23,324,185	277,050,381	21,957,459	308,669,562	45,281,644	585,719,943
1935	27,396,453	255,526,147	18,643,320	284,658,799	46,039,773	540,184,946
1936	45,383,400	341,348,204	40,732,310	458,684,379	86,115,710	800,032,583
1937	59,397,714	383,104,859	38,588,270	526,546,532	97,985,984	909,651,391
1938	58,618,406	415,263,154	49,500,000	516,258,808	108,118,406	931,521,962
Total, 1890–1938	1,556,835,623	18,974,978,096	766,283,448	11,588,498,603	2,323,119,071	30,563,476,699
1939, revised [6]	70,856,972	521,839,824	48,075,000	597,542,738	118,931,972	1,119,382,562

[1] Army Air Service (Corps) organized in 1918.
[2] Includes appropriations for support of the Army, 1890–1922, and military activities of the War Department, 1923–39.
[3] Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy Department organized 1922.
[4] Includes appropriations for the naval service, 1890–1922, and for the Navy Department and the naval service, 1923–39.
[5] Includes $1,000,000 available to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for purchase of aircraft patents.
[6] 1939 figures appearing in compilation have been revised according to the U. S. Budget, 1941.

*Includes bills before committees. Does not include H. R. 8026, which authorizes the increase by 218,000 tons of the composition of the Navy under-age vessels, the increase of naval airplanes to 6,000 and lighter-than-air craft to 36, and the acquisition or construction of 125,000 tons of auxiliary vessels. H. R. 8026 passed the House on Mar. 12, 1940. No amounts were specified to meet these authorized increases.

Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and aviation, 1890–1941—Con.

Year	Army		Navy		Combined services	
	Aviation	Total	Aviation	Total	Aviation	Total
1940, appropriation bills [7]	184, 464, 936	660, 167, 878	82, 798, 000	720, 789, 461	267, 262, 936	1, 380, 957, 339
Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1940 (approved Feb. 12, 1940)[4]	1, 787, 358	109, 416, 689	28, 661, 000	137, 172, 238	30, 448, 358	246, 588, 927
Urgent Deficiency 1940 (approved Feb. 12, 1940)[7]				28, 000, 000		28, 000, 000
Total, 1940						1, 655, 546, 266
Military Establishment, 1941 [8]	165, 762, 162	784, 999, 094			165, 762, 162	784, 999, 094
Navy Department and naval service [9]			94, 202, 900	963, 797, 478	94, 202, 900	963, 797, 478
H. R. 7934 [10]				5, 725, 000		5, 725, 000
Total, 1941						1, 754, 521, 572
Grand total	1, 979, 707, 051	21, 051, 401, 581	1, 020, 020, 348	14, 041, 525, 518	2, 999, 727, 399	35, 092, 927, 099

[7] This money is not all available in 1940, but is included in 1940 appropriation figures.
[8] H. R. 9209, 76th Cong., as it passed the House.
[9] H. R. 8438, 76th Cong., as it was amended, passed the House, and sent to conference.
[10] Authorizes $5,725,000 for modernizing U. S. S. *New York*, *Texas*, and *Arkansas*. Referred to House Committee on Naval Affairs.

Source: 1890-1938, from ms. of Nov. 21, 1939, of the same title. 1939, 1940—U. S. Budget, 1941, statement No. 2. Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1940; urgent deficiency, 1940; Military Establishment; Navy Department and naval service totals, by telephone from the budget departments of the War and Navy Departments; Aviation figures were taken from copies of the acts and bills.

Army: 1890-1922, 1931-38—Digest of Appropriations, 1938; table C, pp. 852-859. 1928-30—U. S. Budget, 1924-31. 1939—U. S. Budget, 1940.

Navy: 1890-1938—Digest of Appropriations, 1938; table C, pp. 852-859. 1939—U. S. Budget, 1940.

1940 and 1941 figures taken from Roosevelt's Budget Details as printed in the Times-Herald, Jan. 4, 1940.

Aviation: Army: 1912, 36 Stat. 1038; 1913, 37 Stat. 571; 1914, 37 Stat. 705; 1915, 38 Stat. 353, 359; 1916, 38 Stat. 1064; 1917, 39 Stat. 622, 910, 40 Stat. 187; 1918, 40 Stat. 42; 1919, 40, Stat. 816, 848-849, 1027; 1920-39, U. S. Budget, 1922-40.

Navy: 1912, 36 Stat. 1268; 1913, 37 Stat. 343, 348; 1914, 37 Stat. 894; 1915, 38 Stat. 396; 1916, 38 Stat. 930; 1917, 39 Stat. 559, 40 Stat. 203; 1918, 39 Stat. 1169-1170, 40 Stat. 369; 1919, 40 Stat. 706; 1920-39, U. S. Budget, 1922-40.

(Thomas R. Baldwin, Nov. 21, 1939.)

That included the Regular Army, the National Guard, and nearly 200,000 in the Navy. The figure for the Navy is now more than 200,000, and much recruiting and voluntary enlistment has taken place since that time in all services. So that I estimate—and I will be glad to substantiate the estimate by definite figures—that we have today 1,250,000 men available now for immediate military service. That is a greater number than we need today to repel any possible foreign foe that might seek to invade America.

Yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains a statement by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], in which he shows clearly and conclusively that it would be physically impossible for any European power or combination of powers to land in America 1,000,000 men in any less time than 3 years. For instance, he called attention to the fact that 1,000 transports of a tonnage of 10,000 each would be required. The ships are not available. They cannot be found. I ask Senators to recall now that the British at the present time are asking us to send our ships into the war zones to transport their children and other refugees. The reason given is that they have not ships available to transport them to the United States.

AMERICAN HOME PROBLEMS

I may say in this connection that it might be well for Americans to give some thought to their own children, their own dispossessed farmers, and their own ten, eleven, or twelve million unemployed, who are being forgotten in the war hysteria which seems to be rather stronger in the Congress than throughout the country, judging from the correspondence that comes to me from Minnesota. My letters from that State run about 50 or 100 to 1 against peacetime conscription.

The American Federation of Labor is opposed to peacetime conscription; the C. I. O. is opposed to peacetime conscription, the railroad brotherhoods are opposed to peacetime conscription. The C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. alone have a membership of more than 8,000,000 and the railroad brotherhoods, composed of men working on the railroads, have a membership of approximately a million. I do not expect the Senate will listen to the resolutions which these great labor organizations have adopted and sent here. I hope the Senate will do so, but I rather expect they will not. Perhaps some day these great labor organizations and the railway brotherhoods may speak at the polls of the country a language that is a little more easily understood than mere resolutions.

If I may again revert to the list of wars in Europe, I presume from now on, whenever any conqueror rises in Europe, we will be urged to go to the rescue. We will be asked to put down the evil power and to rescue the country which the majority may seem to favor at that time.

AMERICA FIRST—ABSOLUTE NEUTRALITY

We have been warned by every great statesman in the history of this Nation not to exercise excessive partiality for any one country; that we should be neutral in the quarrels of Europe, and that we should be scrupulous in our neutrality.

I hear gentlemen on the radio and on the floor of the Senate say that they are going to vote against peacetime conscription but they hope that one set of belligerents will be defeated and the other will win.

I will place in this RECORD today, as I have before, the statement that it makes no difference to me which set of belligerents win in Europe. I want the RECORD to read clearly on that point, so far as I am concerned. Empires are empires; aggressors are aggressors, and, so far as I can see, there is little if any difference between one conqueror and another. That may not be a popular statement with the press or with some of the radio speakers or publicity agencies of the country but, nevertheless, I believe that it follows the policy of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Henry Clay, of absolute neutrality and America first in all things—not Britain first or Germany first or France first, but America first. That was the doctrine laid down by the fathers and founders of this Republic.

Just where do we get this idea that England is protecting us with her great shield, that the British Navy is protecting America? We are sitting now in the Senate Chamber of the Capitol of the United States which was burned to the ground by British troops in the War of 1812–14. The British troops gathered in the House of Representatives yonder and called a mock convention and inquired what to do with the Capitol. Some one moved to burn it down, and they surely did burn it down. In order to make the job complete they went up the Avenue and burned the White House to the ground.

HOW OUR EXECUTIVE MANSION BECAME THE WHITE HOUSE

Perhaps we have forgotten that it used to be called the Executive Mansion, but it was so burned and blackened and its darkened columns stood so conspicuously out in the

gloom that they painted it in glistening white and it became known as the White House after the burning by the British.

I need not refer to the Revolutionary War, but I might refer to the fact that the Alabama cases recall that during the Civil War the British blockade runners were in American waters, furnishing ammunition and guns with which to shoot down the American flag and destroy American boys; and that France was down in Mexico setting up an empire under Maximillian. That happened even within the memory of men now living in the United States.

The Grand Army of the Republic knows that story well; and yet Great Britain is the "protector" of America. She is the shield upon which we are supposed to depend.

What other countries than Britain and France have attacked America? I have never heard of Germany attacking the United States. I have never heard of any other country sending troops over here; but the British troops were here and the French troops were here, in North America, threatening the very existence of this country and this Government.

Mr. President, we are listening to a good many alarmist attacks to which I should like to refer for just a few moments. Here is a Times-Herald article of August 13, 1940:

NAZIS DECLARED READY TO ATTACK AMERICAS BY AIR—SENATOR AUSTIN BARES PREPARATIONS IN REPUBLICS TO SOUTH

Preparation for an attack by bombing planes and parachutists on South America has been made by Germany, Senator WARREN AUSTIN, Republican, of Vermont, declared last night in a radio speech.

Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, co-authors of the Washington Merry-Go-Round, interviewed AUSTIN because of the interest he has displayed in national defense as a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

AIR-LINE PENETRATION

AUSTIN warned that Germans run the Sedta air line in Ecuador and until recently supplied 95 percent of the pilots for the Scadta air line in Colombia.

"In South America," AUSTIN said, "it is no secret that Germany has established her commercial air lines—the Condor, the Lufthansa, and others—in such a way that she already has air bases, gasoline supplies, interchangeable parts, and actual planes in operation in this vital and strategic area.

"If Germany wished to send a large number of four-motored bombing planes through Latin America across our southern boundaries, she would have the facilities to do so.

"If we consider the Panama Canal as the lifeline of American defense—and I think the entire Nation agrees with that—then we must remember that one or two carefully placed bombs can blow up the locks of the Canal and put it out of commission for 2 or 3 months.

"Therefore, German air lines in South America, to say nothing of the glider clubs, the cycling clubs—all of which train for the new Nazi strategy of parachutists—must be a matter of grave concern to the United States."

BULLITT, KENNEDY ON "OUTS"

Allen reported differences have developed between William C. Bullitt, Ambassador to France, and Joseph P. Kennedy, Ambassador to England.

"The two men won't even speak to each other now," Allen said.

COMMITMENTS IN POLAND AND FRANCE

Perhaps when some of these gentlemen have a permanent falling out we shall learn something of what happened in Europe as to commitments with Poland and France. I fear we have had some ambassadors who have been running around in Europe and making commitments for this great country that they had no business making. I am in favor of investigating their activities, and have so said on previous occasions.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. I observe that the Senator is quoting from an address I made.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator question the facts stated?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I do not question the able Senator's statement. I have very great respect for the Senator's ability and his research. I am merely reading it for the information of the public, and I am going to try to answer it if I am able to do so.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wonder if the Senator would object to having the RECORD show that similar facts—in fact, almost the same language—appear in the record of the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate held on January 30, 1939, at pages 141 and following?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I shall be very glad to have that part of the hearings incorporated in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the pages indicated by the Senator be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From hearings before Senate Committee on Military Affairs, January 30, 1939, on House bill 3791]

STATEMENT OF G. GRANT MASON, JR., MEMBER, CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

* * * * * * *

Senator AUSTIN. Will you describe the air lines covering South America and the furnishing of parts, having regard for the difference between those of foreign countries and our own?

Mr. MASON. I would be very glad to, and it might be useful to follow it through one air-line development specifically, because it is typical of what is bound to be coming in at least one or two of the other competitive air lines. But, before doing that, Senator AUSTIN, may I digress again for a moment to give a better picture of the possibilities of those air-line developments and to emphasize, if I may, the significant fact that with these Italian and German planes the Italians and the Germans are sending some able technicians who have recently been trained in special courses in diplomacy in the language of the country where they are going, in technique, in the economic theories of their fatherland, and in the political philosophies of their own country.

Senator THOMAS. Our own law prevents that, does it not?

Mr. MASON. In the case of America, evidently it does. On the other hand, there are a great many of the national air-line operations in Latin America that have many Americans in the way of pilots and technicians with them as ordinary employees. The Italians and Germans which I mentioned, allegedly, are ordinary employees also. I had luncheons with the heads of the aviation units of Italy and Germany with their uniforms off, and they were very proud of these training courses for their Germans and Italians, especially those who went to Latin America. We have no figures as to how many of them there are, but we know that there are a great many Germans and Italians, well trained in many regards, scattered around Latin America in connection with the export of aircraft.

Now, as to the air line, if I may follow the German picture specifically around Latin America, we find that the first successful commercial air line in the entire world was that in Colombia. It was started by Peter Paul von Bauer in 1919, up the Magdalena River from Barranquilla to Bogota, and that operation continued under German control and German personnel until approximately 7½ years ago. At that time, the Pan American Airways System, the American International Airlines, entered the equity of Scadta in a manner which the Colombian Government, our own State Department, and consequently the Pan American Airways have found necessary to explain as being a one-third ownership, outright, of the Scadta system in Colombia, plus an option position enabling our Pan American Airways to exercise some control over the policies of Scadta. Despite that control a somewhat difficult diplomatic picture with Colombia has prevented Pan American Airways from being successful in eliminating the German operators from the air lines. The crews of Scadta aircraft still are at least 95 percent German, and in Colombia they are, obviously, only a short distance from the Panama Canal. We can leave it with that thought, if you do not mind, and move over to the east coast.

In Brazil the Germans started operating the Condor Syndicates——

Senator THOMAS (interposing). Do you know anything about the origin of that company, whether it was foreign or domestic?

Mr. MASON. Entirely foreign. It was started—the Scadta Co.—by Peter Paul von Bauer, a German, with 100 percent German capital; Scadta is a contraction of a Spanish name. Von Bauer and others of the company arrived in Washington in the fall of 1926. They flew a Dornier-Wahl flying boat as far as Habana but could not get a permit to come into the United States. Dr. von Bauer appeared in Washington asking for permission to fly his plane through the Canal Zone up to the United States for an international air line which would be 100-percent German. He arrived at the moment that General Mitchell was being put through a court martial for various statements he had made, a rather inopportune moment for the Germans to be here, and he was entirely unsuccessful in getting any permits of any sort from the United States. But his testimony before various committees, when he tried to obtain permission in Washington from Government departments, became so interesting that Americans picked up the thought and started the international air lines of the United States. That is the part that they had to play. But they remained bottled up in Colombia, and now, as I say, the American entity has, indirectly at least, control over the Scadta system.

Senator THOMAS. Do you know any reason why Colombia was selected, of all the Latin American states?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir; because there is difficult ground transportation over that terrain between two very important centers, Barranquilla, a seaport town, and Bogota, the capital, a large city up in the mountains, with only water communication and trails as connecting links. It took some 3 weeks to go up the Magdalena River as far as the mountains permitted, then over trails to Bogota, when the river was behaving itself, which was rare—either it was in flood or it was dried up. Frequently it took as long as 3 or 4 months to make the trip, whereas it is about a 7- or 8-hour air trip. That is why they picked that particular terrain out of the entire world. That appeared to be the most ideal place for a successful air line, and it was financially successful, without a subsidy, for that reason.

* * * * * * *

The Focke-Wulf is being developed by Germany to be operated in South America by what is known as the Syndicato Condor, a subsidiary of Lufthansa. It is to fly at least from Natal, Brazil, down to Buenos Aires in the Argentine and probably, as nearly as our Authority can judge, across the Andes through Chile and up the west coast. The Germans have other subsidiary companies in Peru. In September of last year they put through a concession contract for a German subsidiary company in Ecuador which might conceivably operate Focke-Wulf four-motored planes that would completely surround South America and cross the Andes. They are surveying routes through Brazil and possibly into Ecuador. The best American answer to that, so far as we can find in our factories, probably is the Boeing commercial interpretation of the "flying fortress."

Senator AUSTIN. Does the production and supplying of parts afford an answer?

Mr. MASON. Yes, Senator; that is very significant, because, obviously, if the Focke-Wulf is to carry through the German program they must have adequate parts and supplies, and they have built up large reserves to tide them over any disturbances or interruptions to their normal means of transportation. That is a logical reason to give for the commercial air line, but having all those reserve supplies in large quantities, it is obvious that they could fly types similar to the Focke-Wulf commercial plane around Latin America in whatever numbers they might want, whenever they might want.

* * * * * * *

Senator CLARK. If these German planes in South America would try to come up here, all they would be able to do would be to bring something and leave it? Is that correct? They would not be able to do any bombing? They might be able to bring a few Germans over to stay with us?

Mr. MASON. May I be very frank indeed? If we put our Boeing "stratosphere liner" on the Latin American service, we would build up reserve supplies for it, here and there, for use in time of trouble or on errands of mercy, such as the Chilean earthquake. And since the Boeing is the commercial interpretation of the flying fortress, that ship could utilize the supplies put in reserve down there for use by the commercial air liner.

To present the German side of that picture: If the Germans wanted to fly a military version of the Focke-Wulfe to Latin America they would have adequate supplies for military use simply because they had been operating a similar type of commercial plane.

Does that answer your question?

Senator CLARK. No; it does not. They have no military planes in South America, have they?

Mr. MASON. Those that they have bartered with Latin American countries are there.

Senator CLARK. You mean they belong to the South American countries?

Mr. MASON. Yes. But if they wished, for any reason, to deliver planes in large numbers, they have the air-line facilities to do so.

Senator DOWNEY. And they have convertible parts?

Mr. MASON. They have the convertible parts. Again, the Focke-Wulf; if instead of that type of commercial plane which carries 28 passengers and cruises at some 210 miles an hour, they wanted to send over bombers of a similar type, it is obvious to us, even though we are civil, that the parts of the commercial ships are already there and since they are interchangeable, they could be used for maintenance of the military plane. That situation is not difficult to visualize since the same plane has already made round trips across the North Atlantic, refueling on this side.

Senator CLARK. I do not know that I entirely understand your thought about the matter.

Mr. MASON. To be more specific, if they wished to send—I have no indication or thought whether they will or not—if they wished to send a large number of bombing planes, four-motored bombing planes, through Latin America to our southern boundaries, they would have the facilities to do so. They would have the fuel supplies in large reserves, they would have the parts, they would have the replacements and the personnel from place to place if they were needed on account of illness or anything else.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I happen to be one of those individuals who, I hope, will never be unwilling to listen to the other side. When I am unwilling to do so, I hope some kind Providence will take me from this earth. I want to hear both sides, and if I am wrong I want to be set right. I have every respect for the opinions of the Senator from Vermont, with whom I am in just about 100-percent disagreement on this bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think it fair to me to have the source of my information incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I have given that as the Times-Herald of August 13, 1940.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I mean the source of my information. I am relying on the testimony of a witness who had lived in South America and had especially attended to such matters for 11 years before testifying.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I think the Senator will grant that we have now fully covered that point as to the authority for his statements; but I am glad the Senator interrupted me to have that point cleared.

I believe the article now branches off into some other subject, so I shall not pursue it further. It covers the point I have just mentioned.

Here is another article:

BULLITT SAYS HITLER WOULD ATTACK UNITED STATES—AMBASSADOR TO FRANCE URGES AMERICAN CONSCRIPTION

PHILADELPHIA.—United States Ambassador to France William C. Bullitt bluntly predicted a German attack on the United States if Great Britain is defeated as he urged the Nation last night to adopt conscription and send aid to the British fleet.

His words, broadcast throughout the Nation from Independence Square, carried the approval of the United States State Department.

"It is my conviction, drawn from my own experience and from the information in the hands of our Government in Washington, that the United States is in as great peril today as was France a year ago. And I believe that unless we act now, decisively, to meet the threat we shall be too late.

"Write and telegraph to your Senators and Representatives," he urged. "Write to your newspaper. Demand the privilege of being called into the service of the Nation. Tell them we want conscription."

Bullitt, the first high-ranking member of the administration to advocate naval aid, declared that "the destruction of the British Navy would be the turning of our Atlantic Maginot line."

Warning against unpreparedness, the envoy said:

"The men and women who tell you the dictators will not attack the Western Hemisphere may be honest, wishful thinkers or they may be the agents of the dictators.

"But in either case, by lulling you into a false security and retarding your preparedness for defense, they are keeping the way clear for an assault on America by the dictators. They are enemies, consciously or unconsciously, of our country and our liberties."

If Great Britain is conquered, Bullitt foresaw the whole of Europe organized into one economic unit directed from Berlin.

No country of North or South America, he said, would be able to trade with Europe except on such terms as "might be pleasing to the dictators."

In the Pacific, he asserted, "would be the Japanese Navy, cooperating with the dictators, which would be able to cut us off from our supplies of rubber and tin and would compel us to leave a large part of our fleet in the Pacific to defend Hawaii and the west coast."

The German military machine today, Bullitt declared, "is without question the most powerful ever created."

THEY WANT US TO RESCUE THE BRITISH EMPIRE

Mr. President, during this crisis of world and national affairs the American people should be given the facts concerning the impossibility of invasion of these United States. Their fears have been played upon by those who see bogeymen in the attic, and see Nazis crossing the Potomac. This is a time when America must be realistic about its defense needs, and not be stampeded into the expenditure of colossal sums for a wild and fantastic defense plan contemplating the rescue of the British Empire.

Certainly we need to build up our defenses and mechanize our troops, but we do not need peacetime conscription. There is no real basis to fear an invasion from nations beyond the seas. Such propaganda is inflicted upon the American people with a view to scaring them into peacetime conscription. These alarmists seek huge appropriations to repel an imaginary foe. It is all an insult to American intelligence.

I wish to place before the American people a statement of experts concerning the danger of invasion.

Mr. President, I have here the statement of Gen. Smedley D. Butler, former marine commander, who has fought all over the map, and whose courage and patriotism cannot be questioned by any Bullitt or any of his associates. Here is an article headed " 'A tale to frighten children.' Fears of Euro-

pean nation invading United States too preposterous to consider, says Butler."

"A TALE TO FRIGHTEN CHILDREN"—FEARS OF EUROPEAN NATION INVADING UNITED STATES TOO PREPOSTEROUS TO CONSIDER, SAYS BUTLER

Take it from an old military man, if Adolf Hitler should succeed in beating England and France and then turn his attention to the Western Hemisphere, he will run smack dab into a hornet's nest.

Gen. Smedley D. Butler, former Marine commander, who has fought all over the map, declared in a radio broadcast this week that Americans who are fearful of Nazi aggression have more important things to worry about.

Any nation that attempted to invade this country, the old "Devil Dog" declared, would be compelled to send at least a million men to make a dent against our defenses.

To transport a force of that size, Butler said, would require a thousand large ocean-going vessels. And the soldiers would have to be landed all at once, and there are not enough harbors in the country to handle the ships.

In addition to the human cargo, it would be necessary to transport 400,000 tanks, trucks, cannon carriers, wagons, etc., Butler pointed out. To supply the army for a 9 months' campaign would require 50,000,000 gallons of gasoline. On top of that the invader would have to bring machine guns and countless shiploads of ammunition. When the ships had been unloaded they would then have to return for more materials, and that would call for fuel that would not be available.

While all this was going on, Butler asked, what would the Americans be doing?

The mere suggestion that any European nation seriously considers invading the United States, in the opinion of Butler, is too preposterous to be considered. It is a tale to frighten children, he said.

Mr. President, that falls in line absolutely with the statement of the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, whose statement in the RECORD yesterday clearly shows the impossibility of an invasion by a million men, an invasion which would require a thousand transports of 10,000 tons each.

To transport a force of that size, Butler said, would require a thousand large oceangoing vessels.

Just exactly the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

And the soldiers would have to be landed all at once, and there are not enough harbors in the country to handle the ships.

These are not the opinions of ERNEST LUNDEEN or any of the opponents of conscription. This is a statement by Gen. Smedley D. Butler, courageous and valiant commander of the American Marines in the World War.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the junior Senator from Minnesota yield to his colleague?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am delighted to yield to the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. After he was retired, Major General Hagood wrote an article to the same effect for the Saturday Evening Post 2 or 3 years ago.

TALES TO FRIGHTEN CHILDREN

Mr. LUNDEEN. I believe I will have some reference to General Hagood's articles in these remarks, which are rather extemporaneous remarks. I think it is about time we were giving the opinions of some of the real authorities, men who fought—generals, admirals—who know something about these matters, and not listening to a lot of tales to frighten children.

I continue reading from the article by General Butler:

The soldiers would have to be landed all at once, and there are not enough harbors in the country to handle the ships.

In addition to the human cargo, it would be necessary to transport 400,000 tanks, trucks, cannon carriers, wagons—

And so forth, Butler pointed out.

To supply the Army for a 9 months' campaign would require 50,000,000 gallons of gasoline. On top of that, the invader would have to bring machine guns and countless shiploads of ammunition. When the ships had been unloaded they would then have to return for more materials, and that would call for fuel that would not be available.

While all this was going on—

Butler asks—

what would the Americans be doing?

I can imagine some of the things which might be done. I imagine that any such invading army would never set foot on American soil, that they would go down to the bottom of the sea before they ever had any opportunity to land on any of the mainland of the United States.

The mere suggestion that any European nation seriously considers invading the United States, in the opinion of Butler, is too preposterous to be considered. It is a tale to frighten children, he said.

The distinguished commander is with us no more, he has passed to the Great Beyond, but if there ever was a patriot, and a noble, courageous warrior, it was Gen. Smedley D. Butler, a man who was unafraid in the presence of kings and presidents, and who dared to speak his mind at all times.

I read from another article now:

United States invasion fear held groundless.

Hitler unable to attack here without long and difficult preparation, expert says.

Pacific peril dismissed.

Impatience for speed in new defense program seen as Nation's chief danger by Col. Frederick Palmer, noted military expert.

Perhaps he is a "fifth columnist," or a "fifth-rate columnist"; which was it? Anyway, there has been much talk about that.

I understand that a few days ago someone spoke to the Mothers of America, who have been urging Senators to vote against peacetime conscription. They were asked if they had heard about Lindbergh's "fifth column," and their answer was:

"FIFTH COLUMN"—LINDBERGH DIVISION

Well, if Lindbergh is in command of the "fifth column" then we are in the Lindbergh division, and the isms and the others who may be un-American will have to choose some other number, because we are traveling with Lindbergh.

I should like to quote Col. Frederick Palmer, noted American expert, writing for the North American Newspaper Alliance, who says:

Whence and in what strength will any attack upon us come? Where will it hit us? How much time have we to prepare for it? Will our impatience for speed in our vast preparations defeat the very object for which we are striving?

These questions are suggested by one who is for a two-ocean Navy and the selective-service bill.

I wish to say in that connection that there are many people who believe in military training, who believe in selective service, but who do not believe in peacetime conscription. There are many who believe in conscription for defense in time of war who believe it is unconstitutional to conscript men for service beyond the dominions of America, so stated by Daniel Webster in a great speech in 1814 on the floor of the House of Representatives in this very Capitol.

I call attention to the fact that the French had 6,000,000 conscripts under arms, and experts now tell us that a spearhead of 50,000 Germans, in tanks and air armaments, broke through the lines, and, of course, other German forces followed and scattered the 6,000,000. That should illustrate to us that mechanized equipment, the air forces, and all of the mechanized machines are important, and more important than mere numbers. That is why I am glad the able and efficient senior Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, has put into the RECORD that remarkable statement concerning the impossibility of a million men being landed here in any less than 3 years' time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. WALSH. All the information I have been able to obtain from naval experts through recent months has emphasized the fact the Senator has now expressed, and I have been convinced that our first line of defense is our Navy and our second line of defense is a large air corps, with thousands of pilots and thousands of planes. In my opinion, unless the Germans are able to outmatch the sea and airplane forces of England, they cannot conquer England. The third line of defense that would be necessary to prevent invasion, I have been taught, is a mechanized motor spearhead force, as the Senator has properly called it, or what I choose to call a professional army in charge of the so-called mechanized units. In my opinion we cannot in 1 year train and develop a professional army for that purpose and for that objective. It is

a life career; it is a Regular Army job. It is not a job of a conscript force that is changing from year to year.

The fourth line of defense, in my opinion, is an antiaircraft force with a sufficient number of antiaircraft guns. We have not that force. We have no second, third or fourth line of defense in this country that is sufficient for our defense. I think that is generally admitted and I do not charge the Army has been solely responsible.

In my opinion, one of the evils of the pending bill is that it scatters the efforts of the limited number of officers and men in the Army now, and jumps over the three really essential defenses which should be concentrated upon, and instead provides for bringing in and out of the Army for 1 year draftees who will create a constantly changing Army, and not a steady, well trained, well developed professional Army.

Furthermore one of the things I am disturbed about in regard to this matter is that I think this is going to do away with any volunteering in the future, that everyone is going to say, "Let us wait and be drafted. This conscription policy is for 5 years. We do not need to volunteer. There is no occasion for volunteering." We are likely to have little more than a changing personnel in our Army year after year.

I thank the Senator for having given me this opportunity to express my views. The Senator referred to an editorial I had placed in the RECORD yesterday. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] inserted an editorial from an expert, an Englishman, written from London, criticising the pending bill because it was proceeding upon the old theory, of a large number of men, rather than emphasizing a small, powerful, well-trained, professional Army, with all the latest motorized, modern war machines, which the recent war in Europe has demonstrated are necessary, and not only are necessary, but are much more effective against millions of the ordinary conscripted army, who are called generally "foot soldiers."

I thank the Senator.

SENATOR WALSH ON CONSCRIPTION

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator of our Naval Affairs Committee for his expert opinion on these matters. I wish the Senate would listen a little more carefully to the excellent advice he gives with respect to the defenses of our country. I cannot hope that the Senate will listen to any poor words of mine, but I do ask the Senate to listen to the distinguished chairman of our Naval Affairs Committee, who from a background of many years experience, and with knowledge obtained through much research, and through having had contacts with every admiral and general now in the military and naval branches, and from his association with experts, gives us the noble statement which he has now made on the floor of the Senate. I cannot sufficiently express my appreciation for the statement he has just made and for many speeches he has delivered in the Senate in recent days upon the matter of our foreign policy. I hope he may continue to serve in the Senate as long as it is his wish to do so.

Col. Frederick Palmer further says:

He is not worried when he reads that the Soviet is reported as fortifying a little island in the Bering Straits. Russia does not plan an invasion of Alaska on the way through roadless Arctic expanses of mountain and forest to Oregon, across the Peace River Valley and the plains of Manitoba to Minnesota. She is not going to try to pass by the Japanese Army and the immensely superior Japanese Navy when she has only a few patrol boats and some submarines in Far Eastern waters.

That reminds me that some time ago I sat at a dinner table with an Army officer and his good wife. This fine lady had been reading an article published in some magazine which spoke of how savage and ferocious the people of Russia were, and that they were about to burst in upon America, to invade our country. She said, "Senator, are you not afraid they will come over here and invade the United States?" I said, "I am afraid they will." She said, "Do you not think they will come right over here and take our country?" I said, "I think they will. I understand they have no navy, they have no transports, but they are training all their men to swim with full equipment, and they will no doubt be landing in New York one of these days."

From that time on we had no further discussion about invasion from the navyless Russians.

I continue to read from Colonel Palmer's article:

Japan will not turn her back on China, where her Army is fully occupied, and send her Navy in belligerent challenge to our side of the Pacific when she has much more accessible plunder in French Indochina and parts of the British Empire, should it be dismembered.

This dismisses any immediate danger on the Pacific side. It is the Atlantic emergency that stirred us to the burst of immense preparations when we saw the Nazis making almost as swift a conquest of the Low Countries and France as of Poland.

In that connection let me say that we often forget that the nations in Europe are warring against one another, and nations are warring against one another in Asia. Picture the spectacle of one of these nations, or of a group of nations, leaving the other hemisphere and coming over to our hemisphere, seven or eight thousand miles away, while their mortal foes are right at their front door.

A GENERATION TO RECOVER FROM WAR

I wish to say to Senators that history will bear me out in the statement that when a great war is fought, after the war for a generation both sides are so exhausted they are not thinking of any more wars. Their people are bleeding from their wounds, they are exhausted, they are endeavoring to build up their shattered forces, both their economic and their military forces, and have no time to think of attacking any other country.

Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of Colonel Palmer's article be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NO MILITARY MIRACLE

Neutral military observers, who have been over the ground as guests of the German staff, did not conclude that the German was a wonder army that wrought a military miracle. Chancelor Hitler got an astounding break in his favor in the tragic military blunder of the French high command, which permitted the thrust across the Meuse River. The Germans had an all but free swing in the air, with roads open for tanks and infantry-laden trucks for only 150 miles to isolate the Allied armies in Flanders.

The French armies south of the resultant gap lost all contact in an amazingly disorganized retreat. In Flanders, after the Germans broke through the Belgian fortress system, they had only 100 miles to go to the English Channel ports. Not only the fear-stricken refugees, but the confusion of the Belgian Army, which lacked munition trains and commissariat, hamstrung coordinated resistance.

While we thrilled over the gallant audacity and skill of the British Navy in protecting the evacuation of the British Army from Dunkerque, we did not realize, as it is known now, how the British Army in its retreat held off the attacks of four times its numbers. So did some French groups that fought in the Marne and Verdun spirit.

Consequently, there is no reason why we should be scared or overimpressed by German might as touched by some kind of hellish, totalitarian magic. The mettle of the victorious German divisions is no better than that of those we met in France in the World War.

If Herr Hitler attempts to invade Britain, he will not have continuing roads across a land frontier for his army. It will have to cross at least 22 miles of water. It will meet such resistance as that of the British in those final days in Flanders and of the stubborn little French groups—such resistance as he will meet from us, on land, sea, and in the air.

NEW PROBLEMS FOR HITLER

But suppose he conquers Britain as swiftly as he conquered France. Many Americans would accept the danger they had envisioned as immediate. Herr Hitler's next blitzkreig would strike in our direction.

His position in any overseas campaign would be reversed. Hitherto his sea tactics have been negative and destructive. He has struck at an enemy's surface sea command with bombs, mines, and submarines to destroy naval vessels and merchant shipping.

Now he must have surface sea command himself. He must protect his convoys across the Atlantic from our submarines, planes, destroyers and fast cruisers, while our superiority in capital ships could overwhelm his capital ships. Suppose he conquers Britain in a month—and I venture to predict this invasion will fail—he will have to prepare for the trans-Atlantic "blitzkrieg" as he has for previous "blitzkriegs." It is a set German military tradition, to which he has held fast, not to strike until ready.

He would hardly be ready before next spring. By that time we should have 15,000 planes. He could not bring planes on aircraft carriers, when his only two in construction will not be

finished. And axis partner Mussolini has none. Against long enemy plane flights, ours would be short from Caribbean bases. If our submarines and surface naval vessels were not enough, our planes would blast Herr Hitler's transports off the sea. By spring we should have an Army striking force of 200,000 men. German invasion with an equal number would be hopeless.

But we should keep constant watch and be able to match and overmatch any probable attack with sufficient sea, land, and air power and have the resources for prompt production of munitions and thoroughly trained reserves to draw upon. The danger is that we shall get an extravagant, unbalanced preparedness whose continuance in thorough form we shall neglect when we are lulled into security, with the result that one day an enemy, or a combination of enemies, will get the jump on us.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article by Walter Trohan, which was referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] a moment ago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HITLER CAN'T INVADE AMERICA FOR 2 YEARS, SAY EXPERTS—EVEN THEN HE'D PROBABLY FAIL, THEY CLAIM, IN CITING HANDICAPS

Invasion of the United States would require the largest and most intensely organized military and naval effort the world has ever seen and even in the face of the meager defenses America has today, the chances of success of such an invasion are extremely remote.

This was the verdict of responsible Army and Navy officers and defense experts to whom was put this question: "Just what would it take to invade America with 500,000 or 1,000,000 men, and what chance would the invading force have?"

NO THREAT OF INVASION

Despite all the war hullaballoo in the country today, the experts agreed that America faces no serious threat to immediate invasion, because it would take upward of 2 years to prepare a force for invasion, and within that time the United States could make herself impregnable against any invader.

Germany spent 5 years preparing for her invasion of Britain by way of France and the Low Countries. Even at her present state of preparation for war—assuming she defeats Britain and wants to invade the United States it would take at least from 2 to 3 years to get an invading armada organized.

ONE MILLION MEN NEEDED

In the sixteenth century Philip II of Spain spent 8 years in gathering together his armada of 130 ships, manned by 8,000 seamen and 19,000 troops, which were to constitute the vanguard of an invading force against England. The armada met disastrous defeat at the hands of a far smaller foe.

Experts fixed the need of a twentieth-century armada for a force of 1,000,000 men with ample weapons, ammunition, and merchant vessels. Any attempt at invasion with a smaller force would be absolute suicide, they feel. However, the needs of any army of 500,000 would approximate half that of the larger force. The greater army would have more corps and army weapons.

WHAT INVADER NEEDS

The experts fix the needs of the force of 1,000,000, as follows:

Weapons	*Quantities*
Rifles	300,000
Pistols	100,000
37-millimeter antitank	2,500
Machine guns	15,000
Mortars	5,000
105-millimeter howitzers	3,000
105-millimeter guns	2,000
155-millimeter howitzers	2,500
155-millimeter field guns	1,000
240-millimeter howitzers	250
37-millimeter antiaircraft guns	1,000
90-millimeter antiaircraft guns	2,000
Tanks	1,500
Scout cars	1,800
Motor vehicles	200,000
Airplanes	7,500
Ammunition, in rounds	
Rifle	445,000,000
Pistol	50,000,000
Machine gun	200,000,000
37-millimeter antitank	15,000,000
105-millimeter howitzer	3,000,000
105-millimeter field gun	2,000,000
155-millimeter howitzer	2,000,000
105-millimeter field gun	1,000,000
37-millimeter antiaircraft	7,000,000
90-millimeter antiaircraft	8,000,000
Mortar, ammunition	5,000,000
Bombs, tons (up)	100,000
Number of merchant ships	*Average tonnages*
1,000 transports	10,000
2,000 freighters	5,000
500 supply ships	7,500
250 oilers	8,000

NEED HUGE WAR FLEET

Many of these vessels would turn to supply service to maintain the Army should it get a foothold.

In naval craft the invading fleet must have a force equal to if not superior to the 400 ships in the American Navy, and because such a fleet would be operating far from home it would need a full complement of tenders and auxiliary craft of all kinds.

Granted a foreign invader had driven the American Navy from the seas—and that is quite a job because it is acknowledged to be the best trained and best equipped navy in the world—experts say the invader would still face a mass of difficulty.

RAIDS CAN'T CONQUER LAND

In all the fear of invasion being built up at present for political purposes no attention has been paid to the actual mechanics of invasion. Politicians have emphasized the possibility of air attack, but have said nothing of the difficulty an enemy would encounter in seeking to establish air bases. Nor have they stressed the fact that neither America nor any other country can be taken by air raids, but can only be counted taken when infantrymen are in actual possession of the soil after having killed or driven off the defenders.

NEEDS GOOD HARBORS

The first thing an invader needs are points of attack. In taking these into consideration, he must find harbors large enough for his fleet and with sufficient facilities to unload not only his men but also his heavy machines. Behind the harbors must be railroads and highways to take the invaders into the interior.

To capture the United States from the northeast the invader would have to take Halifax, Nova Scotia, as well as lesser harbors in Newfoundland and on Cape Breton Island. There are inlets in the area which would take the entire United States Fleet, but they have no facilities and are not improved.

Though American coastal defenses are in a state of neglect, these defects can be corrected at most in 2 years—sooner than an enemy could prepare the gigantic force for invasion—and the American coast put in such shape that no enemy would dare to make a thrust.

Even at present, with the American Navy what it is, the experts are confident that an invader could not establish himself on American soil.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I wish to read from a report submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]:

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted the following report (No. 1615) to accompany H. R. 8026—May 15, 1940.

I read from page 2 of the report, as follows:

The armies of Europe and Asia do not menace us. To be a menace they must be transported across the sea in ships. Airplanes based on the continents of Europe and Asia do not menace us. To threaten seriously our continental security they must be conveyed across the sea and operated from bases in or near this hemisphere.

The armed forces of no foreign nation or group of nations can seriously threaten our continental security if we make sure that we command the seas which separate us from all potential enemies.

IMPOSSIBILITY OF INVASION

Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood in an article entitled "We Can Defend America" has this to say:

For the present, it will be sufficient to consider the difficulties that would be encountered by a hostile nation that attempted to invade this country. * * *

British experience during the World War indicated that about 40 pounds of general cargo per soldier per day was required to supply an army from an overseas base. In the A. E. F. we started out with that figure. We attempted to build up a 90-day reserve for an army of 2,000,000 men, but we did not get very far with it. So we arbitrarily shortened our objective. On the basis of 2,000,000 men, we would have had to unload at the ports an average of 40,000 tons of cargo per day. We shortened our objective to 30,000, but, as a matter of fact, we never reached 25,000. Our shortage was met by the Allies.

I ask, Senators, Who is going to provide the shortage for an invading foe which may come to America?

INVADING ARMY OF 1,000,000 MEN

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BROWN. I gave a few figures earlier today on that precise subject, which perhaps the Senator from Minnesota did not hear. The estimate of experts is that it would take 13,000,000 tons of shipping to supply an army of 1,000,000 men, which the Senator from Texas says is the minimum army that can come over here and be of any effect. Thirteen million tons is a figure that none of us can comprehend without some sort of comparison.

The combined navies of the six most powerful nations in the world, the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan, total six and one-half million tons,

or one-half the amount of tonnage which would be required to service an army of a million men in America, and there simply is not so much tonnage available for that purpose.

THEY ARE TRYING TO DO AN ORSON WELLES INVASION FROM MARS

Mr. LUNDEEN. I will say to the able Senator from Michigan that perhaps they will get the shipping from Mars. If the tonnage on earth is not sufficient, perhaps Mars will provide it. They will figure that out in their imaginations tonight, when they see the bogeys in the attic, and hear the tramp of German troops coming across the Fourteenth Street Bridge.

Mr. President, the whole thing is an insult to American soldiers, the American veterans, the Spanish War veterans, some of whom are still in the service of the United States, as well as World War veterans and members of the National Guard. It is an insult to my own son, who has been trained to the point where he is now a second lieutenant in the armed forces of our country. It is an insult to the intelligence of the great American people, 130,000,000 of them. It is an insult to our country, which contains one-half the manufacturing establishments of the earth, to say that any country can come over here and successfully invade our country.

For that reason I am quoting from some authorities, because perhaps many statements have been made without support; but let us have these statements supported by authorities. I thank the able Senator from Michigan for the figures he has given. They are conclusive and unanswerable.

This cargo consisted not only of food, clothing, big guns, ammunition, and all that sort of thing, but of such little odds and ends as 35,000 motor trucks—we needed 80,000—fifteen hundred standard American locomotives, 20,000 freight cars, 5,000 miles of standard steel rails, and three and one-half million cross ties.

Speaking of the World War conditions—

We had all of the French ports at our disposal. Our line of communication across the ocean was never seriously threatened. And all we had to do was to run our ships back and forth like ferryboats. But our difficulty was in getting the ships loaded at one end of the line and getting them unloaded at the other, and, after that, evacuating the ports. For this we had the French railways and a magnificent system of highways, none of which was in any way interfered with by the enemy.

Remember that at that time a great number of nations had declared war; we had all the tonnage and all the aid in the world at that time. All we had to do was to run our ships back and forth like ferryboats. Our difficulty was in getting the ships loaded at one end of the line and unloaded at the other, and after that evacuating the ports. For this we had the French railways and the magnificent system of highways, which were not in any way interfered with by the enemy.

Continuing:

In order that the reader may get a physical conception of what is meant by 40,000 tons of cargo per day, I will say that there are only five ports in the United States that can handle so much tonnage, and that if it could have been loaded on army trucks it would have required a daily truck train over 150 miles long.

So much for the difficulty of shipping. Had we attempted to fly it would have been just so much worse.

Mr. President, I have a further authority on the impossibility of invasion. I refer to an article by Hanson Baldwin, entitled "Wanted—A Plan for Defense," published in Harper's magazine for August 1940, at page 236. Perhaps I should not be so much concerned about this program. To my mind, this whole thing will end in a great debacle followed by a great financial crisis and depression. In as plain words as I can use I shall warn the Senate and the country, lest we go into further hysteria not justified by the facts.

Mr. Baldwin says:

The Army is this Nation's and this hemisphere's third line of defense. It is an important element of that defense (we should not make the mistake of thinking that wars can be won by sea power and air power alone), and some of its functions are particularly vital. In the past we have been committed to the principle of a small citizens' army, rather than the maintenance of a huge standing army which can be utilized effectively not in this hemisphere, but only on European or Asiatic battlefields, where the borders of hostile nations crowd across the map and mass is still hurled against mass. The mass armies of Europe or Asia cannot easily be transported to this hemisphere—can never be so transported provided we retain control of the seas and maintain a proper air defense. A small army could be transported, might elude our fleet or take advantage of its presence in another ocean to establish some beachhead in a remote area. But probably the maximum force that could be so transported—the maximum initial force that could be transported even if control of the sea were wrested from us—would not be much larger than 50,000 men. The transportation of such a force would require 375,000 tons of shipping, perhaps 40 ships, about the largest force that could conveniently be convoyed in a single operation. To supply such a force might require 650,000 tons of shipping to 2,000,000 tons monthly; in other words, perhaps half of the tonnage of the German merchant marine would have to be devoted solely to the job of supplying 50,000 soldiers. If this force were to be doubled, the shipping tonnage necessary would be doubled; to supply an army of 1,000,000 men in this hemisphere would require at the very least 13,000,000 tons of shipping.

As pointed out by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]:

Economically and commercially the problem seems impossible; not even Britain, or a combination of Britain and Germany, has sufficient shipping to divert such an enormous amount of it from their ordinary and vital trade routes to military purposes.

I have a further article from the book, Our Military Chaos, which I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks, quoting several officers in this connection, and bearing out the statements just made.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Villard, Oswald Garrison: Our Military Chaos, New York, 1939, pp. 29–30]

If we turn next to military officers, Major General Hagood, in 1937, declared: "Considered from the defensive standpoint, America is the strongest military nation on earth—that is, it is the easiest nation to prepare for defensive warfare. It would not take much to make it invulnerable against any nation or combination of nations that might be brought to bear against it." Major General Rivers, another lifelong soldier, has repeatedly stated that an invasion of the United States by any large force is out of the question. Maj. George Fielding Eliot, the author of The Ramparts We Watch, an outstanding book on the defense of the United States, exclaims: "We should thank God that today we can pursue our national way secure as yet from the fear of invasion." Hanson W. Baldwin, a former naval officer, now the military and naval critic of the New York Times, wrote in Foreign Affairs, in April 1938, before the super-Navy expansion of that year: "The Army and Navy are at present prepared to defend both coasts of the United States against simultaneous invasions, and at the same time to protect Hawaii, Panama, Alaska, and probably South America from any attacks that can reasonably be foreseen."

NO SUPREMACY ON THE SEA WITHOUT SUPREMACY IN THE AIR

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to talk with Maj. Al Williams, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, Brig. Gen. William Mitchell, and other great aviators. I knew General Mitchell personally over a period of years.

My record in the House and Senate shows that on every occasion I voted for top figures for airplanes. In 1919 I introduced the first Department of Air Service bill which was ever introduced in the Congress of the United States. It has been followed by a long line of bills since that time. I have a list of them with me. I have asked for aviation, and more aviation. I have stated—not without expert authority on which to rely—that no fleet of oceangoing war vessels can live in the vicinity of land-based aircraft. They must retire beyond the effective striking distance of land-based aircraft. I go further. Distinguished Senators may disagree with me, but I believe it to be true that supremacy on the sea cannot be maintained without supremacy in the air. Both are necessary. We are now seeing a classic struggle between Germany and Britain for air supremacy. If Britain can win the mastery of the air she will have mastery of the air and mastery of the sea, and, of course, Germany will then be driven back to the Continent.

GERMANY PONDERS THE 20-MILE ENGLISH CHANNEL

In that connection I am not here to say that Hitler will not try to invade Britain. Who can tell what the future has in store? But we do know that he has been standing there for about 2 months, looking at that 20-mile ditch. We do know that he has been looking at the waters of the English Channel, where the cliffs of Dover can be seen across from France. Guns are firing across that channel, but he has not

yet ventured to cross. If he pauses for 2 months or more before a 20-mile channel, I wonder how long he will pause before he tries to cross 4,000 miles of water. Perhaps we should stop and think about that for a moment.

WILBUR AND ORVILLE WRIGHT

Aircraft first saw the light of day in America. One of the Wright brothers was recently in Washington. I think the glory and grandeur of their invention and achievement can never be fully rewarded. There is no reason why America should not be supreme in the air, with our great distances from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from Canada to the Gulf, and with the many thousands of possible airfields. I have encouraged the building of airfields and of lighted airways. I have tried in a small way to further aviation. On the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate I have delivered more than 20 speeches in which I have tried to encourage the building of war planes and commercial planes. I am now advocating that we go down into South America and there establish lighted airways and airfields, to make it possible for American businessmen to have the shortest, quickest, and best air transportation in the world to the South American markets. Germany, France, and Great Britain are now pretty well occupied. This is our chance for Yankee businessmen to get down into South America and sew up that trade.

Mr. President, I have great respect for the opinions of men like Maj. Al Williams, the Scripps-Howard aviation editor. He says that the United States is safe from invasion. Of course, I know that that statement does not meet with the approval of some of the alarmists who cannot sleep at night because they fear that Hitler is coming right over here. Of course, he has not crossed the English Channel, but he is coming right over here! Al Williams says that the United States is safe from invasion. His statement is:

> Any interpretation of the current stage of Europe's war as another threat to the security of the Americas ("mystic immunity" is President Roosevelt's "blitzkrieg" phrase) is ridiculous. What European nation, with what machinery—and how—can invade the Americas? If our security and national safety is a myth or mystic—the sole responsibility can be traced to the administration. We have spent billions of dollars for national defense, and yet the Army is at least 18 months deficient in personnel, training, and equipment, according to experts. Second, a Navy too much concerned with gunfire and submarines has neglected to provide for attacks from air power. American air power cannot muster 1,000 first-line war planes for 1 day's combat wastage, such as in the current campaign in the Low Countries.

Mr. President, in spite of that statement we go ahead and turn our bombers over to an empire in Europe. We fly them over to Canada, and even fly them across the ocean to get them to Europe as rapidly as possible. So we are deficient in training planes for our own aviators, our own Army, and our own Navy.

ARMING GREAT BRITAIN

Not only did we send over 800,000 rifles that we had on hand, but we have sent over thousands of 3-inch fieldpieces; we have sent over 132 carloads of TNT. That was the first shipment. I do not know how many more shipments have followed. I stated the other day on the floor of the Senate, we cannot keep our powder dry any more, because we have not any powder. It has all been sent over to the King.

Very well. If that is the way to defend America, go ahead and defend America in that manner; but I make my protest here on the floor of the Senate against defending America by taking the sword out of the hands of the American soldier and putting it in the hands of European nations—nations which may some day be hostile, and may some day be our antagonists.

I warned the Senate and the country against sending our planes to France. I warned against sending our armament to France. I said, "What if that armament becomes a part of the armament of Hitler and Germany?" I ask Senators now, "Where is that armament?" At Brest alone, 200 complete airplanes fell into the hands of Hitler, and 2,000 motors, with blueprints for mounting them. I have no other information except that given in the press, which I am now giving. Another press report gave as 1,637 the number of American airplanes captured in France by the German Army, and just the other day we saw a picture of a French airplane shot down in England. I understand over 800 French planes were flown across the Mediterranean and are now in the German service against Great Britain. So this thing has swung around to a situation in which both French and American planes are used against the British Empire.

I regret that this terrible struggle is going on. I have visited the British Isles a number of times. I should hate to think of Great Britain being sunk in ruins. It is a great country. It is a great empire. I am not solicitous about the British Empire. That is four and a half times as large as we are. Perhaps it is too large. I cannot say. Perhaps it should be divided. That is for history to determine. But in the case of Great Britain, with its glorious civilization, it does seem as though Germany and Britain might get around the conference table and end hostilities before these two great leaders of the white nations of Europe destroy each other.

In that connection, remember the statement which the Kaiser made, away back in the days before the World War, about the "yellow peril"; that the white nations cutting each other's throats and destroying one another on the battlefield might one day be overrun by the armies of the East, the Mongols and the "yellow peril."

AIR PROTECTION FOR AMERICA

This might all end in security for America if we had a little more air protection. Instead of stripping our country of its air defenses, why not build up our air defenses?

Maj. Al Williams says:

> If we had a few hard-headed patriots in Washington today, instead of a lot of supercharged politicians who fear more for their careers than for the welfare of America, the roof would be blown off that "roaring volcano of words." Congress is to blame as well as President Roosevelt for fostering a top-heavy Navy, a woefully deficient Army, and for continuing our military aviation as a messenger for the older services.
>
> If Mr. Roosevelt thinks we are going to be invaded, how does he think the job will be attempted? England and France have the only two navies that could even make a start. If Germany wins this war, how would the victory be achieved? Victory may be consolidated by land power, but every strategist in Europe already knows far too pointedly that any victory on the surface will be preceded by dominance in the air—by air power.
>
> An invasion of the United States would mean a minimum of 1,000,000 soldiers.

There seems to be a general agreement that that is the minimum number of soldiers that could be brought over here and make any possible dent in our defenses.

> Such an overseas force means the control of the sea communications, 3,000 miles in length—

And I say more than 3,000 miles in length—

> and the availability of more than 3,000 cargo vessels. Would the Germans be fools enough to set sail for America and attempt to use the sea power against us that failed for the British against them? The Germans may be lots of things, but they are not fools in war.
>
> But Mr. Roosevelt and Congress seem to think they would attack us with captured sea power. Nothing, apparently, will bring to this administration the air-power lessons that are biting into the mental hides of British and French politicians in this crisis. They all had a chance and ample funds to build air power that would have swamped that of Germany. But none of them could see beyond battleships and fortifications, paralleling the United States' lack of mechanical vision.

LINDBERGH'S WARNING

I want to recall here that Col. Charles A. Lindbergh in 1936, in Berlin, warned the world of the strength of the German air power. He had visited the air forces of Russia; he had said that they were not to be compared with German air power, and he had visited the air forces of all the other nations. In Europe and here in America he made clear the picture of the air situations of the different nations 4 years ago. The little critics that now swirl around his shoe tops are busy criticizing him and questioning his patriotism, but he will live so far beyond their memories that history will fail to record their existence. History will deal with the patriotism of Colonel Lindbergh and his critics.

They were warning us. Al Williams warned us; Eddy Rickenbacker, all these great men of vision, warned us in the press and on the platform and over the radio. In a small way I myself tried to do so by introducing a Department of Air Service bill here in 1919, and for 25 years, since 1915, I have urged that sort of thing.

At that time I had my first flight, and became enthused over aviation; and while I am no pilot, as our colleague in the House, Representative MAAS, and others are pilots, I have an enthusiasm for aircraft and the building of air forces, and for land-based aircraft along our coasts. I have repeatedly asked on this floor and I have been most ably assisted by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], whose resolutions I am glad to follow—that we should acquire air bases from Greenland, St. Pierre, Miquelon, and Newfoundland down along the coast to Bermuda and the Bahama Islands, and thence down to the coast of South America; a great line of fortification and defense there.

ISLAND AIR AND NAVAL BASES FOR AMERICAN DEFENSE

If we have those island bases, if we fortify them, if we put land-based aircraft on them, what nation in the world is going even to attempt, or think of attempting, to break through those lines? And those lines are far distant from our shores. These islands are American islands. They should not be European. They should not be foreign. Over these islands should fly the American flag. I look forward to the day when there will be no flags but American flags in the Western Hemisphere. I look forward to the day when from the North Pole to Panama our flag will be supreme, so that we shall have no intrigue from Europe, Asia, and Africa coming into the other nations of North and South America and dragging them into war, and then when they are whipped they howl for us to come and aid them. That is a tiresome thing; that is a dangerous thing for American security, and the security of our people.

Al Williams further states:

American admirals and generals are telling Congress and the President just what British admirals and generals told Parliament during the rearmament period from 1935 to 1940, i. e., more warships—never mind mechanized land forces and never mind this "aircraft is a new weapon" (Secretary of the Navy Edison's enlightening comment of very recent date).

You will remember that Secretary Edison asked that we build our Navy over again, or at least rearm it, because of aircraft and because aircraft have outmoded our Navy.

Never mind going to the trouble of analyzing what kind and types of machinery should be bought to meet the changed specifications of this age's war. Just buy more of the same old junk that fitted other wars. Air power? Don't bother with it; it's a new weapon, and all it can do is win Europe's war.

If our American foreign policy (whatever under the sun it may be) is really and factually one of military defense and not aggression, we should cut our Navy in half, hold our Army to continental police force proportions, and consolidate all our air-power efforts in a department of air commensurate with that of our Army and Navy. We should build the greatest air power the world has ever seen and relax in the knowledge that we have applied the air-power lessons of Norway and the current war in truly sensible and American fashion.

I believe that will be done. I am an optimist. It may be dark and cloudy; it may be darkest just before dawn; but one of these days we are going to do these things, and when Americans get together on something they go with a great rush. We shall have an air force the like of which the world has never seen; but let us not buy any more of the old junk that Al Williams was talking about; that is useless, and will only go to the scrap heap.

No matter what the end of this war, air power has already demonstrated that it is the one single weapon which supersedes all others. Why not buy some of it? The belligerent which controls the air will win this war in Europe. Why doesn't the same rule apply to the United States—ever more definitely—with our thousands of miles of seacoasts? Why not get our house in order by uprooting the little air services maintained and jealously held by the Army and Navy and consolidating them into an American air force?

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, AIR, ARMY, AND NAVY

In connection with that I call to the Senator's attention the fact that Germany has a consolidated air department; Great Britain has a consolidated air department; Mussolini and Italy have a consolidated air department; Japan has a consolidated air department. But we are running around with a little air service in the Army and a little air service in the Navy, and a little air service in the Coast Guard, and with jealousy and with different types of planes and parts which are not always interchangeable, and with a mixed situation which brings nothing but chaos. We have no coordinated air system.

I have here an article by Hugh Russell Fraser in the Inside Washington column, in which he deals with the defense program, which I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE WASHINGTON

(By Hugh Russell Fraser)

The propaganda reaches a climax. As America prepares to build up her armed forces—which, of course, should have been done long ago—the cry is becoming more and more insistent that we ought to send our naval and air force to England; that the British Navy is our first line of defense, and that if it is wiped out we are lost.

Indeed, most of the support for the nomination of Knox and Stimson to the Cabinet comes from this very source. The hysteria for aid to England before it is too late—and it may be too late before this column is in print—is so great that it may be difficult to withstand.

And the curious thing about it is this: Not one expert, military or naval, has testified that it would be possible for Nazi Germany, or any other power or group of powers to invade the United States now.

On the contrary, their testimony has been unanimously to the contrary. Yet, as this is being written, Dr. Charles Seymour, president of Yale University, is speaking over a network of radio stations and saying: "If Britain is conquered and the British Navy wiped out, there is nothing between the invader (Hitler) and us."

Now, Dr. Charles Seymour is a very brilliant and learned gentleman. He is 54 years of age and in good health. Yet he makes boldly and deliberately a statement for which he could not secure the support of any naval or military expert of this or any other country.

And it is precisely such statements, and such propaganda that are leading this Nation to the brink of the war.

What are the facts about the situation? Is it possible that Dr. Seymour has chosen to ignore them? Hardly. Or, at least, let us be charitable and assume that he has not. Then, presumably, in his anxiety to aid the Allies, he has forgotten them. If he has, then he has forgotten quite a list of facts. What are these facts? There are more than a dozen of them.

He has forgotten there are 3,000 miles of ocean between the United States and Europe;

That there is not a Nazi bomber, or any other kind of bomber, built that can make a round-trip flight of more than 1,000 miles without refueling;

That the average bomber cannot fly more than 500 miles in the direction of the United States without giving up all hope of returning to its base;

That Hitler could not even attempt to invade the New World without securing an air base in this hemisphere;

That such a base could not be secretly seized; it would have to be secured by armed invasion;

That such a base could not be secured by naval forces alone, since the seizure of territory requires the use of troops;

That there are not enough aircraft carriers in the navies of Britain, France, and Germany combined (assuming Britain and France surrendered their naval aircraft carriers to Hitler, and he could train crews to master the technical details of their operation and at the same time find adequate parts and replacements for them) to carry sufficient planes across 3,000 miles of ocean to protect a naval landing force from a navy and air force operating within a few hundred miles of its home bases;

That even if such a base could be secured it still would not be within bombing distance of the United States;

That modern Nazi bombers could negotiate only half the distance between Bermuda and the United States, or only 375 to 500 of the 690 miles, without giving up hope of returning.

That they could fly only a fourth of the almost 2,000 miles from the Azores and the United States;

That from the Cape Verde Islands, off the West Coast of Africa, they could get less than a third of the distance of 1,500 miles to Brazil;

That from the French island of Martinique, off the coast of Venezuela, they could fly only 375 to 500 of the nearly 1,400 miles to the Canal Zone.

That from Greenland, which Col. Charles A. Lindbergh has declared is utterly impractical as an air base, they could get only half way even to Newfoundland;

That they could not fly—without giving up hope of ever returning—more than a third of the distance from Greenland to the United States;

That among all the American experts from Maj. George Fielding Eliot, once described as "America's foremost military authority." to Admirals Yarnell, Stark, Leahy, Cook, Lanning, and Taussig, there is complete agreement that the United States could not be successfully invaded, and that the seizure of a naval or air base in the Western Hemisphere would be virtually impossible without the development of a new type of bomber hitherto unknown;

That further, if the British Fleet was captured tomorrow, and that if by some miracle the technical difficulties of operating it could be overcome by the Germans and that fleet added intact to their own—a well-nigh impossibility, yet assuming for the sake of the argument it could be done—an invasion of the United States would still only be possible by landing simultaneously at least 500,000 men;

That there are not enough transports in the combined British-French-German navies to land this number of troops simultaneously;

That there are only five ports on the Atlantic coast anyway big enough to accommodate such a disembarkation;

That in addition to landing 500,000 men simultaneously, tanks, antiaircraft guns, armored cars, thousands upon thousands of tons of supplies, not to mention heavy artillery, dock cranes, special landing equipment, etc.;

That, according to the latest figures, for every soldier transported by sea, there must be a tonnage displacement for equipment—including guns, tanks, ammunition, food, fuel, and reserve stores—of from 200 to 250 tons per man;

That, taking the lower figure, this would mean that the total shipping displacement of the enemy armed force would need to be 100,000,000 tons;

That unless our Navy and air force are sent to Europe and there destroyed in whole or in part, any such gigantic undertaking as the invasion of the United States under these circumstances would not only be improbable but absolutely out of the question. On this the military and naval experts are agreed.

Our duty, therefore, is to defend the Western Hemisphere. That we can, must, and should do.

Then, and only then, are we safe.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I have here an article by Karl H. von Wiegand, world-famous correspondent, who has interviewed various European leaders of different nations as to how they feel about air power and the possible invasion of the United States, which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES INVASION IMPOSSIBLE, SAYS GOERING—CALLS FEAR OF NAZI OR JAPANESE ATTACK "STRANGE DELUSION"

(By Karl H. Von Wiegand, noted foreign correspondent, and for 25 years outstanding American political observer in Europe and the Far East)

BERLIN, July 27.—America cannot be invaded from across the Pacific.

Militarily considered the idea is utter absurdity.

That's the conviction expressed to me today by Reichsmarshal Hermann Goering in a 75-minute talk I had with him, the first marshal of the German realm, who, as such, is next to Hitler, the highest ranking officer in Germany.

As creator, builder, organizer, and commander in chief of the newest, largest, most powerful, and most successful air power in the world, I thought his views might be of interest.

It was the first time since the beginning of the war that he received any foreign journalist.

" 'STRANGE DELUSION'

"To Germany your fear in America of invasion from across the seas strikes us as a strange delusion, and stranger still is the delusion that the invasion is to come from Germany," said the man who commands more war planes than any other man in the world.

"With a 'moat' over 3,000 miles on one side and more than 5,000 miles on the other, America is simply not invadable by air or sea. That's particularly true if America's armaments and national defense are appropriate to or commensurate with the country's size, population, resources, and industrial production, not to mention the spirit of the people.

"Militarily it's absurd. We are not yet in an age of interhemisphere air wars.

"There is no war plane in Germany that can fly to America with a load of bombs and get back, nor is there a war plane in the United States than can fly to Germany nonstop and return without landing.

"We cannot understand why you pick on Germany as the professed cause of your fear.

NOT SO STUPID

"Where is the logic of it? What do you think we want over there?

"The American people are certainly not so simple-minded as to believe we really are so stupid as to think we can invade and conquer a country of 130,000,000 people 3,500 miles across the Atlantic.

"Even if you don't like us, give us some credit for common sense and reason," Goering said somewhat impatiently.

"There is much talk of Greenland as an air base, but Lindbergh said that was not possible," I remarked.

"Lindbergh is a great flyer, a man of great experience and with great technical experience," Goering replied. "He does his own thinking and I respect his judgment. It was his judgment that Greenland is impossible as an air base, and the best proof of his judgment is that the commercial air lines dropped plans for a base there."

"Wouldn't that also apply," I asked, "to Japan's defenses against 'an attack or invasion of Japan from overseas?' "

"Yes," said Goering, "if Japan's air force is large enough and strong enough and strategically based on land. It must be remembered that aircraft carriers have become very vulnerable to land-based warplanes, and themselves can carry no large or long-range bombers."

INVASION OF UNITED STATES UNTHINKABLE

The marshal waved further discussion of America's fears aside with the statement:

"I will only add that I underline what the Fuehrer said that the whole idea of anyone in Europe, least of all Germany, thinking, contemplating, or dreaming of an invasion of North or South America is a strange delusion which I hope will pass away just as quickly as a feeling of utmost self-reliance returns to the American people through what they consider adequate armaments and defenses on land, sea, and air."

We sat in the marshal's working room at Karinhall, his palatial hunting lodge in the forest 45 miles from Berlin. Col. Gen. Ernest Udet, chief of the technical division of Goering's general air staff, was waiting to see the commander in chief. It was difficult to keep Goering on the subject of America's fear of invasion. He considered it quite "too childish."

BERMUDA DISCUSSED

Asked if he were America's air minister, would he insist on acquiring Bermuda and the Bahamas for advance air bases for national defense, he said:

"If you don't take advantage, for national defense, of what God or nature has given you, that's up to you. If American defenses are what they should be, particularly if her air force is properly developed, built up, organized and strategically based, America can defy any power or any group of powers. No one would be so idiotic as to attempt an invasion."

Considering the importance air power has become in war, Goering could not understand why and how in the United States there has not been created a separate air ministry when all the other great powers have found such a ministry necessary or advisable.

I asked the marshal his views on air power versus sea power in light of the experiences of the war; would air replace navies and had aircraft carriers become obsolete?

AIR POWER STILL YOUNG

He leaned back in his chair and answered the question slowly, and very thoughtfully.

"Air power is still very young. It's made tremendous progress in a very few years, both technically and tactically, especially when we consider development of the land and naval branches. The future of air power is unmeasurable, but at this time it still has its limits.

"Italy's splendid air force has been hitting the British Navy hard, and Italian air power can be said to dominate the Mediterranean. German air power dominates the North Sea and the Channel.

"Air power will dominate wide stretches along coasts with land-based air forces, but in far-flung sea regions and in wide oceans navies will still have their tasks. Aircraft carriers with their wide, flat decks are relatively easy targets for bombers. In fact, this war has brought wholly new strategy and tactics predicated upon new weapons of war. So I believe something approaching revolutionary change in the design and construction of navies will follow on the heels of this war."

AIR FORCE DECISIVE IN POLAND

Goering said the air force was "quite a decisive factor" in Poland, Holland, Belgium, and France; that German armies could not have had victories or made their unprecedented advances without cooperation of air. "But still we must bear in mind that the air force could not go down and occupy the ground."

"Except parachutists," I interposed.

The marshal smiled.

"In special instances as a start, for which preparations had been made," he qualified. "Together with land fighting forces, air power was supreme on the Continent. Germany has mastery—yes, command even—of the air on the Continent, and we shall keep that mastery.

"My air force is stronger today than at the beginning of the western offensive last May, thanks to German production of planes and the small losses we've suffered. German production is still higher than British production plus American deliveries so far.

"The high German production is due in part to the astonishingly low number of types used, which made standardization easy. More than 20,000 usable planes captured since September have been used for training purposes, thereby greatly broadening my training of pilots and fighters.

ADDED TO OIL RESERVES

"It may astonish you that in Holland, Belgium, and France we found twice the amount of gasoline and oil I have consumed in all air operations since May 10, so that not only did I not have to draw on my reserves but have actually added something to those reserves."

Finally our talk arrived at the impending campaign against England. Goering said:

"My air force is completely prepared and all set for the signal or command from the Fuehrer to do our part in the general attack. I can assure you that our attacks in England so far were merely armed reconnaissance. My air force is ready. We await the command of the Fuehrer."

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I began my remarks by referring to the number of wars which had been fought in Europe, and how the interventionists want us to go over there and solve all the European problems. My point is that we had better try to solve the problems we have in the United States, and never mind Europe and Asia. We are going to hear the cry around the earth, "Asia for the Asiatics, Europe for the Europeans, and America for the Americans." That is going to be the cry and millions on this earth will listen to it. The Asiatics will have their Monroe Doctrine and the Europeans will have theirs. We have a Monroe Doctrine now which forbids Europe to mix in our affairs here, and the other half of the doctrine is that we do not meddle in their affairs, as was so ably stated by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], whose learned eloquence I delight to hear. I wish I could have stated it half as well as the eloquent Senator did.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. A moment ago the Senator said that we passed a Monroe Doctrine which guaranteed that no one would bother us here. Is that correct?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I do not think I said we "passed" or guaranteed it. It is a declared doctrine.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator stated it was adopted. He said it did guarantee that European powers would not meddle with us. Is that correct?

Mr. LUNDEEN. It means that Europe shall not meddle in American affairs, as I understand it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator used the word "guaranteed." I was going to express great satisfaction that there was anything which guaranteed they would not bother us. We might not have to raise so many troops.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I did not use the word "guaranteed," but if we are to guarantee it, I will say to the able Senator, who is also a soldier and a veteran, he knows and I know, and all Senators know, that the only way we can guarantee anything is by being prepared for defense.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

Mr. LUNDEEN. In that regard I agree with the distinguished Senator. I am for defense. As for the views of the Senator and me—and I admire his ability and his long service here—we may differ as to how defense should be best brought about, but as to the necessity of defense, there can be no difference of opinion. I do not think there is a Senator on the floor of the Senate who does not believe in national defense sufficient to protect us from any European threats.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has really anticipated my other question, which was whether it is not true that the only way we can make good our declaration in the Monroe Doctrine is to have an Army and a Navy so strong——

Mr. LUNDEEN. Do not leave out the air force.

Mr. CONNALLY. The air force is part of the Army and the Navy; it is not separate. It is all part of the military and naval force. Does not the Senator think it is necessary to have a Navy and an Army and an air force—if the Senator wants that included—so strong that no ambitious conqueror shall ever attack us here?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I fully subscribe to the Senator's statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I am trying to get right now with the pending bill.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am very glad the Senator has stated that so well. However, the pending bill is not necessary for that purpose.

Speaking of the air force, on February 28, 1919, I introduced a bill for a department of the air service, and I stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as appears on page 405 of the Appendix, March 3, 1919, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, these words in reference to the development of the Department of Air Service:

The navigation of the air is the newest field just now fairly opened up to the enterprise of men and nations. In order that our people may take their proper place, and share in the development of this new science, I introduced the following bill (H. R. 16195) to create an executive department of the United States Government to be known as the department of air service. Other nations are making rapid strides in this field, and in the rivalry of securing the benefits, commercial and otherwise, from this new form of navigation I believe such a department will be a great benefit to the Government and the people of the United States.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. HOLT. Did the Senator read the New York papers on Sunday, and see an article written by Mr. Allen, who used to be with the Civil Aeronautics Authority, in which article he stated that the United States Government now had 80 fewer planes; that is, Army and Navy planes, than we had on the 1st day of January of this year? Speaking about defending America, it proceeds to discuss and show that the United States Army and Navy have 80 fewer planes than we had on the 1st day of January. Is that good for our defense?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, the Senator forgets that we must take care of the King over in Europe. We must take care of the British Empire. We must see that the airplanes and war planes and bombers get over to His Majesty's service. That is where they have gone. That is where our planes are now. They have been flying over the Canadian skies until the Canadian skies are black with American planes flying to the British Empire.

Mr. HOLT. The article also states that out of every hundred planes produced in the United States in this period of which I speak, 80 percent of them went abroad. In other words, out of all the planes we are building we are shipping out of the country four out of every five. And yet we hear talk about defense.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I thank the able Senator. I wish to say in that connection that one minute we hear that we have no defense, and that we must have four or five million men conscripted, and that we have no armaments, no weapons, with which to train them, and the next minute we find armaments shipped over to defend the great empires of Europe, so that they may not fall into the discard. How does that hang together?

Mr. HOLT. Furthermore, we do not have enough planes today with which to train the boys who desire to be pilots in the United States Army and Navy. We have sent over even our pilot planes, the planes necessary for training. Of course, we have planes on order in which they may train, but it is not very easy to learn to fly a plane by watching a blueprint.

INTERVENTIONISTS ENDANGER UNITED STATES

Mr. LUNDEEN. There is one more thing I wish we had sent over there—our newspaper and columnist interventionists. If they would send some of the interventionists over, it would be a good deed done. I refer to the interventionists in the columns of the press and on the radio. If we could be relieved of them, we would get along better in our defense of the United States.

We are so intervention-minded now that we have to intervene everywhere. I see talk in the press that we must protect the British interests in China. I noticed the other day that when the British troops marched out of Shanghai, they were headed by the American Marine Band. As soon as the British left, we took over the British interests in China.

Just what sort of a connection is there between the British Empire and the United States, and what understanding may there be, and are we supposed now to take over in China? Are we supposed to have our gunboats up the Chinese rivers? Are we supposed to have our American troops on Chinese territory? Are we supposed to be in the Japanese waters over there with our warships and run the possibility of war?

If Japan ever fights America it will not be in the Hawaiian region; it will not be off San Francisco and San

Diego and Portland; it will be in Japanese waters. The Japanese are too clever to come over and tackle us here. They will want us to go over there, so that we will have to extend our lines six or seven thousand miles, and our Navy must be three or four times the size of theirs if we are to be on a parity in any such struggle.

Mr. HOLT. It is generally understood in all diplomatic circles that the United States Government and the British Government have an understanding and an agreement in the Far East. The American people do not know it, but those in charge do. It was even brought up when Captain Ingersoll went to London and discussed the matter on a so-called mission, which was not what he was sent for, but the question for discussion was the use of the United States Navy in conjunction and cooperation with the British Navy, not to protect America, but to protect the interests of the financiers of Great Britain and the United States in Asia.

I desire to bring that to the attention of the Senate, and to say that when time writes its final history, we will find disclosed more secret diplomacy and more secret understandings on the part of the present administration than has ever been known in the history of the United States, and the penalty of secret understandings will be the death of American boys.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. A few minutes ago the Senator and I were discussing the importance of building up our mechanized forces. May I read a letter, and then comment on it?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I shall be delighted if the Senator will do that.

Mr. WALSH. This is from No. 7 Church Street, Ayer, Mass. Ayer, Mass., is about 40 miles from the city of Boston. The letter is addressed to me and reads:

AYER, MASS., *August 23, 1940.*

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Is there anything you can do to help me enlist in the United States Army Tank Corps? Apparently there is no way at present for a man in New England to join the Tank Corps because there are no troops in this section and as the nearest Tank Corps is evidently located at Fort Benning, Ga. I cannot afford the expense of a trip way down there.

I have just gone through a long tiresome experience in trying to join up in Boston. I have journeyed back and forth between Ayer and Boston for the last 4 days but they are unwilling to provide my transportation to the nearest Tank Corps company. After filling out numerous forms, passing the physical examination O. K., and otherwise being eligible, I am just about where I started except for an education in red tape.

If you want to go through an enlightening experience you ought to investigate what a young man has to go through in order to volunteer nowadays. Common sense demands that the way should be made easy and not difficult for men to join if the administration is sincere about wanting men.

Have just finished a 6-month term with the C. C. C. and hold my honorable discharge as well as letters of recommendation from my supervisors, so it is not a question of eligibility. My serial No. CC1-165395.

The least that Uncle Sam could do would be to pay the necessary transportation expenses to the nearest point where he can join the branch of service he desires.

This is the first time I have ever asked your assistance but your interest and kindly help given to others in their problems has prompted me to appeal to you for a solution to my difficulty which, after all, is a simple matter if some of the red tape is dispensed with. You may also be interested in having this case brought to your attention so a way may be provided to help many other fellows who encounter similar setbacks when they attempt to answer their country's call in its defense program.

Yours respectfully,

STANLEY D. HARRIS.

Upon getting that letter I called up the Army headquarters and made inquiry in reference to this case, since I wanted to answer the letter and give the writer some information. I found that the young man, in order to join the Tank Corps, would have to pay his expenses from Myer, Mass., to Camp Benning in Georgia, which I assume would cost about $20 or $25. I found out that there is no need for enlistments in the Tank Corps; that the corps has all the enlisted personnel it can handle, but when a vacancy happens, by reason of someone dropping out, a man on the spot or near the Army station is taken in; so if the young man in question paid his own expenses and went to Georgia he could, in case a vacancy took place, be taken into the service.

It is clear from that letter and from the information I have received, that certainly so far as the Tank Corps Service is concerned, which we all agree is an important service, there are no facilities at the present time for receiving additional volunteer enlisted men, and that there is no way for a young man who is not in the vicinity of one of the few stations—there is one in Georgia, and I think there is one in Kentucky, and perhaps there are others in other parts of the country—to join the Tank Corps.

It seems to me that this and other accumulated evidence tends to show that there has not been a serious effort made to increase by new inducements, as to term of enlistment and wages the voluntary enlistments. In view of the discussion we have had concerning the Tank Corps, I thought the Senator should know of this letter. I was not able to learn an answer to my question, "Do you need any more men in the Tank Corps?" I was not able to get an answer other than that if the man was on the spot, and a vacancy occurred, he could be enlisted, but if he came from a part of the country other than where the unit was located he would have to pay his own expenses to get there.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his statement. I recall that a short time ago the Senator gave to the Senate information concerning quotas. Did not the able Senator from Massachusetts give the Senate the information that the quotas in the Army and Navy had been more than filled?

Mr. WALSH. The information I have—and I do not think it is disputed—is that up to August 1 the Army has never failed to fill, through voluntary enlistments, any quota it has fixed for volunteers to enter the Army. That is not only true of the Army, but the Navy has a long waiting list—I think the number of those on the list is 7,000—of applicants waiting to be assigned as soon as places are obtainable for them in the Navy.

The situation, as I understand, is that up to this very hour there has been no failure upon the part of the youth of America to respond to the requests for enlistment in the Army and Navy, as fixed by those services, and they have received the number of men who could be handled in a particular month. I do not think there is much question about that. Apparently one of the reasons given for this bill is apprehension that voluntary enlistments may not continue. The facts do not justify this conclusion.

Mr. McKELLAR. In peacetime.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; in peacetime. Are we not in peacetime now?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; we are in peacetime. But in all our wars we have had conscription.

Mr. WALSH. In some wars; that is true. Let me say that when the bill was originally proposed it was intended to be a trainee bill, and I do not think the Congress then expected or contemplated the turn the legislation has taken, to be a conscript bill for the purpose of inducting young men into the Regular Army. It is not a conscript bill to train young men physically and in military tactics in the popular acceptation of that term, in the manner in which it was used in the World War, when young men who were drafted were sent to a camp in their own locality and given training, and then put into units and sent across the Atlantic to France.

The bill is the first one I have known of in my knowledge of military affairs, that provides for conscripting men into the Regular Army, and as I have said before, I fear, because of the additional advantages that are given to those who are conscripted over those who volunteer, it will result in the breaking down entirely of the volunteer system in our country, and that we shall have a permanent and perpetual conscript system of inducting men into the Army and Navy, which I regret very much to see coming.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. Does the Senator know of a single country in the world, in its entire history, which once it adopted compulsory military training, went back to the volunteer system? I do not know of any.

Mr. WALSH. I do not know of any, but I also would add that I am not familiar enough with the situation in other countries to make that statement positively. I rather assume, however, that what the Senator suggested is so. In my opinion that is one of the evils of the pending bill.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the very able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that there are Members of the Senate present who served in the Spanish-American War, in which there were no conscripts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I think that is true.

Mr. LUNDEEN. There were no conscripts in that war?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LUNDEEN. And in the Civil War, if I remember rightly, there were only 13,000 conscripts that got to the battlefield, although there were slightly more than that number of conscripts. However, there were no conscripts in the Spanish-American War, in which the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] served, and in which I had the honor to serve as a private.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas served in that war in a very obscure and humble position.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The private soldiers are the mainstay of the Army.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the rest of the Army had done no more than the Senator from Texas did we would have been licked.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I cannot subscribe to that statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Minnesota made the statement that in the Civil War only 13,000 conscripts got to the battlefield. I do not know about the Union Army, but I wish to say to the Senator that the Confederate military policy was, I think, superior to that of the Union Army, because the Union Army adopted conscription in 1863, I believe, and provided many bounties, and had a terrible scandal, and there were draft riots in New York City. But the Confederate Congress first called for volunteers, and raised a large force. The Confederate Congress then drafted automatically into the service every man who was in the army. It continued all the volunteers as draftees. So, the Senator from Minnesota is in error when he says that only 13,000 conscripted men ever got to the battlefield, because the entire Confederate Army in the early years was composed of men who were automatically blanketed into the service, something after the manner in which, at the present time, persons are blanketed into the civil service. That is my recollection of the history of that period.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Substantially the same thing was true in the northern army—not that those who had volunteered were drafted into it, but in the northern army the men were drafted also in the same way they were in the southern army. The men were drafted in both armies, and men were also drafted in other wars in which our country has engaged.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Of course, when I spoke of 13,000 men being drafted in the Civil War I was thinking of the American Army, that is, the army which was fighting for our country. That was the only army of which I was thinking.

Mr. CONNALLY. I accept that statement, of course, but the men in the Confederate armies were drafted men, and they did some pretty good fighting.

Mr. LUNDEEN. We grant the courage of the Confederate soldier. He was a marvelous soldier and a very brave man. Nevertheless, the Confederate Army was not the army of the Nation.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. GIBSON. I am sorry the Senator from Massachusetts has left the Senate Chamber. In view of the fact that in our authorized Regular Army of 375,000 men, we have about 235,000 men, I wanted to ask him, if in the event it was found that we could not recruit the required number of men in a period of 2 months, he would be willing to back a peacetime conscription measure. What effect would failure to recruit the required number of men to fill the quota which the War Department has set have on the psychology of the people of the United States and on the psychology of the enemies of our country, of which we have many? It seems to me that such a failure would be a very dangerous thing for our country, and for that reason, and rightfully, the War Department has set a quota which it knows it can fill. I think that is the reason the War Department officials say they are able to fill their quota, but it will be noticed that the quota is a very small number per month; but if the quota provides for raising 140,000 men by December 1 or January 1, it is doubtful if the men could be obtained without a highly organized propaganda to put it over. I think that is what we are up against today.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I will say to the Senator on that point that if we pay a dollar a day to our men in the Army and assure them that they are only going to be used within the United States or its Territories or possessions of the United States, and even include the Western Hemisphere, we will have so many volunteers for our Army that we will not be able to take care of them all.

The quotas have been more than filled right along, and it is my belief that if the quotas are increased they will be more than filled. They have been filled up to date. In that statement I am supported by the statistics. If the quotas were somewhat increased or gradually increased, I believe the Army would still be able to fill our quotas.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. GIBSON. In the event that the quotas were not filled—and let us assume they were not—would the Senator then favor conscription or universal service for our boys, in order to fill up the number required by the Army, or does the Senator think we should go along with those few who will volunteer their lives for their country?

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION UNNECESSARY, UNCONSTITUTIONAL, AND FOREIGN

Mr. LUNDEEN. Let me say in answer to the Senator on that point that on the 31st of January 1940, over the signature of Secretary of War Woodring, I have a statement that there were at the call of the Government 1,015,957 men. That number consists of the Regular Army, the National Guard, the C. M. T. C., the Reserve, the Navy, and altogether the number is more than 1,000,000. We have recruited tens of thousands of men since that time, in fact I know we have, and enlarged our armed forces considerably. The Navy, which formerly had 180,000 men, including its Reserves, now has about 200,000 men. More than a million men have been obtained by voluntary enlistments, and all our military experts say that that force is sufficient to repel any possible invasion.

CONSCRIPTION FOR SERVICE OF EUROPEAN KINGS

What is a conscript army for? I fear that the present conscript army, as was our last conscript army, is for service beyond the ocean, to intervene in the quarrels of other nations, in their boundary disputes and real-estate title quarrels, and in the ambitions of kings, emperors, and empires across the sea. That is why we want conscription. In the last war, after we declared war and we were to send our men across the sea, volunteering in this country fell off. That is true. The records show it. I know what Senators and Representatives in Congress stated at that time. I do not wish to give the exact language, but these words were in the language used: "We will conscript them." They did conscript them, because the American young men did not want to go to Europe. They did not care to go over there. But there never has been a time in the history of this country when American manhood, standing on our own soil, would not come to the defense of the country and the flag more rapidly and in greater numbers than we could furnish arms for them. I think the able Senator will agree with me.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not think there is anyone more sincere in his views than is the able Senator from Minnesota. I know, because I have talked with him personally. I know that he feels very deeply on this subject. Still I should like to have his view as to how he would feel about filling the ranks of our Regular Army by conscription—if he chooses to call it that—in the event that a Regular Army such as the War Department says we need cannot be obtained by volunteers. In that event, would the Senator then favor conscription? That is the question which I tried to ask before, but I did not receive an answer.

EUROPEANS CANNOT INVADE AMERICA

Mr. LUNDEEN. That is a purely hypothetical question, and based upon supposition; but I shall be glad to answer it.

I believe in conscription for defense within the boundaries of the United States and its territories and possessions; but I believe, as Daniel Webster has said, that conscription for foreign service is unconstitutional. Yet we did that very thing in the World War, although it was unconstitutional. When war comes all rules, regulations, and constitutional provisions are shattered. There are no rules, regulations, or constitutions. There is nothing but war, and everything else is overboard. That is why we did those things.

I am sure every other Senator would join with the Senator from Vermont in his statement that if conscription were necessary for the defense of the country in repelling an invasion, suppressing an insurrection, or executing the law of the land, as the Constitution provides, if volunteers did not rise, we should not hesitate to conscript; nor would I hesitate to vote for conscription in that event. But we have not arrived at any such stage. We have more than 1,000,000 men now under the American flag, ready to serve it instantly at the touch of a button. Our experts say that that number is more than enough to repel any possible threat, especially when the nations of Europe are locked in a death struggle.

How are European nations to get over here? They are fighting to the death. There is only one supposition. In the event one side should win and take over all the power of the other side, it is supposed that immediately the victorious power would prepare a thunderbolt to hurl at us, when everyone knows that at the end of the war both sides will be so exhausted that they can hardly rise to their knees for a generation afterward. They are bleeding from every pore. They are wounded and stricken in their economy. They must set themselves in order.

Mr. GIBSON. The Senator and I are in full agreement on one point. I hope that never again will one of our boys be sent from this hemisphere to Europe. I think that is not within the purview of the bill. It seems to me the only difference between the Senator and myself is that I believe that conscription is necessary for our own defense, and the Senator does not think so. I think that is the only difference.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I accord to the Senator the same degree of sincerity which he grants to me. I appreciate his statement. But why not let the volunteer system, which has been so successful to date, go on? We do not drop successful systems. When we are succeeding we do not change our tactics and strategy. We move ahead as we have been moving, because we have been succeeding. Today we are succeeding because we are more than filling our quotas. The able chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. WALSH] stated a few moments ago that our quotas are more than filled. Why abandon that system when we have more than 1,000,000 men? I have put the figures in the RECORD twice, and I shall be glad to put them in again, to show where we stood on the 31st of January 1940. The number of men now under our flag for defense is still greater.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator has probably talked to dozens of fine young American boys, as I have—boys who deep down in their hearts feel that we shall get into the war and that they will be sent to Europe or Asia. For that reason they have not enlisted. Nor do they feel that they should be conscripted. They would defend this country just as eagerly as would any other soldiers, but they are becoming sick and tired of the idea of our boys being sent to some foreign country about every 25 years to protect American commerce or trade.

I do not know whether or not the Senator has had such experience in traveling over the country. I have talked with hundreds of boys. They are becoming tired of being pawns in Europe's battles. Their fathers before them played the same role, and their sons will do likewise if we get into this war and agree to go along to save the world.

INTERVENTIONISTS WOULD UNDERWRITE SECURITY OF BRITISH EMPIRE

Mr. LUNDEEN. I thank the able Senator. I wish it were only a matter of protecting American trade and commerce. However, I fear it is more than that. I fear that some of our interventionists believe it is our duty to protect the dear British Empire, that it is a pure type of democracy, and that it must not go down.

I know of the glories and greatness of the British Empire. We have all read our histories. My own good wife is of Scotch-English descent. She is a good American. I know that American citizens of English descent are good Americans. They are good citizens, just as are citizens whose ancestors came from other lands.

The British Empire has been a great and glorious empire, but it has been an aggressor empire. It has been a warlike empire and it maintains its power today with armies, navies, and aircraft, by fire and sword. It is an autocracy, not a democracy. It rules with a rod of iron, as does Germany, Italy, or any other such power. Let any Senator rise and tell me why I should die for any empire or any country on the earth except our own. The American Army is the only army in which I shall ever enlist. America is the only country in whose Army I should like to see my boy enlist. God forbid that there may be war; but if there should be, he would be in the American Army, as I was in 1898.

Why should we send our boys to Canada or to England? They are going over there and beginning to forge the chains which will gradually pull us in. Propaganda is being broadcast to the effect that we must save the British Empire, and that if it goes down civilization will go down.

CIVILIZATION WILL GO ON

Mr. President, I venture to prophesy that no matter how this war ends, civilization will go right along. Art, culture, science, learning, music, and all that is beautiful in life will go on. We are not so important in our day and age that we can snuff out the candle of liberty, science, beauty, and culture. We cannot do that in our time. The stream of nations will go down the great valleys of history. They may clash, and some of them may go down, and others may rise, but the glories of humanity will go on just the same.

No nation can claim to be spotless. None can claim that it is pure and undefiled in its conduct. None can claim that its treaties are inviolate and that it does not scatter the remnants of treaties whenever it sees fit to do so and whenever it thinks it is to its advantage. It will march and countermarch over the continents of the earth whenever it thinks it is to its advantage to do so.

ENGLISH PROPAGANDISTS SEEK TO INVOLVE UNITED STATES

I have never blamed the British for coming over here and seeking to involve us in war. I do not blame Sir George Paish for being over here. He is a good, patriotic Englishman. He is trying to do something for Great Britain. He comes into Senators' offices and tries to propagandize America into the war. So did Sir Gilbert Parker. So did Lord Northcliffe, who said that we are the most gullible people on earth next to the Chinese. If confirmation of that statement is desired, I can put it into the RECORD. Lord Northcliffe had charge of the expenditure of $165,000,000 of British money—or, rather, of American money which we loaned to the British—which was

used to propagandize us into the war. I do not blame Lord Northcliffe, Sir Gilbert Parker, and Sir George Paish. They are good, patriotic Englishmen. They are fighting for old Mother England. I do not blame them in the least. Those with whom I disagree are pro-British Americans, who want us to die for England and to spend our money for England.

I have met a great many American citizens of German origin. Perhaps some of them were pro-German, but I never heard one of them who had gall enough to ask us to lend money to Germany, or to die for Hitler and Germany. However, we are supposed to die for England on every continent on the face of the earth. I am in opposition to that policy, and I shall fight it alone, or with others, as best I can.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator forgot to mention Sir William Wiseman, who is now an official of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., whose directors are helping to pay for the advertisement to get America involved in the war. As the Senator knows, Sir William Wiseman was in charge of the British secret service in the United States during the World War.

The Senator also forgot to mention Noel Coward, who is doing very active propaganda work in the United States at the present time. He is not registered. Many more could be mentioned.

THE AMERICANISM OF ANDREW JACKSON

Mr. LUNDEEN. I will say to the Senator that if Andrew Jackson were alive today some of the editors and full-page artists who are publishing advertisements calling for aid to Great Britain at the expense of the United States might find themselves on the scaffold; Andrew Jackson would hang them. He once threatened to hang one of the greatest Americans because he hinted at secession. We need more firm measures against such men who come over here. They are good patriotic Englishmen. They are for the British Empire, of course, and I honor them as citizens of another country; but I do not honor their activities here, and I do not want those who work with them to seek to involve America in war in behalf of another nation.

Mr. President, sometime ago I began to talk about the air force, and I wish to revert to that subject, because it is so important to the defenses of America.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks two articles by Charles T. Lucey, entitled "Separate Air Force Aim of Army Officers"; and another article by Mr. Lucey entitled "Admirals and Generals Block Separate Air Unit"; also articles by Maj. Al Williams, entitled "Answer to Admirals"; and several other important articles by this famous aviation authority.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPARATE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AIM OF ARMY OFFICERS

(By Charles T. Lucey)

If war comes to America, in the opinion of many Army Air Corps officers, it will bring the establishment of a separate Cabinet department of military aviation—coequal with the Army and Navy.

These officers say that just as time has underwritten Gen. Billy Mitchell's claims concerning the importance of air strength, so will it justify his demand for a great air force independent of the War and Navy Departments.

They point to the vast air expansion now under way, and to the steady increase in the relative importance of the air arm to the whole defense organization, and comment that the tail cannot go on wagging the dog forever.

OFF THE RECORD

Air Corps officers don't say these things for the record.

They have careers to consider. They recall how the late General Mitchell was court martialed when he courageously, if in defiance of traditions of military discipline, spoke his mind on the importance of the air service and criticized the influences checking it.

The Army and Navy must have discipline, and the opposition of the admirals and generals to the idea of a separate air force is well known today. Army Air Corps men who believe in a separate air arm, whose lives are bound up with flying and who are handling the great air-expansion program, say nothing out loud about an organization that many of them consider vital.

Privately many of them contend that a separate military aviation branch, headed by a new member of the Cabinet, is inevitable.

WAR WOULD HASTEN MOVE

If we remain at peace, say advocates of an independent air force, it may be years before public understanding of the importance of aviation creates a positive demand for a separate establishment—a demand they believe Congress would meet. But if war comes, they hold, need for a centralized air force would be demonstrated early.

If that reorganization came now, some officers say privately, it would save the grief and lost motion of a hurried wartime overhauling.

The United States is almost alone among leading nations in dividing its air force between Army and Navy. Germany, England, Italy, and France have had separate air departments for years.

Numerous bills providing for a separate air force have been introduced in Congress since the World War, but got nowhere.

WOULDN'T STRIP THEM

Advocates of a separate air force do not contend that the Army and Navy should be wholly without airplanes under their own control. They agree that a certain number of planes, based aboard carriers and warships, should be directly under the Navy. They agree likewise that the Army should have its immediate air force for reconnaissance and point action with ground troops.

But, aside from these units, they urge a great department of aviation, containing perhaps 90 percent of all the Nation's fighting planes. This would be a flexible force which could move wherever the mission might be most important—now with the Army, again with the Navy, at another time on its own.

This follows the German and British patterns.

In the minds of many advocates of a separate air force, the three divisions—Army, Navy, Air—should all be under a defense department which would be the high command, directing and coordinating.

WOULD END DUPLICATION

A separate air force, its advocates contend, would eliminate much duplication between Army and Navy, and would make possible important economies in plane procurement.

President Roosevelt opposes a separate air force. In his most recent fireside speech, on May 26, he said:

"One additional word about aircraft. Recent wars, including the current war in Europe, have demonstrated beyond doubt that fighting efficiency depends on unity of control.

"In sea operations the airplane is just as much an integral part of unity of operations as are the submarine, the destroyer, and the battleship, and in land warfare the airplane is just as much a part of military operations as are the Tank Corps, the engineers, the artillery, or the infantry itself. Therefore, the air forces should be part of the Army and Navy."

EXPLICIT IN OPPOSITION

The admirals are explicit in their opposition to a separate department of aviation, and they cite many reasons why they believe it is necessary for the Navy to have its own air fleet, operated by men who were trained with and who live with the fleet. Naval air action, they say, has special problems which land fliers or men from a separate aviation force would have difficulty in meeting.

The Army doesn't even wish to discuss its opposition. The attitude of most officers outside the Air Corps is that the high command has decided against the separate air force and that it would be a breach of discipline for an Army man to say anything in disagreement.

They suggest that many Air Corps men want the separate air force because it might get them some personal preferments.

And yet, establishment of the General Headquarters air force in 1934 had an objective much like that sought by those urging an independent air department.

ANNOUNCEMENT CITED

When the General Headquarters air force was established, an announcement said:

"Among the decisions reached was a definite conclusion to build up in the Air Corps a homogeneous air unit known as General Headquarters air force, comprising all military elements of aviation and adequate to meet effectively the requirement of all military and land operations.

"These operations may be in conjunction with land forces, with naval forces, or at times on distinctly air missions. This unit will supply an air force capable of rapid concentration for the defense of any of our frontiers."

Opponents of a separate air department say this General Headquarters force already provides a flexible striking power which can carry the battle anywhere. Advocates insist that we should go all the way and make the air force independent. They believe the General Headquarters force is the first step in that direction.

ADMIRALS AND GENERALS BLOCK SEPARATE AIR UNIT

(By Charles T. Lucey)

Advocates of a separate Cabinet department of military aviation, coequal with the Army and Navy, say the tremendous growth of our land and naval air forces dictates the liberation of these forces from the older Military Establishments.

For 20 years there has been agitation for an independent department of aviation. Numerous Government commissions have studied

the subject. But always the opposition of the admirals and generals prevailed.

Those were the years, however, when air power in the proportions of 1940 was little imagined. Our air force was a puny thing. But today, advocates of a separate department contend, aviation sets the pace for all warfare and should not be timed to the beat of an older, less mobile type of fighting.

ONE PLANE IN 1909

In 1909 the Army had one military plane.

In 1915 it had one small squadron of planes.

In 1918 there were close to 150,000 men in the Army air force. Thousands of planes were being built when the World War ended, and 400 had been in the fighting over the lines in France.

After the war the Army air force was held to about 1,000 planes and 25,000 men.

In 1939 came the first great expansion since the World War. Army Air Corps manpower advanced from 20,000 to 45,000, and plane strength from 200 to 5,500.

HITLER CALLS TURN

Hitler called the turn, and the purse strings were loosened again. Funds for 2,400 additional planes were provided, and then, for the present fiscal year Congress went "all out" and voted the Army Air Corps 95,000 men and 16,000 planes. This is more men than were in the whole Army in 1916.

If war comes to this country and an army of 2,000,000 men is raised, some Air Corps men estimate that 750,000 might be connected in one way or another with the air force.

It is illogical, they contend, for a fighting unit of such size and might—a unit with an area of influence over an enemy far beyond that of the older services—to be subordinate to these services.

Advocates of a separate air force insist that the Air Corps, in its character and mission, is as different from both the Army and Navy as these establishments are from each other.

CHEER MITCHELL VIEW

Air Corps men still cheer what the late Gen. Billy Mitchell wrote years ago:

"As important as anything else is the placing of one man in charge of aviation who can be held directly responsible for the aeronautical development of the whole country, and next, an air representative on councils of national defense who has equal power with representatives of Army and Navy.

"Not only does this give proper weight to aeronautics, both in peace and war, but the Army and Navy have always and will always deadlock on certain issues where they have equal representation. The introduction of a third service would tend to break this.

"Eventually all military power of the Government should be concentrated in a single department which would have control over all national defense, no matter whether it be on land, on sea or in the air. In this way overhead might be cut down, definite and complete missions assigned to air, land, and water forces, and a thorough understanding of the Nation's needs would result."

FEAR COURT MARTIAL

Many Army officers would have taken up for the air service the broadsword laid down by General Mitchell—but, well they know how his courage drew a court martial.

Advocates of a separate air department say that military aviation, now come of age, has no forceful official spokesman in a country which has heard the stories of the admirals and generals for decades. The head of the Army Air Corps is said to have little direct contact with Secretary of War Stimson who, of course, first got acquainted with the Army when air power had virtually no recognition.

Air Corps men concede that their division has fared well under Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff. But President Roosevelt, they point out, always has been rated a Navy man—he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy in the World War.

Everywhere Mr. Roosevelt goes he is accompanied by a military aide and a naval aide, but no representative of aviation—a detail not in itself important, but symbolic.

NEEDS SPOKESMAN

Many Air Corps men believe military aviation cannot get the recognition it needs from the Nation until it has the spokesman it lacks today.

They believe the development of aviation will not be commensurate with its military importance until there is a separate air department. They contend that General Mitchell was right in demanding that this department have its own budget, its own quartermaster and supply organization, its own procurement system and its own promotion list.

They agree that the Army and Navy should have their own limited air forces, but argue that the Nation's real fighting air force should be independent of these—able to support them or to act on its own as the character of the mission dictates.

ANSWER TO ADMIRAL

(By Al Williams)

Admiral J. H. Towers, Chief of the Naval Aeronautics Bureau, explains his opposition to reorganizing our national defense system into three independent but coordinating forces—Army, Navy, and Air.

Says the Admiral: "The naval aviator is part of the team. If he doesn't practice with the team he can't do his share; he doesn't know the signals nor the plays."

Admiral Towers is thinking of only one team—the Navy team. Americans are thinking of the Navy as only one of the three teams that must be coordinated in the defense of the entire Nation.

I wish someone would explain where and how the German air force that chased the British Fleet out of the Skagerrak, and almost out of the North Sea, learned all it had to know about operating against a fleet, since it didn't have a navy of its own to practice with. What signals did this Nazi air team lack when it came to making a complete mess out of the British seapower attempt to cut the German lines of communication in the Skagerrak? None, as far as the score shows.

Says the Admiral: "Airplanes are as much a part of the Navy today as its guns."

What guns? The big guns of the British Fleet have been cool since this war began, even while air power was hammering the daylights out of them. The 18 obsolete warships that were stripped of big guns, loaded with dozens of antiaircraft guns, and stationed off the coasts of England are far more effective against German air power.

Says the admiral: "Aviation is the forward pass of warfare."

Not by a long shot. It is, in fact, the entire backfield that has done all the scoring to date.

Says the admiral: "The flying man working with the fleet must know more than how to fly, because flying is only one part of the naval aviator's training."

There's nothing new about that, since flying is only a part of a military aviator's training. But there is a grim angle in the admiral's comment in that while he recommends flying as part of the naval aviator's training, it is one part of the Navy commanding officers' training that has been sadly neglected or cleverly avoided. It is nonexistent in the Navy high command.

Like all admirals, Admiral Towers stresses the alleged inability of any pilot except a naval aviator to distinguish one type of vessel from another or a friendly warship from an enemy. That's nonsense. Is a naval aviator's sight any better than an Army pilot's? And with brains enough to pass mental tests for entrance into either service, is it an impossible job for an ordinary alert airman to learn silhouttes or to distinguish one warship from another?

In fact, there is less chance of mistaking warship identity from the air than there is from the deck of another warship, as indicated by naval records to date. In the Battle of Jutland the British fired on their own ships and tried to ram one of their own submarines.

In our own naval war games naval aviators have repeatedly mistaken warship identities. Does Admiral Towers know that British warships have persistently fired on British planes all during this war? Does he know that two British Royal Air Force fighters pounced on and shot down a British bomber last June?

This business of flying seaplanes or flying over the sea is a much overadvertised myth. In two or three hours I trained some of the United States Army Air Corps officers who had never flown seaplanes to make their historic flight around the world.

Says the admiral: "If a separate air force came out to the scene of a naval engagement, and assuming they could tell our forces from the enemy—which I doubt—the bombs should be dropped on that part of the enemy's force which is most important to put out of commission."

That is an enlightening confession from an admiral—namely, that air bombs could put any warship out of commission.

According to the admirals it appears that explosives lose their destructive efficiency when dropped from aloft in the form of a bomb, but remain tremendously efficient as long as they are fired from a big gun. Then, too, is there any hope of a naval engagement in which we are likely to be involved where the opposing forces would not be quickly and completely identified if the Navy were on the job before firing began?

And even if this should happen, does Admiral Towers think airmen would be dispatched on a mission without orders as to what portion of the fleet to bomb or on what targets to concentrate?

UNIFIED AIR FORCE

(By Maj. Al Williams)

British troops in Norway said, "For God's sake, tell them to give us planes and anti-air guns." The same plea was heard during the Battle of France: "Give us planes, and we must have anti-air guns."

And now here's what Maj. Gen. William Haskell, in charge of the New York National Guard, says in his letter to the President: "Give us guns; you can't stick out your tongue at a tank. * * * In my command we have not received a single anti-tank gun. * * * We have two tanks in the State of New York * * * no antiaircraft 37-millimeter guns for our antiaircraft regiment (for use against dive bombers) * * * not a single .50-caliber machine gun. * * *"

Major General Haskell could also have told the President that in the Army's Louisiana maneuvers no dive bombers were available, and single-seater fighting planes were used as substitutes. And with a quarter-million Regular Army, National Guard and Reserve soldiers in the field right now there still are no dive bombers available, and only one mechanized Army unit is ready for field service.

It should be made plain to the people that Germany's dominance in the European war to date is not solely attributable to her powerful air force, nor to her mechanized or motorized land forces, nor to her U-boats. No one of these arms could have waded through Poland, Holland, Belgium, and France. Alone or acting independently, any one of them would have been wiped out or short circuited. Germany's successes may be traced to the clock-like coordination between all her services.

If the German tank and motorized units had broken the time-table schedule and burst into action without waiting for the dive bombers to clear the way and disrupt enemy back areas, the tanks and motorized elements would have been smashed and thrown back. If the air force had dashed into action ahead of schedule and developed a huge time gap between its plunge and the advance of land forces, the air-force destruction would have been wasted, and the defenses would have consolidated to offset the tardy land attack.

Coordination can be preached in the military schoolrooms, but it can be learned only by practice in the field or on the sea. The Germans, from the beginning, made their land, sea, and air forces independent of each other as far as command was concerned. Each had its own general staff, its own responsible command, and its own unified control. Without that unification accomplished coordination with other arms would have been impossible.

Navy opponents of a separate air force say that unless the fleet commander has command of both sea and air units comprising a fleet, victory is impossible. Now let's turn that claim around and ask:

"What about victory in the air? Is it possible to achieve dominance of the air over an entire continent without unified control in the hands of the chief of air operations?"

SEPARATE AIR FORCE HELD NEEDED FOR F. D.'S PLAN

(By Maj. Al Williams)

The President's message to Congress visualizing 50,000 airplanes as American airpower means organization of a separate air force, comparable in autonomy and administrative structure, to the existing Army and Navy Departments—whether he knows it or not.

It means overhauling an antiquated national-defense system into three departments—Army, Navy, and Air. Immediate attack from Europe is in the President's mind alone.

There's time to build America's air power, but only on a sound foundation and not by erecting the roof first and working down. The 50,000 planes recommended by the President is as revolutionary and radical an upset of Army and Navy defense tradition in this country as the defeat of British sea power by German air power in Norway and domination of land operations by air power in Poland and the Low Countries.

But whether the President or Congress will be able to unseat the vested interests of existing national defense to clear a way for air power is open to serious question. Nevertheless, such way should be cleared before another penny is spent. Thousands more planes under the existing system will but intensify ineffectiveness of the present air services plan and completely nullify the desired objective of real American air power.

LACK AERIAL TACTICS

We have no aerial tactics for 50,000 planes, or adequate air research results to justify selection of types of planes, no adequate training facilities for pilot personnel in such proportions. Such air power is nothing more or less than an air army, and must be based on adequate organization.

The British were forced to consolidate army and navy air services in the last war to achieve the requisite air power, and they are deficient in air power today because they failed to adhere to this consolidation. The organization of a separate, unified, and autonomous air force was the first provision of the Germans to insure unhampered development of German air power.

FANTASTIC FOLLY

It is fantastic folly and wishful hoping to spend any more money in quest of American air power without covering this angle. The order of air power is organization, research, pilot training, and mass production of fighting planes.

In 1938 the Germans had 7,500 research scientists on a full-time intensive schedule to determine types of plane. England had about 400, France 175, and the United States about 250. As a result the Germans started this war by freezing types already selected, and holding seven refined types of fighters and bombers, completely tested and approved, in reserve. The British lately were forced to withdraw types from combat service, thereby disrupting production. France likewise.

The Germans today are producing about 3,300 planes per month, England about 900, and the French about 200. Careful organization of a separate unhampered air force, legally enabled to work out the destiny of air power, is the secret of German air superiority. Our Army and Navy will resist the President and Congress in the formation of a unified air force if the President and Congress propose such. Our full air strength today cannot muster 100 fighters capable of combating the 350-miles-per-hour and better of the Germans or the British. American bombers in service total perhaps 500 that are equal to European performance.

HAS RIGHT IDEA

Air power today must be set up to act in coordination with or independent of Army and Navy. Spotting and scouting planes with land and sea forces are not air power.

First things first. And whether he knows it or not, the President has set off a bombshell that may blast loose a foundation for real American air power.

TEAMWORK?

(By Maj. Al Williams, Scripps-Howard aviation editor)

Admiral J. H. Towers, Chief of the Naval Bureau of Aeronautics, explains his opposition to reorganizing our national defense system into three independent but coordinating forces—Army, Navy, and air. Says the admiral: "The naval aviator is part of the team. If he doesn't practice with the team he can't do his share, he doesn't know the signals nor the plays."

Towers is thinking of only one team—the Navy team. Americans are thinking of the Navy as only one of the three teams that must be coordinated in the defense of the entire Nation.

I wish someone would explain to me where and how the German air force that chased the British Fleet out of the Skaggerak, and almost out of the North Sea, learned all it had to know about operating against a fleet, since it didn't have a navy of its own to practice with. What signals did this same German air team lack when it came to making a complete mess out of British sea power's attempt to cut the German lines of communication in the Skaggerak? None, as far as the score shows.

WHAT GUNS?

Says the admiral: "Airplanes are as much a part of the Navy today as its guns." What guns? The big guns of the British Fleet have been cool since this war began, even while air power was hammering the daylights out of them. The 18 obsolete warships that were stripped of big guns, loaded with dozens of antiaircraft guns, and stationed off the coasts of England, are far more effective against German air power than any British battleship.

Continuing the football analogy, the admiral says: "Aviation is the forward pass of warfare." Not by a long shot. It is, in fact, the entire backfield that has done all the scoring to date.

The admiral says: "The flying man working with the fleet must know more than how to fly, because flying is only one part of the naval aviator's training." There's nothing new about that since flying is only a part of a military aviator's training. But there is a grim angle in the admiral's comment, in that while he recommends flying as part of the naval aviator's training, it is one part of the commanding officer's training in the Navy that has been sadly neglected or cleverly avoided. In short, it is virtually nonexistent in the Navy high command.

THE RECORD

Like all admirals, Towers stresses the inability of any pilot except a naval aviator to distinguish one type of vessel from another, or a friendly warship from an enemy. That's nonsense. Is a naval aviator's sight any better than an Army pilot's? And with brains enough to pass mental tests for entrance into either service, is it an impossible job for an ordinarily alert airman to learn silhouettes or to distinguish one warship from another? In fact, there is less chance of mistaking warship identity from the air than there is from the deck of another warship, as indicated by naval records to date. In the Battle of Jutland, the Brtish fired on their own ships and tried to ram one of their own submarines.

In our own naval war games naval aviators have repeatedly mistaken warship identities. Does Towers know that Britain warships have persistently fired on British planes all during this war? Does Towers know that two British Royal Air Force fighters pounced on and shot down a British bomber last June?

This business of flying seaplanes or flying over the sea is a much over-advertised myth. In 2 or 3 hours I trained some of the United States Army Corps officers, who had never flown seaplanes, to make their historic flight around the world.

A CONFESSION

Says the admiral: "If a separate air force came out to the scene of a naval engagement, and assuming they could tell our forces from the enemy—which I doubt—the bombs should be dropped on that part of the enemy's force which is most important to put out of commission." That is an enlightening confession from an admiral, namely, that an air bomb could put any warship out of commission.

According to the admirals, it appears that explosives lose their destructive efficiency when carried aloft in the form of a bomb, but remain tremendously efficient as long as they are fired from a big gun. Then, too, is there any hope of a naval engagement in which we are likely to be involved where the opposing forces would not be quickly and completely identified if the Navy were on the job before firing began? And even if this should happen, does Towers thing airmen would be dispatched on a mission without orders as to what portion of the fleet to bomb, or on what targets to concentrate?

BOSSING THE AIR

(By Maj. Al Williams)

Admiral J. H. Towers, Chief of Naval Aeronautics in presenting his reasons for opposing formation of a separate air force and a three-department system of national defense of Army, Navy, and Air, says: "I don't see how a separate air force man, knowing nothing about naval warfare, could have any means of deciding which vessels to bomb. He would probably bomb the big ships—the best targets, but the most resistant to bombing attack."

Why should airmen have to know so much about naval warfare, especially since it has changed completely within the last 20 years, and since admirals are not required to know much about aviation in order to obtain command of great aviation units?

If the admirals knew aviation and were actually pilots—I just don't mean wearing wings and flying training planes and getting the 4 hours required by law per month for flight pay—there would never have been the scandalous records of mis-used naval air forces, as disclosed in our naval war games. Likewise, many an air operation would never have been launched in dangerous flying weather, as disclosed by the records of some of our war games at sea.

IS THAT SO?

Likewise, we would not have one admiral after another in charge of naval air operations at sea who had never flown his own fighting ship on or off the deck of a carrier. Likewise, we would not have the log books of so many admirals assigned to flight commands containing just sufficient hours each month to qualify under the specifications for flight pay.

Says the admiral: "It might be much more important to bomb smaller ships trying to get around an end for a torpedo attack to drive our big ships under the enemy's guns. But a separate air force man wouldn't know that."

Assuming that a separate air force man would be an American—about which point the admiral appears to be in doubt—why couldn't a separate air force man execute orders to alter or change the objective of his attack in an action at sea, just as infantry units do in a land battle, or divisions of a fleet do in a naval battle?

BRITISH FOOLED

If Admiral Towers means that he is going to outline a naval air action against a sea fleet before the enemy is sighted and force his air command to adhere to those preconceived operation orders to the end of the battle, then the Navy needs to do some reading up on what has happened in the North Sea in this war.

That's just what licked the British Fleet, namely, British admirals believing that the German air force had not been trained with a fleet and therefore would not know how to operate against sea power, only to find out that the German pilots were halfway intelligent and able to dominate every zone of combat which heretofore had been deemed within the exclusive control of sea power.

ONLY TWO KNEW

Within the past 40 years there have been only two admirals who appear to understand that the Navy is only one arm of our national defense, and likewise that the true objective of our national defense is to protect the safety of the entire Nation, not to promote the prestige of individual arms. One was the brilliant Admiral William S. Sims and the other the late Admiral William A. Moffett.

Admiral Sims fought the entire Navy of his age in order to perfect its gunfire-control system, and was forced to go directly to President Theodore Roosevelt in order to effect this change toward efficiency.

Sims was a man of vision, and is accredited with stating publicly years ago: "In another war the best thing to do with our battleships would be to send them as far as possible up the Mississippi River out of harm's way and send our submarines and aircraft to do our fighting."

ONE COMMAND!

(By Maj. Al Williams)

This is the last of three articles answering the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Aeronautics, Admiral J. H. Towers, in his attempt to justify his opposition to the modernization of the American naval-defense system by effecting a three-department plan of Army, Navy, and Air.

Says the admiral: "Having an independent department of aviation isn't as important as having unity of command over all the types of fighting forces in an immediate area of combat operations."

Admiral Towers, of course, is stressing the old plea urged by every admiral and every general for all the manpower and all the forces he can possibly get under his command. Americans, however, are thinking in terms of unifying the command of all our national-defense arms—land, air, and sea.

Forgetting the Navy—for one permissible moment—and applying Admiral Towers' conception of unified command to all our defense arms, we encounter a very interesting angle. In short, that's just what the Germans did: Placing command over all fighting forces, land, sea, and air, in any combat zone under a single commander.

ONE COMMAND

When they planned the Norwegian operations, they logically determined that the air force would play an important part. Therefore, they placed General Milch, an air-force general, in complete and supreme command of this campaign. Obviously, ground troops and naval forces were also required. The former to land and take possession of land positions, and the latter to navigate supplies and reinforcements on the sea through the Skaggerak. All the army, navy, and air force were directly under Milch's command.

When the war shifted to the Continent—Holland, Belgium, and France—it was obvious that land-force operations would predominate. In this case an army general was placed in supreme command of the land and air forces and whatever naval forces were required in coastal operations.

But such a system logically necessitates the set-up of a three-departmental, coequal plan for each campaign in ratios proportionate to the necessities and objectives of that campaign. This is real unity of command for all the forces of a nation.

WORK COORDINATED

All the German fighting forces of army, navy, and air and their immediate commanders, are under the control of a supreme or high command, composed of three members from each arm and three members from the Government. This supreme command coordinates all the fighting forces.

But, applying Admiral Towers' conception of unified command for the Navy logically involves applying it to the three independent arms of our national defense. The independence is to enable each arm to achieve its fullest development without interference from the others. But when it comes to war and acting in furtherance of the national purpose, then all three arms are under the control of a supreme command.

The rest of what Admiral Towers has to say is rather confused—and I say this charitably—because the cooperation now existing between our Army and Navy is a cat-and-dog affair, where the squabbling is done behind closed doors and the purring is done in public.

COMPETITION?

Engines of similar power and type, ordered by the Army and the Navy, are purchased under different specifications, requiring two sets of inspectors, different kinds of nuts and bolts, and all kinds of variances in accessories. I should like to hear what Admiral Towers has to say about the long list of such petty but religiously enforced variances submitted to the Government recently in an effort to eliminate the waste of time and money, when the same manufacturer sells the same item to both services.

If this is the healthy competition the admiral is thinking of, then it had better be ended in the interests of getting some air-defense machinery for the United States. Service partisanship and service pride is one thing, but real efficiency in matters affecting the safety of the entire Nation is distinctly another thing—and more important.

Likewise, what about the present restrictive Navy order preventing the Army flying fortresses, with flight ranges of about 3,000 miles, from flying more than 100 miles over the open sea without permission from the Navy? Our national safety may some day depend upon the capacity of all our air force, Army and Navy, and even converted transports, flying out to sea to attack an ocean invasion. If that time comes, will the existing 15-day delay in securing said permission for Army planes to fly more than 100 miles at sea still hold?

The entire scheme of modern warfare has changed, but our Navy can be depended upon to resist change just as the British Navy resisted.

REAL AIR POWER FOR THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Radio Address by Maj. Al Williams, May 29, 1940)

Ladies and gentlemen of America, of all ages, good evening. I have been invited to speak to you on the subject of air power and the national defense of the United States. Let us devote a moment to calm, reasoned thinking—worthy of Americans who believe in themselves, in the destiny of this Nation, and in our determination to preserve this Nation free from the hysteria and conflagrations which today are devastating many portions of the world beyond our boundaries. Let us refrain, therefore, from following the all-too-prevalent practice of making the gestures for putting out a fire by pouring gasoline on the flames. With wide-open eyes and cool minds, let us survey the situation.

MEDDLED IN INTERNATIONAL POWER POLITICS

I am speaking to you as an ordinary American citizen who wants nothing from his Government except peace, stability, and a sense of security—and who is deeply worried because for 5 years this administration has persistently meddled in international power politics and, at the same time, failed to provide an adequate national-defense system for the country.

And, above all, I am speaking tonight because I believe that it is the sheerest folly to paint a vision of adequate defense until we have, as the first essential, a separate and independent air force which can plan, develop, and operate real American air power without interference and restraint from the Army and Navy.

This recital is not for the purpose of recrimination, but is directly in line with the old-fashioned American practice of looking backward to see where we have been—in order to appreciate where we are—and where we are going.

KNIGHT-ERRANT OF THE HUMAN RACE

This country is not the knight-errant of the human race. The blood of America belongs to America—to no man or group of men—and it must not be shed or mortgaged again in foreign wars nor on foreign battlefields. That blood is for the defense of America—to the last drop. Defense of America—her safety, the peace of her people, and the ideals for which she stands—can never sanely be construed as waging a war on the battle fronts of Europe nor in Asia's zone of influence. As a knight-errant of the human race, some men would have the United States pose before the world, while the knight's armor, his sword, and his shield are made of tin and of obsolescent design.

According to military experts, about 18 months of emergency effort would be required to equip and train an American Army competent in size and power to rate consideration as a first-class fighting force. Woefully deficient in antiaircraft guns of all calibers, strategic reserves, mechanized and motorized equipment, and lacking even the cloth to make uniforms for an army—that, fellow Americans, is the status of the battle efficiency of the United States Army.

BATTLESHIPS ARE NOT FIT TO MEET NEW WEAPON OF AIR POWER

The Secretary of the Navy, himself, has admitted that our battleships are not fit to meet this new weapon of air power. After 20 years to watch the development of foreign air power—as it worked to a position of dominance in Europe's skies—the Navy now reports to us, in this crisis, that it must remodel. No; to be safe, the Navy wants to scrap all our present battleships and build a new fleet.

General Arnold, of the United States Army Air Corps, says our planes are obsolete. I am speaking primarily as an airman, and it has been my privilege to study intimately the air power of the several European nations now at war. Over a period of years I have acquired first-hand knowledge of their principles, organization, administration, policy, and air tactics. I have flown some of the foreign fighting planes whose performances are tossing war-college textbooks and the tactics of sea power and land power into the scrap heap. And in confirmation of General Arnold's appraisal, I say that there is not one squadron of American Army or Navy planes capable of meeting the performances of the British Spitfires or the German Messerschmitts and Heinkels. In the face of this disgraceful accounting our politicians are following the death march of the British admirals in preventing the full development of real American air power by opposing the creation of a unified, separate air force. Our aircraft production has been muddled through this administration's persistent dumping of everything to the Allies.

THROTTLING THE DEVELOPMENT OF BRITISH AIR POWER

The British people first lost control of the administrators of their Government, and they in turn lost control of the army and navy blocs. These naval and military blocs dominated England's rearmament period—from 1936 to the outbreak of this war—went overboard in buying battleships and the wrong kind of war tools, and in throttling the development of British air power. The British Navy could only see the necessity for defending the air over the water around England. The British Army could only visualize the defense of the air over England. Edward, Prince of Wales, upon ascending to the throne, told England that her first line of defense was no longer the British Navy but the Royal Air Force.

We are confronted by coiners of dangerous international phrases, coined in subversion of the safety and peace of America.

Congress alone can save us, and we alone—we ordinary Americans—can save Congress by telling these representatives of ours that we are determined to mend and put our own house in order; that we are demanding the formulation of a coordinated national-defense system—competently organized, administered, and adequately equipped to protect this country—and above all, a unified air force, free from Army and Navy domination.

THE GALLANT SPIRIT OF GENERAL BILLY MITCHELL

The complete answer, as I see it, is (and I can almost feel the gallant spirit of General Billy Mitchell at my shoulder as I say these words): The United States must have a separate air force under a three-way Department of National Defense—Army, Navy, and Air. The development of true American air power must no longer be left in the jealous hands of the land Army and the sea Navy and politicians. To do so is to court the present plight of England, and eventual disaster. Remember these words—because words of similar import were spoken by the airmen of England time and again to the politicians of England, but these politicians all wanted more billions for warships. They got the billions and England got the warships—instead of the air power she needs today to defend herself against the air power invader. Of course, the President tells you we need more warships—and some air power dominated by warship people. The President's information came to him second-hand. My information as to what air power could and would do was acquired first-hand—and much of it from the cockpits of foreign war planes. And that cockpit experience was shared by none of his advisors.

NEW WINGED WAR MACHINERY

Of course, the President cannot see the new winged war machinery if he depends upon advisers who are blinded with warships, and blinded as were Prime Ministers Baldwin, Chamberlain, and Churchill. Loose-thinking men tell you of the wartime weaknesses in a democracy, compared to the dictatorships. That is falsehood. The weakness of England in air power at this moment was not created in wartime. It was created in peacetime by political lobbies refusing to permit the Nation to prepare for the future. Democracy is not on trial—it is these weak leaders of democracy who are on trial. What has the form of government got to do with selecting the right or the wrong kind of war tools? Absolutely nothing—and the excuse is a red herring to cover political falsehood.

The American first line of national or hemispheric defense is to be found in American air power—not in warships, and not in the two tiny air services which act as messenger boys for the Army and Navy. Such messenger boys, under competent management abroad, have developed the capacity of destroying their one-time masters. We must now—and God knows the reason is clear—merge our two air services into a separate department and permit the airmen of America to work out the destiny of real power in the air for the protection of this country.

FAILURE OF BRITISH SEA POWER

The failure of British sea power—the greatest sea power in the world—to cut the line of German sea communications through the Skagerrak because of German air power was the death knell of sea power as any nation's first line of defense. This, with the complete dominance of air power over the present battle fronts of Europe, gives conclusive evidence that no army on the land and no fleet on the sea can move with safety within the range of air power unless control of the air over the combat zone is first established. These factual lessons must be incorporated immediately in our own national defense, and this is no time for half measures nor compromise.

A DEPARTMENTAL SYSTEM OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR

We must have a departmental system of national defense—Army, Navy, and air—the civilian leaders of each to be members of the President's Cabinet. We need a supreme council of defense, headed by the Executive, with members of this council drawn from the Senate and from the House of Representatives. Under such a system the United States would revert to the American way of doing business, with the President and Congress jointly formulating the foreign policy—peace or war—the supreme council of defense interpreting that policy, and the joint board of secretaries of the Army, Navy, and air applying that interpretation. These things can and must be done—now.

Under the system of a separate air force, the main striking power of America in the air will be coordinated under a single command.

Air power dominates the European war and spells the difference between victory and defeat. None but the politically blind could fail to see this. None but the blind could refuse to recognize that air power already has relegated land and sea power to secondary positions in this war. None but those who will not see could refuse the prime lesson of this war; the need for air power, built and administered as an independent arm of national defense, comparable to the Army and Navy.

AIRPLANES TO TOSS INTO THIS WAR

The President knows all this—but I fear that the President wants airplanes in great numbers right now—to toss into this war. If he wants thousands of planes as soon as he can get them—and without waiting to build an air force first—then production of planes for Europe is his goal—not the defense of America.

A congressional committee should be formed immediately by Congress to carry out the constitutional responsibilities of formulating a modernized national-defense policy by providing a three-way plan for Army, Navy, and air departments.

We have time to do this, and now is the time.

OCEANS ARE STILL VITAL FACTORS

Oceans and extended lines of communication are still vital factors in modern warfare. President Roosevelt's panicky flight schedule for the air invasion of America is ridiculous, worthy of Hollywood and certainly not of the White House. Four hours from Greenland to Newfoundland, 5 hours to Nova Scotia, and then 6 hours to New England. As an air line commercial schedule those figures might be sustained, but given to us as the flight schedule of an air invasion of America, they are deceiving and panic-creating for ordinary people who the President knows are not able to interpret them.

Such figures, creating panic and terror, are expected to induce peace-loving Americans to plunge into this conflict now, in the belief that they would be forestalling some future disaster.

FANTASTIC ITINERARY FOR AIR INVASION

To support my argument against President Roosevelt's wild flight schedule for a foreign air invasion of the United States, I offer a single incontrovertible reason. With all their air power, the Germans could not attack and subdue England from air bases 300 to 500 miles distant. Instead, they seized air bases on the north coasts of Holland, Belgium, and France—20 to 100 miles from the coast of England. Each and every stage of Mr. Roosevelt's fantastic itinerary for the air invasion of America would have to be conquered for the establishment of major air bases for the enemy attempting the job. The President must know this—but apparently the pattern is panic first, and then war.

Assume that Germany wins and takes over British seapower. Then what? Would the Germans be fools enough to send warships against us and our air power (if we had air power), using the same ships that had failed for the British against German air power? Nonsense! The United States is in no immediate danger of air invasion, or any other kind of military or naval invasion.

NONSENSE AND BASELESS PANIC

We, therefore, have time—time to provide a competent air defense—but no more time for nonsense and baseless panic, no more time for shipping aircraft to the Allies by men who are more interested in helping the Allies in licking Germany than in saving the United States.

With real air power we could treat any invader of our shores or the shores of any of the Americas to a series of Skagerraks and Norways. If they (whoever they might be) should attack Central or South America, what would our defense be? If the attack is by air, will we invite disaster and defend the Monroe Doctrine with warships? That would be folly, after what we have seen happen in Europe. Is it not sensible that our defense of the entire Western Hemisphere should be attempted with an overwhelming air power that America can and must build—an air power that will strike and return home in far less time than warships would require to reach a distant scene of action. Air power has a most dominant place as an independent factor in the hemisphere defense as well as in the national defense of America.

LACK OF VISION IS COSTING ENGLAND THE WAR

British sea-navy admirals and land-army generals resisted the full development of British air power, and their lack of vision is costing England the war and killing thousands of men. Plans and time build air power—not money. All the $18,000,000,000 of gold in Kentucky cannot produce one expert airman or one additional plane for America tomorrow morning. The air is an atmospheric ocean. Its machinery and navigation are complicated, and mastery of them is no matter for part-time careers. We are safe against air invasion now. Who dares say how long this immunity will last? Shall we, therefore, wait until that immunity is actually dissolved before we organize to provide full experts and competent machinery? Both of which are only possible under another department of national defense.

AIR POWER BEAT THEM TO THE PUNCH

When the Allies contemplated opening up Norway as a new theater of war with preponderant sea power, air power beat them to the punch. When the Allies pressured Italy with sea power, land power, and some air power, the Italian counterthreat of real air power stymied the Allies.

No matter where we look, air power holds the trump cards. This is a fact, not a theory.

The United States can build American air power only by entrusting its development to specialists and freeing those specialists from service and party politics. From the lessons of this war sea power never will be used again by sane commanders within the range of shore-based aircraft. And under a three-department system of defense, our strategy should be shaped to fit this startlingly clear picture.

If England loses this war there will be but two sizable sea fleets left in the world, ours and that of the Japanese. The Germans never will get the British Fleet. That sea fleet will be destroyed in the English Channel attempting to prevent air invasion of England or it will be distributed to the several British Dominions, where it will be beyond the range of major aircraft concentrations.

OUR FIRST NEED, DEVELOPMENT OF REAL AMERICAN POWER

But let us never lose sight of our first need, namely, the development of real American air power, for which airplanes are the last thing to be provided. A national air-defense policy must come first—to lay down the principles of our needs, which, in every event, must encompass a separate and unified air force. From there on we will need research—aeronautical research—to find out what kind of airplanes and engines must be built. We will need a flight-training program under air-force direction to fit the selected ships and the tactics necessitated by these ships. Then—and only then—comes the mass-production program, to provide ways and means for building air-power machinery in great quantities. These are the three timing gears of air power: (1) Research, (2) pilot training, and (3) production. Let one of them falter and air power becomes air confusion.

AIR-POWER LESSONS IN THIS WAR

I, for one, resent the warning that "the American people must recast their thinking about national protection." I maintain that it is the President who must recast his thinking about national protection. We see air-power lessons in this war, but we can do nothing about incorporating these lessons into our national-defense system. That is the President's job and the job of Congress. The President is Commander in Chief of the armed forces of this Nation. He knew Germany was building 600 planes a month in 1938—and he did not then warn America to do likewise. His recent hope—publicly interpreted as a recommendation—for 50,000 airplanes has only confused the minds of laymen and experts alike. "Ship for ship," he claims for our Navy, "ours are equal to or better than those of any foreign power."

Again I say, Then what? Are our ships better able to stand up to air attack than the warships of England? Certainly not. The Secretary of the Navy himself admits that they are not. Those 50,000 airplanes—certainly we can't pay for them out of the last emergency request to Congress. Those 50,000 planes would cost between eight and ten billion dollars, and if we started to build 50,000 airplanes right now what kind would we build? Our research facilities are puny when compared to those of Germany, and that is the starting point to air power—research.

FIFTY-THOUSAND PLANES—WHO WOULD HANDLE THEM?

But even if we had 50,000 airplanes, who would handle them, and who would handle the half-million men necessary to fly and service them? The Army or Navy certainly couldn't do that job since they evidently are unable to handle their own problems now.

It is a blinding flash of the obvious that we need an entirely new department of national defense to handle the air power of the proportions now under discussion. If we had a competent air department today, and had only 10 airplanes in each category, superior or even comparable to the warplanes of Europe, we then would be 10,000 times better off than we are right now. At least we would have our home work done and we would be ready to move toward acquiring real American air power. Then—only then—would we be in position to talk in terms of mass production.

FIRST—PROVIDING AN AMERICAN AIR FORCE

But of what avail is logic or reason? The Allies don't want our Army or Navy. They want our airplanes—to make good their neglect to see the light we are trying to make Mr. Roosevelt see—now, and they want those planes right now, and Mr. Roosevelt wants to give them airplanes right now—without first providing an American air-force organization for the permanent air defense of America.

The airplanes are for Europe. Additional proof of this is to be found in the recommendation of Senator PEPPER (who has been close to the administration) to turn our present United States Army Air Corps' planes now in active service, over to the Allies.

We have been inarticulate too long; it is time for the real blood of America to take stock of these men who are running our Government, and to demand that they free themselves from bureaucratic prejudices and taboos, and heed the lessons of dominant air power which are being so cruelly taught in Europe today.

KEEPING AMERICA OUT OF WAR

Stand up, America. Stand on your feet and make known your demands for actually keeping America out of war and building a modernized, efficient national-defense system, which will cause any potential foreign aggressor to shudder at the prospect of attacking the United States. For this, all our resources and our blood. I am speaking directly and forcibly because I saw British politicians throttle and mismanage the development of air power and bring England to her present crisis—short on airpower.

THE RETURN OF THE LOCUSTS

Not one penny for any such system as recommended by the President for buying airplanes—since this system is typical of the years eaten by the locusts. And not one penny until we are sure that with a three-department national defense—Army, Navy, and air—the return of the locusts will be prevented. Real American air power is possible only under such a system, and it is the only means by which our so-called mystic security can be converted into the actual security we deserve for the safety of America, and for peace, instead of panic, in the minds of Americans.

SEPARATE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. LUNDEEN. I also desire to place in the RECORD a list of the bills which have been introduced on the subject of a separate department of national defense and the air service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter will be printed in the RECORD.

The list referred to is as follows:

Bills introduced in the U. S. Congress relative to creating a Department of National Defense, 68th Cong. through 76th Cong., 2d sess.

(NOTE.—No pertinent bills were found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indexes from the 62d Cong. through the 68th Cong., 1st sess.)

Congress and session	Bill				Congressional Record citation	
	Number	Introduced by—	Referred to Committee on—	Date	Volume	Page
65th Cong., 3d sess	H. R. 16195	Congressman Lundeen	Interstate Commerce	Feb. 28, 1919		405
68th Cong., 2d sess	H. J. Res. 378	Mr. Hill (Maryland)	Rules	Feb. 26, 1925	[1] 66	4793
69th Cong., 1st sess	H. R. 46	do	Military Affairs	Dec. 7, 1925	67	396
	H. R. 447	Mr. Curry	do		67	405
	H. J. Res. 22	Mr. Hill (Maryland)	Rules	do	67	455
	S. 656	Mr. King	Military Affairs	Dec. 8, 1925	67	481
	H. R. 9044	Mr. James	do	Feb. 8, 1926	67	3579
	H. R. 10248	Mr. McSwain	do	Mar. 11, 1927	67	[2] 5443
70th Cong., 1st sess	H. R. 379	Mr. Curry	do	Dec. 5, 1927	69	26
	S. 701	Mr. King	do	Dec. 9, 1927	69	341
71st Cong., 1st sess	H. R. 959	Mr. Curry	do	Apr. 17, 1929	71	75
	S. 208	Mr. King	do	Apr. 18, 1929	71	105
71st Cong., 3d sess	H. R. 14060	Mr. Williamson	Expenditures in Executive Departments	Dec. 2, 1930	74	69–70
72d Cong., 1st sess	H. R. 261	Mr. Curry	Military Affairs	Dec. 8, 1931	75	94
	H. R. 4742	Mr. Williamson	Expenditures in the Executive Departments	do	75	164–165
	S. 28	Mr. King	Military Affairs	Dec. 9, 1931	75	188
	H. R. 7012	Mr. Byrns	Expenditures in the Executive Departments	Jan. 5, 1932	75	[3] 1338

[1] See also: Remarks in House relative to proposed department of national defense, pp. 4772, 4931; consolidation of the Army, Navy, and the air forces, p. 5183.
[2] H. R. 10248 debated, p. 12597.
[3] H. R. 7012 debated, pp. 4515–4516.

Bills introduced in the U. S. Congress relative to creating a Department of National Defense, 68th Cong. through 76th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Congress and session	Bill				Congressional Record citation	
	Number	Introduced by—	Referred to Committee on—	Date	Volume	Page
73d Cong., 1st sess.	S. 288	Mr. King	Military Affairs	Mar. 11, 1933	77	195
74th Cong., 1st sess.	S. 388	Mr. King	Military Affairs	Jan. 7, 1935	79	137
	H. R. 9134	Mr. Boileau	Expenditures in the Executive Departments	Aug. 14, 1935	79	13195
75th Cong., 1st sess.	H. R. 1488	do	do	Jan. 5, 1937	[4]81	31
	H. R. 5785	Mr. Luckey	do	Mar. 19, 1937	81	2532
76th Cong., 1st and 2d sess.	No pertinent bills found.					
76th Cong., 3d sess.	Senate bill by Senator Clark of Missouri.					

[4] Remarks in House relative to amendment to create a department of national defense, 8869, 8870; H. R. 1488, vol. 83 (75th Cong., 3d sess.), p. 790.

Acknowledgement is hereby made of the aid obtained in preparing this compilation, from an earlier Legislative Reference Service manuscript of July 18, 1935, entitled "Legislative History of Bills," contemplating the union of the War and Navy Departments into a new department of national defense from the 69th Cong. to date, 74th Cong.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from an article by Mr. G. Gould Lincoln in the Washington Evening Star in reference to the bill of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. CLARK], which was referred to on this floor yesterday.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 26, 1940]

SINGLE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE PROPOSED BY CLARK—BILL TO ASK MERGER OF ARMY AND NAVY; CABINET SHAKE-UP REPORTS PERSIST

(By G. Gould Lincoln)

While reports continued to spread yesterday that there will be shake-ups in the Cabinet, with the War and Navy portfolios especially involved, Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Missouri, prepared to introduce a bill to merge both these Departments in a single Department of National Defense.

The Missouri Senator said such a move was necessary in the interest of better coordination. His bill will provide for three Under Secretaries, one of the Army, another of the Navy, and a third of the air forces.

"If there is no combination of the War and Navy Departments," said Senator CLARK, "there should be established a new department, that of aviation, with the Army and Navy air forces included in the new department."

As for the Cabinet shifts, it was insisted that before long efforts will be made to dislodge Secretary of War Woodring. Secretary of the Navy Edison, who has been nominated for Governor by the Democrats in New Jersey, has already announced he will resign within 30 days. It seems entirely clear that he would not be able to continue to work at his Cabinet office and campaign for election as Governor.

CONSIDERABLE FRICTION

Senator CLARK, discussing his proposal to bring about a unification of the national-defense agencies of the Government, pointed out that frequently there is a conflict over the tasks of the two present Departments, War and Navy. He mentioned the problem of the coast defenses in this connection, with the Army having control of the coast-defense guns.

He believes that much more stress must be placed on aviation in national defense, and that the way to get the best results is to coordinate the present aviation forces of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Col. W. Jefferson Davis advocating a civil air reserve.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 26, 1940]

COLONEL DAVIS ADVOCATES DEFENSE DEPARTMENT AND CIVIL AIR RESERVE—HEAD OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS ACADEMY URGES PLANE ORDERS ON HUGE SCALE

Declaring the salvation of mankind may depend on the national policy adopted by the United States within the next few weeks, Col. W. Jefferson Davis, member of the staff of the World War Director of Miltary Aeronautics and president of the American Academy of Public Affairs, today advocated creation of a separate department of national defense to coordinate all defense activities, the creation of a civil air reserve, and immediate and vigorous suppression of all subversive activities.

Now engaged in the practice of aviation law in Los Angeles, Colonel Davis is in Washington to attend the President's aviation conference, which will begin at the Treasury Department tomorrow, and to launch a civil air-reserve program in 40 States.

During the World War Colonel Davis was legal adviser on the staff of Brig. Gen. William L. Kenly, director of military aeronautics. During the period of allied occupation of Germany he was sent to Europe by the late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell to make a survey of legal phases of military and civil aeronautics and for a time was attached to the United States Embassy in Berlin as War Department legal adviser.

COOPERATION PROGRAM

Colonel Davis advocates the creation of a department of national defense under a secretary of national defense, who would be a member of the Cabinet, with Under Secretaries for War, Navy, and air. The work of these three branches should be coordinated by a staff charged specifically with assisting in formulation of a policy of national defense and the carrying out of such a policy, he explained.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I do not belong to the Republican Party, but I was glad to see their Presidential candidate come out for a unified air service, with a Cabinet member, a Department of Defense, including the Army, Navy, and Air, which I think is the correct method. I hope the Democratic Party will do likewise, so that there may be no preference on that point.

I ask that an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, under the heading "Willkie proposes defense aviation post in Cabinet," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From St. Louis Post Dispatch of August 25, 1940]

WILLKIE PROPOSES DEFENSE AVIATION POST IN CABINET—G. O. P. PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE SAYS MILITARY STRENGTH RESTS PRIMARILY ON AIR POWER

NEW YORK, August 24.—Asserting that "the military strength of a nation now rests primarily upon its air power," Wendell L. Willkie suggested today the creation of a new cabinet office to handle defense aviation.

"The primary reason Germany was able to crush France and other countries and presently bring England to such distress was her development of planes," the Republican Presidential nominee told reporters.

He said that as a long-range objective there should be a secretary of defense who would have assistants in charge of air, sea, and land forces. He said, however, that it would take time to organize such a set-up.

"In the interim," he added, "We should create a Cabinet member in charge of aeronautics. The emphasis should be upon the branch of the service that today is the most important."

ON DEFENSE PROGRAM

Discussing the administration's defense program, Willkie said:

"My impression is that we are hopelessly unprepared as to airplane production, the training of men, and the gearing up of our industrial machinery to produce planes.

"We are just floundering along. Some of the failures have been due to poor organization.

"We have had the benefit of sitting as spectators at the greatest tragedy in the world's history. We do not want to continue with the obsolete machinery we now have which subordinates the most important branch of the service to the other branches."

Willkie repeated his view that "our best foreign policy consists in becoming strong at home, along both military and economic lines."

RELIEF-ROLL CHARGE

Renewing his contention that the Roosevelt administration is seeking to "pack the relief rolls" for political reasons, Willkie read figures showing that W. P. A. recipients had increased from 1,611,213 on July 3 to 1,700,284 on July 31. The statistics, he said, were from W. P. A. press releases.

"That is an increase of about 89,000," the nominee said, "and it corresponds with the increases of previous election years."

Willkie's appointment list today included Robert L. Vann, Pittsburgh Negro publisher; Emil Hurja, once statistician for the Democratic National Committee, and Charles Graham, president of the Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Co.

Asked about the race for the New York Republican senatorial nomination, Willkie repeated that he had no intention of intervening.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, a Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania, concerning the same subject, national defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Radio address by Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania)

Ladies and gentlemen, 23 years ago tonight America was an armed camp, having been at a state of war with Germany a short period of over 30 days.

Congress was in session. President Wilson was given emergency powers, industry and manpower was mobilized in a supreme effort to defend our national honor, and, as we were told, to make the world safe for democracy.

On November 11, 1918, an armistice was signed, hostilities ceased, battle lines disappeared, and the air was rent with joyous sounds as bedlam broke forth in relentless fury heralding the end of the conflict. America was at peace—the war was over.

With grateful hearts and a prayer on their lips the people of America turned their attention to the many tasks yet to be accomplished. From the tomb of the past came the sound of the voice of the Great Emancipator—Abraham Lincoln—who in surveying the ruins of the Civil War uttered this advice to a heart-weary people:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

With these words ringing in their ears the American people began to realize and experience the aftermath of war.

While they lovingly buried their dead, and with compassion for the sick and wounded caused veteran hospitals to be erected almost overnight, the world's greatest depression invaded the business and industrial life of this prosperous Nation. Millions found themselves unemployed, the economic stability of our Nation was destroyed, and America was face to face with the grim reality that war is not ended on the battlefield.

From the day America entered the World War it was realized that we as a nation were woefully unprepared, and the conviction grew that never again must the security and peace of the American people be jeopardized.

While America proceeded in an orderly way to rebuild its military defense a series of armament-reduction programs were accepted by the major nations of the world which had as their objective world peace.

As a nation we religiously adhered to all treaties as a result of the World War, as well as armament-reduction programs, thus assuming a stationary position, and did nothing to promote our national-defense program. While enjoying this period of world peace, the utter disregard of certain nations became apparent as they proceeded to cast caution to the winds in their feverish anxiety to provide for what they termed their economic needs. Under this guise there developed dictatorships, who, in pursuance of their objectives, launched a period of ruthless and relentless persecution of peaceful nations that gave birth to World War No. 2.

As the world gazed in stricken horror at the invasion of the Lowlands and saw Holland and Belgium in turn devoured by the world's mightiest military machine, once more the attention of the American people was called to the necessity of an adequate national defense.

President Roosevelt, in a surprise and dramatic appearance before a joint session of Congress, revealed in no uncertain terms that "the clear fact is the American people must recast their thinking about national protection."

In other words, from the lips of our Chief Executive—the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States—came the frank admission that streamlining our national defense is the paramount question of the hour.

With the President's message came a literal command, "Awake, America!" echoing those prophetic words uttered by the late Gen. William Mitchell, World War hero, who, in 1929, said:

"The coming of air power has made a greater difference in war than anything in history. Armies are mere holders of land. During the war armies only moved back and forth for 60 miles and killed hundreds of thousands. That isn't war—war is getting at the vital centers of the enemy—where they live, their food, their communications. Air power can go straight to them now, 3,000 miles away, and destroy.

"What we need in this country is a single department of national defense, with a separate department for air force, Navy, and Army. Until we have that we cannot protect ourselves. No rules or regulations or treaties can do away with the necessity of protecting ourselves. If we don't protect ourselves, no one else will."

This timely warning from an unsung hero fell on deaf ears, but there is no man to deny the truthful accuracy of what was then considered a bold assertion.

Billy Mitchell, as he was affectionately called by those who admired him as a friend, evidently knew whereof he spoke.

One has only to consider the development of the German military machine of today compared with 1914. For the past 7 years Hitler has directed the energies of the second greatest industrial country in the world toward a single national objective. Spending close to $40,000,000,000 in 7 years, there has emerged the greatest and most powerful military machine the world has ever known. Functioning at top speed, there is unfolded before the eyes of the world the threatened destruction of our former Allies—France and Great Britain.

As this mighty military machine rolls on in ruthless fashion, the Congress of the United States is eager to approve the Chief Executive's request for additional millions of dollars for national defense. Partisan politics give way to love of country and a desire to protect our most cherished possessions—peace and freedom.

In keeping with the spirit and purpose of the President's solemn warning that we in effect streamline our national defense, there is a crying need that the words of the late Billy Mitchell be translated into positive action.

The American people are entitled to a survey of our national-defense policies, which will determine the following pertinent facts:

I. The area we as a nation are expected to defend.

II. The cost of adequately protecting such area.

III. The adequacy of our present national-defense system.

IV. The advisability of a separate department of national defense to insure cooperation, efficiency, and economy among our defense forces.

The findings of such a survey will give the American people a comprehensive picture of the needs of their national defense, and once they know the area to be defended, money and manpower will unite in true American fashion in defense of their liberties.

No one will deny in the light of present world conditions that America must expand its national defenses immediately. With Congress ready to appropriate billions of dollars the time is ripe for an immediate and thorough survey to develop a maximum of security at a minimum cost.

The necessity of such a survey was conveyed to Congress when on January 10, 1940, it was my privilege to introduce House Joint Resolution 417 which provides for a Commission to survey the national-defense requirements and resources of the United States. This Commission will be truly representative of the American people since it will be composed of Members of the House of Representatives, Senate of the United States, Cabinet officers or their representatives, representatives of agriculture, labor, business, industry, and finance, retired Army and Navy officers, two aviators with at least 10 years of experience, and two women recognized for their mercies in wartime.

Under the terms of this resolution this group will function for the purpose of placing in the hands of Congress information necessary for legislation as a result of their comprehensive survey and study of the national defense, including the following:

1. The advisability of completely revising the National Defense Act in the light of events in Europe and Asia and the need for legislation to establish a peacetime defensive system, based upon the national objectives of the United States, which can be rapidly expanded into a wartime defensive system, which will carry out the national objectives of the United States.

2. The advisability of establishing a Department of National Defense, under which the armed forces of the United States would be combined and coordinated to provide for a more adequate national defense in any emergency.

3. The practicability under a Department of National Defense of promoting and accomplishing among all branches of the armed forces (a) coordination of effort and efficiency, (b) savings in purchases of military and naval material, (c) unified responsibility, and (d) elimination of duplication of effort and conflict of authority.

4. The advisability of establishing a National Defense Planning Board to formulate a long-range national-defense policy that has sufficient flexibility to meet any changes required by developments and maintain an orderly, progressive program.

5. The advisability of expanding and speeding the naval program and to examine the necessity for what is known as a two-ocean Navy.

6. The advisability of further expansion of the air forces of the Army and Navy, the number and type of planes required, and a coordinated program and policy for training personnel and cooperation between Army and naval air operations.

7. The advisability of granting Government subsidies to commercial air lines, requiring their transport planes to be convertible bombers and specifying that their pilots be commissioned in the Reserve Corps of the Army and Navy.

8. The advisability of perfecting a comprehensive program for rapidly mobilizing industry and commercial shipping into a defensive force.

9. The advisability of supplementing "educational orders" by providing an adequate "liquid fund" to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of National Defense for the encouragement of inventions, research, experiment, and development of arms, munitions, and implements of war.

10. The advisability of determining the interests and responsibilities of the United States under the Monroe Doctrine, the declaration of Panama, and the pledges made in the name of the United States by the Chief Executive to defend Canada in the event of an armed attack by any other power.

11. The advisability of determining the interests and responsibilities of the United States in the Philippines if and when that Commonwealth becomes independent in 1946.

12. The advisability of formulating a definite military and naval program in keeping with the announced policy of the United States in the Orient and the possessions of the United States from the Aleutian Islands to the Samoan Islands.

13. The advisability of acquiring territory in the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea which might serve as enemy bases.

In other words, what I proposed in this resolution to Congress last January was that we should do a thorough job of surveying our resources of national defense before taking any action.

If the National Defense Act should be dusted off with a view of making necessary amendments—if the Navy should be overhauled fore and aft; if the Army should be given a rigid inspection; if we must secure islands in the Atlantic and Pacific to serve as air bases; if we need a separate Department of National Defense; if we need 50,000 airplanes—then in the name of God and in memory of those who gave their all that this country might enjoy peace and freedom, let us do the job without delay.

Common sense tells us that instead of doing a piecemeal patchwork job that might find us almost as unprepared as we were in 1917, the national defense must be examined and explored from every angle—to the end that an up-to-the-minute policy can be established and place us in readiness to meet any emergency.

The cry of "Keep America out of war!" is ringing in the ears of every American. The bitter memories of the World War are still fresh in the minds of all of us. Who can forget the horrors of the last World War that took from home, office, and factory the flower of American manhood, whose blood later irrigated the meadows of Europe? Who can forget the human aftermath of the World War, with its toll of wrecked bodies, economic depressions, and huge national debts?

The American people hate war, but in these trying days they recognize that the only way to avoid war is to maintain military defenses that will keep America safe, thereby adhering to the philosophy of the great American, Theodore Roosevelt—"Speak softly, but carry a big stick."

That is the type of national defense the American people want, should have, and are entitled to; and, with such national protection, every American mother will have the assurance that her son will not follow the pathway of the youth of 1917—to join in death those brave young Americans who now sleep in Flanders fields.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, if we who are on the stage now would only turn our attention to the doctrine laid down by the fathers and founders of the Republic, if we would only follow Washington, Adams, Madison, Monroe, Jefferson, Henry Clay, and the other great men who led their country on the road to greatness and glory which America has traveled, we would have a veritable North Star, an unchangeable doctrine by which a true course in foreign affairs could be taken; we would not be in these difficult situations and have these long-drawn-out debates in the Senate of the United States.

WE MAINTAIN DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH ALL NATIONS

The doctrine they laid down was friendship with all nations. Someone referred a short time ago to our enemies. I do not know of any enemy nation with which we are concerned. We have not broken diplomatic relations with any other country. With what nation have we broken diplomatic relations? With what nation are we at war today?

Some newspaper columnists and some other gentlemen may be using harsh language; perhaps they have made certain nations their pet enemies; but, so far as our country is concerned, we have not broken diplomatic relations with any other nation. We should maintain friendly relations with every other nation on the earth, and we should trade with every other nation in the world; we should enter into the quarrels and intrigues of none of them. Friendship and trade with all, entangling alliances with none. Those were the inspired words of George Washington, the Father of his Country. Let the pro-British smile their smug smiles at that if they wish, but that was the doctrine of the Father of his Country, the man who led America to greatness and glory, the man who won our independence from Europe, from conscription, from war, and war taxes—George Washington, who in 8 long years of war, finally achieved our independence and freedom from Europe.

AMERICAN PROBLEMS DEMAND SOLUTION

But now what do we find? We find splendid gentlemen, able, educated gentlemen, whom we love and revere as we meet them from day to day, asking us to go back into the whirlwind of war, death, and destruction in Europe which our fathers left. They left Europe to get away from war conscription and war taxes and misery, poverty, and destitution—to build here in America a new nation—free, independent, and far removed from European intrigues, quarrels, real-estate titles, and boundary disputes. They came here to worship God and build their churches and schools without the threat of conscription, misery, poverty, and destitution; yet today in this country we have poverty and destitution.

On the steps of this Capitol the President of the United States said that one-third of our population are ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed. Those words were uttered in 1936, as I recall, and that condition still obtains. Why? Because we entered into the quarrels of Europe. Why are we suffering from oppressive taxation today? Why are we being pressed down to the very earth by destitution and poverty? Why are men and their families being thrown out of their homes, and having their farms taken from them by insurance companies and great corporations? Why are we having corporation farming now and the number of tenants on the increase? It is because of the colossal blunder, the great error, the fatal mistake we made in 1917. That is why this thing happened to us.

OLD WORLD QUARRELS NOT FOR AMERICA

Do we want more of that? Do we want more taxes, more war, more conscription? Did we not learn enough from the last war? Is not our lesson learned completely? I warn my fellow citizens that if we have not yet learned the lesson, if we have not yet sufficiently suffered, if we enter another war we will suffer more, and there will be more poverty and more destitution in this country, until we finally learn to keep free of Europe and the kings over there and the quarrels over there, until we quit lending $11,000,000,000 to Europe. That is what we did, and Mussolini was to pay one-eighth of 1 percent during the first 10 years on the 62-year refunding loan we made him—one-eighth of 1 percent. I ask Members of the Senate, and my fellow Americans everywhere, if they could obtain money for their homes and for their businesses at one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest we gave the Italian conqueror?

We helped to set Mussolini up in business. We loaned the Italians the money, then we canceled half of it, and the kings of Europe said, "We will oblige you by canceling the other half"; and they certainly did. We canceled $12,087,667,000; we wiped that out in 1926; and they said, "We will oblige you by canceling the rest." They put into arms and armament, into tanks, airplanes, and war munitions our money, which we needed for our own men and women and children in the United States, which we needed for our unemployed in the United States, which we needed for our children, for our widows and orphans, which we needed for social security. We are now getting social insecurity; we need social security, but, instead of that, we are told we must once more go down the road to war.

Well, here is one vote against it; here is one vote that is "No" on foreign war. I will never vote to send American boys to Europe; I will never vote to send them onto the battlefields of kings and emperors to take part in the quarrels over there. I will never vote peacetime conscription. I will never vote to fasten industrial slavery upon the American people, and that is what this proposed act is going to be called—the Industrial Slavery Act—conscripting American boys from the cradle to the grave.

The original bill proposed to conscript them from 18 to 65, which is from the cradle to the grave. Mr. President, if you think that plan has been abandoned by the House of Representatives, you are mistaken. Not long ago, just a few days ago, in fact, the House committee put back in the bill the provision as to age limits between 18 and 65.

I do not think the provision as to paying the men to be conscripted $5 a month which the bill first proposed has been restored.

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION—INDUSTRIAL SLAVERY

What a glorious conscription bill this is! Conscript Americans from the cradle to the grave, from 18 to 65, at $5 a month.

Mr. President, I never thought we would have a throw-back to the Czar of Russia or to czardom or a throw-back away over from Europe. I never thought that; I thought we had graduated from that; I thought we were far removed from it; I thought certainly after we learned the lesson once we would have learned it permanently. One cannot be blamed for making a mistake once; he might make an honest mistake; but certainly if he makes the mistake a second time that is not so good.

I say here on the floor of the Senate of the United States that before we pass this bill and fasten this industrial slavery upon America we had better retire into solitude by ourselves with our conscience and our God and battle it out there before we lightly vote away the liberties of our people. I thank the Senate.

Mr. HOLT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lee	Schwartz
Andrews	Donahey	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Downey	Lucas	Sheppard
Austin	Ellender	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bailey	George	McCarran	Slattery
Bankhead	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Barbour	Gibson	Maloney	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Mead	Taft
Bone	Green	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Tobey
Burke	Harrison	Norris	Truman
Byrd	Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	White
Connally	King	Reynolds	Wiley
Danaher	La Follette	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask leave to withdraw the pending amendment, and offer in lieu thereof an amendment which is a little better prepared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the amendment reported by the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 2 on page 20, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

(b) The Vice President of the United States, the Governors of the several States and Territories, members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States and Territories, judges of the courts of the United States and of the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, and other executive officers of the United States, and of the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia whose continued service in the executive offices held by them is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the public health, safety, or interest, shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces of the United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I think the amendment is in much improved form, and, so far as I am personally concerned, it is entirely acceptable.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Texas permit me to ask a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Who would determine the question of whether the continuance in office of these persons would be necessary? Would it be the local boards?

Mr. CONNALLY. The local draft boards, my understanding is. The standard which I have put into the amendment is the same standard which applies on the next page of the bill, where the President is given authority to classify industrial and other workers, to defer those whose services may be necessary for the public safety, health, and so on.

Mr. WHITE. I am in complete agreement with the purpose of the amendment, but I was a little in doubt as to whether local draft boards should have the authority to pass on that question, or whether it should not be definitely fixed in the statute itself.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would be very difficult to fix it in the statute itself, for the simple reason that there are several million of these men, and I do not know of any other agency to handle it except the local draft boards. If they make a mistake, an appeal can be taken to the appeals board.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, it could be done by making it an absolutely statutory rule that persons holding these offices should be exempt.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what the bill does; it exempts everybody. My purpose is to restrict it. I see no reason why a man in a subordinate position in a State government or in the Federal Government should be ipso facto exempted from the draft if he can be replaced by someone else who is not subject to the draft, perhaps, and who could perform his services. The bill really contemplates that very thing, because elsewhere it provides that men who are drafted and lose their positions shall be returned to those positions; and it provides that if a man's service was with the Federal Government his place shall be restored to him; and if it is in a State government, it is the desire of the Congress that he shall be restored to his position under the State government. So the bill really contemplates that men in these services shall serve. But the language of the bill which I am trying to amend is so broad that I am fearful that many men will evade service in the draft on the claim that they are officers of the Federal Government or officers of a State, when the offices could just as well be filled by one-legged men as by those who are subject to military service.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. It is accurate, then, to say that the amendment of the Senator from Texas definitely restricts the number of those to be exempt, and in no way increases or adds any new classification to the exemptions?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. That is the purpose of the Senator from Texas, and if the Senator from Massachusetts will compare the language of the bill and of the amendment, it will readily occur to him that that is its effect, because there is no limiting language in the bill at all. The limitation in the amendment is that the board must find that a man's continued service is necessary. In other words, if it is not necessary to continue him in the service, he may be drafted. If a position could be filled by someone else, who could perform the duties as well as the holder of the office, the office holder would not be exempt.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Last night it was on my motion that the vote was reconsidered and the amendment became the pending business. Since that time I have conferred with the junior Senator from Texas about the proposed amendment, and, in my judgment, the amendment as now offered accomplishes exactly what he outlines, if it is made clear by the discussion and colloquies here that the method of finding whether or not an executive officer in fact may be dispensed with is to be in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c). At first this morning when we chatted we thought perhaps there should be an amendment inserted after the words "found as provided in subsection (c)," but the Senator from Texas has the view, which I now share, that so long as we make it clear here, it will not be necessary to interpolate that language. Is not that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection to inserting the addition, but it would certainly be tautology, because we have in the amendment the identical language which is contained in subsection (c).

Mr. DANAHER. I think so.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is the same standard. I will say for the record that certainly my purpose in drawing the amendment was to provide that those who might seek to take advantage of this particular exemption or deferment should

convince the local board that a man's continued service in the executive office held by him—and someone determine the question, and there is no one else to determine it except the local board—is necessary, not desirable or practicable, but necessary for the maintenance of the public health, safety, or interest.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry as to a single word in the amendment. The Senator has included, after covering the members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States and the judges of the courts, and other executive officers. It seems to me the word "other" should be stricken out, because we are not dealing with executive officers down to that point.

Mr. CONNALLY. We certainly are. We start out with the Vice President. He is somewhat of an executive. Then we have the Governors of the States and Territories, who are certainly executive officers.

Mr. ADAMS. What is the virtue of the word "other"?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not see that it makes any diffrence whether it goes out or stays in. If it will secure the support of the Senator from Colorado, I will strike out the word "other."

Mr. ADAMS. I would recommend that that be done.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask the Senator from Colorado not to have the word "other" stricken out, and, if I may, I should like very briefly to explain my reason to him, if he will give me his attention.

The word "other" very definitely affects a class of persons who are to come within subsection (c) as distinguished from all those previously named who are automatically exempt. The word "other" is a very marked and definite dividing line, and, in my humble opinion, it is necessary to the thought.

If the Senator will bear with me a moment, let me ask the junior Senator from Texas a question. Is it not the purpose of the junior Senator from Texas automatically to exempt the Vice President of the United States, the Governors of the several States and Territories, members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States and Territories, judges of the courts of the United States and the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia?

Mr. CONNALLY. To be sure; and the language very clearly automatically exempts them.

Mr. DANAHER. That is automatic, and I so interpret it. If we interpolate the word "other" ahead of the word "executive" it makes a brand new classification of executive officers whose indispensability will be tested by the local draft boards mentioned in subsection (c). I think the language as drawn by the Senator from Texas is more than adequate for the purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. With this hung jury, I decline to modify the amendment, and I will let the Senator from Colorado offer his amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. I am not concerned; I thought the suggestion would improve the amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Texas is entirely satisfactory to me.

Let me ask the Senator a further question: I am not sure the Senator from Connecticut is correct in his interpretation that the qualifications in the latter part of the amendment are not to be read back into the first part, and, if the judgment of the draft board does not go back, because there is a conjunctive there, I am inclined to think that the Senator from Connecticut is seeing a division which is not in the amendment. Again, I am not concerned, other than as I have pointed out.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I do not think there is any substantial disagreement between him and the Senator from Connecticut for this reason: This is the language of the amendment:

The Vice President of the United States, the Governors of the several States and Territories, members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States and Territories, judges of the courts of the United States and of the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia.

The Senator from Connecticut says they are automatically deferred. They are. After naming them, we say "and other executive officers of the United States and of the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia whose continued service in the executive offices," and so forth. That ties it to the executives only "whose continued service in the executive offices held by them." That cannot refer to the judiciary and it cannot refer to legislative officers "If found to be necessary to the maintenance of the public health, safety, or interest."

Under the amendment judges and the members of the legislatures are automatically deferred because they are among those named as to be deferred. When it comes to executive officers, only those are deferred whose continued services in particular offices are found to be necessary to the public health, and so forth. I think if the Senator from Colorado will read that again, he will see on reflection that it cannot possibly refer back to the judges and the members of the legislatures.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I will accept the decision of the Senator from Texas as final on matters of English.

Mr. GIBSON. I wonder if the Senator's thought is that this fall a great number of members of legislatures are to be elected, and would the amendment apply to the members-elect of the legislatures of various States? Most members of the present legislatures will remain in office until January 1.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly, it is intended to cover those who may be in service, and I do not think that anyone would draft a man after he had been elected to a legislature, because he then is a member of the legislature, although he may not have assumed his duties.

Mr. GIBSON. Some members of legislatures will go out of office, and then become eligible.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. GIBSON. And others will go into office in January. I wonder if the word "member-elect" inserted in the language would clarify the situation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not believe any draft board would draft a man for 20 minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not think they ought to, but if such persons should once get into the service they would be obliged to stay there.

Mr. CONNALLY. I see the Senator's point, but I do not think there will be any difficulty along that line.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator give me his understanding—and I am asking for information—as to the relative significance of the words "deferred" and "exempted"? Will not the practical effect of the language

shall * * * be deferred from training and service

Be that the person is exempted?

Mr. CONNALLY. Not entirely, for this reason: They are deferred, and then when all men who have not been deferred are taken into service, the authorities can, if they desire, begin over again, but the deferred person is only deferred so long as he holds his office. When he leaves office he immediately becomes eligible for the draft.

Mr. GIBSON. But so long as he is in office he is exempt. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. He is deferred. He is suspended so long as he holds office.

Mr. LODGE. But he does not come into the Army?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wanted to ask the Senator from Texas a final question. I meant to call to his attention the fact that I notice that the language he proposes omits mentioning the President. It commences only with the Vice Presi-

dent, and I wonder if he and I could agree that the reason we have omitted the President is that he has already been drafted? [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from Connecticut is correct in the view that the President has already been drafted, it looks like he is here to serve.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Texas, because it constitutes a greater restriction, but I should like to repeat what I have said once before, that I do not enthuse over the proposition that public officials should be exempt from military service. To be sure, it is more or less of an academic question in this bill, because the bill only takes in men between 21 and 31 years of age, and there are comparatively few officials listed in this section who are within that age group, although I imagine there are several in the State legislatures.

To my way of thinking, if we go to war, and should enlarge the range of ages, we should strike out the provision exempting public officials. In my opinion no man is indispensable, and the finest thing a man can do under those conditions, in time of war, is to show the example himself.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The bill ostensibly applies only in time of peace, does it not?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then why does the Senator talk about what might happen in time of war?

Mr. LODGE. I made it very clear that due to the fact that this bill was a peacetime bill, and was limited to those of youthful age, the exemption of public officials was not a matter of great consequence. I said that in case of war I thought that language ought to be taken out of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that the bill itself provides that the men who are drafted for 1 year—if Congress in the meantime declares an emergency—may be continued in the service for an indefinite period. That emergency might be war. So the bill is not entirely a peacetime measure. It has within it the possibilities of war service, of course.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there is always a possibility of that. That is not the point I was trying to stress. As I said, the question is more or less an academic one, in view of the fact that the range of ages is so narrow, and between 21 and 31 there are not many public officials, but, in my opinion, in time of war it would be much better not to have an exception of that kind, and I know that the Senator from Texas, when he himself was a Member of the House, took that position in his personal conduct.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I received a letter today inquiring if postmasters between the ages of 21 and 31 were deferred from service under this measure. Is it a fact that they would be?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think they would be, but the Senator from Texas can answer that question better than I can.

Mr. CONNALLY. We discussed that matter during the absence of the senior Senator from Massachusetts. Had he come in earlier he would have heard that matter discussed.

Mr. WALSH. I heard a part of the discussion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Postmasters would not be deferred unless the local boards felt that no one else could stamp letters except the postmasters themselves.

Mr. WALSH. The original amendment deferred postmasters.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true; but my later amendment, which I hope will be adopted, limits exempted executive officers to those whose continued service in office is found necessary for the public safety, health, or interest.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CONNALLY. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. No business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The journal clerk advises the Chair that business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

Mr. CONNALLY. What was the business? The Senator from Texas believes no business has been transacted, unless a speech is considered to be business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The offering of the amendment by the Senator from Texas is considered to be the transaction of business.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lee	Schwartz
Andrews	Donahey	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Downey	Lucas	Sheppard
Austin	Ellender	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bailey	George	McCarran	Slattery
Bankhead	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Barbour	Gibson	Maloney	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Mead	Taft
Bone	Green	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Tobey
Burke	Harrison	Norris	Truman
Byrd	Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	White
Connally	King	Reynolds	Wiley
Danaher	La Follette	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have an amendment on the desk which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

> For the purpose of this subsection any person who has been required to leave any position in the employ of any private employer, other than a temporary position, within 30 days prior to the date of the enactment of this act shall be deemed prima facie to have left such position in order to perform the service required under this act.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to offer a brief explanation of the amendment. I have a letter from a constituent in my State who advises me as follows:

> I am reliably informed that a certain company in this section has notified its employees in substance as follows:
>
> As soon as the draft bill is passed, that all single men in the employment of this company could consider themselves laid off until after they can show evidence that they have been rejected from the draft.

The intent of the policy of that company—which I am glad to say is nameless, because I should like not to know of its unpatriotic attitude—is to defeat the reemployment provisions of the bill. My amendment simply contemplates, in substance, that anyone who may have been disconnected from his private employment within 30 days of the passage of the bill shall be deemed prima facie to have left it for the purpose of undertaking the service contemplated in the bill. The amendment was drafted by the drafting service and submitted to the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], chairman of the committee, and to the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY],

and I believe it has their approval. I hope it will have the approval of the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the amendment has my approval.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me suggest to the Senator that if we have the extended discussions and maneuvers we have been having on the part of those opposed to the bill, he had better make the period 60 or 90 days instead of 30 days.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator from Texas has said, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lee	Schwartz
Andrews	Donahey	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Downey	Lucas	Sheppard
Austin	Ellender	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bailey	George	McCarran	Slattery
Bankhead	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Barbour	Gibson	Maloney	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Mead	Taft
Bone	Green	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Tobey
Burke	Harrison	Norris	Truman
Byrd	Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	White
Connally	King	Reynolds	Wiley
Danaher	La Follette	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to make a few inquiries about the purport of the amendment. As I understand, if a man is employed today and tomorrow is required to leave his employment, prima facie, under the terms of the amendment, he shall be deemed to have left his employment in order to perform the services contemplated by the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Suppose a man is hired to pick corn in Virginia, and the corn-picking job expires within a week, and then he is told there is no more work. Or suppose he is hired to pick apples in Connecticut in September, and after the apples are picked he is told there is no more work. Assuming that the bill is not passed until within 30 days of that date, is the Senator assuming that such person is deemed to have left his employment prima facie for the purpose of engaging in the service contemplated in the bill, and that therefore he is entitled to the benefits of the reemployment features of the bill?

Mr. PEPPER. No; I am glad the Senator made his inquiry. The amendment says "other than a temporary position." The positions which the Senator has described are all temporary positions, so the amendment would not affect that type of employment.

Mr. DANAHER. That point is now clear. Suppose the man had been employed for 6 months, or 4 months, or 3 years. What is temporary, according to the Senator's definition?

Mr. PEPPER. Like language use in any other instance, it must be construed, of course. I will say to the Senator that in no case is there more than a presumption raised in favor of the boy who has left his employment. When he asserts the right to avail himself of the reemployment provisions of the bill, the employer resisting such assertion may show that he had let the man go for cause, or for some sufficient reason not related to the enactment of the legislation. If the applicant should insist upon the provisions of the act relative to employment he would have to assert them in court, where they would be subject to rebuttal. The presumption, of course, would be rebuttable.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. DANAHER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The purpose the Senator has in mind is a most commendable purpose—to protect a man from some unworthy employer who seeks to escape the provisions of the bill. I am wondering whether or not, in seeking to reach the commendable result, we may reach some results which are not desirable. As I understand the amendment, it refers to a certain subsection, which I do not have clearly in mind.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to refresh the Senator's mind. The Gurney amendment reads:

> In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such service, has left or leaves a position other than a temporary position—

And so forth.

Mr. ADAMS. Suppose the man were discharged from his position for what the employer says was genuine cause—incompetency, malicious acts, or something of the kind. Or suppose he were discharged and never went into the service. Would the amendment place the man who is discharged, and who does not enter the service, in a position to claim the same benefits as the man who goes into the service?

Mr. PEPPER. No; it would not apply to any one who has not entered the service under the terms of the bill, and who, after completing his service, has not claimed the right of reemployment. If he should claim that right, and the employer should say, "Oh, no; I had already let you go before the act went into effect," then the boy would be able to claim the right to the presumption created by the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, the amendment needs that explanation.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. I am glad the Senator made the inquiry.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there was one moment in the colloquy between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Colorado when the words were so elided that I did not fully understand the answer of the Senator from Florida. Let me see if I can restate it so as to make it clear to me.

I understand the Senator from Florida to say that this amendment would have no application whatever unless the individual who seeks to claim its benefits actually serves in the armed forces of the United States, either naval or military, under this act. Is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 6, in section 8 (d), as amended, after the word "provisions", it is proposed to insert the following:

> And as an incident thereto, to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action.

And on page 25, in section 8, as amended, it is proposed to insert at the end thereof a new subsection, as follows:

> (e) Section 3 (d) of the act "to strengthen the common defense and to authorize the President to order members and units of Reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into active military service," approved August —, 1940, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: "and as an incident thereto, to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I desire briefly to explain the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Has the amendment been printed?

Mr. WAGNER. I am sorry to say the amendment has not been printed. Part of the original amendment has been printed, but the part I have added at the suggestion of some Senators with whom I have conferred has not been printed.

All that this amendment does is a simple act of justice, and I am sure it is an inadvertence that it has not been hitherto provided for.

We now provide under the bill, in the case of one who has served under the draft and has ended his service and seeks reemployment in his former position, that in the event the employer refuses to reemploy the individual he then may petition the court for reinstatement, and then the court of course must proceed by hearing and reach a determination. It may happen that a period of 1 or 2 or 3 months will elapse before the court enters its judgment. In the meantime, if the employee is found by the court to be entitled to return to his position, he has been out of employment for a period of 1 to 3 months, and no authority is given the court to give him judgment for back pay during that period. The amendment simply provides that in addition to entering judgment finding that the employer has violated the law and that the individual is entitled to reemployment, the court may also order that he shall receive back pay for lost wages due to the violation of the law.

That is all that the amendment does as far as this bill is concerned. It also adds the same provision as an amendment to the National Guard Act, because when I submitted the amendment to several Senators it was suggested that the privileges given to those who will be drafted under the pending bill would not be accorded to those who will serve under the National Guard Act; so I am putting them on the same basis.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, just a moment. I do not want to suggest the absence of a quorum, which would take some time; but I should like just a moment, if the Senator will bear with me, to correlate this amendment, which has not been printed, with the act. I saw it for the first time only 3 minutes ago.

Mr. WAGNER. The amendment was prepared by the legislative counsel.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; but, of course, the legislative counsel naturally seeks to use language to carry out the Senator's idea. The point with me is whether or not I like the Senator's idea. Perhaps I shall not, but I probably shall. I want just a moment or two to take a look at the matter myself, if I may.

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly. The Senator understands what I am attempting to accomplish, at least; does he not?

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from New York is trying, as I understand, to put the trainees under this bill in exactly the same position with respect to pay or loss of wages and benefits and the like that has already been accorded to those under the National Guard and Reserve components bill.

Mr. WAGNER. No; I am trying to do just the opposite. The National Guard bill and the bill which we have before us give the United States district courts jurisdiction to hear the cases of individuals who fail to have their positions restored. As the Senator from Connecticut—who is an able lawyer of long practice, particularly in the Federal courts—knows, it may take 2 or 3 or 4 weeks, or even longer, for the case to be finally determined. In the meantime there is a loss of wages, of course, by the applicant. He is not receiving any wages, because he has not been restored to his position. The amendment simply provides that in addition to the power now granted the court to restore the individual to his position if there has been a violation of law by the employer, the individual shall also have the wages lost during the period of the proceeding in court.

Mr. DANAHER. While the issue is being determined?

Mr. WAGNER. Exactly.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the amendment reported by the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 25, after the word "service", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following new proviso:

Provided further, That no person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under this act, except pursuant to voluntary enlistment, unless and until the Congress shall have declared that a state of war exists, or has declared that the United States is threatened with invasion.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, only a brief word is necessary in explanation of the amendment.

This amendment in no way interferes with or delays the provisions of the pending bill relating to registration. It deals only with the act of conscripting. It provides that all of the provisions of the bill shall be in operation so far as registration is concerned, so far as determining who is eligible for service is concerned, so far as concerns making decisions by the various local boards upon those who are eligible and those who are ineligible. The amendment simply provides that the act of drafting, the process of compelling the young men of the country who have registered to become part of the Regular Army, shall not occur until after an additional act is undertaken by Congress—either a declaration by Congress that we are involved in war, or a declaration by Congress that the United States is threatened with invasion.

I repeat the words because, after all, the amendment is self-explanatory:

Provided further, That no person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under this act, except pursuant to voluntary enlistment, unless and until the Congress shall have declared that a state of war exists or has declared that the United States is threatened with invasion.

The opportunity of voting on this amendment will give those of us who are opposed to peacetime draft an opportunity to indicate that we do not want to delay or interfere with peacetime efforts to prepare our country for raising speedily and quickly an army in time of invasion or upon a declaration of war—and there are many of us, because the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and other Senators have introduced similar amendments.

The issue is plain and simple: Shall we pass a bill which not only determines and fixes and establishes registration of all eligibles between the ages named in this bill but provides for actually drafting them into service in the Army, or shall we omit and postpone the act of draft and of conscription until Congress acts?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has used the word "service." I want to be sure that I correctly understand his amendment. Under his amendment, as I understand, there would be no possibility even of training until war had been declared by Congress, or until Congress had declared that the country was threatened with invasion. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is absolutely correct. The amendment would not permit drafting or conscripting the youth of America for actual service in the Army until Congess shall have again acted.

That is the issue. Under the pending bill, though war may never occur, though the possibility of war is a mere suspicion, a probability, a likelihood that may never occur, yet there is

authority to induct into the service these draftees for military training and for service in the Regular Army.

I do not desire to make an extended speech, but I want to say that, in my opinion, there is a tremendous enlightenment coming to the American people when they realize what is provided for in this bill. So far as I have been able to sense the understanding of this legislation from letters I have received, from persons I have talked to, from Senators with whom I have spoken, it has been supposed that this was a bill to train young men in camps or Army posts, to equip them physically, and give them the fundamental knowledge of war that they ought to have in case we should become engaged in war.

We now know that it is no such bill. We now know that under this bill the Government may put its hand upon the shoulder of any young man and say, "You are a Regular Army soldier, and you will go to Hawaii, you will go to Panama, you will go to the Mexican border, or you will go where we send you; and you will take your position side by side with the regular soldier who has been in the Army 1 month, 3 months, 3 years, or 5 years." To me, that is the fundamental objection to this bill.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. Am I correct in understanding that if the Senator's amendment should be defeated, it would be equivalent to a declaration by Congress that young men may be inducted into the active military service of the United States even though there be no imminence of war?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has stated the situation exactly. Even though there is nothing but a suspicion that 10 years from now we may be in war, this bill, if my amendment should be defeated, would permit inducting into the Army any young man who may be between the ages prescribed and be designated as eligible by the board.

The Senator from Colorado, in his very able speech of yesterday, called attention to the very fact to which I am calling attention, namely, the tremendous awakening that is coming to this country when a father and mother discover that their boy has not been drafted to go to a local town, as in the World War, for months of training and months of acquiring the fundamental knowledge that a soldier ought to have, but, as General Marshall has said, he is to be inducted immediately into the Army, to become a soldier in the Army of the United States. This is a draft in peacetime.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. It should be pointed out, although it may not be necessary, that when a man enters the Army, especially as a draftee, nearly all his civil rights are suspended during the period of his service. Therefore Senators will perceive the gravity of such a bill.

Mr. WALSH. In peacetime.

Mr. ASHURST. In peacetime we propose to suspend nearly all, if not all, the civil rights of these young men. Our ancestors remained in prison until their hair fell from their foreheads, they rotted away in prison, they died, to establish civil rights, and it is proposed that at one fell swoop these young men shall have and will have their civil rights suspended.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has stated the purport of the bill better than I could have done it.

Let us take a family of five youths within the ages provided. The first boy is working, we will assume, in a munitions factory, getting $60 a week. He is exempt or deferred. The second boy has poor eyesight, and he is exempted or deferred. The third boy is a divinity student, and he is exempt or deferred. The fourth boy holds some office or position in the Federal Government, and he is deferred. But the fifth son of the family of five is told, "For $30 a month you are from now on, and for 1 year, to be a soldier in the Regular Army." More than that, it provides that if the Congress says so, he cannot get out in 1 year. There is a provision in the bill that if the Congress declares that the national interest is imperiled a draftee may be required to remain in the service until the Congress shall declare that the national interest permits his being relieved from such service.

There is no need debating the issue longer. I am sure we agree that this proposed legislation is very solemn and very serious, and it is very troublesome to us all. None of us wants to leave our country unprotected. But I am not yet convinced that it is necessary to take this draft step.

I was very much impressed by what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] said yesterday, that he had patiently stood and listened in recent days to every Army and every Navy officer who appeared before the Committee on Appropriations—and let me see if I quote him correctly—and that no Army or Navy officer had convinced him that there was any imminent danger of war against this country. Am I correct?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator agrees I am correct. So here in peacetime with merely a suspicion, with war hysteria that some other nation is going to attack us, we are confronted with the responsibility of providing that the power of our Government, to repeat what the Senator from Arizona has stated, shall take away from a young man his whole prospect of the future for 1 year, all his civil rights, his opportunity to progress and advance in whatever work he undertakes for 1 whole year.

The issue is clear and distinct. There are those of us who want to hesitate until such a situation arises that the Congress thinks we are going to be invaded, before we proceed to invoke the draft.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the Senator think, in view of our experience in the World War, that we could afford to wait to train our recruits until war begins and we must meet the enemy?

Mr. WALSH. I personally think that through volunteer enlistments we can provide our country with all the troops it needs for the kind of an army which modern warfare has taught us we need. I do not think it necessary to have a large number of foot soldiers rather than soldiers trained in what I call the mechanized method of warfare. I do not think it is necessary.

All the evidence I have been able to gather from what I have read of the European war indicates that a limited number of highly trained professional soldiers, such as the Regular Army is, trained in mechanized modern warfare, are far more effective than a million or two million only partially trained men who render a year's service to their country.

One of the things about the bill which troubles me is that, in my opinion, it will annihilate the system of voluntary enlistment. That is a terrible thing to contemplate. The young men of the country will say, "Why volunteer? Every year there will be a draft, and we can go in under the draft." They can point out in the bill some advantages in being drafted which they do not get by volunteering.

For instance, if they are registered, they can immediately enter the voluntary service for 1 year. There are other provisions which seem to be of some benefit to them.

I wish to repeat, in my opinion the safety and security of this country depend, not upon a changing and ever-moving year-by-year Army, but a group of men who have volunteered to make the Army their life career, to perfect themselves in the highest kind of mechanized knowledge, and to be ready to defend the Nation in an emergency.

I personally do not feel that there is an emergency, that there is a situation now which requires the training which the distinguished Senator from Florida thinks is necessary.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does not the Senator think the volunteer system will leave untouched the "fifth columnists" and others who are now trying to undermine our Government and who would ultimately fill the jobs of those volunteers who go to the front?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, I am as much against any "fifth columnists" as is the Senator from Florida. I personally

think—and I know this is a dangerous thing to say—that the extent of the "fifth column" activities in this country has been exaggerated. Undoubtedly there are some of them, and I want to stamp them out, but I do not propose, because of fear of some few "fifth columnists," to deprive the young men of this country of their civil rights, unless there is an actual need and a national emergency.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Confirmatory of what the Senator has said, I called attention yesterday to an article by Gault McGowan in the New York Sun. He said:

LONDON, August 24 (delayed by air raid).—President Roosevelt's urgent appeal for conscription, featured in the newspapers here this morning, appears in the opinion of military experts unrelated to the requirements of modern war, which becomes the affair not only of crack front-line troops but of masses mobilized behind the battle lines in the munition factories. Modern war can come to a standstill in a few days if supplies for technical troops fail.

Those who have seen modern war on the Continent unanimously agree that victory is achieved by putting the greatest number of men in one place at one time is obsolete.

Mr. WALSH. I read the article, and I was much impressed by it. It confirms what Col. Bill Donovan wrote as a result of his observations in Europe. He said that 50,000 highly trained German troops with mechanized and motorized weapons invaded Belgium and succeeded in driving back 2,000,000 French troops.

I repeat, in my opinion, we are stressing too much what I consider the fifth line of defense in this country. The Navy, which we are building up rapidly, is conceded to be our first line of defense. Our second, third, and fourth lines of defense should have the entire concentration, all the energy, all the effort of our Army officers to build them up before we scatter our efforts in the field of training soldiers for 1 year in a conscript army.

I repeat, even with a million or 2,000,000 American soldiers with 1 year's training, in the absence of a strong, powerful, large naval force, and in the absence of a strong, powerful mechanized force, in the absence of a strong, powerful antiaircraft force, in my opinion, we would be doomed in case our Navy failed to prevent an invasion of our country.

I have already talked longer than I had desired to, and I know the Senator from Kentucky wants the floor, and I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment very briefly.

I hope Senators will understand that if the amendment shall be adopted, we might as well not pass the bill, and we might as well not have been spending weeks in this discussion. The theory of the bill is that we will not wait until we are invaded, or even threatened with invasion, will not wait until there is a declaration of war, as in 1917, and then wait 13½ months to train an army so that it can fight. That is what occurred in the World War.

The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts provides:

No person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under this act except pursuant to voluntary enlistment unless and until Congress shall have declared that a state of war exists.

In other words, we could not call up anyone for training in order to get ready to fight, if we had to, until Congress declared that a state of war existed, when fighting is supposed to begin.

Or until Congress has declared that the United States is threatened with invasion.

In other words, we could not, under the amendment, call up anyone for service or training unless a war was actually in progress, or an enemy was on his way to our shores.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why pass the bill at all, if the amendment is agreed to?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I have said. If the amendment shall be adopted, we might as well abandon the proposed legislation.

We have debated the merits of the volunteer system. I realize that the Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators are absolutely opposed to any bill which would provide for drafting men in peacetime. It may be that there are some here who would not be in favor of it even in time of war.

I know when we went to war in 1917 it required a long and continued and bitter struggle to obtain a draft law when we were in war, on the theory that the volunteer system was the traditional system of the United States.

Mr. President, it has not been the traditional system. Washington asked that there be a draft law during the Revolution. Some States adopted such a law, but it was never very effective. Washington under the voluntary system, in the entire Revolution, never had at any one time more than 17,000 men under his command, and when he fought the battles of Trenton and Princeton he had only 3,000 men under his command.

In the War of 1812 the voluntary system was tried for a while. The British had only 4,500 soldiers on the American continent when the War of 1812 began, yet they burned the Capitol and the White House. There were only about 3,000 men here to defend the Capitol of the United States under the volunteer system. As a matter of fact, with the exception of the Battle of New Orleans, nearly all the land battles of the War of 1812 resulted in the defeat of the American forces. We were more successful in our sea battles, such as the Battle of Lake Erie and other battles.

After the Capitol and the White House were burned, Congress debated and dawdled around for weeks and months over whether there should be a draft. Both Houses passed laws, but they got into differences between themselves, and before they could adjust those differences peace was declared. [Laughter.]

In the Civil War the country started out with a volunteer system, and when Lincoln called for volunteers in 1861 the ranks were filled, but when he called for volunteers of 300,000 in 1862 the voluntary system collapsed and he could not raise 300,000 men to defend the Union.

Early in 1863 Congress passed a draft law to enlist men in the Union Army under the draft. Unfortunately it was not as successful as it might have been, because the law provided that men could hire other men to enlist for them, and fight in their places. They could pay $300 as a bonus to the Government and get out of service in the draft army.

The Confederate Congress passed a draft law in 1862, a year before the Congress of the United States passed such a law.

Not only did Washington ask for a draft law during the Revolution, but Congress actually passed a draft law in 1792 while Washington was President of the United States, and he signed that law.

So the voluntary system is not the traditional system of the United States in the raising of an army.

Of course, in the Mexican War it was not necessary to draft men. I shall not go into a discussion of that war, because our Nation was vastly superior to Mexico, and our volunteer forces were vastly superior to the Mexican forces, but, even so, on the way from Vera Cruz to Mexico City, many volunteers in the forces of the United States Army left because their enlistment had expired and they were not willing to serve any longer.

In the war against Spain in 1898 there was, of course, no need to pass a draft law.

When the World War came on we had a terrific fight. Some of the most outstanding Members of the party of which I am a member in the House of Representatives and in this body, opposed the draft law on the theory that it was in violation of the established traditions of the United States in the raising of an army.

Mr. President, tradition never won a battle on any battlefield in history. We have been hearing about the draft being in opposition to democracy, and that it destroys democracy and creates dictatorship. The history of democracies does not sustain such an assertion.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Is it not true that in the World War there were in excess of 1,300,000 volunteers?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, there were more than a million—probably even more than 1,300,000 volunteers, but most of them volunteered in anticipation of the draft.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to have the Senator remember as he talks to us that every single instance which he has given, in which he says that the voluntary system is not the traditional way to fill up our armies, has been in time of war.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes; in the main, but not always.

Mr. DANAHER. Every single instance the Senator has named was when a war was in progress. We are not at war.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no——

Mr. DANAHER. No; but the whole scheme is one preparing to take us into war; is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. DANAHER. Is not that the reason why the Senator argues in the way he does?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is not only not a system to take us into war, but it is a system to prepare us so that we will not be compelled to fight a war, because there will be no aggressor who will have the nerve to attack the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator name an instance in history when any country equipped itself with a large army that it did not go to war? There is not one.

Mr. BARKLEY. Many of the nations of the world, including our own, have gotten into war without preparation, and have had to wait until they got into war in order to prepare, and because they were not prepared when they got into war, many of them were defeated, because they had to wait to prepare, as we did in 1917, for 13½ months, before we could train our boys to fight in the war which we entered, when we had the British Fleet and the French Fleet, and the British Army, and the French Army, and the Belgian Army, to hold back the enemy in that particular case—which we will not have if we get into a war in the future.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me point out that if there were a definition of where our national interests lie, or what we are going to be called upon to defend, the Senator would find a very different attitude, not only in the country but in the Senate. I will say to the Senator, that if the volunteer system shall fall down, if he chooses to use that expression—and I do not say or admit that it will, because the facts are otherwise—it will be for the simple reason that the American boys will not volunteer to fight some other country's war, but they will do what they can to defend the United States. That is the whole situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. No one is asking them to fight somebody else's war.

Mr. DANAHER. What are we taking them into South America for?

Mr. BARKLEY. We have not taken them into South America. If we take them into South America it will be our war, and not somebody else's war.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator let me put a proposition to him?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me suggest this possibility to the Senator, just as a matter of tactics.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean tactics in war or in the Senate? [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. In war. I wish I could emulate the tactics which the Senator from Kentucky so eminently uses in his place in the Senate; but let us leave the Senate out of this case, for the Senate is not going to war.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think so, at least. All its battles will be fought inside these four walls.

Mr. DANAHER. And very noisily, too. But let me say to the Senator, if we can assume a case—if any country undertook to invade any part of this hemisphere, in the light of the military facts and the strategy that has been explained to us by the Army officers—and it has been demonstrated over and over again that 3,000,000 tons of shipping would be needed to bring a million men to this country—is our Navy expected to fall dead while that is being done? Is it possible that all foreign armies, with all their equipment, are going to come across the ocean and devastate us and reduce us? Let me say to the Senator that there is not a man named as a trainee under this bill who will ever be called upon to fire a single shot unless our Navy is destroyed. Is that not a fact?

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that the Senator's proposition?

Mr. DANAHER. Is that not the fact? That is the proposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; that is not the fact, and I want to say to the Senator that if his theory of legislation with respect to preparation for any emergency, including war, should prevail, it would be much more likely that an enemy would come in our direction to attack us, not only across the Atlantic but across the Pacific, than if we were so prepared that they would not dare do so.

There is no use to debate possibilities here. It is infiinitely better to have an army and never need it, than to need one and never have it. [Applause in the galleries.]

I hope the Chair will keep the galleries quiet. I appreciate the approval of the occupants of the galleries, but it is against the rules of the Senate to applaud. I hope that they will observe the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, it might as well be said that we ought not to build a tank or an airplane until war starts, and then begin to build tanks and airplanes. Why go to all the trouble to get ready unless war is coming? It may not come, but in any event must we wait until it gets here before we prepare for it?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator that that argument is wholly specious for the simple reason that, of course, our military must be built up. That is why we have been spending billions of dollars over several years. There is no question about that.

The Senator is very courteous in yielding to me. Let me say further to the Senator that if a hostile air force, let us say, were laid down on an airfield in an interior part of Brazil, and if we did not like to see that hostile air force there in Brazil, the alternatives that would confront the people of the United States at that moment would be these: We either would have to attack that hostile force 5,500 miles from the southern point of Florida, or we would have to stay at home and let Brazil defend itself. We would have to make that decision on the one hand.

If we decided that we would attack the hostile air force, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky, and sent a fleet down there, then that hostile air force would be in a position to defend Brazil identically and exactly as England is at this moment resisting invasion. We would be the attacker, 5,500 miles from our position.

If we undertook to attack the invaders of that country and rout them by land, we would find it impossible to attack them by land. We could not even reach them. But if we were going to reach them by water, then, Mr. President, all the hostile air force would have to do would be to take its airplanes out of the country, and then put the United States to the test as to whether we would or would not defend South America.

That is tactically the proposition that confronts us with reference to South America. There is no alternative possible justifying this vast army that is called for, in order to achieve hemisphere defense on such account. There is, I submit, no military answer other than the one that has been suggested.

I ask the Senator from Kentucky, on what possible basis it has been decided in the various votes that have been pushed through here by those sponsoring this proposed legislation that we will send young trainees outside the United States, boys that have never fired a gun, who do not know how to operate a tank or an anti-aircraft gun or anything else? We are going to attempt to justify their being sent to South America, and the amendments to this very legislation so show.

I ask the Senator from Kentucky, for what war are we preparing?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not going to tell the Senator for what war we are preparing, because no one can tell the Senator for what war we are preparing, but it is the duty of the American Congress to prepare not only for probabilities but for possibilities. If I felt sure that the Senator from Connecticut were right in his military prognosis I would recommend that the President make him chief of staff instead of General Marshall. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. This debate has been going on for a little more than 4 weeks. It started a week or two before the bill came before the Senate, and has been going on ever since.

After all the debate that has taken place in the Senate, does not the Senator believe that there are in this body the greatest number of magnificent and splendid admirals, and the greatest number of magnificent and splendid generals this Nation ever had?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not care to describe the military genius and prowess of the Members of this body. However, for men who have never attended either West Point or Annapolis, they know more about military affairs than any similar group with which I have been associated for a long time.

I do not wish to prolong the debate on this amendment. If I knew that the required number of men could be obtained by the voluntary system under the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts I should be opposed to it because I think it would be wrong in time of emergency. Suppose the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and I lived in the same block in a city and we were at war, or about to enter war. Suppose we were in the same circumstances and of the same age. Suppose the Senator from Connecticut were willing to rush forward in a romantic spirit to don the uniform of his country and fight for the flag.

Let us assume that I were not willing to do so, but preferred to stay at home and enjoy a peaceful life. Assume that I were willing that the Senator from Connecticut should do my fighting for me. I do not believe that I ought to be allowed to force the Senator from Connecticut to do my fighting. Neither do I believe that either he or I ought to have the sole power to determine whether or not our country needs us. I think the Government of the United States ought to have a voice in determining whether either of us, both of us, or neither of us, is needed, or whether we can serve in some other capacity to the best interests of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I yield this time, but not more.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to read a few remarks from the hearings——

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator bear with me for only a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have been doing so for a long time.

Mr. DANAHER. I read from the hearings:

> First, voluntary recruiting of the Regular Army should proceed as rapidly as we can secure the men, until the authorized limit of 280,000 is reached. If at that time the situation is as serious as it is at present, and certainly if it is more serious, recruitment of the Regular Army on a voluntary basis should continue, possibly up to 400,000 men as a temporary measure, not as a permanent increase.

Those are the words of the Chief of Staff, General Marshall. I am no rocking-chair general. I rely on him.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will recall that when General Marshall made the statement he was talking about an army of 280,000. Since that time we have raised the figure to 375,000, and under the volunteer system we are nearly 90,000 short of making up the 375,000, the authorized strength of the Army.

Mr. DANAHER. It is a singular thing that all this talk about an Army of 1,300,000, with an Army of 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 men in reserve has developed since Colonel Stimson became Secretary of War.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know when the idea was developed in the War Department, but my recollection is that the bill was introduced in the Senate before Colonel Stimson was appointed Secretary of War. If I am mistaken about that I can be corrected; but certainly the idea of the Burke-Wadsworth bill, which we are now considering, had germinated in the minds of Members of Congress before anybody knew Colonel Stimson was to be Secretary of War.

Mr. President, I have talked longer on this amendment than I had intended. I hope it will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. WALSH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I am not informed how he would vote on this question. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. However, I am informed that if he were present and voting, he would vote as I shall vote. I vote "nay." I understand that the junior Senator from Oregon has a special pair.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHEELER. I announce that if the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] were present he would vote "yea." He has a special pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], who would vote "nay."

Mr. McKELLAR (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that the Senator from Virginia, if present, would vote "nay." I vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], who would vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] are unavoidably absent.

I am advised that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—29

Adams	Davis	Lundeen	Vandenberg
Ashurst	Donahey	Murray	Van Nuys
Brown	Downey	Norris	Walsh
Bulow	Herring	Nye	Wheeler
Capper	Holt	Reed	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead	
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Taft	
Danaher	La Follette	Tobey	

NAYS—54

Andrews	Ellender	Lodge	Schwartz
Austin	George	Lucas	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard
Barbour	Gibson	Maloney	Slattery
Barkley	Green	Mead	Smathers
Bone	Guffey	Miller	Stewart
Bridges	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Burke	Hale	Neely	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Harrison	O'Mahoney	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Overton	Tydings
Caraway	Hayden	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Hill	Radcliffe	White
Chavez	King	Reynolds	
Connally	Lee	Russell	

NOT VOTING—13

Bankhead	Glass	McCarran	Smith
Bilbo	Holman	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Frazier	Hughes	Pittman	Townsend
Gillette			

So Mr. WALSH's amendment to the amendment reported by the committee was rejected.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I make a point of order. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Missouri for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DOWNEY. I prefer not to yield for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I insist on the constitutional right to have a quorum present when business is transacted. I shall be glad to have the Chair rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from California does not have to yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I make the point of order that it is a constitutional matter for the Senate to have a quorum present while business is being transacted. I make a constitutional point of order. Under the decisions of the Chair in the past 2 or 3 days, the question must be submitted to the decision of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will overrule the point of order made by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair be sustained as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the decision of the Chair is sustained.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I insist that under the precedents of the Senate that question must be submitted to the Senate itself.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I submit to the Chair the point of order that the Senator from California did not yield to the Senator from Missouri to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I insist that it is not necessary for a Senator to yield to another Senator in order that the constitutional point of no quorum may be raised because the Constitution of the United States requires that a quorum of the Senate be present when business is transacted. I stand on the constitutional point, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order made by the Senator from Kentucky is sustained by the Chair. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has already sustained the decision of the Chair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senate has not sustained the decision of the Chair, because the Chair gaveled the thing through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will proceed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, does the Chair rule that the Constitution of the United States, which requires a majority of the Senate to be present——

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I would appreciate it as a personal favor if the Senator from Missouri would allow me to proceed before he insists on his request for a quorum. I am very anxious to finish; I am tired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very glad to yield to the request of my friend from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But I did not wish the erroneous ruling of the temporary occupant of the chair, the Senator from New Jersey, to stand as a precedent in this body.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I always listen with respect to any statement made on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I recognize his logic; I admire his integrity and so I believe the able Senator from Kentucky must agree with me, that his argument, that we need a draft now, because one was necessary in the World War, is not to be sustained unless we assume that again we are going to raise from four to five million men for the invasion of Europe or Asia. I say to the Senator that if he now believes, as in the great war, that we are going to require an army of millions for some foreign military adventure then certainly he is right in concluding we cannot raise such in army by the volunteer system.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In what I said, and in what I think, I am not assuming that we are going to be in war but, in the condition in which the world finds itself, I am assuming, not on our own account by any aggression of our own but because the situation in the world which all must recognize, that it is entirely possible—it may even be probable—that we will be dragged into war, and in that event I do not want to wait until a year or longer before we are ready to meet the enemy wherever he may be found.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me again repeat that I will freely admit that if the Senator believes there is a reasonable likelihood that we may again require a great Army for foreign service, then his position is consistent; but, Mr. President, I think it can be easily demonstrated by military authority that we require nowhere near three or four or five million men to defend this hemisphere.

This Senate is already committed to the construction of the most powerful navy in the world and an air force that alone should be able to defend the New World against attack by transport airplanes from the Old. We are now building in the Caribbean and at the Canal the most powerful maritime fortresses in the world. I say that when we plan to add to such military power, a highly mechanized, motorized army of almost a million men we have then completed a safe and sound program of national defense. Beyond that we should not go until some nation commits against us an overt act of war or seeks to violate the Monroe Doctrine.

Does our national safety require that we should abandon our system of voluntary enlistment and set our feet on the regimented road of compulsory military training in peactime? Consider, first, our vast population of 135,000,000. In the last three decades we have added more to our numbers than all those unfortunate people in the British Isles.

In the Great War of 1917, 1,300,000 men volunteered for service, and, according to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], that number of voluntary enlistments could have been increased by hundreds of thousands. We are today 25 or 30 percent numerically larger than we were during that war period. There can be no doubt that that institution of a free people, voluntary military service, is amply sufficient to provide manpower beyond all present needs. Compulsory military training today does not proceed from any national necessity. It is sired by ignorance and fear. If the pending measure passes, we will have needlessly surrendered one of the great protections of a free people.

What is the military lesson of the present European war: That mastery of the air is almost certain victory; that air

power combined with fast-moving motorized, mechanized troops will destroy in a few days the great conscript armies that were invulnerable in the past. The German armies that have just conquered Europe never comprised more than a maximum of from 500,000 to 600,000 men.

The Congress of the United States has already authorized our Army to increase its strength to at least 625,000 men. These figures include our proposed Regular Army of 375,000 and the National Guard of 250,000.

Mr. President, there would be no need to worry about our Nation if we had a highly mechanized, mobile, motorized army of 600,000. That added to the great Navy and air forces we are now building, and to our Caribbean defenses, would guarantee our impregnable defense of the Western Hemisphere.

And the passage of a short period of time will reveal, I think, that all the resources of our General Staff, headed by General Marshall, will be severely strained in building into a mechanized, modern army before next summer, the 625,000 men already authorized. If our military leaders can create within the next 12 months a modern, efficient Army of six or seven or eight hundred thousand they will have made our effective defense certain. And they will have performed a titanic task. And here and now I desire to prophecy that our Army leaders will not be able to efficiently handle the manpower they ask for and that any attempt to process, equip, and train the number they now seek will only serve as a handicap in building up a thoroughly mechanized, efficient, modern army of say three-quarters of a million. And we do not need conscription for that number.

Mr. President, there is no military expert known to me, who has expressed an opinion on the subject, who has not declared that any attempt to land a large number of foreign troops on our shores is an impossibility. There is not in the world the available cargo space to land and service a great army in the Western Hemisphere. Even if there were, troops in transports could not be landed; they would fall easy prey to our Navy, our air force, our mines, and port guns. If my declaration of what all military experts declare brings upon my head the charge that I am a fool or a traitor, then may I answer that for many years I have advocated strong national defense, including a two-ocean navy. I have thought that our reliance upon the British Navy was a weak and dangerous policy.

Likewise, Mr. President, when Mr. Lindbergh told us at least 3 years ago that Germany had acquired marked air superiority over Great Britain and France, and that with her air power Germany could devastate those countries, it seemed plain to me, indeed, that we ought to begin to build an air armada in the Western Hemisphere that would dominate the New World. Likewise it seemed obvious that our Achilles heel was in our lack of tin and rubber, and that ordinary sense would require an adequate supply of those strategic war materials, and this policy, too, I have long advocated.

Then beyond that it seemed to me, Mr. President, in order to make ourselves impregnable, what we needed was not a vast conscript army of millions of men that present European experience has shown is futile but a fast, hardened, professional, motorized, mechanized army of, say, 750,000 men. It is my own opinion that we would have a stronger army, at less cost, and with less burden on our people, if this army were wholly a regular and permanent establishment, to be increased, of course, if war should come or the Monroe Doctrine be violated.

Then, finally, Mr. President, it has seemed to me that we ought to have modern, efficient military highways in America. Our greatest traffic experts tell us that the mobility and striking power of our motorized and mechanized war instruments would be doubled or trebled by improved, heavy, safe roads in country and cities alike. Yet here we are apparently oblivious to the need of modern highways in America. While road-building machines rust unused almost everywhere in the land and millions desperately seek work we fail to begin this vitally needed job of building a modern system of highways everywhere in the Nation.

Mr. President, to establish my long committment to adequate military defense, I here wish to insert in the RECORD an item published in the San Francisco Chronicle of December 13, 1938, and a paragraph from a speech of mine delivered on the floor of the Senate almost a year ago.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of December 13, 1938]

Yesterday at Washington Senator-elect DOWNEY announced his satisfaction with President Roosevelt's foreign policies. He said the Nation should have two strong fleets, one for each ocean, and should build 100,000 airplanes "in order to assure preservation of the Monroe Doctrine against any combination of world powers."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 9, 1939, p. 379]

So far as I am concerned, as a Member of the Senate, let me say to the military men of America: Make us safe against any foreign aggression without weakly counting upon the support or any other nation that well may fail us when we vitally need help. Whatever we ought to do by way of preparation we should do. * * * How idiotic we would be if, like the statesmen of European empires, we should allow ourselves to be overbuilt so that we could truly be said to be the prey of reasonable apprehension and fear. * * * Of course, I hate to say it, but I must say that such expenditures should come ahead of every other expenditure, even expenditures for the unhappy submerged half of the population because, after all, national defense is the supreme necessity of all.

Colonel Lindbergh and our great war ace, Eddie Rickenbacker, have suggested that if we had 25,000 more military airplanes, then even the most timid and hysterical citizen in America would know that we were absolutely safe. * * *

Mr. President, a short time ago I sat in my seat in the Senate and heard with amazement a Senator declare that the safety of the Panama Canal was endangered because Germany has some transport planes in Venezuela, Colombia, or Ecuador.

Mr. President, we have in our long-range bombers of the Navy the finest airplanes that any nation possesses, with skillful pilots, ammunition, and guns. A substantial number of these are at the Canal and in the Caribbean. They have a flying or cruising range of 1,000, 1,200, or 1,300 miles; and, except for a mere handful, they are the only planes of that kind in the entire world.

The transport planes referred to are old, antiquated, civilian ships, one time belonging to Germany, several hundred or thousands of miles from the Canal, 12 in number. And yet some of our Senators and many of our columnists are honestly alarmed lest these 12 decrepit transport planes may break through out powerful defense at Panama to wreck the Canal there.

If our military leaders, after years of preparation and hundreds of millions of expenditures, have not made our Canal safe against Japanese fishing boats and a dozen old planes or a sunken ship in the Canal, then we need new material in the Army and Navy, and that I do not believe. I think our military leaders are of the highest caliber and will, given a fair chance, vindicate that opinion.

In the Caribbean, in the Gulf of Mexico, around the Panama Canal, we have already built one of the strongest maritime bases in the world. Germany has not one ship there, one soldier, or one gun. She is 5,000 miles away, and yet the American people have been brought into a mental condition in which they are in hysteria and fright for fear something may happen to us down in the Panama Canal.

The difficulties that would confront Germany if she should attempt to develop great military bases in South America are many, obvious, and almost insuperable. Consider only one. No nation can fight a war without vast supplies of gasoline and oil. There is only one major source of supply of oil in South America, and that is Venezuela. There are some small holdings in the adjoining countries of Ecuador and Colombia, and there are insignificant wells in Peru; but the only major supply is in Venezuela. We have a strong and diversified military power within two or three hundred miles of Venezuela. The Government of Venezuela is friendly. The oil wells are in the possession of American and British capitalists. At the first overt act by the Governments of Germany or

Japan against South America our military forces could guarantee the defense of Venezuela and thereby prevent Germany from obtaining any appreciable amount of oil in South America.

With the oil of South America in our possession, think of the tremendous handicap that would be imposed on Germany if she should attempt a war in this hemisphere.

Mr. President, I assume that our President and the Army and the Navy intend to proceed with the construction of great military bases in the Caribbean. It is true that we ought to fortify the island of Trinidad, the southernmost island of the West Indies, lying directly opposite Venezuela. When that simple act is accomplished, the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea will become an American lake; and any military expert who seriously considers that Germany in some miraculous way could challenge our power there should be persuaded that we could occupy the Baltic Sea or the Mediterranean.

And let us note that all of Mexico lies behind our defenses in the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean. Germany could not strike Mexico without first destroying our forces there. And for other plain reasons the west coast of Mexico is safe from Japanese attack. With our assistance the defeat of an Asiatic expeditionary force to Mexico would be simple and sure.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion, after long discussion with military men, when we once establish our military power at the Panama Canal, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean we shall be in such a dominating position that no foreign power would dare to challenge the Monroe Doctrine or undertake the invasion of any part of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I was likewise shocked and astonished when I heard a Senator solemnly enlarge upon the likelihood of a "blitzkrieg" from Japan to the coast of California or Panama or South America. We have 10 times or a hundred times the military strength of China. To undertake the conquest of the Western Hemisphere by Japan, according to military authorities, would require 5 or 10 times the strength involved in aggression against China; yet at the end of 3 years Japan has not yet been able to consolidate her position in that nearby peaceful and weak country. Yet certain of my fellow citizens in California are in constant apprehension lest the Mikado may send a "blitzkrieg" there. If Japan were to utilize every ton of cargo space she has, her entire navy, all her fishing vessels, and all her merchant ships, she could not convoy 100,000 men to the shores of the Western Hemisphere and maintain their supplies there, thousands of miles remote from her own bases.

But we seem to have little regard here for obvious, admitted facts. When the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan gave undisputed figures showing the absolute impossibility of Germany's sending any expeditionary force to our eastern coast in excess of 50,000 men, Senators, seemed to pay no attention to it.

Mr. President, no one can ever convince me that the Japanese Army and Navy would be so insane as to attempt the conquest of a strong and powerful people five or ten thousand miles away. To me, of all the nightmares that have been dreamed in the United States, this idea that Japan may engage in a mad venture against us in the Western Hemisphere is almost the maddest one of all.

I desire now to read to the distinguished Senators who favor the bill an authority in the most conclusive language, which, I take it, they all must accept. I refer now to Mr. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the statement I am about to read was made by Mr. Roosevelt when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Said Mr. Roosevelt:

> Nobody, presumably, after all the prophets of 1914 have been proved without honor in any country, would attempt to say what would happen at the end of a military deadlock between Japan and the United States. After the first year or two of hostilities, economic causes would become the determining factor. Tableau: Japan and the United States, four or five thousand miles apart, making faces at one another across a no-man's water as broad as the Pacific. Some genius might then arise to ask what it was all about and what the use was of the atrophy of national life and development. Or, to take a pessimistic view, jingo counsels might prevail in both nations until one or the other, or both, had bled to death through the pocketbook. If then it were realized by the people of this country and of Japan that a war would be a futile gesture, attended by no sufficiently compensating results, each nation might be in a fair way to change its apprehensive habit of mind.

Mr. President, so far as I know, that is the conclusion of every military expert who has ever spoken on this subject. Oh, I wish the American people could realize to what terrible nightmares their fear and fright and confusion have driven them.

Do I hear some Senator suggesting that since Mr. Roosevelt made that statement conditions have changed? Yes; they have changed in one very material respect, and that alone. In the last 20 years a new, a fearsome, and destructive instrument of warfare has been developed. I refer to the airplane. Does that make Mr. Roosevelt's statement any less true? Oh, no. It is true now for a stronger reason than when he spoke.

Before the airplane came into existence we could have met the Japanese Navy and Japanese transports, first by our Navy, then by our fort guns, by our mines, and finally by our Army. In my opinion, if the necessity now arose in California—and I cannot imagine it ever will—we could destroy Japanese transports without a single naval vessel.

Why do I say that? Because in the atmosphere of the sky a greater navy now sails, not at 20 knots, but at 200 miles an hour. Not a single military authority—and I challenge contradiction—but admits that a few hundred planes could devastate any transports attempting to approach our American shores.

Are you apprehensive lest aircraft carriers, convoyed by some navy approaching our shores, could bomb our cities or conquer our air fleet? Consider the facts. All the aircraft carriers in the world provide space for approximately a thousand airplanes, and of this very limited number, almost one-half is in the possession of our own Navy.

Do you suggest that Germany or Japan may seize airplane bases adjacent to the coast lines of the Western Hemisphere and from those points bomb our cities or destroy our military forces? How groundless this fear. Not a single such base is in the possession of either Germany or Japan, and should they attempt to seize bases within striking distance of our shores, those bases could be reached by our airplanes or Navy before any foreign military power could be consolidated there. I have already said that the United States alone has the only great fleet of long-range bombers, whose cruising range is more than double that of the air armadas of Germany and Japan.

Mr. President, the English Channel is but 22 miles across, and for 2 or 3 months the Germans have been unable to land a single soldier over that water into England. Yet we are apprehensive that Japan may risk her Navy, her troops, her whole destiny, upon some mad attempt to land in the Western Hemisphere.

I hear some of the Senators declaring, "Oh, yes; but we may have to fight both Japan and Germany together." Let me say: We have a greater population than Japan and Germany combined, a far greater factory capacity, and wealth many times more. With these nations waging a war far distant from their bases our victory would be assured. We have seen Senators alarmed, and the columnists of the United States frightened by the assumption that Germany may fall heir to the British Navy. Of course, that may happen, and our national policy which depended upon the Navy of Great Britain was weak and fallacious for that reason. But consider—would Hitler send the British Navy over to destroy and be destroyed by our Navy, leaving Japan absolute mistress of the seas of the world? Does anyone think there is any prize that might be offered to Japan by which she would be led to risk virtually her whole national destiny in attempting to destroy our Navy around our bases with the loss of her Navy a substantial possibility?

And remember that the British Navy as it was constituted before this war began—though it is reduced now—required 250,000 men to operate, among them being tens of thousands

of the most skilled officers and technicians. Navy experts tell us that Germany could not hope to secure the sailors and technicians and officers and train them to man the British Navy in less than 18 months, possibly 2 years, and by the time that period had passed, we would be on the way to having a Navy as large as those of Japan and Great Britain combined. And it is my belief that within 2 years we will have built at least 25,000 combat planes, trained the pilots and ground crews for them, and thereby be assured of ample power to pulverize any attack on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, while I have no fear of any distant army, I am apprehensive of the future of my country and of my people. I dread that the same fright, the same hysteria, the same exaggeration, the same refusal to recognize realities, may drive us on to unwise and dangerous conclusions.

One Senator was charged with having said, and he denied it, that men in war industries should be paid only the same salary as was to be paid the men who were conscripted.

Mr. President, when the next hysterical wave floods over the country, when the Nation faces the threat of national insolvency, the cry will then arise, "Oh, we cannot pay the men in the shipyards and in the airplane factories five or six or seven dollars a day. They are in war industries. They have got to work for $30 a month, plus their keep." Mr. President, that would be logical. If in time of peace we take a man out of his career and his job, and say, "Serve at $30 a month, plus your board and room," is it not logical to say in a nation whose finances are crumbling, that the employee in war industries must do likewise?

Then what is the next conclusion that hysteria and fear will drive us to? May it not be to conscript wealth—to take at first not all wealth, but the factories producing war supplies, because certainly it will be argued if we may conscript men in peacetime, in peacetime we have the right to commandeer military factories.

Let us realize that if, as we enter this crisis, we begin to sacrifice fundamental rights, in the end we may have lost free government.

We are now in a confused, hysterical, excited condition, seeing dangers which do not and cannot exist. I look with apprehension to what the future may hold for the American people if we do not begin to act calmly, courageously, tolerantly, realistically.

Wars have proceeded destructively throughout the ages. Europe has been devastated in almost every generation. The present destruction in France is slight compared with the destruction there in past centuries. Our forefathers in almost every generation were compelled to fight for some issue or in defense of themselves. If we Americans have to fight for ourselves or the Monroe Doctrine, let us not proceed in fear, hysteria, confusion, excitement.

Multitudes of Americans shiver at the name of Hitler. The other night I was talking to one. I asked, "What do you fear in the name of Hitler?" The reply was, "Oh, I am frightened at Hitler's power." I asked, "How, specifically? Are you frightened at 10,000 tanks?" The answer was, "Well, that is part of it." I said, "Those tanks are not here, and they cannot be brought here. Are you frightened at an army of 3,000,000 men?" The reply was, "Well, I guess I am." I said, "Those 3,000,000 men are not here, and they cannot be brought here. Are you frightened at 20,000 airplanes?" The answer was, "Well, I guess I am." I said, "In 2 years we shall be able to build in our own Nation more and better planes than Germany can ever produce; and Germany has not a single base in the Western Hemisphere to which she can bring a single airplane."

Mr. President, our fear and apprehension are unworthy a great people. We have almost double the population of Germany. Counting Canada, we have substantially more population than Germany and Japan combined. I suppose it is safe to say that we have three times the wealth, natural resources, and factory capacity of those two nations combined. Here we are, a great—and I hope still a virile people—twice as large as Germany, far stronger, and yet 5,000 miles from Germany we tremble in apprehension of what Germany may do to us.

Mr. President, I wish I could declare to the American people that what Colonel Lindbergh said is true—that a great air armada will make impossible the conquest of the Western Hemisphere.

We already have great bombers which can fly from Panama almost to the southern tip of South America loaded with bombs and then return to Panama; and yet we are afraid that Germany, with nothing there, may undertake the building of great military bases in the face of our rapidly developing military power.

I know that many of our governmental leaders are sincerely and fervently persuaded to the belief that some of the South American governments may form an alliance with Germany or some other dictatorial power, allow that power to seize control of the government and establish military power there. That too seems to me a strange and groundless fear. I cannot conceive that the government of a single South American country would be willing to yield its sovereign rights to a foreign dictator, I cannot believe that the people of any country would consent to their government so doing.

But you ask, may not German "fifth columnists" mobilize in some South American country and take over the government by force and violence? In that event is it not plain that the military power of the United States and other South American nations would immediately be mobilized in defense of any government or any people whose rights were being assailed by "fifth columnists"?

As for the Mexican Government and Mexican people, I know from personal knowledge that those people and its governmental leaders hate, fear, and despise Hitler as much or more than do the people of the United States. I have the certain conviction that in the event of any attempted conquest of the Western Hemisphere, the government and people of Mexico would be linked with our own people and with the Canadians in the firm defense of the North American continent and of the Mondoe Doctrine throughout the entire Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I know that many of our patriotic leaders fervently believe that American wealth and manpower should support the crumbling cause of the British Empire and, failing there, seek to establish the Pax Americana. I have high admiration for English culture, and for English civilization; but has it not been apparent for 20 years that the British Empire cannot survive? Why not be realists? For years the greatest historians and philosophers of England and of the world have been declaring that the British Empire is crumbling.

England has hardly more than a quarter of our population, and not a third of our wealth. Think of the structure which is built upon that tiny island—the control or subjugation of a quarter of the territories of the earth, and of almost half a billion people. Shall we uphold the British Empire in India against the wild tribes of the Himalayas, of Afghanistan, and Russia? Shall we help hold Ceylon, Burma, Singapore, China, and the South Sea Islands against Japan? Shall we battle in the Mediterranean, Egypt, and Africa against the assaults of Italy? Shall we fight Spain to protect Gibraltar? Shall we go over to Europe to engage in warfare with Germany?

Oh, Mr. President, Heaven forbid that any hysterical leadership should involve us in a mad venture in Europe or Asia. Heaven forbid that war shall come between the Old World and the New, for we shall be fighting it for endless decades. Germanized Europe could never conquer us at this distance; nor could we conquer Europe, for the self-same reasons. Shall we waste American youth and our wealth in Asiatic, African, and European wars? I pray that Heaven will protect us against such a tragedy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. It has been again and again asserted that the universal service system of training was the most democratic

method of selecting and building up an army. It has been said here that, even if by voluntary enlistments we could get a sufficiently large army, it would still be desirable and beneficial to our country to have a conscript army in time of peace. Will the Senator, who has so ably spoken on many phases of this very important question, indicate what he thinks would be the consequences of such a policy on this country and the relationship of such a policy to the European totalitarian system?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts for recalling to me the remark of the senior Senator from Kentucky that, even assuming that a volunteer army would be sufficient, he would still champion and advocate compulsory military training. I totally agree with the statement heretofore made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, that such a declaration and such a policy constitute a long step toward regimentation.

As I conceive a free government, it is one that interferes as little as possible with the lives of its citizens. To make my example simple, I am well acquainted with a family with two young boys, both in their twenties. One of them is anxious to be a chemist, and expects to enter the university next fall. The other would like to have a year of military training, and would enjoy it and invite it.

If we follow the declaration of the Senator from Kentucky, we would not let the boy go voluntarily who wants to go, but we would gratuitously interfere with the rights of the boy who does not want to go.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin in his argument suggest that because we train firemen and policemen, therefore we should train men for military life. Let us consider. A policeman, a fireman lives a hard and hazardous life. I would not want it, nor would most of the men I know. Would the Senator from Kentucky say because policemen and firemen are performing an arduous and difficult task in the public defense, that we should conscript them from the public generally; that even though there were plenty of men who wanted to be firemen and policemen, he would not let them serve but would conscript men who wanted to follow other occupations?

Mr. President, that seems a strange and unrighteous doctrine to me. I can admit if a city were burning down and there were not a sufficient number of police officers and firemen, of course, the sheriff, the mayor, or the Governor would have the right to conscript citizens generally. But I cannot agree that men should be drafted into West Point, Annapolis, the Army, or the training camps if there are enough men who want to enter there voluntarily. When voluntary enlistments are sufficient, why should we draft our manpower? Like the Senator from Massachusetts, I was shocked at the declaration of the senior Senator from Kentucky that he believed in compulsory training, in regimentation, even though it is not necessary.

While we are on that subject, let me say that some of the military men who appeared before the Military Affairs Committee took the same viewpoint, by implication admitting that we could get all the men we wanted as volunteers but said, "Still we do not want that; we want to take the men by compulsory draft."

Mr. President, one of the things that has terrified me in the last few months has been the rising tide of hate and bitterness among the American people. I have received tens of thousands of letters from California and other sections of the Nation, and those letters, whichever side they advocated, many, though not all of them, intimated that I was a fool or a traitor or a "fifth columnist" if I did not agree with them. If such a spirit continues to grow and to be inflamed by public officials and the newspapers of the country, we may reap a tragic national harvest during this crisis. I impugn the intellect and integrity of no man who has spoken on the other side. I trust that the advocates of this measure will be tolerant and fair to those who cannot willingly accept the principles of the pending measure.

The tragic year of 1929 saw the American people engulfed in an economic crisis of widespread unemployment, poverty, and desolation. We have not yet emerged from that crisis. Its causes still devastate and destroy the prosperity and well-being of our people. Only a steadily expanding public debt, which now threatens our national solvency, has prevented the total collapse of our economic structure.

Now the tragic year of 1940 sees imposed upon our first economic crisis the secondary crisis, arising from the European war. I pray that our governmental leaders may clearly perceive that we can meet the demands of this war crisis without the sacrifice of the rights and institutions of a free civilization, and may immediately recognize that the energies of our Government must be applied not only in the efficient preparedness for war, but beyond that, we must, with intelligence, courage, and vision, undertake the solution of the problems of unemployment and poverty. Failing that energetic and courageous action on our own internal problems, the end of this war crisis, whenever it comes, may well find us engulfed in such an abyss of insolvency, poverty, and unemployment, as may cause the total destruction of our Government and our civilization.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have been seeking again to arrive at an agreement for a limitation of debate. I now ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of the pending bill, and during the pendency of amendments and substitutes, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes, and that on the bill itself no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 30 minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, there have been some Members of the Senate who had no objection to a 15-minute limit, but they wanted, as they stated, to have a 15-minute limitation apply in the aggregate rather than to one speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to modify the request so as to provide that no Senator, in the aggregate, shall speak more than 15 minutes on amendments and substitutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I myself have no objection personally but I feel other Senators who may be absent should be protected. If the Senator from Kentucky does not object, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, as frequently unanimous-consent requests are not agreeable to all. I repeat that I myself have no objection personally.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I have been conferring with some Senators who have now left who agreed to this proposal. I do not think there will be any objection on the part of any Senator who is not now present.

Mr. HOLT. Did the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] agree to it?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator from Montana can speak for the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I think it is entirely agreeable to the Senator from Missouri. I may say that I talked with the Senator and, as I understood, fixing a definite hour for voting was what the Senator from Missouri objected to; but he said such an agreement as is now proposed would be entirely agreeable to him. There are some Senators who had to go home because of illness; the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] happens to be ill. I have tried to notify them. I think the proposition of the Senator from Kentucky would be satisfactory to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HOLT. If it is satisfactory to the Senator from Missouri, I myself have no objection, but I feel that absent Senators should be protected. I do not like unanimous-consent agreements to be entered into when some Senators are out of the Chamber. I do not, of course, mean that the Senator from Kentucky would do that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator I have been trying to accommodate all Senators who are opposed to the bill, and I am satisfied that the request I have made is not objectionable to any of them.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, may the proposal be repeated?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I will repeat it in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to make an inquiry of the leader of the majority. Is it correct to interpret his request that a Senator may speak only once upon both the bill and the amendments, or may he speak more than once on both the bill and amendments?

Mr. BARKLEY. The request is as follows:

That during the pendency of amendments or substitutes, which includes amendments to substitutes, no Senator shall speak, in the aggregate, more than 15 minutes, which means he may speak 10 minutes and reserve 5 and speak again on an amendment; and on the bill itself the request is to the effect that no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 30 minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it correct to interpret the request that, if granted, a Senator could occupy the floor, if he saw fit, 45 minutes if he divided his time between an amendment and the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. The effect of the request is that when an amendment or substitute is pending, a Senator has 15 minutes in the aggregate, and, when all those are disposed of, then a Senator can speak 30 minutes, or if a substitute amendment is not pending a Senator may speak 30 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by me be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. TAFT in the nature of a substitute for the bill as reported by the committee, as amended, is as follows:

To strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the last sentence of section 2 of the National Defense Act, approved June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'Except in time of war or similar emergency when the public safety demands it, the number of enlisted men of the Regular Army shall not exceed 500,000, including the Philippine Scouts.'

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish an Army Training Corps, which shall be a component part of the Army of the United States, for the purpose of providing training in the various branches of the military service, and for such purpose the Secretary is authorized to establish and maintain such camps, to prescribe such courses of training, and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary. Pending the establishment of such camps the persons who enlist in the Army Training Corps as hereinafter provided may be assigned to units of the Regular Army or the National Guard while in the service of the United States.

"(b) Until the expiration of 1 year after the date of enactment of this act every person between the ages of 18 and 35 who is qualified for enlistment in the Regular Army shall be afforded an opportunity to enlist for a period of 12 months for the training prescribed pursuant to subsection (a), but except in time of war or similar emergency declared by the Congress the total number of enlisted men in the Army Training Corps and the men who have completed the training therein and have been transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps as provided in subsection (d) shall not exceed 1,500,000. Upon the expiration of 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, enlistments in the Army Training Corps shall be limited to boys who have graduated from standard high schools, standard colleges, or similar institutions and who have not attained the age of 25, and to boys who have not so graduated who are between the ages of 18 and 25, but no person who has not attained the age of 21 shall be enlisted in the Army Training Corps under this section except with the consent of his parents or legal guardian.

"(c) The persons who enlist in the Army Training Corps as herein provided shall, during the period of their training, receive the same pay, allowances, and other benefits as are provided by law for enlisted men of like grades and length of service of that branch of the military service to which they are assigned. After their transfer to the Enlisted Reserve Corps as provided in subsection (d) they shall receive the same benefits as are provided by law in like cases for other members of such Enlisted Reserve Corps.

"(d) Each person who completes satisfactorily the 12 months' period of training in the Army Training Corps shall be transferred to and shall constitute a part of the Enlisted Reserve Corps for a period of 10 years, unless he is sooner discharged, and except in time of war any person so transferred shall be entitled to be discharged from the Enlisted Reserve Corps at the expiration of 1 year after he makes application for such discharge.

"(e) In addition to the training herein provided through the Army Training Corps, the President is authorized to prescribe standards for a course of military training to be given at high schools and colleges, with their consent and cooperation, and to last for a period of 3 or 4 years as he may determine. Such course shall consist in part of periods of study at such high schools and colleges and in part of actual military training and service at training camps designated by the Secretary of War for that purpose. The course of training prescribed pursuant to this subsection shall be deemed to be the equivalent of the 12 months' period of training in the Army Training Corps, and persons who complete satisfactorily such prescribed training course shall be transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps with the same rights, obligations, and benefits as the persons transferred to such corps under subsection (d) of this section.

"SEC. 3. The President is hereby authorized to provide for recruiting the Regular Army to its full strength as soon as possible, and to provide for recruiting the Army Training Corps to its full strength as rapidly as training facilities are made available. For such purpose the President is authorized to organize such recruiting force, including civilian employees, as he may find necessary to cooperate with State officials, members of the National Guard, and volunteer committees, to make expenditures for advertising and presenting the advantages of training and service in the Army of the United States, and to take such other action as he may find necessary.

"SEC. 4. (a) Effective on the first day of the first month following the date of enactment of this act, the first sentence of section 9 of the act of June 10, 1922 (relating to the monthly base pay of warrant officers and enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps) is amended by striking out 'enlisted men of the fourth grade, $54; enlisted men of the fifth grade, $42; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $30; enlisted men of the seventh grade, $21,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'enlisted men of the fourth grade, $60; enlisted men of the fifth grade, $50; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $40; enlisted men of the seventh grade, $30.'

"(b) Effective on the first day of the first month following the date of enactment of this act, the second sentence of section 10 of the act of June 10, 1922 (relating to the monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Navy and Coast Guard) is amended by striking out 'sixth grade, $36; seventh grade, $21,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sixth grade, $40; seventh grade, $30.'

"(c) On the request of any man enlisting in the Army of the United States, he shall be entitled to assign, revocably or irrevocably, to any member of his family that he desires to support, such portion of his pay in excess of $10 a month as he may indicate.

"(d) Hereafter any enlisted man of the Regular Army who shall have served therein for a period of at least 12 months shall be entitled, except in time of war, to be discharged therefrom at the expiration of 90 days after he makes application for such discharge.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to provide for the enlargement of the Army of the United States and the establishment of training camps, and for other purposes.'"

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I offer proposes a volunteer system of training in lieu of the compulsory system. I have previously stated at some length the ideas which I feel should govern the training of men, and I only wish now to explain the purpose of this proposed substitute.

It seems to me that the whole procedure has put, so to speak, "the cart before the horse." We have been considering the method before we have agreed on the size of the army we want or the goal we wish to attain or what the ultimate aim of the legislation is. The Congress has never authorized an army larger than 375,000 men; it never has authorized anybody to operate training camps or to offer any training to American boys. The amendment which I offer as a substitute proposes to increase the Regular Army to 500,000 men and to authorize training camps in which there may be trained a total Reserve of a million and a half.

I have had some difficulty in arriving at the exact numbers, because the authorities on the other side, so to speak, do not agree on what the number should be. The distinguished chairman of the committee said the other day that an army of 600,000 or 700,000 would be sufficient. The President only in June seemed satisfied with 280,000. The Assistant Secretary of War has recently said we should have an army of 1,300,000; so it has been somewhat difficult for a layman to fix any figure. But the amendment fixes the figures of 500,000 for the Regular Army, plus 250,000 for the National Guard, and then the building up of a Reserve until the Reserve is a million and a half. It authorizes the enlistment of men for the Regular Army and for the Regular Reserve. It increases the pay of the Regular Army, and, of course, of those who are actually in training who have the same pay, to presumably $40 a month if the Appropriations Committee authorizes the advancement of men to the sixth class in the Army, as in the Navy.

It authorizes men after 1 year of service to give 90 days' notice of withdrawal, or, after they have been transferred to the Reserve, 1 year's notice of withdrawal.

The purpose of the amendment is to proceed with a voluntary system of enlistment. If we want an army of 750,000 today, certainly the way to get it is not through conscription. That army should be a highly trained professional army. We cannot possibly get highly trained men within 1 year. We shall have to make the Army sufficiently attractive so that we can get men to come in and spend their lives in the Army. A machine gunner or an antiaircraft gunner cannot be trained in 1 year. If we want an expert army, we can, through 1 year's training, gradually build up a Reserve which can be added to the Army.

I desire to read briefly from an article by Col. John F. C. Fuller, who was the chief general staff officer of the British Tank Corps in the World War, printed in the Encyclopedia Britannica in 1932, and prophetic of what has happened since. He says:

> The theory of conscription has run its course, and is today growing out of date. A few years hence no conscript army will be able to face an organized attack by armed motorcars, let alone by tanks and kindred weapons. It will have its use solely as an army of occupation, a force of men which will occupy a conquered area but not conquer it.
>
> The fighting armies of the future will be voluntary, highly professional and highly paid, consequently comparatively small; this is the whole tendency of present-day military evolution.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The tendency is, consequently, one toward small armies in which quality will replace the quantity theory of the present cannon fodder masses. None but great industrial powers are likely to wage wars with any hope of success, for, in spite of all opposition, gasoline power is transforming armies as surely as steam power transformed navies from 1860 onward; the result must be the same. One hundred years ago any merchantman could be converted into a warship in a few days; today, not all the merchantmen in the world could fight on equal terms a single dreadnaught.

Conscription, as provided for in the pending bill, is an utterly fallacious method of providing any such army as is there described—the kind of army which defeated the conscript armies of France, the kind of army which time has proved Colonel Fuller to be correct in judging to be the army of the present. So, it seems to me the conscript theory is utterly incompetent to supply the kind of army we need for that purpose.

I quite agree that the conscript theory of what may be called universal compulsory military training may be a better method of providing Reserves. There is something to be said, I think, for universal education for a year, when the boy is just out of school, as part of his education; but this is no education bill. This is no universal compulsory education military training bill. This bill does not take the boy as part of his education. It proposes to take men from 21 to 31, 80 percent of whom are already employed, probably in their life occupation, in which they have already made substantial progress.

The substitute which I offer proposes that boys be enlisted in training camps for training upon their graduation from high school or upon their graduation from college. I am quite convinced that if the camps are made attractive we shall have no trouble in attracting every year hundreds of thousands of boys to the training camps until we build up a Reserve of a million and a half, or whatever else may be thought to be necessary.

So the problem which is before us—the problem of supplying a small, highly professional mechanized force, plus a partially trained Reserve, without interfering with the normal progress of the life of the Nation—can be carried out through the amendment I offer, through a voluntary bill, far better than it can be carried out by the compulsory conscript bill which the Senate is considering.

Today, if we want a professional army, 1-year enlistment obviously is wholly insufficient. Three-year enlistment is not enough. We cannot let men come in every 3 years and go out. We have to make the Army sufficiently attractive so that men will stay there for the greater part of their lives, just as they stay in any other occupation; and I have no hesitation in offering a measure providing that they shall be paid $40 a month besides their clothing, their lodging, and their board. That is probably the equivalent of $100 a month, which any common laborer can get in any city in the United States; and why we should not pay men that amount when we ask them to serve, I do not know. I do not see why the Army should be unattractive. I do not see why we should have to force men into it. I do not see why we cannot make it a force which men seek, just as they seek the police and fire forces.

When an examination is given for policemen or firemen in New York City 10 applications are received for every job there is to fill.

In this country we have a democratic form of government. We may in wartime, we may at times, have to impose regimented measures. We may at times have to compel people to do something and limit their freedom; but certainly when we approach an emergency we should approach it with measures which are careful to preserve every element of American freedom that we possibly can preserve under the emergency.

I am against the pending bill because I do not think the draft is an appropriate method of carrying out the aims we have in mind, the kind of army we want to get. I am against it because I think it is a wholly unnecessary infringement on the basic principles of American democracy. I ask that the Senate adopt the substitute voluntary system, and I ask for a roll call on my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Ohio to the amendment reported by the committee, as amended. On that question the yeas and nays are demanded. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and vote "nay."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before with reference to my pair I am privileged to vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. TYDINGS (when his name was called). The pair I have with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] I transfer to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. If those Senators were present the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay." Being free to vote, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. AUSTIN. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent on public business.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] are unavoidably absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who, if present, would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], who, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is absent on account of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] has a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—22

Adams	Danaher	Nye	Walsh
Ashurst	Davis	Reed	Wheeler
Brown	Holt	Shipstead	White
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Taft	Wiley
Capper	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho	
Clark, Mo.	Lundeen	Tobey	

NAYS—56

Andrews	Gerry	Lucas	Russell
Austin	Gibson	McKellar	Schwartz
Barbour	Green	Maloney	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Guffey	Mead	Sheppard
Bridges	Gurney	Miller	Slattery
Burke	Hale	Minton	Smathers
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Stewart
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Herring	Overton	Truman
Chavez	Hill	Pepper	Tydings
Connally	King	Pittman	Vandenberg
Donahey	Lee	Radcliffe	Van Nuys
Ellender	Lodge	Reynolds	Wagner

NOT VOTING—18

Bailey	Downey	Holman	Murray
Bankhead	Frazier	Hughes	Smith
Bilbo	George	Johnson, Calif.	Townsend
Bone	Gillette	McCarran	
Clark, Idaho	Glass	McNary	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee as amended was rejected.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I offer a clarifying amendment, which I have heretofore presented, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are several amendments together. Are they to be stated as one amendment?

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to have them considered as one amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 5, after the words "fixed for" insert the words "the first or any subsequent"; on page 15, line 6, after the word "time", insert the words "or times", and after the word "place" in the same line insert the words "or places"; on page 15, line 7, after the word "group", insert the words "or groups"; on page 15, line 12, after the words "thirty-one", insert the words "at the time fixed for his registration".

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from South Dakota has conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and that there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I had prepared, and had intended to offer, an amendment somewhat similar to the amendment just considered by the Senate, presented by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It was a proposal to provide for trying out longer the volunteer system before adopting the conscription system. It proposed to set up a volunteer reserve in the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard, with 4-year enlistments, and 1 year of actual training, as provided for in the pending bill, with provision for students to volunteer for 3 months a year for 4 years, so as to make up the complete service of 1 year.

There was further provision that if at the end of 90 days after the enactment of the law the President should find that enlistments did not provide a number sufficient to the needs of national defense, the same method of providing for an increased number outlined in the conscription bill should be followed.

I concluded, after hearing the result of the last vote, that it would be useless to present such an amendment, and I now ask that the amendment I had drafted and an explanation of it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment and the explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. WALSH to the bill (S. 4164) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service, viz:

On page 14, line 12, strike out the words "selective compulsory."

On page 14, after line 25, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of providing an additional reserve of men available for military or naval service when needed, there are hereby established in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, respectively, Volunteer Reserve Corps, which shall consist of persons who have volunteered for training in any such corps for periods of enrollment of 4 years. Except in time of war, such persons shall not be required, without their consent, to be employed on active service or to engage in active training for more than 12 months in the aggregate during any single period of enrollment. During periods of enrollment in the Volunteer Reserve Corps of any of the land or naval forces of the United States, persons so enrolled who are students at any recognized college or university shall not, except during any war, be required to be employed on active service or to engage in active training during any semester or term for which such person has registered at any such college or university as a resident student.

"(b) Every male citizen of the United States between the ages of 18 and 35 years who applies for enrollment in the Volunteer Reserve Corps of any of the land or naval forces of the United States and is found to be physically, mentally, and morally qualified for such service and training shall be enrolled in one of these corps.

"(c) Persons enrolled who are found to be qualified for special technical duties shall be given technical ratings, and persons enrolled who are found to be qualified for special technical training shall be given ratings as technical apprentices.

"(d) The pay, allowances, and benefits of persons enrolled in the Volunteer Reserve Corps of any of the land or naval forces of the United States shall, during the period of their training and service, be the same as the pay, allowances, and benefits provided by law for officers and enlisted men of like rank or grade and length of service of that component of the land or naval forces in which such persons are enrolled. The number of such persons in each pay grade in the Volunteer Reserve Corps shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively. Persons enrolled in such Volunteer Reserve Corps shall have an opportunity to qualify for promotion and shall be given priority in competition for vacancies in the regular services.

"(e) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall each make a report to the Congress at the end of each month showing the number of persons who have applied for enrollment in the branch of the Volunteer Reserve Corps under their jurisdiction, the number of persons who have been enrolled, and the number of persons who have enlisted in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard."

On page 15, line 15, strike out the word "The" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "If after 90 days from the date of the enactment of this act, the President finds that the number of enlistments in the land and naval forces of the United States is not sufficient to meet the needs of national defense, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect, and thereafter, the."

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT PROVIDING VOLUNTARY TRAINING OF RESERVE CORPS, BY MR. WALSH

The amendment provides for the establishment of Volunteer Reserve Corps in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, in an effort to give the volunteer system a fair trial before resorting to conscription. It changes the present bill in two important respects: First, it provides for voluntary enrollments in a Reserve Corps for 4 years, only 1 year of which must be served on active duty, except in time of war; and, secondly, it provides that if after 90 days from the date of enactment of the act, the

President finds that the number of enlistments in the land and naval forces of the United States is not sufficient to meet the needs of national defense, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect, and thereafter conscription shall become effective. It does not delay registration.

I am convinced that voluntary enlistments have not been given a fair trial and I am opposed to the draft until it is definitely determined that voluntary enlistments will not bring our land and naval forces to sufficient strength to defend our country, our institutions, and our freedom.

There have been many obstacles in the past to voluntary enlistments that should be removed.

Can anyone blame a young man, no matter how patriotic, for not enlisting for 6 years in the Navy, 4 years in the Marine Corps, or 3 years in the Army? If he enlists, he cannot get out even in time of peace, no matter how distasteful the life may be or how his circumstances or the circumstances of his family may change. If he once enlists, practically the only way he can be discharged prior to the expiration of his enlistment is by a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge.

At the present time practically every enlisted man who enters the Army or the Navy is enrolled in the lower ratings. He is first taught to be a soldier or a sailor. Some of them are later trained in specialists' duties. A young man interested in radio or in mechanics receives no assurance whatsoever that he can continue, while in the Army or the Navy, along the lines he is interested in and for which he is qualified.

In the Officers' Reserve Corps, doctors are put in the Medical Corps and others are assigned to the groups in which they are qualified as civilians. I can see no reason why this principle of taking into the Reserve force of the Army and the Navy, both officers and men, who are qualified for specialists' duties and train them to perform these duties in the Army and the Navy.

I believe that the amendment will accomplish by voluntary enlistments, the same purpose as the bill S. 4164, as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Military Affairs hopes to accomplish by conscription. If it is found that volunteer enlistments do not suffice, the compulsory features of the bill as reported to the Senate become effective. If conscription does become necessary, I believe that the Army should conscript mechanics, electricians, radiomen, and other trained men rather than mere foot soldiers.

The proposed amendment strikes out the words "selective compulsory" on page 14, inserts a new section, section 2 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e), and on page 15 provides that if sufficient enlistments are not obtained in 90 days after the enactment of the act, compulsory service shall become effective.

Section 2 (a): This section establishes a Volunteer Reserve Corps in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. Enrollment in these corps is for a period of 4 years. Except in time of war, persons enrolled in these corps, shall not without their consent be employed on active service for more than 12 months during any 4-year period of enrollment. It also provides that students enrolled in these corps, shall not without their consent, except during war, be employed on active service or training service during any term for which they are registered at any recognized college or university.

It shall be noted that men enrolled in these corps are available for active duty in time of war and as far as training is concerned may be given as much training as the men who it is proposed to draft, if training facilities are available.

Section 2 (b): This section provides that every male citizen of the United States between the ages of 18 and 35, who applies and is found to be physically, mentally, and morally qualified shall be enrolled in one of these corps.

The purpose of this section is to assure that everyone who applies and is found to be qualified shall be enrolled in one of the corps established by the amendment. It is not mandatory, however, for the Government to give training to all those who are accepted. At the present time and for some time past, insofar as the Navy is concerned, we have more persons who want to enlist than can be accommodated. It is believed that a similar situation exists regarding the Army Air Corps. Can conscription be justified when we have more men applying than can be trained?

Section 2 (c): This section provides that persons found qualified for special technical duties are to be enrolled in technical ratings and that persons found qualified for special technical training are to be enrolled as technical apprentices. We have thousands of boys who can drive and repair automobiles, and who would probably be glad to enroll for 1 year's active service to drive and repair tanks, but who do not want to sign up for 3 years to merely carry a musket and drill. We have thousands of boys who would probably be glad to enter the Army or Navy for 1 year and learn things for which they have a liking.

The Army and the Navy are working on an entirely different theory. They are taking in boys and men and first making soldiers and sailors out of them and are then training some of them to become specialists.

If we are in a great emergency to get trained men, is it not more sensible to take into the Army and Navy men already trained as specialists and teach these specialists to become soldiers and sailors instead of following the reverse course? If time is the essential element, is not this the proper procedure?

The principle of enrolling persons in the ratings they are qualified to fill is not new. It is and has been employed in building up a Reserve Officers' Corps for the Army and the Navy. This section of the amendment simply proposes that a similar method be employed in building up a reserve of trained technicians.

Section 2 (d): This section provides that the pay and allowances of persons enrolled in the Volunteer Reserve Corps shall during the period of their training and service receive the same pay and allowances and other benefits as are now provided by law for officers and enlisted men of like rank and length of service of that component of the land or naval forces in which such persons are enrolled. It provides that the number of persons in each pay grade shall be as prescribed by the Secretary of the departments concerned. It also provides that persons enrolled in such Volunteer Reserve Corps shall have an opportunity for promotion therein and shall be given priority in competition for vacancies in the regular service.

The Navy has never had any difficulty getting men, even with the 6-year enlistment period. Persons in the Navy have opportunities for advancement. When the Army becomes mechanized, skilled mechanics, rather than mere "doughboys," will be required. This part of the amendment is designed to give these technical men an opportunity for advancement and to be enrolled in the technical ratings required in the armed forces and the ratings they are qualified to fill.

If the amendment is adopted, persons in the Reserve forces who find that they like Army and Navy life can then enlist in the regular service.

Section 2 (e): This section merely provides that the Secretaries concerned shall report to the Congress at the end of every month the number of persons who have applied for enrollment in the Volunteer Reserve Corps; the number accepted and the number of men enlisted in the regular service.

The amendment to section 3 of the present bill merely provides that if, after 90 days from the date of enactment of this act, the President finds that the number of enlistments in the land and naval forces of the United States is not sufficient to meet the needs of national defense, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect, and thereafter the other provisions of the bill become effective.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the agreement which has been entered into for a limitation of debate, and in view of the necessary absence of three or four Senators tonight because of illness, I have no desire to proceed further with the session, because I think that under the limitation we can easily dispose of the bill tomorrow. Therefore, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the nominations of sundry citizens and officers for appointment and promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

IN THE ARMY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs I report favorably the nominations of certain persons for appointment in the National Guard of the United States, and certain other nominations for promotion or transfer in the Regular Army. These nominations are entirely of routine character and total over 500 in number, and because of the large amount of printing involved, I ask for their present consideration and confirmation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask unanimous consent that the President may be at once advised of these confirmations, and that the names of the persons confirmed be not again printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but that proper reference be made to the pages on which their nominations appear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John D. Martin, Sr., of Tennessee, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Marlin S. Eckerd to be postmaster at Martinsburg, W. Va.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 28, 1940, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 27 (legislative day of August 5), 1940

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

John D. Martin, Sr., to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

GENERAL OFFICERS

Harold Holmes Richardson to be brigadier general, Adjutant General's Department, National Guard of the United States.

Thomas Colladay to be brigadier general, National Guard of the United States.

John Watt Page to be brigadier general, National Guard of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

NOTE.—The nominations of persons named for promotion or transfer in the Regular Army, which were received on the 26th instant, were confirmed today and a list of their names will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26, 1940, beginning on page 10943, under the caption "Nominations."

POSTMASTER

WEST VIRGINIA

Marlin S. Eckerd, Martinsburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of might and of mercy, in these days when hearts are heavy and ways are dark, may we yield ourselves unreservedly to divine guidance. May our groping and faltering spirits be brought under the sway of the eternal truth that emancipates from all anxiety and despair.

We pray that we may live in the strength and light of Thy presence. Grant that our whole life may be an adventure of godly faith, a sacrament of divine love, and a sure prophecy of life that shall endless be.

May the blessing and benediction of the Lord, our God, be given unto our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress as they seek to minister unto those who are burdened by care, haunted by fear, and beshadowed by sorrow. Unite us with all who are striving to heal the heartache of humanity. Humbly and confidently we would continue to pray and labor for the coming of the brotherhood and peace.

In the name of the Christ, kingdom of our Saviour, we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 304

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
August 26 (legislative day, August 5), 1940.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. George N. Seger, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now take a recess until 11 o'clock antemeridian tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the foregoing resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. BARBOUR as members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9575) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Aid Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article that appears in this morning's Washington Post, written by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS BILL

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution, for printing under the rule:

House Resolution 578

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 7236, a bill to provide for the adjustment of certain claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the Court of Claims and the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE SEGER

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and include a resolution unanimously adopted by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries this morning on the death of Hon. GEORGE N. SEGER, a member of that committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas this committee has sustained the irreparable loss of one of its best beloved and most faithful members, whose sudden departure has brought the greatest grief to all of his associates in the Congress of the United States, as well as in this committee's labors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved: First. That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries records its deep appreciation of the faithful, untiring, and

efficient service of GEORGE N. SEGER, late a Representative from the Eighth District of New Jersey, whose public service has been marked with distinction, not only in the labors of this committee but also in the Congress of the United States;

Second. That this committee recognizes that in the death of GEORGE N. SEGER the Nation has lost one of its most devoted, loyal, and patriotic sons; the House of Representatives of the United States has lost one of its best beloved, most highly cherished, kindly, and genial Members; and this committee has lost one of its most faithful workers, who was always sound in judgment, wise in counsel, courageous in action, fair in deliberation, frank in discussion, and impelled by the highest ideals in his public and private life;

Third. That this committee will always hold in fondest remembrance its association with GEORGE N. SEGER and will find in his work an inspiration and an example;

Fourth. That the chairman of this committee is hereby authorized to request that a copy of this resolution be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and

Fifth. That the clerk of the committee is directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of its meetings and to transmit a copy to the family of the deceased.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address which I delivered over the radio last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a column written by Charles G. Sampas in the Lowell Sun, a young man who loves his country and who has faith in America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD; also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article appearing in this morning's Post, written by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER. That article has already been placed in the RECORD.

Mr. BLOOM. It is a good article. I withdraw my request.

NEGRO C. C. C. CAMPS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that there are 150 Negro C. C. C. camps in the country and that there are only 2 of these camps that have colored personnel. Now, I do believe that they might as well give the colored people of this country who are capable a break, and here is one place they could at least supply colored doctors and colored chaplains for these colored boys.

If my information is correct, there are two men in the administration who are responsible for this. The one is "Honest Harold" Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and the other is Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Ickes presented Marian Anderson when she sang here in the Capital and Secretary Wallace made a speech at Tuskegee Institute. These two men were at the same time conspiring to keep qualified colored people confined in their place in the sun and now they are in turn asking for the support of these same people. They might do well to explain their actions.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE AND PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege and the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to present a question of personal privilege and privilege of the House?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must present his resolution in writing on the question of the privilege of the House.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Just a moment. Is the gentleman's resolution included in the papers he has sent to the desk?

Mr. THORKELSON. I will send the resolution to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Where is it? The Chair sees no resolution among these papers.

Mr. THORKELSON. I have the resolution here. Will the Chair allow me to state my complaint?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will present the resolution.

Mr. THORKELSON. If the Chair will allow me to state my complaint, I will be glad to send it up.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must present his resolution before he can make a statement, if it is a matter affecting the privileges of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If a Member raises a question of personal privilege as well as the question of privilege of the House, on the question of personal privilege is he required to file a resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not so rule. The gentleman from Montana coupled his statement to include both questions of privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May a Member not speak on his question of personal privilege, without sending up a resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his question of personal privilege. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan that the Chair made the ruling because the gentleman from Montana coupled both the question of personal privilege and the privilege of the House, which the rule requires to be in writing.

The Chair will hear the gentleman from Montana on the question of personal privilege.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege and to a question of the privilege of the House, and offer a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk. The question which I raise may be stated as follows, and, for clarity, attention is called to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of August 14, 1940, to the matter contained on pages 10341 and 10342.

On August 14 I asked and received unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and then proceeded without objection to make a statement which appears on page 10341 of the RECORD, in the left-hand column.

Thereafter, another Member of the House obtained unanimous consent and addressed the House. Thereupon the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] obtained unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and according to the official transcript of the reporter of the House, the following occurred:

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I objected to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON] to insert some articles in his statement because all his utterances and all his insertions were not based on facts, no justification, unfair, and unwarranted.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, sit down.

Mr. THORKELSON. I want his words taken down, Mr. Speaker. He has made the statement that my information is not based on facts. You sit down yourself. You are talking too much anyway.

Mr. SABATH. When I talk, I do not talk or insert nonsense.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will rule that if the words were taken down the Chair would hold that they did not infringe the rules as far as the statement so far has been made. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. SABATH. Every Member knows what I have said is right. The gentleman from Montana in the last few days, though he has been repudiated in his own district and defeated, has plugged up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with about 12 pages of stuff that is

unfit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He puts in stuff that he sends out under his frank by the thousands, misleading the American people. I know they have no confidence in him.

Thereafter, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] revised and extended his remarks by causing to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following:

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I objected to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON] to insert some articles in his statement because I have found in the past that many of his extensions of remarks were not based on facts, were without justification, were unfair, and unwarranted.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, sit down.

Mr. THORKELSON. I want his words taken down, Mr. Speaker. He has made the statement that my information is not based on facts. You sit down yourself. You are talking too much anyway.

Mr. SABATH. When I talk, I do not talk or insert nonsense.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will rule that if the words were taken down the Chair would hold that they did not infringe the rules as far as the statement so far has been made. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. SABATH. Every Member knows what I have said is correct. The gentleman from Montana in the last few days, though he has been repudiated in his own district and defeated, has loaded down the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with more than 12 pages of stuff unfit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He sends this misleading information out under his frank by the thousands at the expense of the American taxpayers, whom I know have no confidence in him.

The House will recall that in the Appendix of the RECORD, pages 3006–3010, I showed that he had placed in the RECORD up to that time 210 full pages of scurrilous matter at a cost of $9,400 to taxpayers. I showed that he had imposed upon the House by inserting in one of his leaves to print a forged letter of Col. E. M. House, confidant of the late Woodrow Wilson, in which Colonel House was placed in the false position of being in a conspiracy to restore the American Colonies to Great Britain. After that performance, and even before, I lost all confidence in him. [Here the gavel fell.]

A comparison of the official record furnished by the Reporter of the House with the printed CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], without having obtained permission to revise or extend his remarks, not only revised his remarks as made on the floor of the House, but he added to those remarks the following words and figures:

The House will recall that in the Appendix of the RECORD, pages 3006–3010, I showed that he had placed in the RECORD up to that time 210 full pages of scurrilous matter at a cost of $9,400 to taxpayers. I showed that he had imposed upon the House by inserting in one of his "leaves to print" a forged letter of Col. E. M. House, confidant of the late Woodrow Wilson, in which Colonel House was placed in the false position of being in a conspiracy to restore the American Colonies to Great Britain. After that performance, and even before, I lost all confidence in him.

It is of the utmost importance that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be a true record of the proceedings of the House. The integrity of the RECORD is destroyed by the insertion of remarks purporting to have been made on the floor of the House, but which were not so made, when no permission has been granted by the House to insert those remarks.

The remarks which have just been quoted as having been inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] were not made on the floor of the House and violate the rules of the House in two particulars.

First, the remarks charge that the Member from Montana had inserted 210 pages of "scurrilous matter" in the RECORD. "Scurrilous," among other things, means "grossly offensive," "vulgar," "opprobrious."

Such remarks reflect upon the character, the reputation, of the Member from Montana; tend to hold him up to ridicule; reflect upon his ability, his reputation, and his character in his representative capacity.

They also charge him with having inserted in the RECORD a forged letter.

Each of these charges raises a question of personal privilege, which can only be taken advantage of in the manner here brought to the attention of the Speaker, for the reason that, not having been made on the floor but having thereafter been inserted in the RECORD, a demand that the words be taken down could not be made.

Even though permission to revise and extend his remarks had been obtained by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the remarks inserted in the RECORD are subject to a point of personal privilege, for the reason, as just stated, that, not having been made on the floor, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] could not be called to account and a demand that they be taken down could not be made.

The action of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] also involves a question of the privilege of the House, for the reason that the last quoted remarks, beginning with the sentence, "The House will recall that in the RECORD of May 16," and ending with "I lost all confidence in him," were not uttered upon the floor, no permission to revise and extend his remarks was granted to the gentleman from Illinois and the insertion of those remarks in the RECORD falsifies the record of the House.

I therefore offer a resolution, and ask that I be recognized on my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the gentleman from the Fifth District of Illinois, Mr. SABATH, caused to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 14, 1940, on page 10342, the following remarks:

"The House will recall that in the Appendix of the RECORD, pages 3006–3010, I showed that he had placed in the RECORD up to that time 210 full pages of scurrilous matter at a cost of $9,400 to taxpayers. I showed that he had imposed upon the House by inserting in one of his leaves to print a forged letter of Col. E. M. House, confidant of the late Woodrow Wilson, in which Colonel House was placed in the false position of being in a conspiracy to restore the American Colonies to Great Britain. After that performance, and even before, I lost all confidence in him."

And whereas such insertion is a violation of the privilege of the House, in that said remarks charge a Member of the House with having inserted in the RECORD a forged letter; and

Whereas the insertion of said remarks results in the RECORD being inaccurate, in that the RECORD as printed contains statements which from the RECORD appear to have been made on the floor of the House, but for which permission for insertion in the RECORD was not obtained; and

Whereas said remarks, as so inserted, were not in order and were an abuse of the privilege of the House: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the remarks appearing on page 15814 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of August 14, 1940, to wit: "The House will recall that in the Appendix of the RECORD, pages 3006–3010, I showed that he had placed in the RECORD up to that time 210 full pages of scurrilous matter at a cost of $9,400 to taxpayers. I showed that he had imposed upon the House by inserting in one of his leaves to print a forged letter of Col. E. M. House, confidant of the late Woodrow Wilson, in which Colonel House was placed in the false position of being in a conspiracy to restore the American Colonies to Great Britain. After that performance, and even before, I lost all confidence in him," be, and they hereby are, expunged from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and are declared to be not a legitimate part of the official RECORD of the House.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Montana raises the question that the word "scurrilous" has been used. For the purpose of saving the time of the House, if he objects to the word "scurrilous" I will withdraw the word "scurrilous."

Mr. THORKELSON. I wish to be recognized on my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would state that in looking over the matter presented by the gentleman from Montana there is only one phrase which, in the opinion of the Chair, would give the gentleman recognition as a matter of personal privilege. That is the word used by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] in his extension of remarks in the RECORD, the word "scurrilous." The gentleman from Illinois has stated that he is willing to withdraw that word from the permanent RECORD. In view of that fact, would the gentleman from Montana object to that?

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I also want to take up the question of forgery, of which I have been accused—of using forged matter in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman answer the first inquiry submitted to him by the Chair with reference to the

offer of the gentleman from Illinois to withdraw from the RECORD the term "scurrilous" as used in his extension of remarks?

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the withdrawal of the matter that is set forth in the resolution, but I want to clear my name of the stigma which has been cast upon it by the gentleman from Illinois. That is the reason I raised the question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has asked unanimous consent, in view of the fact that the gentleman takes offense, and probably a proper offense, at the use of the word "scurrilous" on his part in his extension of remarks, that that word be withdrawn from the permanent RECORD. Does the gentleman object to that?

Mr. THORKELSON. No.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I shall object unless there is included in the request a further request to withdraw all the words regarding forgery and accusing the gentleman from Montana of being a member of a conspiracy with reference to a forgery insertion in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to feel that there is nothing to substantiate the assertion that the gentleman from Illinois charged the gentleman from Montana with forgery. The Chair is going by the RECORD and the papers presented to the Chair by the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. THORKELSON. I did not hear.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall object unless the gentleman from Illinois withdraws his remarks in his extension with reference to accusing the gentleman from Montana of introducing a forged letter in the RECORD. Unless he makes that further request, I shall object.

Mr. SABATH. The House letter has been acknowledged to be a forgery. I merely stated what had actually taken place on the floor of the House.

Mr. COX. Reserving the right to object, I wonder if it would not be agreeable to the gentleman from Illinois to amend his unanimous-consent request by asking leave to withdraw the word "scurrilous"; to expunge from his speech the word "scurrilous" because it violates the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has submitted that request, and it has been agreed to.

Mr. COX. But he attached a condition. In order to save time, I am sure he is willing to amend it, because it is a violation of the rules of the House, and I am sure that the gentleman is willing to state in his own place that he had no intention of accusing the gentleman from Montana of knowingly inserting in the RECORD a forged letter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that that implication can be drawn legitimately by the request already made by the gentleman from Illinois, which has been agreed to.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do we understand that the gentleman will withdraw the language in the extension which accuses the gentleman of putting a forged document in the RECORD?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, I may say, cannot do that because the so-called House letter was put in the RECORD and was proven absolutely to be a forged letter, and the gentleman from Montana did not object to its being noted as a forged letter.

Mr. THORKELSON. The gentleman is out of order. Pardon me; that is not a correct statement. I did not say that. I said the substance matter of the letter was correct, and I am going to prove that the letter is correct.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman from Montana mean to say——

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. I make the point of order that these gentlemen are out of order.

The SPEAKER. The House is in order. The Chair is hearing the gentlemen on the broad question of personal privilege.

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, if he states that I am out of order, that I made my statement under a reservation of the right to object and was perfectly in order according to the rules of the House.

My understanding about the whole matter is that everybody agreed that the so-called E. M. House letter was a forgery. What does the gentleman from Montana say?

Mr. THORKELSON. The gentleman from Montana says he is going to prove that it was not a forgery.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, in order to get at the crux of this controversy, is now prepared to rule that the statement that the gentleman introduced a forged letter into the RECORD does not say that the gentleman from Montana forged the letter or that he introduced it knowing it to be a forged letter, and the Chair rules that that did not constitute a matter of privilege.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, if there is a forged letter there must be an original. There could not be a forgery without there being an original and I want to prove the original letter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana is not charged with having forged any letter.

Mr. THORKELSON. By inference he is.

The SPEAKER. It does not reflect upon the gentleman's action, reputation, or standing with reference to the letter itself; it merely states that he introduced this letter and it was forged—not by him.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have not seen these papers, and, of course, I had no knowledge that this matter was coming up. But, as I understand the Speaker, he has inspected the papers, and the Speaker finds that there is nothing in the papers charging the gentleman from Montana with knowingly inserting any forged documents in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. That is the conclusion the Chair draws from the papers that have been presented.

Mr. MICHENER. And there is nothing in the document that in any way reflects upon the integrity or the honesty of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON]?

The SPEAKER. Not with reference to the matter of the forged letter. The Chair does hold that the use of the word "scurrilous" as described in Webster's Dictionary is unparliamentary, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has asked unanimous consent to withdraw that term from the RECORD. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the Chair's ruling with reference to the purported forged letter not casting any reflection upon the gentleman from Montana, I shall withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, forgery is unlawful in the first instance, and it is also unlawful to knowingly utter a forged instrument. As I understand, the Speaker holds that there is nothing in the RECORD or in these papers to indicate, even had the letter been forged, that the gentleman from Montana had any knowledge of such forgery.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would be inclined to hold that there is no implication whatever reflecting upon the gentleman from Montana with reference to the so-called forged letter. There is no allegation that he was conscious of the fact it was a forgery and there is nothing else seeking to bring his reputation into disrepute. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not the gentleman from Montana entitled to proceed on the theory that the gentleman from Illinois inserted in the RECORD certain matter which did not occur on the floor of the House, so the RECORD, as printed, is not an accurate transcript? Does not that raise a question of the privileges of the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan raises the point that the gentleman from Illinois did not have permission to revise and extend his remarks?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Montana so stated and the matter sent up to the desk includes at least 9 or 10 typewritten lines inserted in the printed RECORD which the Member from Montana claims were never uttered on the floor of the House and for which no permission was granted for insertion in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman contend that the gentleman from Illinois did not receive permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the contention of the gentleman from Montana.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] have to say about that?

Mr. SABATH. I obtained unanimous consent to revise the brief remarks I made on the floor of the House that day. In fact, I received two different privileges to extend and to revise.

Mr. THORKELSON. I have examined through the RECORD and he did not get permission.

Mr. SABATH. This is a statement appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a month ago; that is all it is. It is not by me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, that raises a question of the accuracy of the gentleman from Montana and of the gentleman from Illinois and is easily determined by a search of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. It does not raise a question of veracity in the opinion of the Chair, but it does raise a question in reference to the RECORD itself, as to whether or not such permission was obtained by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Montana says the gentleman from Illinois did not obtain unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. That is purely a question of fact.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Surely.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON] withhold his request for the time being so that the Chair may have the opportunity to find out from the Reporter's notes whether such request was granted?

Mr. THORKELSON. I will withhold the request until the RECORD may be examined. I want to make this statement in regard to the letter that has been discussed a great deal. That letter is absolutely true, as it is written in the Geneva hearings.

Mr. SABATH. What letter? The so-called House letter has been admitted to be a forgery.

The regular order was demanded.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill (S. 4271) to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain what the bill is and what it does, and whether it comes from the committee with a unanimous report?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if the House will bear with me for one moment I shall endeavor to explain the bill so each Member can thoroughly understand it.

This is a departmental bill, recommended by the Navy Department, and in accordance with the financial program. The bill has passed the Senate. The bill was considered by the Committee on Naval Affairs and, after 2 or 3 days of hearings, it was voted out by the committee with one minority vote. One member of the majority voted against recommending passage of the bill. I may state that all the minority members of the committee voted for the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to do one simple thing, that is, to permit the alternates appointed by Members of Congress to the Naval Academy, and who passed the examination, to go to the academy as well as the principal. As you understand, every Member of the House and every Senator appoints a principal and 3 alternates. The principal has passed the examination and gone on to the academy. The alternates who passed the examination cannot enter because there are no vacancies. This bill merely permits those alternates who have qualified and have passed the examination to enter the academy just as their principal has entered, because there are vacancies at the academy. There are 145 Members of Congress who will have at the academy a principal and 1, 2, or 3 alternates, because their whole group passed.

In the report of the committee, which is now available, every Member of Congress will see the name of the boy appointed and will see from what district he goes to the academy. In other words, if you appointed a principal and your principal qualified, he is already at the Naval Academy and will commence the term in September. If your alternate passed he is also permitted to go to the academy. If your principal passed and your alternate did not pass, he cannot go to the academy.

This bill does not take in anyone but those alternates of appointees of Members of Congress and the Presidential appointees, and others, who have actually passed the examination. All they will have to do is meet the physical requirements. I hold here a complete list showing the appointments of every Congressman and every Senator as well as the Presidential appointments. They appear in the report on the bill.

Now I shall yield to Members of the House for questions.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I believe the gentleman has answered my question, but do I correctly understand that if a Member has one, two, or three alternates, all three of them will be accepted?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. All three can go. If your principal passed and your three alternates passed they will enter the academy, and will have to enter between now and September 14.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. What effect, if any, will the enactment of this bill have on the several districts? That is, assume that in my district, for instance, I had one appointment this year, the principal was admitted and all the alternates failed, but in the district of the gentleman from Georgia, let us assume, the gentleman had one vacancy and his principal and all the alternates passed. Under this measure would the gentleman then receive three or four appointments this year?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. What effect would that have on a district next year, when, under ordinary conditions, a vacancy might hold over?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It does not affect the appointment next year at all. It does not affect what you are going to do on the 1941 appointments. The emergency exists to have more officers in the Navy. We have room at Bancroft Hall to take care of them. We have the instructors there. We have the boys who have passed the examinations, but they cannot go into the academy because the law states that

none but the principal can enter. This bill permits the alternates to go in as well as the principal, having passed the examination.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Suppose a Member of Congress has a principal who passed and also an alternate who passed. The principal, of course, got the appointment for this year. The alternate was not entitled to an appointment, but the Member of Congress, the alternate being just short of the age limit, makes a trade so that he can get that boy in this year. Had this law been passed a month ago that alternate could come under this law, but under the present circumstances he could not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We cannot legislate to handle trades. If your principal passed, he is over there now. If your alternate passed, this bill permits him to go in, and that is all it does.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. This measure has already passed the Senate. Am I correct in stating that the real purpose of the consideration of the bill at this time is that it fits into the needs of our national-defense program?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from West Virginia is absolutely correct. My principal passed and all of my alternates failed. As a matter of fact, I hardly think that in the case of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs there are more than two alternates who can go into the academy. It is to be hoped that no Member of Congress will hesitate to give unanimous consent to the favorable consideration of this bill because he does not have something in it. The national-defense program cannot be built upon politics or upon logrolling, or upon patronage. This measure should pass because we have the boys qualified to go there and we need the officers.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Does it apply to this year only?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It applies to those of 1940 who go in. The examinations have already been held, and they must enter the academy between now and the 14th day of September.

Mr. COOPER. It does not apply to any alternates who may qualify next year?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all; it does not apply to anyone who is going to be appointed in the future. It applies to appointments that have already been made.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think the gentleman should point out that this applies to appointments made a year ago and also to those for 1940.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; but the examinations have all been held and no new boy can be examined. It simply permits the alternates who passed the examination to go to the academy now as well as their principal who also goes there.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. How many young men will be admitted to the academy under this law?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The report is available in the document room——

Mr. HULL. He cannot get it there.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I got mine there a moment ago.

Mr. EBERHARTER. There are no copies available here.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On the Presidential list there are 7, in the Naval Reserve there are 21, and in the Congressionals 156, which is a total of 184, and out of the 184, approximately 15 percent will fail physically, and there is a list here of every Congressman who is involved in the matter.

Mr. MASON. The report is now available, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The report is here and the Members can all get the report and see if they have a boy going in under this bill.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Many of the Members of Congress this past year did not have any appointments to the Naval Academy and therefore he would not be entitled to have a boy on the list, but nevertheless he may have had 50 or 75 good applications from boys who could pass both mentally and physically. This has been in the mind of somebody for sometime——

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; it has not.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that the Members of Congress should have the right and the opportunity to present boys who could take this examination instead of permitting one Member of Congress to have three or four candidates enter the academy, while other Members do not have that opportunity.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman had no vacancy last year, his vacancies will occur in the future, because every Member is entitled to have four appointees. If the gentleman has none now he will have an appointment when his vacancy occurs over in the academy. This does not take away a single thing from any Member of Congress.

Mr. RICH. Yes, it does.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But it permits those already available to go to the academy now.

Mr. RICH. Will these appointees from these particular districts be deducted from the Member of Congress——

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all; it simply means that these boys from these districts will go in now and these Congressmen when their other vacancies occur from their respective districts, recognizing the fact they cannot have more than four there at one time, will not be permitted to name more than one.

Mr. RICH. Then the Member of Congress who gets these appointments will not be permitted to have more than four boys at the academy at one time?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the law.

Mr. RICH. And this bill does not change that law.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I understand that these extra boys will be charged to your four-man allotment at the academy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all. These extra boys go in because they are qualified now, but the law and the appropriation fixes it so that there can be but four appointees at the academy from any one Member of Congress.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I understand that this bill simply creates this additional number of places in the academy, without reference to existing statutes. It authorizes the admission to the academy of a group already qualified so far as changing the present law is concerned.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct. There is nothing in this bill that repeals any existing law. It merely permits these boys who are qualified now to go in because we have the places and we have the professors and we have the accommodations there for them. It is contemplated in the appropriation bill that will be before the House the next fiscal year to have five appointees. It is contemplated a little later to have six. To have six, it will cost $10,000,000 to fix up the Naval Academy, but it does not cost anything to take care of these boys now.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me see if I understand. Suppose a Member has four in the academy now. Under the terms of this bill, if he has three alternates who have heretofore qualified, either in 1939 or 1940, they will go in in addition to the four.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. And then he will have seven?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman not think that we should amend this and charge those to his quota?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all. We debated that before the committee. There is only one thing. We have an opportunity to take these boys in, but if any Member of Congress wants to object to this bill, he has the right to do so. I certainly hope, because I have but one, and the gentleman from Texas may have seven and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] none, that no one will object to it because we need these boys; they have qualified, they have met every educational requirement, they have passed the elementary tests, and they should be entered into the academy irrespective of the fact of whether I have seven or two or have none. [Applause.]

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KITCHENS. It is not so long ago that the academy had to let out a lot of young men who graduated down there because there was no place for them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true, because we had no ships. That was in 1932. Since 1932 we have built and put into the Navy 111 ships.

Mr. KITCHENS. That is the point that I am raising. What have you done about permitting or arranging for these young men to go back into the service now?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We passed a law to permit every one of those who could qualify to come back in the following year. They are all in who qualified.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Then it is my understanding that the Senate in unanimously passing the measure, and your committee in recommending it, have brought us a bill that is not based upon the origin of the boys that are qualified, but upon the need for the boys at the present time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On the origin of those that are qualified now, and based on that need. For instance, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has in this bill, as I remember it, three men. His principal passed and his three alternates passed. He has probably four at the academy now. That will make seven. I have but one there. Do gentlemen think that I would be serving my country if I object to this because the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has seven there and that I have but one? I had my opportunity, I gave it to the boys. My principal passed but my alternates did not. That applies to a great many of us, and I certainly trust that no one here will object to this because he has not the equal patronage at this time that some other man has. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, what is the situation of a boy who has now passed the entrance age requirement?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The age requirement is kept the same.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. MICHENER. There is a bit of uncertainty about this matter on this side. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], a minority member of this committee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, is not this the fact, that this bill enlarges the authority of the President of the United States to nominate candidates to Annapolis, but limits that enlarged authority to those congressional nominees who have already passed and met the physical examination?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right. Of course, the bill permits the President to do it, but he is restricted to this list in this report to these men who have been nominated by various Representatives and Senators.

Mr. COLE of New York. So that it does not in any way affect the rights of any Member to appoint candidates?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It involves no Member's rights as to what he can do in the future.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would make plain what is meant by the proviso in the bill that "no such candidate shall be eligible for admission who was more than 20 years on April 1, 1940." The reason I ask the question is this: Assume a boy qualified as to age on April 1, but has become more than 20 years of age since April 1, would he be admitted to the academy under the terms of this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The age limit requires that he be between 16 and 20, and that is holding it down to the age limit.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. But the point I am making is that with the proviso contained in the bill, reading "that no such candidate shall be eligible for admission who was more than 20 years of age on April 1, 1940," it would not seem to preclude a boy who had not reached the age of 20 until after April 1.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; it does not.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. PACE. A hurried check over this list shows that one Member of Congress has four boys. Assuming he now has four boys in the academy, that would give him eight?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. PACE. Then would he continue hereafter to have his regular appointments?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly. I do not think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has anyone in here. As a matter of fact, going over this list, I think there is but one Member of the Georgia delegation whose alternates passed, and that is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], from the Second District. Now, some Members might have four. Some Members might have three. I certainly hope, because the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has not anybody in here, he will not object to it because of these other boys.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has that distinction, and not I.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I stand corrected.

Mr. PACE. I am trying to get it straight from the gentleman. One time he says these extra boys will be charged to your appointments.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They will not be charged. If I made such a statement it is in error.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly they will be charged to the extent that when the senior cadet graduates it would not create a vacancy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The four appointments are not affected at all. They will not be charged against any Member of Congress having the right to keep at the academy at least four men. It simply means that these additional candidates who have qualified can go to the academy.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. A few moments ago I asked you certain questions.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I was in error then. I did not catch the question.

Mr. RICH. Then we understand the ones who have the appointments now, if they have four men in the academy, if they have four on this list, can have eight men in the academy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly. If it happens that you have four from your district now, you could have four under this bill, and that would make eight from your district. But that would not in the slightest degree affect my right to have four at the academy.

Mr. RICH. I want to say to the gentleman that this bill comes up in the House, and we only have about a half an hour to consider it. If it is so important that it must go through, why was not notification given to the House that we would consider legislation of this kind today, and why were not the Members given an opportunity who did not have any appointment last year and who have no boys on the permanent list or on the alternate list, to get into the academy? You are giving them to some Members, while other Members do not even have an opportunity, where they have 50 or 60 candidates who could take an examination and qualify. The Navy Department could examine those boys in 24 hours, and they could be given a certificate and admitted.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I will object unless we have time to debate this.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let us have it right now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has had a half an hour already.

Mr. RICH. That is all right. We have nothing else to do. We have not had very much to do for weeks, and we can discuss this matter.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The reason why the bill is here at this time is due to the fact that the boys have gone into the academy in June. The course starts in September. The Navy Department checked up and found out that it could accommodate about 250 or 300 more in Bancroft Hall. It could not hold a new examination and get them all in there by September 14. So they said, "Here is a group of boys who have qualified; 184 from congressional appointments have qualified, and they cannot come in because their principals have gone in." The Navy Department recognizes the national-defense situation; recognizes that we have to have officers; recognizes the fact that we are paying these professors at the academy when we can educate this many more boys.

Mr. RICH. Would the gentleman object——

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will not the gentleman withhold his demand for a minute to let us iron this out?

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman from Georgia because he said his bill would take only a couple of minutes, yet we have consumed over half an hour. We have a lot of business to transact and I must insist on the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland demands the regular order. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RICH. Under all circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not going to bring the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has objected to the request.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

SECOND OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL

The Clerk called the first omnibus bill on the Private Calendar (H. R. 8717) for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes.

MIKE L. BLANK

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.

Title I—(H. R. 809. For the relief of Mike L. Blank.) By Mr. CANNON of Florida

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mike L. Blank, of Delray Beach, Palm Beach County, Fla., the sum of $20,150 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage done to his nursery gardens and property, located in sec. 28, T. 46 S, R. 43 E., Palm Beach County, Fla., from October 2, 1933, to the date of this act, by their overflow with salt water from the Intracoastal Waterway, due to the widening and deepening of the waterway adjacent to and in the vicinity of said nursery gardens and property and the removal of the dikes along the waterway by the War Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: No. 1. Strike out all the language of title I, H. R. 809, on pages 1 and 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mike L. Blank, of Delray Beach, Palm Beach County, Fla., said claim arising out of damage done to his nursery gardens and property, located in section 21, township 46 south, range 43 east, Palm Beach County, Fla., from October 2, 1933, to the date of the passage of this act, caused by their overflow with salt water from the Intracoastal Waterway, allegedly due to the widening and deepening of the waterway adjacent to and in the vicinity of said nursery gardens and property and the removal of the dike along the waterway by the War Department. Suit hereunder may be instituted at any time within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act, and proceedings therein, appeals therefrom, and payment of judgment thereon, if any, shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which said court has jurisdiction under the provisions of the Judicial Code."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COSTELO moves to strike out all of title I.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in offering this amendment is purely to gain an opportunity to address the House for a minute.

This bill is similar to another which previously passed the House and which met with the approval of the President. This bill authorizes Mr. Blank to go through the Federal courts and sue for damages he alleges have arisen through the work which has been done on the Intracoastal Waterway in Florida. In view of the fact that his neighbor under the same circumstances was allowed to go to the Court of Claims I believe the same redress should be granted this claimant. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be withdrawn and that the claimant may be allowed to have the same relief that was granted to the claimant in an earlier case under the same circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the President vetoed a Senate bill very recently wherein a certain individual was granted the right to sue in the district court. Was that bill vetoed because that case was sent to the district court rather than to the Court of Claims, or was it because there was an appeal from the district court of the United States to the Supreme Court without going through the court of appeals?

Mr. COSTELLO. I am not familiar with the bill to which the gentleman refers, so I could not state, but the pending bill is identical in language to another bill which was passed by the Congress and signed by the President and is now public law. The two parties are in exactly the same situation, asking for the same relief.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Mike L. Blank."

WILLIAM C. REESE

The Clerk read as follows:

Title II—(H. R. 1429. For the relief of William C. Reese.) By Mr. PATRICK

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay William C. Reese, of Birmingham, Ala., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained from the kick of a mule on October 15 or 25, 1917, while the said William C. Reese was in the performance of his duty as an employee of the Goodrich Construction Co. engaged in the construction of an Army camp as a subcontractor under authority of the United States, said injury having been sustained through the negligent or reckless act of a soldier of the United States Army in charge of such mule whilst in the performance of his duties as such soldier: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COSTELLO moves to strike out all of title II.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, the present bill provides for the payment of $3,500 to William C. Reese, of Birmingham, Ala. Mr. Reese was employed upon a project at Camp McClellan in Alabama doing construction work. At that time an Army soldier was exercising an Army mule in the vicinity of the project. William Reese had asked the soldier not to exercise the mule in the particular location, but the soldier continued to do so. Mr. Reese apparently at the time was talking to an Army officer, obtaining instructions in regard to construction work which was being done. The mule kicked Mr. Reese, and as a result he sustained injuries from which he claims to have suffered during the 20 years that have elapsed since that time. The injury took place some time between October 15 and 25, 1917. The War Department has no record of the injury. At the time Mr. Reese was eligible to receive the benefits of the insurance which was held by the contractor. The premiums for that insurance were paid for by the Federal Government in making the payment to the contractor on this project. To my mind there is no justification for the Federal Government's making a payment to Mr. Reese when he had the right to sue the insurance company.

The sole purpose of requiring insurance to be carried by the contractor was to obviate this very situation and to prevent any possibility of the Federal Government becoming liable for any injuries that might be sustained by employees engaged in construction work. These injuries were undoubtedly sustained by Mr. Reese while he was engaged in work on that construction project. He would certainly come under the provisions of the insurance policy in that event. Having failed to avail himself of that remedy, I do not believe he is entitled to come here and ask the Federal Government to grant him relief. For this reason I have offered an amendment to strike out the title.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HANCOCK. Does the gentleman think it is a wrongful act for a soldier to lead an army mule along the road at an army post?

Mr. COSTELLO. The soldier was carrying out the orders of his superior officer in exercising the mule and was carrying it out in the particular area in which he was instructed so to do.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Why does the gentleman want to strike out the title if this man was doing what he was ordered to do by his superior officer?

Mr. COSTELLO. For the simple reason that Mr. Reese had a remedy provided under the insurance policy. He was an employee on this construction project and the contractor carried insurance to take care of injuries to employees. He was injured in the course of his duty on that work, yet he did not avail himself of the opportunity to obtain relief under that insurance policy.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does the gentleman have anything in writing to indicate the insurance company admitted liability or to show that liability was fastened on them?

Mr. COSTELLO. The fact is that the contractor had to carry the insurance policy, otherwise he could not have obtained the contract from the Government. The Government reimbursed the contractor for the amount of the premium paid for that policy.

Mr. PITTENGER. As a matter of fact, a lot of these insurance policies for one reason or another have exceptions. Might not the insurance company have held that this man out here leading the mule was not covered by the policy and perhaps that is the reason he did not pursue the remedy suggested by you?

Mr. COSTELLO. Under the policy he should have been entitled to recover because he was engaged in the actual work of construction which that insurance policy covered. While the injury was not from a falling log or from a load of bricks, he was injured during the course of his employment on that project. I cannot see any reason why the insurance company would be able to avoid payment of its obligation under the policy.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons above, I hope the House will agree to my amendment.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. Speaker, this is the case of William C. Reese, of Birmingham, Ala., who is making a claim which seems to be entirely justified from my analysis of the facts. This accident happened on October 15, 1917. He was in the performance of his duties as an employee of the Goodrich Construction Co. He was at an Army camp at Anniston, Ala., working under a subcontractor and was not in anywise connected with the Government. There seems to be a little error here as to exactly what he was doing. He was foreman of a work crew at Camp McClellan, near Anniston, Ala. While he was performing his duty he was twice kicked by a Government mule. Now, I have heard of folks being kicked by a Government mule all my life, but this man actually had that experience—an untamed mule was out being exercised by a soldier for the Government.

That is the extent of the situation. I cannot have the time to go into a detailed description of it.

Mr. SCHULTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SCHULTE. What amount is he asking?

Mr. PATRICK. Three thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. SCHULTE. For being kicked by a mule?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; he has spent the rest of his life in bad health.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the record show that this claimant ever received any money whatsoever from any source as a result of these injuries?

Mr. PATRICK. No; there was no insurance that could touch it. There was no policy or anything that he had that would reach him.

Mr. EBERHARTER. He has been suffering as a result of this since that time?

Mr. PATRICK. He has been greatly an invalid. He has been unable to do any physical labor at anything.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously there is not a quorum present.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 195]

Allen, Ill.	Cummings	Jenks, N. H.	O'Toole
Allen, Pa.	Darrow	Jennings	Pfeifer
Arnold	Delaney	Johns	Pierce
Barden, N. C.	Dempsey	Jones, Tex.	Randolph
Barry	Dies	Kelly	Reece, Tenn.
Barton, N. Y.	Dirksen	Kennedy, Michael	Richards
Bates, Mass.	Ditter	Kerr	Risk
Beam	Douglas	Kilburn	Rockefeller
Bolton	Doxey	Lambertson	Ryan
Bradley, Pa.	Drewry	Larrabee	Sacks
Brewster	Evans	Lemke	Sandager
Bryson	Fay	Lewis, Ohio	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckler, Minn.	Ferguson	Luce	Schwert
Buckley, N. Y.	Fernandez	Lynch	Shanley
Bulwinkle	Fitzpatrick	McArdle	Sheridan
Burch	Flaherty	McDowell	Smith, W. Va.
Burdick	Flannery	McGranery	Somers, N. Y.
Burgin	Ford, Miss.	McLeod	Starnes, Ala.
Byrne, N. Y.	Ford, Thomas F.	McMillan, Clara	Stearns, N. H.
Byron	Fulmer	McMillan, John L.	Sullivan
Caldwell	Garrett	Marcantonio	Sweeney
Camp	Gavagan	Marshall	Taylor
Celler	Gifford	Martin, Ill.	Treadway
Chapman	Gillie	Martin, Mass.	Vreeland
Clark	Guyer, Kans.	Merritt	Wadsworth
Cluett	Hall, Edwin A.	Miller	Weaver
Collins	Hall, Leonard W.	Monkiewicz	White, Ohio
Connery	Hare	Myers	Wigglesworth
Cooley	Healey	Norrell	Winter
Corbett	Hennings	Norton	Wood
Courtney	Hope	O'Brien	
Culkin	Jeffries	O'Leary	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. RAYBURN, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, immediately after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS STRAITS OF MACKINAC, MICH.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1379) granting the consent of Congress to the Mackinac Straits Bridge Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the House amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 3, down to and including "Legislature", in line 6, and insert "State of Michigan."

Page 2, line 16, after "and", insert "reasonable."

Page 2, line 22, strike out all after "tolls", down to and including "management" in line 1, page 3.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan."

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

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from California asked to send this bill to conference the other day I objected because the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], who was very much interested, was momentarily absent. I understand it is now satisfactory to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] that this bill may go to conference.

Mr. LEA. That is true, as I understand the facts.

Mr. MICHENER. May we have the assurance of the chairman of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that the House conferees will insist upon the House position and not agree to the Senate bill until they come back and get instructions so to do?

Mr. LEA. The agreement was that the House would insist upon the amendments of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. That is my question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am not too clear on the agreement which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has mentioned. Will the gentleman from California yield for me to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES] a question about this matter?

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Perhaps an hour ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and I were discussing this matter with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES]. Is that the agreement that is now being referred to by the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MICHENER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am no party to any of these cloakroom conferences. The only question in which I am interested is this: The House gave consideration to this bill. It passed on the Consent Calendar, but with the express understanding that the amendments placed in the Senate bill by the House were to be insisted upon in conference. I am asking the gentleman from California, as the chairman of the conferees, for his assurance that he will insist upon the position taken by the House. I do not care what your cloakroom talk was.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the reason I enter this conversation at this time is that the gentleman from Michigan was pointing out that an agreement had been made, and my name was mentioned. I do not know anything about the agreement, and that is what I want to get clear on. I do not know from whom the gentleman from Michigan obtained his information. If this bill is to go to conference and the language in lines 4, 5, and 6 is to be reinserted in the bill, of course, I shall have to object, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. MICHENER. Coming from Michigan, I am interested in this bill and am not interested in any agreement. I am simply asking that the conferees stay by the House position.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to demand the regular order on this bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman withhold it for a moment?

Mr. RABAUT. I withhold it for a moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this is the day set aside for the consideration of omnibus claims bills; therefore, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland demands the regular order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KELLY, of Illinois; O'TOOLE, of New York; and HOLMES, of Massachusetts.

SECOND OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL

WILLIAM C. REESE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, William C. Reese—Uncle Billy Reese, as he is affectionately known—was foreman of quite a crew of workers on a Government job. The soldiers had been warned by him not to come with their mules upon the property on which they were working. They had to be there at their jobs. Notwithstanding this, one Army man took a mule that was among a bunch of unbroken mules and led it up behind Uncle Billy while he was on the job. It kicked him behind, and that turned him around, and it kicked him in the abdomen. He has not been a well man since. We have abundant testimony from doctors stating that he is incapacitated from 70 to 80 percent. He was making over $200 a

month as a foreman then. He has not made over $100 a month since. For a long time he was in bed. Then he was a ticket taker at the gate at a terminal station out there, making $100 a month.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Is it not true that the Government officials were warned not to exercise the mules at this particular property because of the danger existing there?

Mr. PATRICK. They were. They disregarded that warning, and it was while doing so that this man suffered this injury. He has been practically an invalid ever since.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. This claim has been considered twice by the Committee on Claims and there has been a favorable report from the entire committee on it both times?

Mr. PATRICK. Both times there has been a favorable report.

Mr. PITTENGER. If you vote "yes" on the motion that is now pending, you vote to undo the work of the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman very kindly. That certainly is true.

I believe this is an unusually meritorious bill. The gentleman has been an invalid in a measure since that time. He did not get any insurance and could not get any insurance. There was nothing in his insurance policy that would pay him for such an injury. He has never received a dime compensation. He has just simply suffered all these years, having been bedridden for a while.

This matter has been running now for over 20 years and he has been an injured man ever since and has not received a penny for it. He is a man of family and still has responsibilities. There is no way in the world of getting compensation except in this way. The original bill was for $5,000 and it is cut down now to $3,500.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. I have studied this bill and I think it is a just claim and one that should be allowed and I am going to support it.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California striking out the section.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HANCOCK) there were—ayes 27, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

TITLE III.—MARIE K. TROTTNOW

The Clerk read as follows:

Title III—(H. R. 2919. For the relief of Marie K. Trottnow.)
By Mr. DISNEY

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 to Marie K. Trottnow, in full settlement of any and all claims against the Government on account of the death of her husband, Alfred H. Trottnow, from injuries sustained when the vehicle in which he was riding collided with a truck of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, on United States Highway No. 66, near Britton, Okla., April 1, 1938.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,500 to Marie K. Trottnow, of Tulsa, Okla., as executrix of the estate of Alfred H. Trottnow, deceased, and the sum of $1,000 to Paul Lindley, of Tulsa, Okla., in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Alfred H. Trottnow, and personal injuries sustained by the said Paul Lindley, as a result of a collision between the vehicle in which they were riding and a truck of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, on United States Highway No. 66, near Britton, Okla., on April 1, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK: Page 4, line 17, strike out all of title III.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the House for just a few minutes, I think I can persuade the Members of the House that this bill is without merit. It is an attempt to recover damages for personal injuries arising out of a collision between a Government truck operated by an employee of the Forest Service and a private car operated by one A. H. Trottnow, of Tulsa, Okla.

It seems that the Government truck was proceeding east on an improved highway and the private car was proceeding south, also on an improved highway. The truck therefore had the right-of-way. There was no obstruction to the vision from either direction as they approached the intersection, although the visibility was poor. There was a heavy snowfall at the time. The Government truck, as it neared the intersection, came to a complete stop, according to the testimony of the truck driver, corroborated by the testimony of the attendant at a service station immediately across the road. He entered the intersection slowly and carefully and turned north in the direction from which the private car was proceeding. The testimony is that the private car was proceeding at 35 miles an hour and that it did not diminish its speed until it got within a few yards of the intersection. At that time the truck had nearly cleared the intersection. The driver then jammed on his brakes and his car slid into the side of the truck near the rear. The accident was investigated by State policemen in Oklahoma and I want to read just a line from the report of one of these officers:

Upon asking Mr. Trottnow—

That is, the private driver—

how he happened to hit the truck, he told me he didn't know exactly, but that it was snowing pretty heavily and he was talking to the young fellow in the car with him and that after he saw the truck he tried to stop but couldn't stop in time to avoid the collision. Mr. Trottnow stated that he was traveling between 25 to 35 miles per hour, but didn't know just exactly, but Mr. Lindley—

That is, the passenger in the car with Mr. Trottnow—

told me that he had noticed the speedometer and that they were going about 35 miles per hour just before they got to the intersection.

Mr. Trottnow received injuries from which he died, and Mr. Lindley, the passenger, received minor injuries, for which he seeks damages in the amount of $1,000. The estate of Mr. Trottnow asks for $7,500, which is $2,500 more than the usual award in death cases.

All the evidence in the case indicates that the truck driver did everything that any cautious driver could possibly do to avoid an accident at that corner. He came to a complete stop, he turned to the left slowly, and looked before he started. He saw this approaching car about 250 feet away, which he thought was ample distance to permit clearance. The driver of the private car did nothing whatever to avoid the accident. If he had taken his foot off the throttle, even for a moment, or slowed down the least bit, or if he had kept his car under control, there would have been no accident. The policeman who examined the scene afterward testified that the truck had completely made the turn; that the right rear wheel was off the pavement on the right-hand side of the road facing north; and that the right front wheel was just on the pavement, facing north. It may be that the collision pushed the truck around, but it is perfectly obvious that the truck had nearly completed the turn when the other car crashed into it.

Of course, the road was very slippery and it was snowing. It was a wet snow which was melting as it hit the ground

and the private driver did exactly the wrong thing by jamming on his brakes. His car skidded and he completely lost control of his car. After the accident, his car was in the middle of the road. If he had been going more slowly or had used the ordinary care of the ordinary driver, he could have proceeded behind the truck in perfect safety. The most we ought to do in cases like this, where the evidence strongly favors the Government, or where there is a serious dispute as to the facts, is to confer jurisdiction on the district court and let the court and jury decide the case. We have no right whatever to make awards of this kind, especially when the evidence is all in favor of the Government.

There were no eyewitnesses except the truck driver and one of the claimants in this case, Mr. Lindley. All of the circumstances and all of the evidence of the disinterested witnesses corroborate and sustain the position of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. With all due deference to my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], if I were engaged in a lawsuit, I would say that he had overstated the evidence. The physical situation is important to take into consideration. All of the traffic on Highway No. 66 flows down to Oklahoma City. Up at Edmond, Okla., the heavy traffic from Wichita comes in and the heavy traffic from both those areas comes across this route to Oklahoma City on Route 66. The Government driver was driving on Route 77, which is a side road. And there is a warning sign up to keep traffic from 77 coming onto this road making rolling stops as was done in this instance.

Mr. HANCOCK. But may I call the attention of the gentleman to the testimony of the State officer that there is no stop sign there.

Mr. DISNEY. Oh, I object to the gentleman stating that. I object to the gentleman making a speech and having it taken out of my time. I will yield for a question, but not for an argument. There is a stop sign where the truck driver was to come in. He was to stop. Who says he stopped? His testimony has something to do with this job. He says he stopped.

Mr. HANCOCK. The station master across the street——

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, if I am going to discuss this question I would like to discuss it without interruption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. DISNEY. The man in the hamburger joint whom the committee did not believe, thinks the driver stopped. What does the eyewitness say, Mr. Lindley, the only witness that really could know what was going on? He not only says that the driver of the Government truck after the accident was over—this is a part of the res gestae, right when it happened—he says that the driver of the Government truck said, "I am sorry, but I could not help it." Does that sound like a man who had completely stopped? "I am sorry, but I could not help it." Mr. Lindley, who was with Mr. Trottnow, said they were going about 35 miles an hour about 2 minutes before they met this truck, and that as soon as they saw the truck they slowed down. It was snowing, and the fellow from the side road is expected to be more careful. He owes a higher degree of duty coming from the side road where there is a warning sign than the man on the main highway with no "Stop" signs. Here is a man killed because the driver of the Government truck made a rolling stop and wheeled along to the main highway in a snowstorm. That is how it came about. Mr. Lindley says:

> I know Mr. Trottnow saw this truck at about the same time I did because I noticed he started slowing down. The truck did not stop at the "Stop" line but instead, made a rolling stop or rather just slowed down and rolled on out to the intersection. When this truck rolled up to the west edge of the highway on which we were traveling, or up to the west edge of the intersection, it seemed that the driver of the truck was going to stop as he slowed down again and seemed to hesitate.

Why should he not hesitate, with a "Stop" sign in his face and no "Stop" sign on the main highway in the face of the man who was killed?

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

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLIS. To say that I was a member of the subcommittee to which this bill was referred. I studied it carefully and thoroughly and came to the conclusion that this Government driver who pushed in from the side road was solely and wholly to blame.

Mr. DISNEY. I thank the gentleman for that suggestion. I think that must be so. The whole committee reviewed it for a second time. First, on the original bill, before it was objected to, and second, afterward the committee went over this and discussed it thoroughly before putting the item in this bill. If any one of you were a judge of a district court, you would permit this to go to the jury as to whether or not the jury would believe the Government truck driver or Mr. Lindley, who is now alive, though still suffering from this accident. Or would you believe the Government truck driver or the man in the hamburger joint who thinks he saw something in a snowstorm but does not know anything about it. The committee decided he knew nothing about it, and it did not give credence to his testimony because it is not worthy of credence; but the res gestae statement, made at the time, was admissible, and you would admit that. Or, if you were a district judge, would you allow the testimony of Trotnow to come in, made maybe half an hour after the accident—an ex parte statement on the part of the officer?

I doubt whether, if you were a district judge, you would admit that statement, but when the Government truck driver says, "I am sorry; I could not help it," you would admit that testimony. Here is one man injured for life; another man dead. You construe a variance in the testimony in favor of the plaintiff in the case, if you sit as a juror. The Claims Committee has twice reviewed it. I believe you can take the judgement of the Claims Committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] to strike out the title.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HANCOCK) there were ayes 21 and noes 50.

So the motion was rejected.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, is it too late for me to object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present?

The SPEAKER. The objection comes too late.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KENNEDY].

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 196]

Allen, Pa.	Collins	Fitzpatrick	Kilburn
Arnold	Connery	Flaherty	Kirwan
Barry	Cooley	Flannery	Lambertson
Barton, N. Y.	Corbett	Ford, Leland M.	Larrabee
Bates, Mass.	Courtney	Ford, Miss.	Lemke
Beam	Creal	Ford, Thomas F.	Lewis, Ohio
Bolton	Crosser	Fulmer	Luce
Bradley, Pa.	Crowe	Garrett	McArdle
Brewster	Culkin	Gavagan	McDowell
Bryson	Cummings	Gifford	McGranery
Buckley, N. Y.	Darrow	Guyer, Kans.	McLean
Bulwinkle	Delaney	Hall, Edwin A.	McLeod
Burch	Dempsey	Hall, Leonard W.	McMillan, Clara
Burdick	Dies	Hennings	McMillan, John L.
Burgin	Dirksen	Hope	Marcantonio
Byrne, N. Y.	Ditter	Jenks, N. H.	Marshall
Byron	Douglas	Johns	Martin, Ill.
Caldwell	Drewry	Keller	Martin, Mass.
Chapman	Fay	Kelly	Mason
Clark	Ferguson	Kennedy, Michael	Merritt
Cluett	Fernandez	Kerr	Murdock, Utah

Myers	Risk	Smith, Ill.	Wadsworth
Norton	Rockefeller	Smith, W. Va.	Wallgren
O'Brien	Routzohn	Somers, N. Y.	Walter
Oliver	Sacks	Starnes, Ala.	Weaver
O'Toole	Sandager	Sullivan	Wheat
Pfeifer	Schaefer, Ill.	Sumners, Tex.	White, Idaho
Pierce	Schwert	Sweeney	White, Ohio
Randolph	Shafer, Mich.	Taylor	Wigglesworth
Reece, Tenn.	Shanley	Treadway	Winter
Richards	Sheridan	Vreeland	Wood

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and five Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 5, line 5, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to reduce the amount of the appropriation authorized under this bill from $7,500 to $5,000. Five thousand dollars is the amount which was authorized by the committee. However, in this particular bill the committee, in its report, makes the statement that they are appropriating $7,500 because it appears reasonable, due to the earning capacity and life expectancy of Mr. Trottnow. It seems to me rather a dangerous precedent for this Congress to embark upon, if we are going to place the basis of the compensation that we allow on bills of this character entirely on life expectancy and earning capacity. On that basis, if a person who was earning $100,000 a year were to be killed in an automobile accident, then the Congress would be called upon to reimburse his widow in an amount proportionate to that earning capacity. I believe it is an unwise policy, and for that reason I have offered this amendment to reduce the amount to make it conform to the amount which is usually appropriated in cases of this character.

I personally feel that the bill itself should not have been passed. I state that because of the fact that the evidence as submitted by the committee's own report definitely shows that there were no "Stop" signs at the intersection of these two highways. On the contrary, approximately 250 feet away from the intersection were signs cautioning the drivers using these highways to slow down because of the nature of the dangerous curving intersection. The testimony of the man who was in the service station—not in the hamburger joint, but in the service station—definitely shows that he was watching the Government vehicle at the time it entered the intersection. He states that he saw that vehicle stop.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. No; I do not yield.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this debate is not on the amendment but is an attempt to go back and debate the bill that has already been passed. I make the point of order that he has no right, in common fairness, to discuss the bill itself when his amendment relates solely to the question of the amount involved. You could not do that in court.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, on the point of order that my amendment is an effort to reduce the amount of the bill from $7,500 to $5,000, in substantiation of that I have made the statement that it should be reduced because it is based on an unwarranted premise by the committee which would establish a dangerous precedent; and to further substantiate my argument that the amount should be reduced I am showing that the claim itself is not meritorious and that the amount being excessive should therefore be reduced.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that in court that is known as pettyfogging.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that the gentleman from California is discussing an amendment to reduce the amount of the appropriation and is justified in discussing the original amount.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. The gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] is quoting the record itself. He is quoting from the sworn testimony.

Mr. DISNEY. And so did I.

Mr. COSTELLO. I am not surprised that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] objects to having the evidence show that there were no stop signs on this highway, because the House has been led to believe that stop signs did exist on the highway. We have the statement of the Government driver, Craig, and we have also the statement of the Oklahoma police who investigated the accident to the effect that there were no stop signs at that intersection.

The facts show that the Government vehicle was not driving in excess of 10 miles an hour at the time of the accident. The facts also show according to the testimony of Mr. Lindley who was driving with Mr. Trottnow, that Mr. Trottnow was driving his car at approximately 35 miles an hour. Mr. Trottnow in his own statement, quoting the officer who investigated the accident, said that he was unable to avoid the accident at the time he saw the truck. He had been talking to Mr. Lindley in the car with him and said that he did not have an opportunity to stop when he first observed the truck. In other words, he came into a dangerous intersection without due caution; and to my mind the gentleman from New York was absolutely right in moving to strike out this title. I believe the claim is without merit, and certainly the Congress in passing this bill should not establish a dangerous precedent by allowing the beneficiary hereunder to receive compensation not merely for death but compensation based upon the earning capacity and life expectancy of the claimant, Mr. Trottnow, I hope the House will at least reduce the amount from $7,500 to $5,000 by adopting my amendment.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, let me appeal to the sense of fairness of the Members. Before this quorum call we decided against an amendment to strike out the title which carried $7,500. In other words, the House by its action has decided that the claim is a proper claim, and I take it for granted that the Members here accept as final the action of the committee when it agreed to pass the bill.

The testimony shows that Mr. Trottnow was a comparatively young man. The testimony before the Claims Committee is to the effect that he made $350 a month. If you were sitting as a district judge, you would have to instruct the jury that according to his life expectancy and his earning capacity at the time of his death he would be entitled to a verdict of as much as $53,000. That is in the testimony. He would be entitled in district court to a verdict of not to exceed $53,000—I think that is the figure; maybe it is $56,000 or $47,000; it is in that general neighborhood.

Now, based upon the merits of the claim, it becomes a question of whether or not you are going to allow $5,000 or $7,500. I take it for granted that the merits of the claim having been passed on, in all fairness you are not going back to the merits of the claim to determine whether or not you are going to allow $5,000 or $7,500. It becomes a question of whether or not the committee was wise in awarding $7,500, not the attitude of one or two persons; that is not the judgment; the judgment of the committee was that in view of the fact that he was a young man and had a long life expectancy and high-earning capacity, and according to the committee report he left some young children who should be educated, that impelled the committee in its action. The House committee finally decided, after discussing this among themselves, upon two considerations that this family ought to have $7,500.

The accident came about as a result of the fault of the truck driver. The fault was with the Government. This Congress within the last 30 minutes has decided that the fault was with the Government. Since the fault was with the Government, conclusively decided in this Chamber, then the matter of the amount, it seems to me, in all fairness can be left to the judgment of the Claims Committee.

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

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think it fair to say that Congress has decided that the full amount was in order when there were only about 32 Members present before the quorum call?

Mr. DISNEY. I did not say that. The gentleman puts words in my mouth that I did not say. I say that the matter of the merits of the claim was decided.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. By 32 Members out of the entire body of 435?

Mr. DISNEY. How else can it be decided except by the rules of the House?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. We might have something to say about that; we will decide that later in the day.

Mr. DISNEY. I appeal to the gentleman to remember that in this case a young girl is deprived of her opportunity to be in her station of life, to have an education, as the result of a reckless truck driver killing her father. Substantially that is what happened. I think it is wholly unfair in him, and I do not feel that my friend when he stops to reason with himself will differ with me. I will be ashamed of him if he votes for this amendment after this committee determined that question. They had all the facts before them, not just some fragmentary arguments pro and con. The committee took into consideration this child's welfare. I leave it to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] whether or not he will put his judgment against the judgment of the entire Claims Committee and award only $5,000. This is an exceptional case.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 22, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Marie K. Trottnow, executrix of the estate of Alfred H. Trottnow, and Paul Lindley."

LESTER P. BARLOW

The Clerk read as follows:

Title IV—(H. R. 3683. To carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Lester P. Barlow against the United States.) By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lester P. Barlow, the sum of $592,719.21, in full settlement of his aerial torpedo patent-infringement claim against the United States as found by the Court of Claims to be due him in its decision of June 7, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: On page 6, line 1, strike out all of title IV.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to pay the claimant, Lester P. Barlow, the goat bomb specialist, $592,719.21, representing the loss of royalties on certain aerial bomb patents which the Court of Claims found to have been infringed as the result of the activities of the United States during the World War.

First of all, may I say that it is difficult for me to stand here and oppose this particular title because of the very high regard I have for the chairman of the Claims Committee and also for the members of the subcommittee who reported the bill. At the same time, if every Member of the House will just read the 27 pages of the report he or she will feel as I do about it; that is, it is not fair to come in here today and ask us to pass a bill appropriating $592,000 and only have 10 minutes in which to debate the issue.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Did not the gentleman overlook the fact that the Congress previously passed a bill referring this matter to the Court of Claims and only because of an error in that bill are considering this bill at all? If the bill had been properly drawn the court would have rendered judgment and it would have been paid without any question by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. That might be the case and it might not be the case. We are called upon here today to pass on whether or not we will appropriate $592,000. May I say further that I realize this subcommittee spent 8 hours in determining the merits or demerits of this bill, but if it took the subcommittee 8 hours to determine whether or not it should approve this bill, certainly it is not fair to us to come in here and in 10 minutes be called upon to pay this goat specialist $592,000. If you will read the report you will find that the governmental agencies that have been asked to make a report on this bill differ among themselves. You will find that while the Attorney General's office is in favor of it, the War Department is absolutely opposed to it and they give pages and pages of reasons for being opposed to it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Just as soon as I finish one statement. Some of the reasons they are opposed to this bill in a way are very similar to some of the things that we read about in the last test during which Mr. Barlow tried to blow up the goats. I doubt very much if the improvements on the bombs at that time which he invented during the World War were much an an improvement over the bomb he had down there at the time he was trying to blow up the goats.

I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Is it not true that the report of the committee will show that two high officials of the War Department testified before the committee that the Government did owe some money and owed it to somebody, that the findings of the Court were proper but failed to state to whom this money was due?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Yes; that is true. Some officials in the War Department did say some money was due Mr. Barlow, but it will also be recalled that they never said that $592,000 was due Mr. Barlow.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. The Court said that.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. We are called upon here in 10 minutes to determine whether we will pay this goat specialist $592,000. I am opposed to the bill. It ought to go to the Rules Committee and there given a rule and then it should be brought out here for unlimited debate. That is one of the reasons why I am opposed to the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly 8 years I have been a member of the Committee on Claims. For almost 6 years I have been its chairman. I have taken a certain amount of pride in the work of that committee. I have tried to perform my duties in a conscientious manner, protecting the Government in every way possible, and also I have tried to see that everyone who had proper claims against the Government was given justice.

I sponsored this bill. I have no particular interest in it other than to see that this man gets what the Congress years ago directed him to have, and that is justice. This is not a bill to merely authorize the payment of the money based on the facts just being brought out today. Years ago the Congress passed a bill authorizing the Court of Claims to hear and determine whether or not Mr. Barlow had a claim against the Government. The court considered the claim and took testimony.

A representative of the Attorney General's office appeared before the Committee on Claims, and the report will show this to be true, and testified that the Government had its day in court, had the opportunity to submit to the court every defense it had, and that this claim should be paid.

As stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], if it were not for a technical error in the original bill, this claim would have been paid years ago, not only for the $592,000 plus, but as determined by the court and as instructed by the court for over a $100,000 interest in addition to said sum. Following the committee custom, we declined to allow any interest. The situation today is that this man is simply being paid the amount of money designated by the court as due him, less over a $100,000 in interest.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that at the hearings of the subcommittee Mr. Holtzoff, who tried this case before the Court of Claims representing the Government, testified as follows:

> I feel, representing the Department of Justice, that we are bound by the court's findings, and I have no argument to present why they should not be given effect and no reason to suggest why they should not be given effect.

On page 46 of the committee report, Major Richmond, representing the War Department, testified that it was the opinion of the War Department that Barlow was entitled to an award, but that they would not state how much, and left it entirely to the committee to decide; and we were bound by the findings of the Court of Claims in justice as to the amount. Is not that a fact?

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. That is absolutely correct.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Following up what the gentleman from Wisconsin has just said, I call the attention of the Members to the fact that after the Court of Claims found the claim of Mr. Barlow was meritorious, an accounting question arose and the court appointed a commissioner. This commissioner sat down with representatives from the Department of Justice and the War Department, and representatives of the claimant, and they agreed on an amount which was to be paid for a certain number of these bombs. In a letter from the Assistant Attorney General in charge of claims before the Court of Claims, he said this:

> The offer contained in your letter of August 31, 1936, to Mr. Alexander Holtzoff of this Department, has been submitted to the War Department, which has recommended its acceptance.

Further, the court's opinion stated with relation to the other bombs:

> The royalty of 10 percent fixed by the court's finding 4 is arrived at by accepting the sums the parties agreed upon in the license contract.

This shows that Mr. Barlow is entitled to every cent called for in this bill, and in addition, if the court's findings were followed, he would be entitled to $120,000 as interest.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. That is absolutely correct.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. May I say to the Members of this House that I have no personal interest in this bill, but I am interested in preserving the integrity of the Committee on Claims. With the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KENNEDY] as chairman of the Committee on Claims, the Members of the House can feel sure that a bill that does not have merit does not get his O. K. [Applause.] We have had no abler chairman of any committee in this House than the gentleman from Maryland. The amount of the bill makes no difference. The question that concerns you is backing up the Committee on Claims, which has twice heard this claim and has twice made a unanimous report that this man ought to be paid.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I made over the radio a few nights ago.

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

There was no objection.

SECOND OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL

LESTER P. BARLOW

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] to strike out the section.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey) there were—ayes 18, noes 76.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 73, nays 193, not voting 163, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

YEAS—73

Angell	Grant, Ala.	Ludlow	Sweet
Beckworth	Gross	Magnuson	Taber
Blackney	Halleck	Mahon	Tarver
Boren	Hancock	Monroney	Thill
Brown, Ga.	Harter, N. Y.	Mott	Thomas, N. J.
Buckler, Minn.	Hoffman	Nelson	Thomason
Byrns, Tenn.	Holmes	Norrell	Thorkelson
Cannon, Mo.	Horton	Osmers	Tibbott
Carter	Johnson, Ind.	Pierce	Tinkham
Cochran	Johnson, Okla.	Powers	Van Zandt
Cole, Md.	Jones, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.	Vinson, Ga.
Colmer	Kean	Rich	Voorhis, Calif.
Costello	Kinzer	Romjue	Warren
Durham	Kitchens	Schafer, Wis.	Whittington
Dworshak	Kunkel	Schiffler	Williams, Del.
Fish	Landis	Smith, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gerlach	Lanham	Springer	
Gillie	LeCompte	Stefan	
Gore	Lewis, Colo.	Sumner, Ill.	

NAYS—193

Alexander	Dickstein	Hunter	Moser
Allen, La.	Dingell	Izac	Mouton
Andersen, H. Carl	Dondero	Jacobsen	Mundt
Anderson, Calif.	Doughton	Jarrett	Murdock, Ariz.
Anderson, Mo.	Duncan	Jenkins, Ohio	Murray
Austin	Dunn	Jennings	O'Connor
Ball	Eaton	Johnson, Ill.	O'Day
Barnes	Eberharter	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Leary
Bell	Edelstein	Johnson, Lyndon	Oliver
Bender	Elliott	Johnson, W. Va.	Patman
Bland	Elston	Jones, Tex.	Patrick
Bloom	Engel	Jonkman	Patton
Boland	Englebright	Kee	Pearson
Bolles	Evans	Keefe	Peterson, Fla.
Boykin	Fenton	Kefauver	Peterson, Ga.
Bradley, Mich.	Flannagan	Keller	Pittenger
Brooks	Fries	Kennedy, Martin	Plumley
Brown, Ohio	Gamble	Kennedy, Md.	Poage
Buck	Gathings	Keogh	Polk
Camp	Gearhart	Kilday	Rabaut
Cannon, Fla.	Gehrmann	Kleberg	Ramspeck
Carlson	Geyer, Calif.	Knutson	Rankin
Cartwright	Gilchrist	Kocialkowski	Rayburn
Case, S. Dak.	Goodwin	Kramer	Reed, Ill.
Casey, Mass.	Gossett	Lea	Rees, Kans.
Chiperfield	Graham	Leavy	Robinson, Utah
Church	Grant, Ind.	Lesinski	Robsion, Ky.
Clason	Green	McAndrews	Rodgers, Pa.
Claypool	Griffith	McCormack	Rogers, Mass.
Clevenger	Gwynne	McGehee	Rogers, Okla.
Coffee, Wash.	Harrington	McKeough	Rutherford
Cole, N. Y.	Hart	McLaughlin	Sasscer
Cooper	Hartley	Maloney	Scrugham
Courtney	Havenner	Mansfield	Seccombe
Cox	Hawks	Martin, Iowa	Secrest
Cravens	Hendricks	Mason	Shannon
Crawford	Hennings	Massingale	Sheppard
Cullen	Hess	Michener	Short
Cummings	Hill	Miller	Simpson
Curtis	Hinshaw	Mills, Ark.	Smith, Maine
D'Alesandro	Hook	Mills, La.	Snyder
Darden, Va.	Houston	Mitchell	South
Davis	Hull	Monkiewicz	Sparkman

Spence	Tolan	West	Woodruff, Mich.
Stearns, N. H.	Vorys, Ohio	Whelchel	Youngdahl
Sutphin	Wallgren	White, Idaho	Zimmerman
Talle	Walter	Williams, Mo.	
Tenerowicz	Ward	Wolcott	
Terry	Welch	Wolfenden, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—163

Allen, Ill.	Dempsey	Johns	Risk
Allen, Pa.	DeRouen	Kelly	Robertson
Andresen, A. H.	Dies	Kennedy, Michael	Rockefeller
Andrews	Dirksen	Kerr	Routzohn
Arends	Disney	Kilburn	Ryan
Arnold	Ditter	Kirwan	Sabath
Barden, N. C.	Douglas	Lambertson	Sacks
Barry	Doxey	Larrabee	Sandager
Barton, N. Y.	Drewry	Lemke	Satterfield
Bates, Ky.	Edmiston	Lewis, Ohio	Schaefer, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Ellis	Luce	Schuetz
Beam	Faddis	Lynch	Schulte
Boehne	Fay	McArdle	Schwert
Bolton	Ferguson	McDowell	Shafer, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.	Fernandez	McGranery	Shanley
Brewster	Fitzpatrick	McGregor	Sheridan
Bryson	Flaherty	McLean	Smith, Conn.
Buckley, N. Y.	Flannery	McLeod	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Folger	McMillan, Clara	Smith, Va.
Burch	Ford, Leland M.	McMillan, John L.	Smith, Wash.
Burdick	Ford, Miss.	Maas	Smith, W. Va.
Burgin	Ford, Thomas F.	Maciejewski	Somers, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Fulmer	Marcantonio	Starnes, Ala.
Byron	Garrett	Marshall	Steagall
Caldwell	Gartner	Martin, Ill.	Sullivan
Celler	Gavagan	Martin, Mass.	Sumners, Tex.
Chapman	Gifford	May	Sweeney
Clark	Gregory	Merritt	Taylor
Cluett	Guyer, Kans.	Murdock, Utah	Thomas, Tex.
Coffee, Nebr.	Hall, Edwin A.	Myers	Treadway
Collins	Hall, Leonard W.	Nichols	Vincent, Ky.
Connery	Hare	Norton	Vreeland
Cooley	Harness	O'Brien	Wadsworth
Corbett	Harter, Ohio	O'Neal	Weaver
Creal	Healey	O'Toole	Wheat
Crosser	Hobbs	Pace	White, Ohio
Crowe	Hope	Parsons	Wigglesworth
Crowther	Jarman	Pfeifer	Winter
Culkin	Jeffries	Randolph	Wood
Darrow	Jenks, N. H.	Reece, Tenn.	Woodrum, Va.
Delaney	Jensen	Richards	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Folger with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Risk.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Jeffries.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Gartner.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Guyer of Kansas.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Edwin A. Hall.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Marshall.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Johns.
Mr. May with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. O'Brien.
Mrs. Clara G. McMillan with Mr. Lewis of Ohio.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Barden of North Carolina with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Arnold with Mr. Brewster.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Ferguson with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Collins with Mr Routzohn.
Mr. Doxey with Mr. Sandager.
Mr. Burch with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Harter of Ohio with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Wheat.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Luce.
Mr. John L. McMillan with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Martin of Illinois with Mr. White of Ohio.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Barton of New York.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. McDowell.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Darrow.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the American Jewish World.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. WARREN]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put into the Appendix of the RECORD an address I recently gave over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the question of Bullitt and Bergdoll, Philadelphia draft dodgers, and to include certain excerpts of record which are necessary to develop my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, and the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

SECOND OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL

LESTER P. BARLOW

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN: On page 6, line 8, strike out "$592,719.21" and insert "$250,000."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House seem to be of the opinion the Congress is required to appropriate money after the Court of Claims has made a report on a resolution directing the court and granting jurisdiction to the court to investigate a claim against the Government and report its findings. Such is not the case, because if it were this bill would not contain the amount that it now contains, but would also contain the amount that the court said should be paid as interest.

I have offered an amendment to reduce this amount to $250,000. I think it is fair because no one can read this report and say that the evidence does not show many points in favor of the Government as well as points in favor of the claimant.

You can read on page 26 of the report in the letter of the Secretary of War, where the Secretary states:

On numerous occasions Mr. Barlow made to the War Department officials a desire to waive any financial returns that might come to him.

In other words, he told the War Department officials he would be willing to waive any financial returns.

My interest in this claim develops from a letter I received from the Secretary of War. Let me read in part what the Secretary of War told me. I have here his letter. He said:

In this connection it should be noted that the inventions were made at a Government arsenal after Mr. Barlow had been given

access to all confidential data and advice by Government experts who were likewise engaged in making designs in the same field. For that reason it was believed impossible to determine whether Mr. Barlow was in fact the inventor.

I do not doubt that the subcommittee went into this matter very fully. I do not doubt that the Claims Committee went into the matter very fully, but I say there is grave doubt in my mind as to whether the Government of the United States owes this tremendous amount of money to a man who back during the period of war, certainly, from patriotic motives, told the Secretary of War that he would be willing to waive any financial benefits that might come to him, and that is in your report. They are not my words.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In the first place, that report, in speaking about the waiver, refers to some bombs that were invented before this claim arose and refers to altogether different bombs from those involved in this issue, and will the gentleman please answer this question: How does the gentleman arrive at a basis for paying this man $250,000?

Mr. COCHRAN. To give the man the benefit of the doubt and to give the taxpayers of the country a little break.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, the gentleman has no basis whatever for his amount of $250,000?

Mr. COCHRAN. I explained why I offered the amendment. I do not yield any further. Let me tell you something about the bombs, and I want someone to contradict me if the information is not true. The bombs were sent abroad to France and the War Department tells me that the French and the English bombs were so far superior that the Barlow bombs were only used for target practice.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will ask the chairman of the committee whether or not that statement is true. The statement comes from the War Department.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. I did not hear all of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I shall answer the gentleman. The gentleman is referring to the same bombs I mentioned a few moments ago that are not involved in this case whatsoever. Those were known as the Barlow bombs that were sent to Europe before these later bombs were manufactured.

Mr. COCHRAN. How do we know that the bombs you refer to were really valuable? The new bomb Barlow recently had did not kill the goats. You pass this bill and the taxpayers of the United States are going to be the goats. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the Members of the House, I have no interest in this matter except the interest that I have in the Claims Committee and the work of the Claims Committee. I have been a member of that committee for almost 11 years. I say to you as I have said before, that I think more often than not the Government is totally unfair to people who have meritorious claims presented to that committee. The departments nearly always recommend against the payment of the claim, as the War Department has done in this case. This case was originally referred to the Court of Claims by act of Congress, and the court was directed to hear the evidence and to make a determination of the law and the facts and report back to the Congress. If you will turn to page 44 of the report, you will find that the very able, distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], a member of the subcommittee, asked these questions of the attorney for the Department of Justice who represented the Government in this case before the Court of Claims.

Mr. KEOGH. Do you think the Government had an opportunity and availed itself of all defenses, general or special, it had in this case?

Mr. HOLTZOFF. Yes. While I did not agree with some of the rulings of the court, nevertheless I feel I was given every opportunity to present my contentions, and I know the court gave them thorough consideration.

Mr. KEOGH. What I would like to know is whether there is any reason why this award, as it is called, should not be upheld.

Mr. HOLTZOFF. I do not like to make a categorical answer, yes or no. I would like to say this, that this case was contested very strenuously by the Government. We presented a number of defenses, which we thought were valid, some going to the validity of the patent, some going to the title, and some going to other points. The court sustained us as to one of the six patents and threw it out and ruled against us as to the others.

We had a considerable contest as to the amount of the recovery, and the court allowed a much larger amount than we claimed was due. But I must say that we had an opportunity to present all of the evidence that we were able to secure, and an opportunity to present all defenses at length that seemed to us to be available, and, therefore, I feel that we had our day in court. And, irrespective of whether we agree with the decision or not, the Court of Claims was the tribunal established by law to make findings, and we submit to those findings and abide by them.

The gentleman from Missouri refers to what the War Department said to him. I have not the time to go into that, but I submit as a matter of common decency and justice to a citizen of the United States, that the War Department had its day in court before the Court of Claims, and that it is beneath the dignity of a great agency of this Government to come here surreptitiously and give information to a Member of Congress in contravention to a decision of a court set up by the Congress to render judgment in this matter. The only reason this bill is here today is because whoever drafted the bill in the first place failed to include in it, by technical error, the right to render judgment after the court found the law and the facts. Gentlemen know the procedure. If this bill had said, "render judgment," it would have been certified to the Committee on Appropriations and paid without any question. So all we have here today is the question of whether we are going to abide by the decision of the Court of Claims. Surely no man on this floor would say that the Court of Claims was not fair to the Government of the United States. They heard this case, they rendered three separate decisions, first on the question of the validity of the patents, second on the question of infringement, and third on the determination of the amount involved, and then they certified the result to the Congress of the United States, and this committee has eliminated the interest, to which the court said this man was entitled, and we have in this bill only the principal which the court said was the amount Mr. Barlow is entitled to because of the infringement of his patents. We ought to sustain the action of that honorable court. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title V—(H. R. 4017. For the relief of John P. Shorter.) By Mr. BLAND

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to John P. Shorter, of Newport News, Va., the sum of $7,750, the same being $2,750 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States Government for expenses incurred by reason of collision with a Civilian Conservation Corps truck, on June 20, 1936, and the additional sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of his claim for permanent injuries sustained by reason of the aforesaid collision, the said collision being due to the wrongful and negligent operation of said truck of the United States by its agents or employees.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John P. Shorter, of Newport News, Va., the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses and injuries sustained as a result of a collision involving a United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck, on June 20, 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in

excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the committee amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COSTELLO moves to strike out all of title V.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, the present bill is an accident case involving a C. C. C. truck. It provides for the payment of $3,500 to John Shorter, who was injured while riding a motorcycle and who had a collision with this C. C. C. truck. Mr. Shorter was apparently driving behind the C. C. C. truck, proceeding at a normal rate of speed. The driver of the C. C. C. truck gave a signal to turn off the highway and proceeded to do so. The point at which he turned off the road was a driveway and not a regular crossroad or cross-highway of any character. The road was not particularly well marked. The claimant in this case, on a motorcycle, was not anticipating such a turn and did not see the signal given. As a result a collision ensued and the claimant did suffer injuries.

The only question that is involved is whether the Government should be held responsible, in view of the fact that the driver of the C. C. C. truck had used normal precaution in giving the proper signal at the time of making his turn off the highway.

That, I believe, is the only question that is involved before the House in this connection. In view of the fact that this was on the Private Calendar and objected to at that time, I offer this motion to strike out the title in order that the House may determine whether or not it desires to make payment under such circumstances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In order that the facts may be fully before the House, I have been through the record very carefully, and I am going to read this statement:

On June 30, 1936, Shorter was injured in a collision between his motorcycle and a Government truck driven by a Civilian Corps enrollee accompanied by seven other enrollees, all colored.

The truck and motorcycle were going in the same direction on a straight road with unobstructed view for several miles. Shorter blew to pass, and the truck suddenly and simultaneously turned left in front of Shorter to enter a dirt road, little more than a bypath, 6½ feet wide, intersecting the highway at right angles, unmarked by any sign, and concealed by grass and weeds. Shorter was compelled to turn left also, and struck the front left fender.

Shorter was a ship's carpenter earning good wages in the shipyard. He suffered a compound fracture of the right leg and other injuries. The shattered bones protruded. He can only hobble now. His occupation is gone. The doctor says he can never work again at his trade. He was in bed 6 months and incurred $650 in bills; he lost $1,850 in wages, and his cycle of $250 value. The $3,500 allowed him barely covers expenses and lost wages.

When the accident occurred, another car with two passengers approached from the opposite direction. Another car going in the same direction had just passed Shorter and the truck. It cut in front of the truck to avoid the approaching car. When the truck cut in front of Shorter, he had to turn left also for the approaching car had to turn left on Shorter's right to avoid a collision. Shorter could not turn that way.

Was any turning signal given? The truck driver, two others in the truck, with another witness, say "Yes." These colored people, without any cross-examination, being interviewed by an officer of the Government, appeared one right after another, and three of them testified to the same thing but the others all did not say that. Other witnesses say positively that no signal was given. Shorter, the injured man, Miss Porter, who was with him on the motorcycle, and the passengers in the approaching car, who were particularly vigilant, say that no signal was given. These two were facing the truck and facing the approaching motorcycle. One car, coming the same way as the truck and the motorcycle, had passed them. These two say positively they were watching and the turning signal was not given.

The affidavits of the enrollees are about word for word the same, except that five out of eight say nothing about a signal having been given. Almost all of the enrollees say they saw no other traffic on the road at that time, yet the undisputed evidence shows one car coming toward the truck, another had just passed the truck; the motorcycle was there, and another car had passed shortly before. The result is that the enrollees say there was no other traffic, but the undisputed evidence shows that there were two other cars and the motorcycle fairly close to the truck.

There was something said in the evidence about the motorcycle having attained considerable speed, as was shown by its speedometer after the accident. The gentleman from California has said nothing about it. The speedometer was one of those which has two indicators; one shows the maximum speed allowed at any time, and the other the current speed. The speedometer is attached to the rear wheel. When the rear wheel left the ground in the accident, the accelerated revolutions caused it to show an increased speed, and the maximum indicator remained at that speed until a button was pressed. One witness said that in all accidents of this kind the maximum-speed indicator will show a high speed due to the accelerated revolutions of the rear wheel when lifted from the ground. Shorter and Miss Porter say he was not going fast, and another driver who had passed says Shorter could not have been going at a great speed or he would have gotten farther down the road than he did.

The complete evidence was not before the War Department. They did not have these affidavits at first, and when they were submitted to it, the War Department itself saw it wise to submit all this testimony to the committee and to refer to the committee the decision as to negligence. The committee has decided. The evidence of witnesses who had no interest in the result of the claim, who were not in the truck, who were not enrollees, and who were charged with the duty of looking out for signals, shows that no signal was given at the time this truck turned into this blind road which was wholly unmarked. There was nothing to indicate the intersection. According to the evidence, grass had so grown up that it concealed the intersecting road, and that an approaching car could not see that there was an intersecting road.

The evidence is irresistible in showing Shorter entirely free from negligence and that the turning signal was not given.

I ask that the claim be allowed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title VI—(S. 760. For the relief of Mrs. Guy A. McConoha)

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Guy A. McConoha, of Poplar, Mont., the sum of $425.50 in full satisfaction of all claims of such Mrs. Guy A. McConoha against the United States resulting from the loss sustained by her when dispossessed by the Government of a certain Ford automobile purchased with a like sum by the said Mrs. Guy A. McConoha, such automobile, without her knowledge, having been previously forfeited to the United States under the internal-revenue laws and laws relating to the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among the Indians: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning in line 14, page 8, strike out the proviso and insert: "That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of

10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HANCOCK moves to strike out all of title VI, on page 8, line 1.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the report on this bill is rather meager, but the facts I think are simple. It seems that in 1929, while a bootlegger was transporting intoxicating liquor into an Indian reservation in Montana, his car was seized by Government agents. During prohibition days automobiles used in transporting liquor were subject to seizure and forfeiture to the Federal Government.

The car was turned over to the Ford agent in a village in Montana for temporary safekeeping, for storage. The agent proved to be a crook. He sold the car to an innocent purchaser, the claimant in this case.

When the Government agents discovered that the car had been sold they repossessed the car, completed the forfeiture proceedings, and then sold the car according to law. The woman who was victimized by the dishonest Ford salesman is now asking to be reimbursed by the Government for what she paid.

I cannot see that there is any liability on the part of the Government. She, of course, has a good cause of action against that Ford agent, and I think he is probably liable to criminal prosecution; but there is no sound legal theory under which the Federal Government can be held responsible for the loss this woman sustained.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill involves $425.50 to reimburse a lady at Poplar, Mont., for loss sustained by her in being dispossessed of an automobile she purchased in good faith from an automobile agent at Poplar, Mont.

The gentleman from New York has not stated all of the facts. This car was being used by a bootlegger to bootleg whisky in an Indian agency in Montana. While the bootlegger was so engaged, a special officer of the Indian agency at Fort Peck seized the car and took possession of it, but the officer released the car on a bond given to him apparently by the attorney, or furnished by the attorney, for the company that sold the car to Mrs. McConoha.

The claim against the United States Government is based upon the fact that it was a United States agent or officer—a representative of the United States Government who permitted this car to get out of his possession without any authority. It is true he accepted some sort of bond, but he had no authority to accept the bond. The bond proved no good.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. A little later, if the gentleman will pardon me.

In addition to that fact, the Department of Justice points out—and it is in the report:

This loss may be traced to the unauthorized release of the seized car by a representative of the United States Government.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The claimant in this case, as I understand it, attempted to recover from the man from whom she purchased the car but he had gone out of business and the judgment was invalid.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly. I thank the gentleman. Not only that, but she paid out $150 attorney's fees trying to recover for the loss of the car she purchased because of the neglect and of the act of the agent of the United States Government. The case is clear, it seems to me.

There is not a scintilla of evidence before the Committee on Claims that this claimant did not act in good faith in the purchase of the car. Let me point out to the Members that the Committee on Claims passed this bill out twice. The bill passed the United States Senate in the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses. I do not need to extol this committee before the Members of this House. It has as high a standing as any committee of the House and is chairmanned by as able, as fine, as sincere, thorough, and honest a gentleman as holds a seat in this House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KENNEDY]. [Applause.] I want to point out that the committee studied this bill, and twice I appeared before the committee on the merits of the bill and on the question the gentleman from Georgia asked. She could not recover from the man who sold her the car wrongfully, because he was insolvent, and, not being able to recover from him, she has the right to recover from the United States Government because of the unauthorized act of the officer. There is no reason why this bill should not be allowed. It is a just claim and it is due her because of the facts I am stating.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. On what ground was the plaintiff denied relief against the Ford agency?

Mr. O'CONNOR. She recovered judgment, but her judgment is not collectible.

Mr. HANCOCK. She did have a legal claim?

Mr. O'CONNOR. She tried to assert her legal claim.

Mr. HANCOCK. But the man was insolvent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; there is no question of her right of action against the Federal Government, because the claim grows out of the original wrongful act of a representative of the United States Government releasing the car in the first place. He had no authority to do it, but he did it, and as a result the car got into the hands of an innocent purchaser. I say therefore that she is entitled to recover from the Government. I might add that the Government repossessed the car from the claimant and sold it for $415 and now has the money. This is one bill that will not really cost the Government anything, and I express the hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

SUNCREST ORCHARD, INC.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Title VII—(S. 927. To confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Suncrest Orchards, Inc.)

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Suncrest Orchards, Inc., against the United States for damages for the alleged wrongful seizure of certain fruit shipped in interstate commerce during the year 1926.

SEC. 2. Such claim may be instituted at any time within 2 years after the passage of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings in any suit before the Court of Claims under this act, and appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code as amended.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Strike out all of Title VII.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, my amendment would strike out title VII of the pending bill, which would authorize the Suncrest Orchard, Inc., to go to the Court of Claims to sue the Government because of the fact it lost several shipments of fruit which the Department of Agriculture held up pending inspection. The cause of action arose back in 1926. The Department of Agriculture found that much of the fruit shipped by the claimant was adulterated by an arsenic residue and because of this was dangerous to public health.

The claimant has previously had a trial on the merits of this case, and the jury found in favor of the Government and

against the claimant. I heard it argued here at great length the fact that in view of a judgment of a court against the Government, this Congress should not stand up and refuse to authorize payment of a claim or, as in the previous case of Mr. Barlow, permit the claimant to go back to the Government and obtain his judgment. Now you have the reverse of the situation.

The claimant has already been to court and has failed to recover judgment, and yet you are asked to allow him to go back to the Court of Claims in order that he may have further opportunity to collect from the Government.

The amount of the claim involved here is $76,000. In my opinion, the claimant does not have a valid claim. The Department of Agriculture was merely carrying out its proper function. The fruit which it withheld was, as they found, actually so adulterated by the arsenic residue from sprays as not to be satisfactory for public consumption.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LANHAM. If we were to assume that the claim was altogether just, what reason would there be even under such circumstances to have the provisions of section 2 allowing the institution of suit at any time within 2 years after the passage of this act, thus obviating the lapse of time in the operation of the statute of limitations?

Mr. COSTELLO. I am frank to state to the gentleman I do not know why a period of 2 years has been allowed. Ordinarily only a 6 months' period is granted. Perhaps it may not be fair to the claimant to make the statement, but I believe the party in interest here is in the penitentiary by reason of other violations of the pure food and drug laws. It may be on that account that the 2-year period is put into this bill in order to give him ample opportunity to exercise his civil rights.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. Speaker, if the Members present will read the letter of Mr. Llewellyn A. Banks, who, with his family, was the owner of the Suncrest Orchards, which appears on the last page of the report, I am sure they will be convinced of the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] was in error in both observations upon this bill. In the first place, the Department of Agriculture is not opposing this bill. This bill gives jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the Suncrest Orchards against the United States, and the letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture states very plainly that the Department has no objection to the bill and that it does not intend to offer any objection.

The facts are as follows: Back in 1926 the Suncrest Orchards, of Medford, Oreg., shipped 100 carloads of pears to the Atlantic seaboard for export to France and Great Britain. While these pears were in transit the Department of Agriculture instituted a series of suits, and those suits are referred to in the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture. Those suits were not suits in the Court of Claims at all. They were suits to confer upon the Department of Agriculture jurisdiction to seize these pears, to examine them, and to find out whether the arsenic spray coating on them was heavier than that permitted by law. The Government seized these pears and found out that they were too heavily sprayed. It then became the duty of the Government under the law to return these pears or to release them to the owner so that he might reprocess them in such manner as to make the arsenic-spray content conform to the law. Instead of doing that, however, the very careless agents of the Department of Agriculture held these cars up for 10 days in the hottest part of the summer without re-icing them, and they thereby ruined the entire 100 carloads of pears.

This bill is to permit the Suncrest Orchards, Inc., now to present its case to the Court of Claims in order to ascertain whether the Government owes this corporation anything in damages. That is all it amounts to. I do not see how there can be any legitimate objection to the enactment of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the omnibus bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 99, noes 12.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present. I have some respect for our bankrupt Treasury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 180, nays 86, not voting 163, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

YEAS—180

Allen, La.	Eaton	Kefauver	Plumley
Anderson, Calif.	Eberharter	Keller	Poage
Angell	Edelstein	Kennedy, Martin	Rabaut
Arends	Elliott	Kennedy, Md.	Ramspeck
Austin	Ellis	Keogh	Rayburn
Ball	Engel	Kilday	Reed, Ill.
Barnes	Fenton	Knutson	Robertson
Bell	Gamble	Kocialkowski	Robinson, Utah
Bender	Gathings	Kramer	Robsion, Ky.
Blackney	Gearhart	Lea	Rogers, Mass.
Bland	Gehrmann	Leavy	Rogers, Okla.
Bloom	Geyer, Calif.	Lesinski	Rutherford
Boland	Gilchrist	McAndrews	Sasscer
Boren	Gillie	McCormack	Satterfield
Boykin	Goodwin	McGehee	Seccombe
Bradley, Mich.	Gossett	McKeough	Secrest
Brooks	Graham	McLaughlin	Shannon
Brown, Ga.	Grant, Ala.	Magnuson	Smith, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Green	Maloney	Smith, Maine
Camp	Gregory	Mansfield	Smith, Wash.
Cannon, Fla.	Griffith	Martin, Iowa	Snyder
Cartwright	Gwynne	Mason	South
Case, S. Dak.	Harrington	Massingale	Sparkman
Casey, Mass.	Hart	Miller	Spence
Chiperfield	Hartley	Mills, Ark.	Stefan
Church	Havenner	Mills, La.	Talle
Claypool	Hawks	Monkiewicz	Tarver
Clevenger	Healey	Monroney	Tenerowicz
Coffee, Wash.	Hess	Moser	Terry
Cole, N. Y.	Hill	Mott	Thomas, Tex.
Cooper	Hinshaw	Mouton	Thomason
Courtney	Hook	Mundt	Tolan
Cox	Horton	O'Connor	Van Zandt
Cravens	Houston	O'Day	Voorhis, Calif.
Creal	Hull	O'Leary	Wallgren
Crowther	Hunter	O'Neal	Walter
Cullen	Izac	Osmers	Ward
Curtis	Jacobsen	Patman	Weaver
D'Alesandro	Jennings	Patrick	Welch
Davis	Jensen	Patton	West
Dickstein	Johnson, Ill.	Pearson	Whelchel
Dingell	Johnson, Luther A.	Peterson, Fla.	White, Idaho
Disney	Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Ga.	Wolverton, N. J.
Dondero	Jonkman	Pierce	Woodruff, Mich.
Dunn	Keefe	Pittenger	Woodrum, Va.

NAYS—86

Alexander	Costello	Harter, N. Y.	McGregor
Andersen, H. Carl	Crawford	Hoffman	Mahon
Anderson, Mo.	Crowe	Holmes	Michener
Andresen, A. H.	Darden, Va.	Jenkins, Ohio	Murray
Beckworth	Durham	Johnson, Ind.	Nelson
Bolles	Dworshak	Jones, Ohio	Norrell
Buckler, Minn.	Edmiston	Kean	Oliver
Byrns, Tenn.	Elston	Kinzer	Polk
Cannon, Mo.	Englebright	Kitchens	Rankin
Carlson	Fish	Kleberg	Reed, N. Y.
Carter	Gerlach	Kunkel	Rees, Kans.
Clason	Gore	Landis	Rich
Cochran	Grant, Ind.	Lanham	Rodgers, Pa.
Coffee, Nebr.	Gross	LeCompte	Romjue
Cole, Md.	Halleck	Lewis, Colo.	Schafer, Wis.
Colmer	Hancock	Ludlow	Schiffler

Schulte	Sutphin	Tinkham	Wolcott
Scrugham	Sweet	Vinson, Ga.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Smith, Ohio	Taber	Vorys, Ohio	Youngdahl
Springer	Thill	Whittington	Zimmerman
Stearns, N. H.	Thorkelson	Williams, Del.	
Sumner, Ill.	Tibbott	Williams, Mo.	

NOT VOTING—163

Allen, Ill.	Ditter	Johnson, W. Va.	Randolph
Allen, Pa.	Doughton	Jones, Tex.	Reece, Tenn.
Andrews	Douglas	Kee	Richards
Arnold	Doxey	Kelly	Risk
Barden, N. C.	Drewry	Kennedy, Michael	Rockefeller
Barry	Duncan	Kerr	Routzohn
Barton, N. Y.	Evans	Kilburn	Ryan
Bates, Ky.	Faddis	Kirwan	Sabath
Bates, Mass.	Fay	Lambertson	Sacks
Beam	Ferguson	Larrabee	Sandager
Boehne	Fernandez	Lemke	Schaefer, Ill.
Bolton	Fitzpatrick	Lewis, Ohio	Schuetz
Bradley, Pa.	Flaherty	Luce	Schwert
Brewster	Flannagan	Lynch	Shafer, Mich.
Bryson	Flannery	McArdle	Shanley
Buck	Folger	McDowell	Sheppard
Buckley, N. Y.	Ford, Leland M.	McGranery	Sheridan
Bulwinkle	Ford, Miss.	McLean	Short
Burch	Ford, Thomas F.	McLeod	Simpson
Burdick	Fries	McMillan, Clara	Smith, Conn.
Burgin	Fulmer	McMillan, John L.	Smith, Va.
Byrne, N. Y.	Garrett	Maas	Smith, W. Va.
Byron	Gartner	Maciejewski	Somers, N. Y.
Caldwell	Gavagan	Marcantonio	Starnes, Ala.
Celler	Gifford	Marshall	Steagall
Chapman	Guyer, Kans.	Martin, Ill.	Sullivan
Clark	Hall, Edwin A.	Martin, Mass.	Sumners, Tex.
Cluett	Hall, Leonard W.	May	Sweeney
Collins	Hare	Merritt	Taylor
Connery	Harness	Mitchell	Thomas, N. J.
Cooley	Harter, Ohio	Murdock, Ariz.	Treadway
Corbett	Hendricks	Murdock, Utah	Vincent, Ky.
Crosser	Hennings	Myers	Vreeland
Culkin	Hobbs	Nichols	Wadsworth
Cummings	Hope	Norton	Warren
Darrow	Jarman	O'Brien	Wheat
Delaney	Jarrett	O'Toole	White, Ohio
Dempsey	Jeffries	Pace	Wigglesworth
DeRouen	Jenks, N. H.	Parsons	Winter
Dies	Johns	Pfeifer	Wood
Dirksen	Johnson, Lyndon	Powers	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Gartner.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Fries with Mr. McDowell.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Jeffries.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Warren with Mr. Short.
Mr. Jones of Texas with Mr. Simpson.
Mr. Parsons with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Murdock of Utah with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. Kilburn.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

LESTER P. BARLOW

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 313 for the House bill, H. R. 3683, to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Lester P. Barlow against the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is this bill identical with one of the bills just passed?

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. It is, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lester P. Barlow the sum of $592,719.21, in full settlement of his aerial torpedo patent-infringement claim against the United States as found by the Court of Claims to be due him in its decision of June 7, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3683) was laid on the table.

JOHN P. SHORTER

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill, S. 823, for the House bill, H. R. 4017, for the relief of John P. Shorter.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is this bill identical with one that was passed in the omnibus claims bill?

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. It is, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John P. Shorter, of Newport News, Va., the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses and injuries sustained as a result of a collision involving a United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck, on June 30, 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4017) was laid on the table.

VIOLET KNOWLEN

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3976) for the relief of Violet Knowlen, a minor, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,500".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAZEL THOMAS

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6061) for the relief of Hazel Thomas, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEARL WALDREP STUBBS AND GEORGE WALDREP

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6334) for the relief of Pearl Waldrep Stubbs and George Waldrep, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out ", and George Waldrep, father of."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "sums of $4,000 and $1,000 respectively" and insert "sum of $1,750."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "sums" and insert "sum."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Pearl Waldrep Stubbs."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY JANIEC AND IGNATZ JANIEC

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8605) for the relief of Mary Janiec and Ignatz Janiec, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. J. GREENLEAF

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 527) for the relief of J. J. Greenleaf, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KENNEDY of Maryland, RAMSPECK, and THOMAS of New Jersey.

FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the House passed the bill (H. R. 10033) with certain changes, so that the bill is now identical with the Senate bill (S. 4042) to provide for the acquisition of flowage rights and the payment of certain damages in connection with the operation of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation Project, Idaho. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill, which is now on the Speaker's desk, be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury, upon receipt of advice from the Secretary of the Interior to the effect that an appropriate and properly executed easement has been obtained, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Emory Poulson, or his heirs, an amount not exceeding $4,500: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be in full settlement for any and all past and present damages to the lands or personal property of the above-named Emory Poulson in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Blackfoot Reservoir, Grays Lake, and the conveyance channel from Grays Lake to the Blackfoot Reservoir of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation Project, Idaho, and in full payment for the easement obtained from said individual covering the right to flood, impound, withdraw at will, water on, over, and from all lands owned or possessed by said individual in connection with the future operation of said project; and the acceptance of said sum by the said Emory Poulson or his heirs shall act as a quittance of any and all rights or claims that may previously have existed against the United States by reason of such construction and operation of the said project: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents or attorneys on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a disdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the business of the Committee on Claims for today.

SUPPOSE A GERMAN VICTORY—SOME PROBLEMS WE WILL HAVE TO FACE

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, we have been following closely the course of the war in Europe and world conditions, and are now centering a great deal of our efforts upon the consideration of our defense program. We all recognize that as a natural result of this war there will be fundamental changes in economic principles and practices, whoever the victor may be. In considering those changes, and in considering our defense policy, it is necessary for us to give some thought to the commercial, economic, and political principles that would be put into force and effect in the event of certain victories, and what we should do to offset the same, or adjust our economy to the new order. At the outset, in considering this problem, I am not going to venture any solution. I will have served my purpose if I succeed in awakening national consciousness to the fact that the character of the economy that will follow the war will be a reflection of the political philosophy of the victor, and that it will be necessary for us to be prepared to meet the challenge when that time comes.

In discussing this problem, I think we should consider first some of the basic elements of the totalitarian economy, and see, in a general way at least, how that economy differs from our own. In the totalitarian state the executive has the supreme power over the law-making processes, the courts, and over all business and economic activity. This power is used to direct from the top all economic activity according to the plans and objectives of the government. In other words, the government has complete control over all labor as individuals, and dictates exactly what employment each individual should have, what rates of pay he should receive, how long he should work, and what contributions, if any, he should make to the government. It also has complete control over the production and distribution of all commodities. Prices are set, both for the producer and the consumer, even going so far as to tell the producer or businessman what he shall produce.

In the field of agriculture the government takes complete control of all farms. It sets the price at which the farmer sells his products, it tells the farmer what he can produce, and certain standards he must meet in the production of the crops; and, if the individual does not come up to the desired standard, it may even take the farm away from him. In the field of manufacturing the same is true, even going to the extent of telling the manufacturer what products can be used, his rates of pay, the price he is to receive for his products, and whether or not the same can be sold for export. In other words, in the totalitarian state all forms of private interests are declared completely subservient to the policies and commands of the rulers of the state. The individual literally has no rights, either in law or fact, save those which the rulers of the state at any particular time may choose to grant him.

This philosophy of government, which we have seen spread in Europe, and whose rulers desire to spread over the world at large, is obviously in direct contrast to our form of government, which supports the individual in the maintenance of both his private and economic liberties. We, in this country, rely for production primarily upon the incentive of gain and private profit. We leave to the individual consumer the right to buy what he chooses, and thereby

determine what is produced. The worker is left free to select his employment and to bargain individually or collectively, and to determine the conditions of his employment. It is necessary for us to realize that if we are to be confronted with a totalitarian Europe, with its form of economy, we must take steps to protect ourselves from encroachment upon our rights, and be in a position to estimate in some degree the nature of the economic problems which will confront us.

In considering the possibility of a Nazi victory we should also take into consideration the exact character and ultimate purposes of the totalitarian politico-economic system. In other words, let us see what Europe would be like under that situation. We have read many articles, books, and so forth, as to the purpose of Germany in this struggle. It must be conceded that Nazi leadership has fully informed the world of its purposes and objectives. I am not going into detail, but would like to make one quotation that I think fairly well embodies the German philosophy:

> It is the destiny of the German race to create a new Europe and a new world, organized under German dominance. The world of the democracies is a "rotten and tottering world," now in the final stages of passing away. The superior culture of the west was shown in the heroic period of European expansion when the Portuguese, the Spanish, the French, the English carried that culture to the ends of the earth. But this glorious tradition was vitiated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by romantic democracy and by defeatism. The nations that had been the carriers of culture lost the capacity for self-defense, and their societies were atomized by the rise of individualism.
>
> The German people have preserved western culture free of these two defects. They realize that force is the basis of all social relationships and that as society is better organized the menace to it from disruptive movements is greater and the force exerted to maintain order must likewise be greater. Germany has the capacity to reintegrate the individual into the race. Some 60 percent of Americans and a large proportion of Englishmen belong racially in this unity, but they have failed to understand their mission. It is because of their failure that Germany has been forced to seek allies in the Italians and the Japanese.
>
> The 30 to 40 states now in Eur-Afr-Asia are far too many. The area requires a single center for its ideology, its military strength, its commercial planning. The new commonwealth will be created by the Germans, with the collaboration of the French, Italian, and Slavic peoples, who will be directed by the superior race in matters of production, distribution, and consumption, and in military matters.

I do not think you will find elsewhere a more concise expression of the totalitarian philosophy. In those few paragraphs you see the elevation of the German race to world leadership; the elevation of force as the arbiter of destiny; the suppression of the individual to the rule and worship of the state; the contraction of Europe into a political entity under the control of axis powers. In considering this last phase, some people have questioned the ability to assimilate all into one political unit. I think this is possible because they will be able to control the press, the radio, dominate the church, and close the universities. All secret organizations will be abolished; therefore, the control of all mediums of thought and expression will be in the hands of the government, not giving to the individual the opportunity of self-expression or organization, whereby unfavorable public opinion might gain headway or start a counter revolution.

In the economic field the state will replace the individual, and the competitive price system will be gone. The relation between the monetary unit and wages and prices will all be set by the government. Undoubtedly, they will furnish the directing personnel for all industry, probably even down to the shop foreman. A further unifying force will be the governing elite, whose loyalty will be retained by the offer of jobs, prestige, and security in the great political bureaucracy which this continental system would require. The propertied classes would probably support this regime, even though they might dislike all the Nazi regulations. They would do so because of the fear that a breakdown of this system would mean a proletarian revolution.

In other words, the Germans count upon political power following economic power and not vice versa. Economic pressure will accomplish their results. Territorial changes would not concern them because there would be no France nor England, except as language groups, as none of these controlled nations would have control of its own finances, economic systems, or of its customs. No orders would be taken from, or given to firms headed by personalities unfavorably regarded by the Nazis. Consequently, by this economic pressure and by the installation of fear, they could easily dominate these countries with a small group.

In considering the possibility of a Nazi victory, we must include, in our speculations, its political and economic effects in this country and in South America, including the possibility of aggression upon this hemisphere. In regard to South America, we may expect attempts of economic penetration, particularly in the Argentine and Brazil, for Germany has in the past and will continue to seek political power as a consequence of economic control. We have entered into defensive commitments with South America, which imply that we would be required to resist Nazi economic penetration there. But, even if this were not the case, it would be absolutely essential to our political and economic principles to oppose the spread of totalitarian economic policies in that section of this hemisphere.

Germany has been very successful in promoting its political influence among the small states of Europe through the negotiation of bilateral treaties and trade cartels. There is opinion that she would employ these methods in seeking a foothold in South American markets. Through her long experience with such trading methods she could organize her trading agreements and exert tremendous influence upon markets which always have been geared to the European economy. Governments with indispensable markets at stake are hardly in a position to demand favorable terms in trade negotiations. Also, she undoubtedly would control and set the rate of exchange. The rate could express the master and subject-race principle, and thereby raise the standard of living of the master people, and even go so far as to affect the relation of the various classes within the country in which they occur. Also preferential terms given to one country over another could be used to undermine the political situation in any one country. Some believe that the economic penetration by Germany into South America would bring those countries sufficiently within the German orbit without changing their sovereignty or form of government. This would be extremely advantageous to Germany, because it would free her from the responsibility of managing production in those countries.

We must recognize that economic necessity, rather than political ideology will exercise controlling influence in South America. These nations are primarily exporting nations. Surpluses are their major problems. Major and rapid shifts will be required to change their economies from a foreign to a domestic market. There has been discussion of the organization of a hemispheric cartel or pool for economic defense. I doubt whether this would work. Should this be attempted, I think the German strategy would be to attempt to divide the unit by arranging to obtain European necessities from the southernmost countries of South America, leaving the rest with large unsold surpluses and difficult internal conditions.

Coming a little closer to home, what would be the impact in our country of a German victory in Europe? As pointed out originally, it would be an impact upon the civilization of which American civilization is a part. We in the United States have in the past been accustomed to measure our resources against the resources of individual nations, but we receive a rude shock when we contrast all of the assets of the countries of Europe lumped into a continental total against our own resources. We in the past have considered ourselves as bigger and better, but would we be under this unification?

Europe in the past has been the best regional customer of the United States; Great Britain our best individual customer. If the standard of living of the populations of the German-occupied areas is reduced to that of subject peoples, the demand for the kind of goods that we produce in this country would be replaced by goods which Japan and Germany are better fitted to supply. Also the question of bilateral bargaining comes in again, and by this method, undoubtedly, Europe would close itself to American exports, except to products essential to further their own economy, and then at a very

low price. Concentration of European manufacturing power under Germany would tend to break American markets elsewhere.

Let us consider briefly how this would affect the average businessman, farmer, and laborer in this country. Under totalitarian control, the American businessman would not be dealing with a European or Asiatic businessman, but with a monoply administered by a government. He would not be engaged in free competition. Then, again, in dealing with the few open countries left, we would be competing not with foreign individual concerns, but with a highly centralized government.

Our farmers, who produce more than is consumed, would be able to dispose of their surpluses only to governments, and then in exchange for manufactured products produced by so-called slave labor, and which would undoubtedly undersell American-made products.

Will it be possible for us to maintain existing living standards while attempting to compete with a government monopoly resting on slave labor and with no financial overhead to burden production? Will a tariff, a subsidy, or labor laws, and so forth, protect our agriculture and industry against the inroads of such a system? If we let the imports in, how can we compete against them? If we exclude them, how can we dispose of our surplus?

In other words, can our economy of free prices and high labor costs successfully meet the challenge of the totalitarian system of fixed prices, managed currency, and trade by barter? Can there be an adjustment between a managed and free economy with profit to the proponents of these conflicting systems? This, in the last analysis, is the problem that will confront us in the event of a complete Nazi victory. We must concentrate our attention upon it; it requires exhaustive study. This study must be undertaken without delay, lest we suffer the fate of others who have neglected to put their defenses in order. It requires little imagination to foresee that, unless it can be avoided, a conflict between two such economic systems would end in a clash, the results of which would be devastating.

When peace comes there will be gestures toward this country and statements will be made that the totalitarian states are now satisfied nations, and that they have no interests in this hemisphere. They will state that the nations of Europe are starving and that the destruction has been tremendous, and that we, in this country, should send our money and resources over to rehabilitate them. The sending of our funds to rehabilitate Europe will appeal to certain groups in this country who believe that a satisfactory arrangement could be made, whereby world trade could be carried on and our markets reopened. In doing this, we should remember that during the period of rehabilitation these same countries could replenish certain exhausted stocks of essential materials and it might be only another breathing spell, which will be held at our expense.

Others seeking to reduce the tax burden incident to our rearmament program would seize upon peace as a reason for reduction, or even a halt in our arms program, on the theory that we can, without hesitation or suspicion, resume trade with the dictator powers. Appeasement will be the watchword of these groups.

I mention these forces for the purpose of emphasizing the necessity of cautious action. We must not be misled into another Munich. We must thoroughly understand the implications of a Nazi victory in the light of the avowed objective of the totalitarian philosophy, and we must never lose sight of the effect of economic penetration in advancing that objective. The desire for appeasement must be tempered by vigilance and, in seeking trade, we must not make it possible for those who seek to destroy democracy everywhere to obtain the means through replenished resources to pursue that aim. By clear understanding of the policies of the totalitarian powers and by the employment of our natural elements of political and economic strength, I believe that whatever the outcome of the war, it will be possible for us to regain our share in world trade without endangering our institutions and without encouraging the spread of opposing philosophies elsewhere. This will be no easy task, but it will not be impossible, if we are prepared, to meet the problem when it develops. Our influence, if properly applied, is too potent to be ignored by any dictator or combination of dictators, whose motives we clearly understand.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DARDEN] at the annual meeting of the American Legion in Norfolk.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary to file a supplemental report on the bill S. 1681.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is this bill?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is the court bill that we had up in the Committee on the Judiciary this morning.

Mr. MICHENER. This is the bill that provides for an additional district?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. And it now simply provides for the distribution of the patronage?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; it provides for the distribution of jurisdiction.

Mr. MICHENER. I shall not object, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection by those having special orders for today, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when we last met, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made some remarks on the floor of this House about the very much reduced activities of the United States Housing Authority today and the size of its staff. He also talked about lobbying on the housing bill.

First, with reference to the administrative expenses of the U. S. H. A., it is true that the U. S. H. A. has 1,786 employees now against 2,080 a year ago, but it is not true that its work load is less. On the contrary, it is a tribute to the efficiency of the U. S. H. A. and the productiveness of its staff that it has been able to get along with fewer employees because its work load is actually greater than last year. On page 1516 of the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill, there are charts showing the project work units of the Authority for this fiscal year. These charts show a work load 10 percent greater for this year than last, because there are more projects under construction and management this year than last year and because this necessarily involves more work by U. S. H. A. Despite a 10-percent increase in the volume of work, the Authority is now functioning with a smaller staff.

Referring to lobbying there has been lobbying for the housing bill, but not by U. S. H. A. There has been lobbying by the host of organizations and people who are supporting this legislation and who, as citizens, are entitled to make their support and interest known to us. There have been few measures before us which have had such wide support. Labor is united behind it—including both the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. It is supported by farm organizations and State commissioners of agriculture. It is supported by various business and industrial organizations. Finally, it is supported by many governors, mayors, and other leading local officials of both parties who have had direct contact with the program in their own communities. The lobbying that my colleague from New York has described is the result of the interest of these groups and organizations.

All of these organizations and people speak in behalf of a cause which is vitally important to the welfare of this Nation today. I say, gentlemen, we should take heed of this interest and act on S. 591 at this session to enable the use of the balance of loan funds already made available to the U. S. H. A. [Applause.]

CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the mayor of Sioux City.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief extract from the hearings on the Banking Act of 1935, before the Senate committee.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, may be dispensed with.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what will be the order of business on tomorrow?

Mr. RAYBURN. The business on tomorrow will be, first, a rule on the so-called Tennessee judgeship bill, and after that is disposed of, probably, the rule on the so-called wool-labeling bill. That will be all for tomorrow and I may say that on Thursday we will have the tax bill.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and in the first to include a brief statement from the Washington News by John T. Flynn, and in the second to include a statement by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and also a copy of a House resolution, a very brief resolution, which I have introduced.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address by Virgil Jordan, president of the National Industrial Conference Board.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FIVE-HUNDRED-MILE-PER-HOUR PLANE

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

The SPEAKER. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, this last week end I took the opportunity presented by our recess from Thursday to Monday to fly home to my district. One of the things I did while there was to visit the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation's plant in Burbank, Calif. I hold in my hand a page from the Los Angeles Times containing a photograph of the *P–38*, the fastest, most deadly interceptor-pursuit plane in the world. I was privileged to inspect this fighting plane in the Lockheed plant.

I have heard so much about it for the past year that I was most anxious to see it to confirm, with my own eyes, the fact of its existence. Members of the House will recall that I have discussed the *P–38* on several occasions, wondering why more of them had not been ordered by the Army Air Corps, and why they have not long since been in production. Now I believe production is about ready to commence, and I hope that we may soon have a large fleet of them for our own defense. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article from the Los Angeles Times of August 23, 1940, concerning the *P–38*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[From the Los Angeles Times of August 23, 1940]

INSPECTORS SEE 500-MILE-PER-HOUR PLANE—LOCKHEED'S NEW PURSUIT SHIP TRUNDLED OUT FOR KNUDSEN AND ARNOLD

The mobilized might of the West's military-aviation industry whirled in review yesterday before William S. Knudsen, production chief of the National Defense Commission, and Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the United States Army Air Corps.

The two men, in whose hands lie the air preparedness of the United States, were on the move throughout the day, but their first official act was to inspect the world's fastest interceptor-pursuit plane just completed for the Air Corps at the Lockheed factory in Burbank.

The tiny, silver, wasp-like plane is believed to be the world's deadliest fighter, according to General Arnold.

It is designed to cruise 460 miles an hour, but refinements have been added since the first experimental model was built, and the Army hopes to bring its speed up to 500 miles an hour.

HOWARD HUGHES VISITED

Each of its two Allison motors has more than 1,000 horsepower—just how much more is one of those military secrets. It has a cruising radius of 1,100 miles and will climb to 4,000 feet altitude in 1 minute. It will be armed with four .50 caliber machine guns and one 1-inch cannon. The wing span is 42 feet and the length 38 feet.

After also inspecting bombers and other production in the Lockheed factory, Knudsen and General Arnold paid a short call upon Howard Hughes, speed flyer and designer of speedy military types of aircraft.

At noon a brief respite was given the inspection party when General Arnold and Knudsen were guests at a luncheon given by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

In the afternoon inspection tours were made through the Kinner airplane-motors factory in Glendale and the Menasco motors factory, where the Government has contracts for many engines. Numerous manufacturers of airplane parts also were called upon by the pair in their inventory of aviation production power.

PHOTOGRAPHS PERMITTED

During the day General Arnold took occasion to permit the first official photographs of a giant bomber being built for the Air Corps at the Douglas Aircraft Co. factory at Santa Monica.

The giant plane, designed to be the mightiest military bomber in the world, though still in the jigs, is rapidly taking form. Just how many of this type will be purchased depends upon the results of its tests, General Arnold said.

Orders for the powerful little Lockheed interceptor, known as the *P–38*, already number more than 900. Many of these are for England, it was indicated, but Army officials admitted that the United States Air Corps has placed its largest order for pursuit

planes with the Lockheed factory. The plane is in production, with the goal set at 100 planes a month within a year.

TESTS NEXT WEEK

The tiny plane will be tested on some secret date next week by a crew of special flyers from Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, according to Maj. K. B. Wolfe, chief production engineer for the Army at that point.

Today General Arnold and Knudsen will go to San Diego to inspect a giant bomber being built for the Army by the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation and training models in production by Ryan Aircraft.

From San Diego the two men will leave for San Francisco, where they will continue their tour of inspection in the West, which will take them later to the large Boeing factory in Seattle.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the American Legion Chelmsford Post, No. 212, and the resolution that that post passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CHALLENGING MR. WENDELL WILLKIE

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

The SPEAKER. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have decided to challenge Mr. Wendell Willkie to debate with him all over the country on the platform. The President has declined to debate with him, and Mr. Willkie said it would be a waste of time for him to accept debate with Mr. Paul McNutt.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I make this challenge in all sincerity. Of course I am so unknown that the gentleman probably never has heard of me, but until a few months ago I had never heard of Mr. Willkie. It might be a waste of time as Mr. Willkie states and probably would be for him to debate with Mr. Paul McNutt—I think it would be a waste of Mr. McNutt's time; but it would not be such a waste of Mr. Willkie's time if he could step down before the people and debate with some little, obscure, unimposing Congressman such as I, and it might be perhaps the cleverest thing that he could do, the shrewdest move he could make, although I might make it more interesting for him than he would think. But, as I say, I sincerely challenge the gentleman and am sure I feel no safer in making this challenge than he did when he issued his challenge to the President of the United States.

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

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

"FIFTH COLUMNISTS"

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article from the Brooklyn Eagle of Thursday, August 22, 1940. Also, I ask unanimous consent that in my address I may include a letter dated August 24 from the Reporter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What did the gentleman say about a speech on August 22?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not my speech. I asked to include a short clipping from the Brooklyn Eagle, dated August 22, 1940, on the question of nazi-ism in this country.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does that have anything to do with the National Rifle Association?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise here to call the attention of the Congress and of the American people to a serious menace in this country today, which has been growing steadily in spite of the fact that we have a committee that is supposedly investigating un-American activity; in spite of the fact that the whole country is looking for "fifth columnists." The real "fifth columnists" have integrated their activities into the various phases of our political, economic, and social life. I rise here to call the attention of the Congress to the fact that our mails are flooding the country with un-American and anti-American propaganda, and, strange as it may seem, our own post office is distributing mail directed against the aims and purposes of the Constitution of the United States and the people of the United States. At my request, Mr. Henry Hoke, publisher of a magazine known as the Reporter, has submitted to me the following letter, containing information which I believe should be communicated to this House, and which I append herewith:

THE REPORTER OF DIRECT MAIL ADVERTISING,
New York, N. Y., August 24, 1940.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman, House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am submitting as briefly as possible the information you requested.

I have been engaged in the direct-mail-advertising business for some 20 years. For 5 years I was executive manager of the Direct Mail Advertising Association. At the present time, I am publisher and editor of The Reporter of Direct Mail Advertising, the only magazine devoted to this field.

About 6 or 7 months ago I became interested in the growing use of the mails for propaganda purposes. I started studying the foreign propaganda that was sent to me by our subscribers. When I became alarmed at the growing volume, I asked many of my contacts around the country to be on the watch. I asked my son at the University of Pennsylvania, and other college boys to be on the watch for student propaganda.

As the volume of our evidence grew, I began comparing the propaganda with the known aims of Hitler and with the known strategies of direct-mail advertising in order to discover the complete set-up.

In the May issue of our magazine I released for the first time the story of how Germany is using the mail. I claimed that this use was fraudulent, and I appealed to the Post Office Department for a fraud order. I realized at the time that it might be impossible for the post office to issue a fraud order under our present laws.

I am submitting a galley proof of the article which appeared in May. Shortly after the appearance of our first release, I received, in my home, a letter from Ernst Schmitz, manager of the German Railways, 11 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York. I am attaching a reproduction of that letter, together with my reply, in which I refused to apologize.

As a result of the publicity surrounding the threat from Mr. Schmitz and my reply, I was able to obtain additional evidence which has been very helpful in proving our case.

In our report for the month of July we revealed all of the evidence we have obtained so far concerning the German campaign in the mail. I am submitting another copy of this magazine, and the story starts on page 12, and continues to page 24.

The summary of our evidence is as follows:

Before analyzing the actual pieces it is necessary to realize that the power of direct mail and the inherent value of direct mail lies in its selectivity and its secretiveness. Germany has been hammering away through the mails for years, and that hammering is intended to influence the thinking of individuals in this country, and to stimulate some definitely desired action.

It is also necessary to analyze the aims of Germany. By analyzing the statements made by Hitler in his Mein Kampf, in Rauschning's report, and in the Official Guide for the Education of the Hitler Youth it is comparatively simple to show that Hitler's mailed propaganda is built around the theories he has publicly expressed. There is definite antagonism to America and the whole scheme is built on the basic idea "divide and conquer."

Hitler is using our mails as the background of a monster campaign to divide the United States into various warring groups.

Here is some of the evidence.

Case No. 1: Boatloads of mail are coming into the United States via Siberia and other channels. Under the International Postal Union agreement, Germany simply prints the postage stamps and puts them on the envelopes addressed to German-Americans and others residing in the United States who have relatives in Germany. The United States Post Office carries this mail free under the International Postal Union agreement. Hitler's government has built one of the largest direct mail mailing lists ever conceived.

Here is what these German-Americans have been getting. (See magazine for reproductions of some of the pieces which we showed you in our personal conversation.)

Twice a week German-Americans get a 48-page bulletin entitled "News From Germany." It is mailed from Steinberg, Bavaria. Sometimes the heading is changed to British News and Views, but it is still mailed from Bavaria.

About once a week there is a bulletin in German entitled "Europaischer Kulturdienst." In these bulletins Germans are told what books to read and what radio programs to listen to. They are also given news about the wonderful state of affairs in Germany.

A few weeks ago every German-American on the list received a 36-page-and-cover 5-by-6¼-inch booklet, entitled "Jew and Gentle," by Otto Edward Lessing. It is one of the most violent attacks on the Jews yet published, and it is a good piece of evidence in

revealing Hitler's technique of attacking the Jews during the first stages of his "divide and conquer" campaign.

Several months ago the German-Americans received a 316-page book, weighing 2 pounds and 4 ounces, entitled "Die Polnischen Greueltaten an den Volksdeutschen in Polen." Postage stamps amounting to 1 mark and 50 pfennings, equivalent to about 42 cents, were attached to each piece. However, Germany only printed the postage stamps and our Government carried these books without recompense.

The book is obscene. No one in the United States would be able to mail such a book. But, under the International Postal Union Agreement, there is also no censorship.

At various intervals German-Americans in the United States receive booklets from various cities. I have seen at least 25 different samples.

This campaign is intended to intimidate Americans of German origin and to secure their cooperation in disrupting the thoughts and the unity of the United States.

I have one specimen which illustrates the "divide and conquer" principle to the nth degree. About 20 individual sheets are stapled together. Each sheet is a separate argument. About 50 of the stapled sections are shipped in a package via Siberia to the German-Americans here. They are instructed to separate the sheets and hand or mail them to the persons who would be most likely to fall for the selected topic, such as an attack on Roosevelt or an attack on the Jews, or on the press, on capital, etc. We understand that the same type of campaign was carried on in the countries Hitler has already conquered. We believe something should be done at once, either to abrogate the International Postal Union treaties, so far as Germany is concerned, or some law should be passed preventing a foreign government from soliciting or approaching residents of the United States for the purpose of selling them on a form of government opposed to our own.

Case No. 2: The German Library of Information at 17 Battery Place, New York, has been flooding the country with mail for some years. They issue a small 8- or 16-page magazine entitled "Facts in Review." They have a master mailing list of approximately 100,000 ministers, school teachers, editors of college papers, newspapers, and other centers of influence. The whole purpose behind Facts in Review is to give distorted news about the perfect form of government under Hitler and it is also intended to disrupt the thinking of the American leaders of thought. The German Library of Information also issues miscellaneous pamphlets and booklets, all along the same line of endeavor. We have gathered evidence that shows that material from Facts in Review has been entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and reprints from the RECORD have been mailed to the German Library list. We believe that this Facts in Review campaign is a fraudulent use of the mails. It is a deliberate attempt on the part of a foreign government, unfriendly to our own, to sell our ministers, school teachers, and newspaper editors on an undemocratic, brutal, and murderous form of government.

During the past month or so Facts in Review has been attempting to regain the confidence of religious leaders by printing silly and ridiculous stories on how Hitler is concerned with the spiritual welfare of his soldiers, and of how he is carefully watching and guiding the affairs of the church in Germany.

Some law should be passed as quickly as possible limiting the freedom of speech and press to Americans, or we will lose all of the freedom of the press. Why should any foreign government be allowed to misuse our freedom of the press, and undermine America?

Case three: The German Railroads Information Office at 11 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, mails 6-page bulletins, entitled "News Flashes From Germany," to an undeterminable number of travel agents, members of the stock exchange, professional men, and prominent national advertisers. These bulletins seem innocuous and sometimes simple. Their obvious purpose is to confuse businessmen about conditions in Germany, and to help in the appeasement program.

We became suspicious of these bulletins because they seemed to be a cover-up for other activities. Ernst Schmitz, the manager, is the man who threatens to sue me for libel.

We made as thorough an investigation as we could of Mr. Schmitz' activities, although we prefer to confine our investigations to the use of the mails. Most of our findings concerning Mr. Schmitz are corroborated in the article which appeared in PM on August 22, and I am attaching a tear sheet for your information.

The Dies committee has served a subpena on Schmitz as a result of our article and the expose by PM. This is just another case of a Nazi agent hiding behind the protection of our lenient laws. They are using our hospitality to defraud. And behind their direct-mail campaign they are carrying on un-American activities. In other words, they are just plain spies gathering information for the Hitler government.

Case No. 4: The Board of Trade for German-American Commerce should be thoroughly investigated. It is publicly proclaimed as an American corporation, but it is Nazi controlled. German agents guide its policies. They publish a magazine entitled "German-American Commerce Bulletin." The whole purpose of the magazine is to wean American businessmen to the German way of thinking. There is the background for the appeasement campaign and the recently departed Westrick was mixed up with Dr. Degener, who guides the board of trade for German-American commerce. This case is an example of how the Germans use an American corporation for sending poisonous propaganda through the mails.

Some law should be passed to put a stop to it.

Case No. 5: Here is another situation which should have some action. Recently the German Government had published by Howell, Soskin & Co., New York, a booklet entitled "The German White Paper." It is reported to be stolen documents which are intended to prove that Roosevelt, Bullitt, and Kennedy were trying to get the United States into the war. Several history professors refused to write the foreword. But it was finally written by a man named C. Hartley Gratten, who has worked with various pacifist groups in Washington. This book, even though priced at $1, is being delivered to an American mailing list by the ton. Our contention is that no foreign government should be allowed to have published in the United States an attack on our Government or on the executives of our Government.

Miscellaneous: We have other miscellaneous evidence which it is not necessary to discuss here. Our contention is that if the Post Office Department cannot issue a fraud order against foreign propaganda, even though the mail seems deceptive * * * if our laws are not adequate to stop this flood of foreign propaganda * * * if the International Postal Union treaties require our postmen to deliver propaganda from Germany without recompense to the Government * * * then some action should be taken at once.

Here are my two suggestions: First, an emergency legislative act making it illegal for any foreign government or its agents to solicit or approach by mail, or in person, any resident of the United States for the purpose of influencing an acceptance of a form of government opposed to our own.

That is, if we are to save the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech * * * why shouldn't Congress limit that freedom to Americans? Why should any foreign government be able to approach American residents as individuals in an effort to sell them on a form of government opposed to our own? Why shouldn't foreign approaches to American residents be made through regular diplomatic channels?

The only other solution is a severance of diplomatic relations and an abrogation of the Postal Union treaty as far as Nazi Germany is concerned.

Germany has been arrogant in flaunting its contempt for the United States of America. Germany has flooded this country with mailed propaganda and with Nazi agents. They are disrupting the thoughts, the actions of Americans.

The time has come for action. It is high time for mail users, business leaders, and Members of Congress to work together to put an end to destructive foreign interference with our business and with our life.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY HOKE, *Publisher.*

Tons of foreign mail have poured into this country through our post office, and, of course, the mail originated on the other side, and therefore we received no compensation for the transmission of mails directed against our own institutions and Government.

I believe Mr. Hoke's letter calls for prompt action by Congress, and I intend to introduce a bill as well as a resolution to put an end to this transmission of propaganda by our mails. No other country in the world would allow the mails to be used to undermine its institutions, and as the present statutes are inadequate for that purpose, it is the duty of Congress to pass proper legislation to correct this situation.

There is no question that legislation could be enacted making it illegal for any foreign government to solicit or approach by letter or in person any resident of the United States for the purpose of influencing an acceptance of a form of government opposed to our own.

This propaganda by mail is in line with Hitler's aim and purpose to utilize the machinery of democracy in order to destroy democracy. Just as in Germany, freedom of speech which was guaranteed in the German Constitution was used by the Nazis to overthrow the republican form of government of that country, so now American mails which do not prevent the circulation of all kinds of propaganda are used to distribute anti-American publications.

The purpose of Mr. Hitler is to stir up discontent and disunion among the various groups constituting the American Nation. Gentiles are to be alined against Jews, Catholics against Protestants, the South against the North, Negroes against whites, poor against rich, capital against labor, and the like. "Divide and conquer" is the rule. In union there is strength and the totalitarian rulers do not want our Nation to remain united. Mr. Hitler and his cohorts will stir up discontent everywhere, create "fifth columns" among all the ranks of our people, and later, if they succeed in their plans, America could never rise again to its preeminent position

among the nations. Here are some excerpts from Hitler's speeches:

America is permanently on the brink of a revolution. It will be a simple matter for me to produce unrest and revolts in the United States, so that these gentry will have their hands full with their own affairs.

Again he said:

National socialism alone is destined to liberate the American people from their ruling clique. I shall undertake this task simultaneously with the restoration of Germany to her leading position in America.

Herman Rauschnigg, who was at one time a close collaborator with Hitler, and who broke with him and wrote an important book entitled "The Voice of Destruction" reports that Hitler believed he could break Anglo-Saxon influence in America, make America a German-speaking nation, and eventually use America to set up Germany as the world empire. Hitler is quoted as saying as follows:

The German component of the American people will be the source of its political and mental resurrection. The American people is not yet a nation in the ethnographical sense, it is a conglomerate of disparate elements. But it is the raw material for a nation.

And again:

We shall soon train our youth there. And we shall have men whom degenerate Yankeedom will not be able to challenge. We shall succeed in making the new political and social order the universal basis of life in the world.

I guarantee that at the right moment a new America will exist as our strongest supporter when we are ready to take the stride into overseas space.

Since the Civil War in which the Southern States were defeated in violation of all historical logic and common sense, the American people have entered upon a plane of political and racial decadence. Nothing but national socialism can deliver the American people from their oppressors and reestablish the foundation of their national greatness.

In order to understand Hitler's views concerning religion it is necessary to refer to his official guide for the education of Hitler youth, which is sort of a catechism, teaching the following lessons:

Christianity is a religion for slaves and fools.

Christianity does not differentiate between whites and Negroes.

The New Testament is a Jewish lie concocted by four evangelists.

The church is international.

Christianity is only a substitute for Judaism and was invented by the Jews in Rome.

Jesus was a Jew.

The implication of all that is that if America is to be reborn it must be only under the domination of the German master race. To accomplish this purpose the Nazis seek to weaken America from within by trying to disseminate their poisonous doctrines through all propaganda channels at their disposal.

As I said before, today foreign mail by the tons is coming into this country and is being circulated throughout the country at almost no cost to the foreign governments. It seems that under some sort of agreement reached at a universal convention, held every 5 years, the rate of postage on mail which passes in international traffic is fixed at this international convention and applies to all countries alike. The rate is based upon a fictitious gold franc. The last convention of this so-called International Mail Conference was held about a year ago in Buenos Aires, at which time it was agreed, and an agreement was signed, as to the rate of postage on international communications. The present rate is 4 centimes of 1 franc for 2 ounces. One franc is about 32.67 cents, which amounts to 1½ cents for each 2 ounces.

I feel very strongly that it could not have been the intention on the part of this Government to participate with the Nazi government or the Fascist government or any other government to enter into a contract to give them almost free mailing on foreign material if the United States Government knew then what it knows now. Instead of sending us mail of cultural or of educational or commercial value, 98 percent of the mail from Nazi Germany today is definitely attacking democracies and everything that those democracies stand for. As a matter of fact, my colleagues, as a result of this enormous amount of propaganda in this foreign mail, this Government is losing millions and millions of dollars, because for the same book that they pay almost 1½ cents you would have to pay 40 to 60 cents if you wanted to mail that first-class mail anywhere in the United States.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. When did that first begin?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, it is an international convention of all governments.

Mr. PATMAN. But I mean the propaganda being sent through the mails.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In the last 6 months it has been very heavy.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that it began when Hitler went into power about January 1, 1933?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We had plenty of it at that time, but when Hitler started in 1933 most of the propaganda came in by the ships of the North German Lloyd Line—20 or 30 ships a month. They would actually bring the physical literature or propaganda into the ports of New York, Philadelphia, and San Francisco, and then it would be distributed by the so-called bund organizations throughout the country and to Nazi sympathizers within our own border. However, now that the ships are not coming in since September of 1939, tons of this material are coming in by mail, at a loss to our Government of millions of dollars, and there is not one piece of mail that has any bearing upon education or enlightenment or business, but only upon propaganda, attacking race and creed and our form of government.

I have called attention to that before, but not as forcefully as I hope to do now, because at that time, 4 or 5 months ago, I did not have the positive evidence I have now. I have called attention to this fact, but the so-called Committee on Un-American Activities does not seem to care what is coming in and what is flooding the country. All we hear is another statement, another release in the press about a "pink" they found in Los Angeles or somewhere in California.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I know he has something to ask.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand that the gentleman is suggesting that the distribution of this so-called propaganda through the mails, coming in from Germany, should be curtailed?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not only from Germany but any other country. Curtailed; yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. This propaganda that is coming through the mails, that is seeking to involve us in the affairs of Europe, should be stopped.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes, sir; absolutely.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is aware of the fact that almost a year ago I stated upon the floor of this House that I thought the time had come when a reappraisal should be had in this country of the fundamental constitutional rights of free speech and free press. Is the gentleman now reappraising the right of free press under the Constitution?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. My position is the same as it was. I am not changing my position on the question of free speech or free rights. But if the gentleman will bear with me a moment, the point that I make now is that at this conference that was held in Buenos Aires a year ago, an agreement was entered into between all of these governments for the purpose of receiving second- and third-class mail, and it was there discussed that that material was for the purpose of national and international business, or for the purpose of education, or whatever the case might have been. It was not intended at that time that any government would be permitted to disseminate and deliberately print documentary books and papers which would try to superimpose their form of government upon others and which would seek to destroy other forms of government. That is the point I make.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand the complaint the gentleman is making is that the Post Office Department is not getting sufficient revenue because of this distribution, or is his complaint based upon the fact that he feels that the minds of the people of this Nation are being poisoned by the things that are being circulated?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. My friend, we will take the latter. I do not care about the revenue. We have always lost money on foreign mail, but I am protesting to this Congress and telling the American people that we must find a way to stop the sending of tons of poison into this country by foreign governments that seek to overthrow our democratic form of government or to involve us in a war.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further and direct his remarks also, if he will, to those publications that have been published in this country that had been registered as being published by foreign agents such as the Daily Worker, the Communist publication that has poured poison throughout the land for years and years?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. My friend knows that I am in sympathy with his views. I am on his side on that argument. And I also tell him right now that we have a lot of domestic crackpots who use the mails to disseminate un-American propaganda. I can name about 150 domestic groups that are using our second- and third-class mail on which we lose money. I do not care so much about the question of dollars and cents but I do care about the things they put in those envelopes that are shipped throughout the country making the post office the medium of the "fifth column."

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman if in his remarks he intends to indicate a course of procedure as to just exactly how without violation of the constitutional rights as recently proclaimed by the Supreme Court of the United States, how you are going to stop the dissemination of literature of the character he has described? That is a matter I am interested in and other people are interested in, too.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question because I feel I have at least a partial solution of it, and in my humble way and within my capabilities I hope to offer some solution. I ask the gentleman to examine a letter I have inserted in my remarks addressed to me by Mr. Henry Hoke, an outstanding publisher. I am sure the gentleman will find his suggestions very helpful.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman mind placing in the RECORD the names of these 150 associations?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I would not mind, but I do not think it is exactly right because I want to give every one of them the benefit of the doubt and I am still doing some checking. I have not completed my list. So far I have reached about 75 or 80 of these domestic organizations which are helping, aiding, and assisting foreign agents in disseminating propaganda on behelf of Italy and Germany and other subversive groups in this country.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly.

Mr. PATMAN. I suggest that the gentleman place in the RECORD the names of the 75 or 80 he has checked.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think they belong in one block, and I am going to keep them in one block, because you cannot separate one from the other. The groups are tied in and interwoven from one end of the country to the other.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman also insert the name of William Allen White, who has been disseminating foreign-invasion propaganda as well as articles and false statements in Liberty magazine attacking the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have not gone into his activities. We are talking about the "fifth column." What is the "fifth column"? It is invisible. We do not know where its members are. But here we continue an agreement with some foreign governments that have violated the agreement, in that they have within the last 6 months deliberately forwarded malicious, subversive propaganda to various parts of our country attacking our institutions and attacking democracies in general. I have cited some quotations from Mr. Hitler's talks showing that he intends to Germanize the United States and that he says until that is done this will not be a happy world. Those statements have appeared in propaganda material coming into the United States, propaganda sent through the mails, thus making the post office an innocent member of a conspiracy. I say, therefore, that the post office is an innocent party to the "fifth column" conspiracy in this country because the "fifth column" uses it to disseminate its foreign propaganda; and this in turn is possible because we are so foolish as to continue our side of agreements with countries that have broken their solemn pledge to us. It is up to Congress to correct this intolerable situation.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I assume the gentleman receives at his office every so often the same literature that comes to the rest of us from the Friends of New Germany depicting the wonders and glories of Germany.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right. There is somebody in the office of the German consul in this country who does that particular line of work with money sent him from the Nazi Government. They are directed to disseminate all kinds of poisonous un-American propaganda. It is shipped through the so-called German bund whose members claim to be 100-percent Americans.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman and I are in substantial accord, I believe, upon the premise that these things are taking place. I would like to ask the gentleman, however, whether he considers those things any more inimical and dangerous to the welfare of this Nation than to have upon the pay rolls of the United States Government, holding official positions, people who have been definitely identified as members of the Communist organization, or those who hew to the Communist Party line? And I am going to take the floor of the House in the next 2 or 3 days and name them on the floor of this House, tell who they are. The gentleman talks about "fifth columnists." They can be identified.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All right, now; we are getting together. Just let us dissect this problem for a moment. We have gone into a lot of extraneous matter.

Mr. KEEFE. It is not extraneous. The evidence is conclusive.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We do a lot of hollering about the "reds." Now, I have no use for the "reds." About a year or 2 years ago ago they picketed my house because I directed the Department to deport a few of these agitators. For months and months they walked up and down in front of my house with placards. I am ashamed to tell you what they said about me, but that does not make any difference at all. I have no more use for them than any other man on this floor. But between the two, fascism seems to be the greater danger at the moment. The "red" agitator takes a soap box and speaks his mind. I may take the next box and tell the people what I think of him and his ideas. But your Fascists, your Nazis, your "fifth columnists," your foreign agents do things on the sly. You do not know what the next step will be. Is that not true? You cannot get away from that. I say that the Communists, the Fascists, and the Nazis all belong to the same family; but between them, as I said before, the Fascists and Nazis seem to be more dangerous at present. Can you deny that? I have no use for either of them, but we must face the facts.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand the gentleman's statement to be that those who adhere to the philosophy of nazi-ism are

more dangerous than those who advocate the philosophy of communism. Do I correctly understand the gentleman?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, I have just simply defined one as a little more dangerous than the other at the present time. One just talks and barks and the other acts at the present time. I say they are all inimical to our form of government, and I mean nazi-ism, communism, and fascism. But we have been paying too much attention to communism, and have given fascism a chance to take root in this country. I agree with the gentleman that all these isms are no good. But at the same time the Committee on Un-American Activities has done nothing to advise the country of the menace and danger of fascism. That is as far as I want to go.

Mr. KEEFE. May I make an observation in connection with that statement?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. My time is limited, and I have been courteous to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. I concede that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman has any particular thing in mind let us get down to the point.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman will concede, will he not, that there are communistic activities that are active and open in this country?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. People who are promoting and fostering activities of sabotage, strikes, discord, and hatred, and they are doing it openly. The gentleman knows that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman, but this House does not seem to be interested in that——

Mr. KEEFE. I am interested in it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am not speaking about the gentleman. I am talking about the Congress, and I want to justify my statement. We brought out a resolution 2 years ago to investigate the smugglers who were bringing into this country undesirable and suspicious aliens. We have been before the Rules Committee for 2 years begging for a rule. Apparently certain people did not want this investigation to take place and the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization was unable to get any action on the resolution for which it had asked unanimously.

To summarize my observations and to show you that high Government officials have been forced to take notice of the menace of foreign propaganda being carried on in our midst, I wish to insert at this time the last of a series of four articles on this subject made public by the Secretary of the Navy. The information revealed in this article substantiates all the charges that I have been making against the Nazi government for the last 7 years and brings out the fact that, unfortunately, all the predictions I made back in 1933 with regard to the spread of Nazi ideology in this country have become realities.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of August 22, 1940]

ARMED NAZI UNIT DRILLS IN UNITED STATES, DONOVAN SAYS—"FIFTH COLUMN" HERE HELD FINEST IN WORLD—PROPAGANDA COSTS REICH TWO HUNDRED MILLION A YEAR

(By Col. William J. Donovan and Edgar Mowrer)

Since we must ascribe a huge share in Adolf Hitler's incomparable military successes to his use of Germans and "fifth columnists" in victim countries, the question arises how such a success was possible. How are Germans abroad brought to such self-sacrificing enthusiasm for the Nazi regime? How, above all, can foreigners living under relatively mild and civilized governments be induced voluntarily to betray their own countries for Hitler's Germany? It seems mysterious.

The answer is $200,000,000 spent annually on organization and propaganda abroad. The immensity of this sum is the secret. Nazi Germany is not a government—not even a "folkdom" of the sort Nazi orators talk about.

Nazi Germany is a conspiracy. Its scope is universal and its aim world dominion. Its primary agents are as many of the millions of Germans in Germany and abroad as can be induced or compelled to serve the German fatherland.

In the United States an organization of Nazis is being trained in arms. As matters now stand, it is conceivable that the United States possesses the finest Nazi-schooled "fifth column" in the world, one which in case of war with Germany could be our undoing.

Its activities begin with attempted proselyting of Germans abroad, go on to the murder and kidnaping of real or fancied enemies, and end in armed insurrection against the foreign country Hitler wishes to conquer or absorb. Such insurrections of Germans actually occurred in Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Holland. But for the firm attitude of the United States such an insurrection would, many students believe, have occurred in Brazil.

ACCEPT TRAITORS AS ALLIES

Naturally, the Nazis accept traitors as allies wherever they can find them and welcome the assistance of non-Nordics. But peoples racially akin to Germans—Scandinavians, Dutch, Flemings, German-speaking Swiss, even Anglo-Saxons—are made the object of special proselytizing as belonging to the "same blood."

The center is the Nazi Party. The tool is the Auslands organization (or organization abroad) of this party. Today this organization of Germans abroad has nearly 4,000,000 members, all of whom are conscious agents. Over 600 local groups or "supporting points" are organized in 45 or more Landesgruppen"—one in each country.

BOHLE IS SOLE DIRECTOR

The headquarters is in Stuttgart, but all the groups are directed by a single man in Berlin, Gauleiter Ernst Wilhelm Bohle, with some 800 assistants. Technically, Bohle is a "state secretary" in the German Foreign Office.

But everywhere, whether the members are Germans, naturalized Germans or non-Germans, the aim is the same, to achieve Hitler's end by trickery or terror; the organizing principle is the same, with Hitler youth and Hitler sport, marching, emblems, ruthless discipline, ceremonies in honor of Nazi heroes or Hitler's birthday parties; and in case of war they would all be on Germany's side.

In time of peace they make lists of Hitler's enemies, who are marked down for murder or kidnaping to Germany and torture when the great day comes.

There are in fact no less than seven others. The political police or Gestapo, the propaganda ministry of Dr. Paul Joseph Goebbels, the German labor front, the intelligence service of the German Army, of the German Navy, and of the German air arm, and finally the German Foreign Office with its embassies and consulates all over the world.

SPEND TWO HUNDRED MILLIONS YEARLY

Together, these eight organizations spend on propaganda, espionage, and sabotage roughly $200,000,000 a year. It seems a lot of money, but Hitler has publicly expressed his intention of keeping this service at full blast even if it means fewer divisions in the army.

When one considers that this combined service, with its 35,000 employees, can probably claim credit for the ease of Hitler's many victories, it is obvious that the same result could hardly be obtained so cheaply in any other way.

The German Gestapo of Heinrich Himmler, whose ruthless efficiency surpasses even the Russian Ogpu, employs only about 5,000 agents abroad. One of its special tasks is watching over German refugee emigrants, but it does not scorn to cast an eye even on Nazis in good standing, some of whom have been known to speak slightingly of the Fuehrer or to express a passing wish for greater personal freedom.

COLLAPSE UNDER OPPOSITION

The Nazis are strong only where unopposed. Where they are resisted, where the initiative is taken from them, they tend to collapse. The revelations in the American press of the fortunes amassed and held abroad by leading Nazis kept Goebbels busy denying it for 2 weeks.

It is hard to see why under present circumstances, in view of "fifth column" activity observed abroad, countries that do not intend to submit to the Third Reich permit any German-language publications or why they do not adopt legislation allowing naturalizations obtained under false pretenses to be annulled by executive act, or do not insist on knowing just which domestic industries and commercial houses have tie-ups of any sort with the Nazis.

Failure to do this, failure to study and combat the entire Nazi-Auslands organization may have tragic consequences. Unearthed in time, the Nazi conspiracy is relatively harmless.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me thank the membership of the House for their courteous reaction to my rather long statement today. I am glad to notice that the House as a whole is beginning to realize the importance of the problem we are facing in fighting the enemy from within and that there seems to be a strong will for unity of action in this fight. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PRESENT FACTS AND PAST HISTORY INSURE CONTINUED DEMOCRATIC CONTROL

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, now that the former machine Democrat, whose only elective political office holding seems to have been as a regular organization—"machine" if you will—precinct committeeman from the thirty-seventh precinct of the fifteenth assembly district of New York County, has endorsed the Roosevelt foreign policies, and has assured the country that he accepts the administration's domestic policies from farm program to Federal regulation of stock exchanges, we may consider the campaign open. May

I congratulate the minority party in the discarding of its futile fumbling behind its Deweys, Landons, Hoovers, Vandenbergs, Hamiltons, and Tafts and in reorganizing its shattered ranks under the banner of a leader borrowed from the minor leagues of the Democratic Party. However, this may be taken as a confession of complete bankruptcy of capacity in the veteran ranks of the once Grand Old Party.

There appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 4946, a most interesting set of figures, reprinted from the Hearst publications, supposed to indicate that the Republicans might possibly gain control of the House of Representatives.

In view of the fact that the Democratic Party now holds one of the largest majorities in congressional history, and the further fact that no party with a clear majority at the midterm congressional elections has, since 1855, lost control of the House of Representatives at the subsequent Presidential elections, this type of statistical reasoning might be properly called whistling one's way past the cemetery. As a matter of fact, the party holding a majority in the House of Representatives at the midterm has increased its majority in the subsequent Presidential year in every test for the past 40 years with the single exception of the 1906–8 elections, when the Republican membership had a net loss of three seats, but retained firm control of the House. The Democratic certainty of success does not rest upon historical precedent alone.

In spite of the traditional "off year" gains of the minority party in 1938, in the Seventy-sixth Congress the Republican Party now has but 170 seats, including 2 vacancies, while there is a net Democratic majority over the Republicans of 90, including 2 sure Democratic seats now vacant.

Probably the most ridiculous of the dreams of this Republican statistical juggler is the one that the Republicans will not only hold each and every one of the gains made in 1938 but that the new gains in 1940 will be as great over 1938 as 1938 was over 1936.

Even the most casual observer of politics knows that in 1938 the Democratic Party was suffering from a maximum of State and local party feuds. Party organizations in several of the most important States were in nearly complete chaos, especially in Ohio and Pennsylvania, where the major losses occurred and open sores from the primary campaigns were unhealed. Those conditions have disappeared.

It is true that spectacular announcements have been made that a number of persons who, at one time or another, supported the Democratic ticket are today enlisted under the banner of the ex-Democrat who, in his acceptance speech, could not find a single word of praise for any Republican leader or policy since Lincoln, with the exception of La Follette and Theodore Roosevelt, both of whom completely repudiated the Republican Party and all of its works. However, it is most interesting to note that, from Jim Reed to RUSH HOLT, practically every one of these new recruits either openly supported Governor Landon in 1936 or consistently opposed each and every one of the President's efforts to assist the common man. It is particularly interesting to recall that the combined efforts of the Republican Party plus that of renegade ex-Democratic leaders without followers produced the astounding total of 8 electoral votes.

In spite of the fact that the Republican minority in this Congress, after their so-called victories of 1938, now comprises but 23.9 percent of the Senate and 39 percent of the House, their party weakness is not adequately revealed until we examine the 1938 election results.

Then we find that 165 sitting Democrats in the House received over 60 percent of the total vote for Member of the House in their respective districts in 1938, while only 72 Republicans received similar votes. In addition, of the 97 remaining Republicans, 14 received less than 50 percent of the votes cast in 1938; 25 received but from 50 to 52.5 percent; 20 from 52.5 to 55 percent; 16 from 55 to 57.5 percent; while 22 had from 57.5 to 60 percent of the congressional vote.

The following list shows the districts in which the present Republican Members received less than 50 percent, or a minority of the vote cast for Member of the House:

	Percent
1. JOHN C. SCHAFER, Fourth Wisconsin	31.7
2. JOSHUA L. JOHNS, Eighth Wisconsin	37.7
3. B. J. MONKIEWICZ, at large, Connecticut	42.9
4. WILLIAM J. MILLER, First Connecticut	43.4
5. ALBERT E. AUSTIN, Fourth Connecticut	43.4
6. LEWIS D. THILL, Fifth Wisconsin	43.4
7. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Seventh Minnesota	44.3
8. CHARLES HAWKS, Jr., Second Wisconsin	44.8
9. JOHN G. ALEXANDER, Third Minnesota	46.1
10. CARL HINSHAW, Eleventh California	47.0
11. THOMAS R. BALL, Second Connecticut	48.1
12. Thomas M. Eaton (deceased), Eighteenth California	48.5
13. REID F. MURRAY, Seventh Wisconsin	48.8
14. STEPHEN BOLLES, First Wisconsin	49.1

Twenty-five Members received such slender majorities that an extremely slight change in sentiment from 1938 would result in defeat.

	Percent
1. Harry W. Griswold (deceased), Third Wisconsin	50.1
2. EARL R. LEWIS, Eighteenth Ohio	50.1
3. CLARENCE J. MCLEOD, Thirteenth Michigan	50.6
4. NOBLE J. JOHNSON, Sixth Indiana	50.6
5. JOHN M. VORYS, Twelfth Ohio	50.9
6. CHESTER H. GROSS, Twenty-second Pennsylvania	50.3
7. JOHN MCDOWELL, Thirty-first Pennsylvania	50.7
8. WALTER S. JEFFRIES, Second New Jersey	50.6
9. ALBERT L. VREELAND, Eleventh New Jersey	50.3
10. ROBERT LUCE, Ninth Massachusetts	50.9
11. J. FRANCIS HARTER, Forty-first New York	50.9
12. GEORGE H. HEINKE (deceased), First Nebraska	50.9
13. CHARLES F. RISK, First Rhode Island	50.3
14. ROBERT J. CORBETT, Thirtieth Pennsylvania	51.2
15. GERALD W. LANDIS, Seventh Indiana	51.1
16. FRED BRADLEY, Eleventh Michigan	51.3
17. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, Eighth Minnesota	51.0
18. ROBERT A. GRANT, Third Indiana	51.0
19. ANTON J. JOHNSON, Fourteenth Illinois	51.4
20. WILLIAM H. WHEAT, Nineteenth Illinois	51.5
21. LOUIS E. GRAHAM, Twenty-sixth Pennsylvania	52.3
22. HENRY O. TALLE, Fourth Iowa	52.1
23. GEORGE H. BENDER, at large, Ohio	52.4
24. JAMES SECCOMBE, Sixteenth Ohio	50.7
25. L. L. MARSHALL, at large, Ohio	52.4

A third group, 20 other districts, would be lost by even a very moderate swing away from the Democratic low of 1938. In each of the following, the Republican Member named received between 52.5 to 55 percent of the vote cast in 1938:

	Percent
1. FRANK O. HORTON, Wyoming	52.8
2. FRED C. GARTNER, Fifth Pennsylvania	53.0
3. ROBERT L. RODGERS, Twenty-ninth Pennsylvania	53.7
4. IVOR D. FENTON, Thirteenth Pennsylvania	53.2
5. THOMAS D. WINTER, Third Kansas	53.4
6. MELVIN J. MAAS, Fourth Minnesota	53.5
7. BRUCE BARTON, Seventeenth New York	53.5
8. HENRY DWORSHAK, Second Idaho	53.5
9. ARTHUR B. JENKS, First New Hampshire	53.8
10. KARL M. LECOMPTE, Fifth Iowa	53.9
11. PEHR G. HOLMES, Fourth Massachusetts	54.1
12. Clyde H. Smith (deceased), Second Maine	54.2
13. J. THORKELSON, First Montana	54.1
14. JESSIE SUMNER, Eighteenth Illinois	54.3
15. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, Fifteenth Illinois	54.5
16. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL, Fifth Minnesota	54.6
17. JOHN TABER, Thirty-sixth New York	54.6
18. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER, First West Virginia	54.8
19. FRANK B. KEEFE, Sixth Wisconsin	54.8
20. ROBERT W. KEAN, Twelfth New Jersey	54.9

Still another group of 16 districts show Republican majorities of narrow range, from 55 to 57.5 percent.

	Percent
1. JOHN Z. ANDERSON, Eighth California	55.0
2. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, Sixth Michigan	55.0
3. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, Tenth Indiana	55.0
4. JOHN C. KUNKEL, Nineteenth Pennsylvania	55.0
5. FREDERICK C. SMITH, Eighth Ohio	55.2
6. FOREST A. HARNESS, Fifth Indiana	55.4
7. FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr., Tenth New Jersey	55.5
8. HARVE TIBBOTT, Twenty-seventh Pennsylvania	55.7
9. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN, Third Ohio	55.8
10. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS, Delaware	56.0
11. DEWEY SHORT, Seventh Missouri	56.3
12. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN, Thirty-eighth New York	56.1
13. CHARLES L. GERLACH, Ninth Pennsylvania	56.6
14. CLIFF CLEVENGER, Fifth Ohio	56.8
15. U. S. GUYER, Second Kansas	56.4
16. JAMES VAN ZANDT, Twenty-third Pennsylvania	57.1

In 22 additional districts the Republican vote was from 57.5 to 60 percent of the total vote. According to the Republican statistical genius who compiled the material previously inserted in the RECORD, districts of this type are debatable.

	Percent
1. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Seventh Ohio	57.6
2. CHARLES A. HALLECK, Second Indiana	57.7
3. THOMAS E. MARTIN, First Iowa	57.9
4. RALPH E. CHURCH, Tenth Illinois	58.0
5. ALBERT J. ENGEL, Ninth Michigan	58.1
6. CARL T. CURTIS, Fourth Nebraska	58.1
7. CHARLES H. ELSTON, First Ohio	58.1
8. FRED L. CRAWFORD, Eighth Michigan	58.4
9. GEORGE W. GILLIE, Fourth Indiana	58.8
10. ALLEN T. TREADWAY, First Massachusetts	58.8
11. FOSTER STEARNS, Second New Hampshire	58.8
12. WILLIAM E. HESS, Second Ohio	58.9
13. BEN F. JENSEN, Seventh Iowa	58.9
14. JAMES C. OLIVER, First Maine	59.0
15. J. PARNELL THOMAS, Eighth New Jersey	59.0
16. Cassius Dowell (deceased), Sixth Iowa	59.1
17. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Fourteenth Massachusetts	59.1
18. Carl E. Mapes (deceased), Fifth Michigan	59.1
19. GEORGE P. DARROW, Seventh Pennsylvania	59.2
20. CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Fourth Michigan	59.2
21. FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr., Ninth New Jersey	59.3
22. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, Fifteenth Massachusetts	59.9

When we recall that in contested districts, practically without exception, in both 1932 and 1936, President Roosevelt received many more votes than any other man on the Democratic ticket, and that in every election in which he has been a candidate for Governor or President he has carried districts never carried by any other Democrat, we may be assured that the Republican Party will remain a weak minority party in the House. This is especially fortunate, since the Senate is absolutely certain to remain overwhelmingly Democratic.

Present facts and past history insure to the people of the country a continuation of Democratic control of the Government. [Applause.]

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

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

Mr. KEEFE. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to state that there were only two instances in his compilation where in an off-year election the party in power was defeated?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No; I did not say that. My observation was that in none of the years when a President was elected has the party which held the majority of the votes in the House of Representatives lost any of its majority except in one instance. That is in Presidential election years, not in off-year elections.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECCOMBE. The gentleman will agree, then, that in the last Presidential election there were a number of Democrtic Congressmen who rode in on President Roosevelt's coattails?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will agree with the gentleman that in the last Presidential election there was a large number of Democrats elected partly because of the approval by the candidate for Congress of the President's policies and his personality. If you want to call it riding in on the coattails of the President, naturally, the Presidential candidate often carries with him those Members who approve of his policies, because he is the leader of the ticket. I ask the Republican Members, how in the world they can expect support from their people back home who are going to vote for Wendell Willkie when they are carrying on policies opposite to those of their leader, Mr. Willkie.

Mr. SECCOMBE. The people back in the districts have no faith in the present leadership, and they are anxious for a change.

Mr. EBERHARTER. They have no faith in the present leadership of the Republican Party, which is directly opposite from the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives on very fundamental policies affecting the future of this country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DAIRY FACTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal operates for the temporary benefit of the few, at the expense of the many. The waste, extravagance, and uneconomic policies of the New Deal will ultimately ruin not only the many but also the minority group temporarily benefited.

This is shown in the dairy industry, where the New Deal has set up machinery to help the very few, while the dairy industry as a whole is harmed by injustices, and in time the group temporarily benefited will lose the advantages gained over the other groups. The public debt will crush it all.

No one who will take the time to nonpolitically study the agricultural situation in this country will or can deny the above statement of facts.

The constant controversy over the local milk supply brings out many angles of the entire dairy question. It reveals that the national dairy situation is complicated by prejudices, controversies, unscientific conclusions, and injustices.

The following statements are expressed in the hope of clarifying some of the issues involved:

First. Out of 100 pounds of milk produced in the United States approximately 30 pounds is immediately marketed as fluid milk, approximately 42 pounds goes into the making of butter, 6.6 pounds is used in the production of cheese, 3.8 pounds is used for ice cream, and 4.1 pounds is used for condensed and evaporated milk. The remainder is consumed on the farms; fed to calves or wasted. The fluid milk being immediately consumed, it is evident that butter is the tail that wags the dairy dog, since the amount of butter made is so large in comparison to other manufactured dairy products. The producer of milk for city consumption has a greater bargaining power with his customer than the producer of milk for manufactured dairy products. This, no doubt, is reflected in the fact that the producer acquires a better price and a more stable market for his fluid milk. The consumer demands a constant supply of milk for family use, though he may be led to use substitutes for the manufactured dairy products consumed by his family.

Second. The importance of dairy products in the human diet has been definitely recognized by the medical profession. Milk is the drink of youth, the middle-aged, and the aged. Butter is a protective food, and has a food value exceeding its calorie content. Cheese has long been recognized for its food value, and is universally known as the poor man's meat. Some authorities have recommended that 25 percent of the family food budget should be spent for milk and its products. Dairying is by far the most important branch of American agriculture. The annual value is nearly $2,000,000,000. The value of dairy products equals twice the value of each of our important farm crops. About 75 percent of the farms of the country keep one or more cows for milk production.

THE MILK-MARKETING AGREEMENTS

Third. The present administration has inaugurated milk-marketing agreements as of 1933, 1935, and 1937. These agreements apply to the fluid milk in the milksheds of this country. The Congress delegated the power to the Secretary of Agriculture to issue marketing agreements or orders to regulate the price of milk in interstate commerce. He is also given the power to fix the price which the handler must pay the producer. Some States have State milk-control boards.

The present administration has also evolved milk-marketing agreements for the evaporated milk farmers of the Nation. This is done by establishing a minimum price for butterfat, and is based on the price of butter and cheese. Through its support of the butter-buying program, partially in cooperation with the Dairy Products Marketing Association, the administration has also made an effort to support the price of butter and keep its price from declining to ruinous low levels.

The F. S. C. C. has made large purchases of butter for distribution for relief. It has gone into the market and purchased butter around the 25-cent-per-pound mark. This or-

ganization really has not fixed the price, but has tried to make purchases of butter to keep the price from declining too much. While the prices paid by the F. S. C. C. have not intentionally been made to peg prices of butter, many people feel that the prices paid by the F. S. C. C. have assumed the aspect of price-fixing for this commodity. Many observers think this buying has caused a more uniform price. It is also to be borne in mind that there is no doubt but what the dairy-marketing agencies of the Agriculture Department would be willing to see that the farmers producing milk for manufactured dairy products also had their own marketing agreements, if and when this group has a feasible program. The need for some kind of protection for the producers of milk, used for butter and cheese, is shown in the low prices which have prevailed during the past 7 years in comparison to fluid-milk prices and in comparison to the prices which prevailed during the 7 years before the New Deal.

Fourth. I wish to call your careful attention to the fact that I am in no way trying to tear down the prices for fluid milk. This price is still low when compared with pre-New Deal prices. However, I do address myself to the problem of trying to work out a program which will give the producers of milk used in manufactured dairy products a return for their milk that is more in keeping with what it costs them to produce this milk. Criticism is easy; constructive thought on this question is difficult, and must be approached with a full understanding of the problems involved.

Fifth. The following table shows how the milk production of the United States is used:

UTILIZATION OF MILK IN THE UNITED STATES

One hundred pounds of milk produced in the United States has the following uses:

	Percent
Creamery butter	32.4
Whey butter	.5
Butter produced on farms	9.2
	42.1
Cheese:	
For American cheese	5.2
For all other	1.4
	6.6
Evaporated milk	4.1
Ice cream	3.8
(1) Consumed as fluid milk or cream on farms where produced	11.5
(2) Fed to calves	2.6
Milk consumed as fluid milk or cream in cities and villages	29.4
Total	100.0

Above figures computed from "Production of Manufactured Products, 1938," chart No. 35 U. S. D. A.

SUGGESTIONS, QUESTIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

First. If the power to fix the price for the producers of fluid milk is delegated by law to the Secretary of Agriculture why should not the power to fix the price for the producer of milk for manufactured dairy products also be delegated to the same agency?

The 30 percent of the milk producers of this Nation are not entitled to any legislation that is not enjoyed by the other 70 percent of the milk producers. If the price of the fluid milk is fixed on a cost-of-production basis why are not all farm products entitled to this same protection? In other words, any Secretary of Agriculture who has fostered legislation and is in sympathy with legislation which fixes the price for one group and which gives cost of production must, in fairness, be in favor of legislation which fixes the price for all agricultural groups. Furthermore, I cannot see how any Secretary of Agriculture who sympathizes with and fosters cost of production for one group of farmers can, in fairness, oppose legislation as submitted by our colleague the gentleman from North Dakota, the Honorable WILLIAM LEMKE.

Second. Most Members of Congress are interested in removing interstate trade barriers. Our Agricultural Department has issued a booklet one-half inch thick, rehearsing the unfairness and undesirability of these interstate trade barriers. Yet we have an artificial trade barrier in our milk markets which is erected under the guise of health requirements in connection with this milk supply. The artificial trade barriers erected around cities for milk must be carefully considered in connection with this elimination of trade barriers between States.

Third. The artificial trade barriers erected around cities under the guise of health requirements can easily be analyzed by careful study. There is no reason for anyone who has ever studied bacteriology to conclude that any germs which are injurious to human health will not as effectively cause harm when incorporated in a carton of butter as they will when found in a bottle of milk. Milk cannot be too clean but modern milk producers are producing it in a most sanitary manner and in great volume.

There is not much difference in the cost of producing 100 pounds of clean milk and the same amount of unclean milk. There are not any scientific facts to justify unnecessary handicaps in order to produce clean, desirable milk. From a human-disease standpoint it is just as necessary to have clean, wholesome milk for butter production as it is to have it for fluid-milk consumption.

It is ridiculous to talk in detail about dairy sanitation when we consider for one moment the fact that dairy products are being imported into this country and no man can, with certainty say whether the cows that produced the milk for these imports were even tested for tuberculosis or Bang's disease. In fact, no one has definite knowledge of the sanitary conditions under which the imported product is manufactured. While the American taxpayer pays millions to eradicate diseases, the imports of dairy products of unknown cleanliness merrily roll into our shores. This is a problem of long standing.

Fourth. From a practical standpoint, I maintain that we should have Federal health requirements for milk. I contend that any milk which is produced in conformity to these requirements should be entitled to be shipped to any State in the Union the same as graded potatoes or any other graded farm crop. Unfortunately, the cities can by law insist upon useless additional requirements that complicate the whole problem and add millions to the living costs of the people in the cities.

Fifth. Some fluid milk has a local high-production cost. Adjacent to many cities we find farms not really adapted to the economic production of milk. The result is a high fixed price and the consumer limits the per-capita consumption. When surpluses of fluid milk occur the surplus is made into butter or other manufactured dairy products. This weakens the butter price and the cheese price. An example of this was brought out last year here in Washington when a quart of milk was 14 cents a quart under the fixed price and cheese was 14 cents a pound, and it takes about 5 quarts of milk to make a pound of cheese.

Sixth. If we are to progress on the basis of the greatest good to the greatest number, we cannot continue to legislate to fix the price for one group of milk producers that represents 30 percent of the producers and give them from 50 cents to $1 for butterfat and then have the second group that represents 70 percent of the milk producers receive whatever they may be able to obtain. Nor can we expect to always have one branch of our Agriculture Department delegated power so that one group gets 50 cents to $1 per pound for butterfat by milk-marketing agreements; and also have another unit, the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation buying cheese on the lowest bid. Buying on the lowest bid tends to lower the price to the farmer. The F. S. C. C. also goes into the market and supports the butter market when butterfat is only 25 to 30 percent per pound. This is not meant as criticism of the F. S. C. C. They are no doubt following the law. But one fact is evident and that is that one group of 30 percent of our producers gets the advantages of legislation that gives them a fixed price, while the 70-percent group does not have this advantage and in practice is sometimes harmed by the legislation that fixes the price for the group of 30 percent of our producers.

Seventh. It has been disturbing to note the unfairness of certain milk producers of the 30-percent class who are enjoying the benefits of a fixed Federal price, in that they support measures that are harmful to the 70 percent of the producers whose milk goes into butter and cheese. I have heard producers who were receiving fixed prices of 50 cents to $1 per pound for their butterfat try to support the Hull brand of reciprocal trade treaties which have reduced the tariff on cheese by 42 percent and have cost the cheese farmers of America millions upon millions of dollars. Cheese averaged 17.5 cents per pound the last 7 years before the New Deal. It averaged 14.7 cents per pound the last 4 Republican years. Cheese averaged only 13.2 cents per pound the first 7 years of the New Deal, and in 1938 and 1939 it averaged only 12.7 cents per pound. While cheese averaged only 10 cents in 1932, it averaged only 11 cents-plus the first 6 months of 1939. According to Bulletin 200, U. S. D. A. and W. D. A., pages 33 and 41, the farm price of butter was 35 cents per pound the 7 pre-New Deal years, 32 cents per pound the last 4 Republican years, and 26 cents for the 7 years of the New Deal. Fluid milk averaged $2.12 per hundredweight for the 6 pre-New Deal years and only $1.68 per hundredweight for the first 6 New Deal years. One minority group cannot for long expect to sit with a fixed definite price for their product and expect the majority group to absorb the surpluses of the protected minority group and also give encouragement to legislation that is harmful to the majority group.

Eighth. Many Members of the House from areas enjoying the benefits of federally fixed prices for milk were exceedingly vociferous in their praise and support of the Hull brand of trade treaties that have so materially reduced the incomes of the butter and cheese farmers.

The first treaty was made in 1935 and the tariff was reduced 2 cents per pound. This went into effect January 1, 1936. In 1936 there were 14 times as much American cheese imported as there was in 1935. In 1938 when cheese was only 12.6 cents per pound the second trade treaty was made and the tariff was reduced another cent per pound. In 1939 there were 3½ times as much American cheese imported as in 1938, even though cheese averaged only 11 cents-plus per pound the first 6 months of 1939. While some of my New Deal colleagues seem willing to secure a protected, fixed market price, and, in fact, want the American market with a fence around it for their farmers, they are also willing and eager to give the big majority of dairy farmers the uncertainties of a New Deal manipulated market and also a chance to compete with the cheap labor and living standards of Europe, Asia, and South America. We cannot continually have legislation for the benefit of the few with the American market for the minority and not in justice have the American market for the majority of our farmers. No effort has been made to reduce the tariff on butter. Six times as much milk is produced for butter as there is for cheese. Any attempt to lower the tariff on butter would meet with universal opposition while cheese is produced in a comparatively small area, with Wisconsin producing half of it. If you think the 42-percent reduction in the tariff on cheese was justified, do you believe that a 42-percent reduction in the tariff on butter is desirable? Ask any trade-treaty advocate that question.

Ninth. Would-be authorities use weasel words in saying that imports of dairy products represent less than one-half of 1 percent of our national dairy production. Some New Dealish agricultural colleges sent out this kind of information. Anyone knows that the fluid-milk market is not affected by imports on account of the nature of the business as the product must have immediate consumption. I am sure many of them have not even taken the time to look it up. However, it will be refreshing for them to know that we import in terms of years an amount equal to 7 to 10 percent of our annual production of all cheese; and import an amount of Swiss cheese equal to 20 to 25 percent of our annual production.

Tenth. What has the effect of the low prices of dairy products been on the dairy regions producing milk for butter and cheese? The undisputed fact is that the Federal foreclosures and acquirements of farms in Wisconsin have never been as high during the whole period of Federal loans as it was in 1939 after 7 years of the New Deal. In Wisconsin in 1932, 264 farms or 4 percent of the total were acquired by the Federal land bank, while 1,356 farms, or 4½ percent, were acquired by the Farm Credit Administration in 1939. If farmers receiving over 17 cents per pound for cheese for the 7 pre-New Deal years were in difficulties and they had an average mortgage of $2,300, how can anyone expect to see these farms paid for with an average mortgage of $3,000 when cheese is only averaging 13.2 cents per pound under the New Deal? If these mortgages cannot be paid with 32- to 35-cent butter, how are they going to be paid with the New Deal price of 26 cents per pound? Is it any wonder that 50.2 percent of the farms in the Seventh Wisconsin District were delinquent on January 1, 1940? As long as dairy products bring 25 to 30 percent less under the New Deal than before the New Deal the dairy farmer must look for a brighter day than the New Deal has ever given him.

Eleventh. It is not very consoling to the farmers of this country who have been driven from their homes by the New Deal because they could not pay an average annual interest of $98 to $112 per farm on an average $2,800 mortgage to find out that the New Deal has built 90,436 housing units for other groups of people in the big cities that have cost an average of $4,359 per unit and that they also subsidize this group $28,000,000 a year for 60 years or $1,680,000, and also to learn that the Federal Treasury pays $193 each year toward the rent for each of this subsidized group? More people were driven from their homes by the New Deal than homes were provided for by the New Deal, and the public debt was increased by $1,680,000,000. Is this one of the social gains of the New Deal?

Twelfth. I am happy to think that I have at least been able to equalize and reduce the interest burdens of the farmers of this country to an extent that it means the saving of tens of thousands of dollars to the farmers of my district and an annual saving of millions of dollars to the farmers of the Nation.

Strong support was given to make milk a basic commodity but the Agriculture Department gave an adverse report, and the bill was never voted on even in committee. In fairness it must be here recorded that the dairy farmers did once have the opportunity to include milk as a basic commodity. If parity payments are to be paid they must be paid to all branches of agriculture or else the program will fail.

If we fix prices for the minority we must for the majority. [Applause.]

We cannot always maintain a farm program that benefits only one-third to one-half the crop production of the country. We surely cannot wish to make an arrangement with a small percentage of the total milk producers of this country by fixing their price, and then turn around and follow practices like buying cheese on the lowest bid and buying butter at one-half to two-thirds the cost of producing it and giving it away to the farmers' customers to sit down and eat it, and expect the farmer to pay his taxes in support of such a procedure.

The farmer has furnished one-fourth to one-third the cost of feeding the people of this Nation the past 10 years, and if his food is going to be given away, there is no sense in further impoverishing the farmer.

Let us have a program that gives all farmers the same consideration with justice to all. We will then have the greatest good to the greatest number instead of continual New Deal legislation for the benefit of few at the expense of the many. [Applause.]

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H. R. 10004. An act to provide for the transfer of the duplicates of certain books in the Library of Congress to the Beaufort Library of Beaufort, S. C.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 28, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, August 28, 1940, for the consideration of Senate bill 3248, regarding the pay of immigration inspectors for overtime.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a hearing on Wednesday, August 28, 1940, before the Committee on the Judiciary on the bills H. R. 10365 and H. R. 10403, to facilitate preparation for national defense by amending section 3477 of the Revised Statutes. The hearing will begin at 10 a. m., and will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on Thursday, August 29, 1940, at 10 a. m., in room 128, House Office Building, for the purpose of considering H. R. 10122.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on Thursday, August 29, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of the defense-housing bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, August 30, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the purpose of considering all fourth-class postmasters' salary bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1925. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report of the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital listing the detailed expenses of that institution for the fiscal year 1940, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 578. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 7236, a bill to provide for the adjustment of certain claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the Court of Claims and the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2884). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 10295. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 944); without amendment (Rept. No. 2885). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 10410. A bill authorizing the construction of certain dams and reservoirs on the White River, Ark., and Mo., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 10411. A bill to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 10412. A bill to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 10413. A bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 10414. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to manufacturers' and producers' taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 10415. A bill to amend paragraph 19 of section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 10416: A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10417. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOUTON:

H. J. Res. 595. Joint resolution authorizing the participation of the United States in the celebration of a Pan-American Aviation Day, to be observed on December 17, of each year, the anniversary of the first successful flight of a heavier-than-air machine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 580. Resolution to provide current information to Congress by a permanent staff during the emergency relating to national defense activities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 581. Resolution for the consideration of S. 4271; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 10418. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. Peter Florey; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 10419. A bill for the relief of Lucy Lewis; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 10420. A bill for the relief of John J. Jenkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10421. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Clarice Joan Dickens; 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:

9229. By Mr. BALL: Resolution of the Ladies' Auxiliary to the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, for the registration of all firearms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9230. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee, favoring the setting up of a Home Owners' Loan Corporation office in southern California, and further requesting that this southern California office be filled with southern California residents insofar as they are qualified; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9231. By Mr. GREGORY: petition of Edwin J. Paxton, Sr., publisher of the Sun-Democrat, and many other prominent citizens of Paducah, Ky., urging the sale of destroyers to England; also the immediate passage of the Burke-Wadsworth selective-service bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9232. By Mr. SANDAGER: Petition of the American Legion, Department of Rhode Island, advocating an adequate national-defense program for all branches of the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9233. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9974 and Senate bill 4041, to establish a Division of Aviation Education in the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

9234. Also, petition of Local Union No. 12036, Fairmont, W. Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9235. Also, petition of A. L. Maloyan, Long Beach, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to banking and currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 28, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, August 5, 1940)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, whose loving hand hath given us all that we possess: Grant us grace that we may honor Thee with our substance, and remembering the account which we must one day give, may be faithful stewards of Thy bounty and of all the responsibilities which Thou hast entrusted to our care. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Tuesday, August 27, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lee	Schwellenbach
Andrews	Donahey	Lodge	Sheppard
Ashurst	Downey	Lucas	Shipstead
Austin	Ellender	Lundeen	Slattery
Bailey	George	McCarran	Smathers
Bankhead	Gerry	McKellar	Smith
Barbour	Gibson	Maloney	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Mead	Taft
Bone	Green	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Tobey
Burke	Harrison	Norris	Truman
Byrd	Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hill	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	Wiley
Connally	King	Russell	
Danaher	La Follette	Schwartz	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] are unavoidably absent.

The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] are absent on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETITIONS

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia praying for the prompt enactment of pending selective compulsory military training legislation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. REED presented the petition of Samuel L. Gorham, of Turon, Kans., and 210 other citizens of that vicinity, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the body of the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the interest of our national welfare, we, the undersigned citizens of Turon, Kans., do hereby urgently request that you use your utmost influence in backing the program to deliver to England 50 or 60 of our more or less obsolete destroyers in exchange for naval bases or other considerations as you might deem proper, and that such transaction be made at once, as we believe that time is most urgent.

RESOLUTION ON CONSCRIPTION OF WASHINGTON NEWSPAPER GUILD AUXILIARY

Mr. WHEELER presented a letter from Florence Dozier, secretary of the Washington Newspaper Guild Auxiliary, embodying a resolution adopted by that organization on the subject of conscription and the national defense, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWSPAPER GUILD AUXILIARY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.,
Silver Spring, Md., August 22, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the regular membership meeting of the Washington Newspaper Guild Auxiliary, Tuesday, August 6, 1940:

"Whereas we believe that voluntary 1-year enlistment at an adequate rate of pay would provide a sufficient army for the national-defense needs of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Washington Newspaper Guild Auxiliary is opposed to the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill."

Yours truly,

FLORENCE DOZIER.
Secretary, Washington Newspaper Guild Auxiliary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 8474. A bill to further amend the Alaska game law (Rept. No. 2053);

H. R. 9123. A bill to approve Act No. 65 of the Session Laws of 1939 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to amend Act 29 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1929, granting to J. K. Lota and associates a franchise for electric light, current, and power in Hanalei, Kauai, by including Moloaa within such franchise" (Rept. No. 2054); and

H. R. 9124. A bill to approve Act No. 214 of the Session Laws of 1939 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to amend Act 105 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1921, granting franchise for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within Kapaa and Waipouli in the district of Kawaihau on the island and county of Kauai, by including within said franchise the entire district of Kawaihau, island of Kauai" (Rept. No. 2055).

Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 4571. A bill for the relief of LaVera Hampton (Rept. No. 2056);

H. R. 5264. A bill for the relief of Maj. Clarence H. Greene, United States Army, retired (Rept. No. 2060);

H. R. 6060. A bill for the relief of John P. Hart (Rept. No. 2057);

H. R. 6230. A bill for the relief of James Murphy, Sr. (Rept. No. 2058); and