

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3524. A bill for the relief of Bessie Eason; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 3525. A bill granting a pension to Ethel Crow; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3526. A bill granting a pension to Ethel Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky:

H. R. 3527. A bill to authorize the presentation of the Medal of Honor to John C. Reynolds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. R. 3528. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3529. A bill for the relief of Noland Blass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM:

H. R. 3530. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Thomas McGovern, deceased member of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

320. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Tonawanda, N. Y., and the Board of Supervisors of Niagara County, N. Y., disapproving the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

321. By Mr. HAINES: Petition of Rev. Wayne A. Lutz, of Hellam, Pa., and members of his church, urging proper protection of the young men in the various training camps throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

322. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of the members of the Board of Supervisors of Lake County, Ill., asking for the defeat of House bill 1776 (lease-lend bill), because they feel it takes away powers rightfully vested in Congress and gives them to the President, thus adding another step on our country's road to dictatorship, and believing the enactment of this bill will lead us into war against the wishes of the people and will in no way increase the amount of aid that we all want to give to Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

323. By Mr. WHITE: Petition of the Lewiston Grange Supply, Inc., referring to an appropriation for the completion of the Snake River for year-round river navigation from Lewiston, Idaho, to tidewater; to the Committee on Appropriations.

324. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1941

(Legislative day of Thursday February 13, 1941)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Zeburney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, who art ever gracious and merciful, as we bow before Thee at the threshold of another day, with its call to service, its challenge of manifold duties, responsibilities, and opportunities: We can but acknowledge our own

unworthiness; yet we beseech Thee to have compassion on our infirmities and be not extreme to mark what is done amiss, but, according to the multitude of Thy mercies, do away our offenses.

Grant that this day we may not transgress Thy righteous law in thought, word, or deed, nor yet misuse or waste the talents Thou hast given. Be Thou near to all who are in special need and trouble, all who are in danger, necessity, or tribulation; turn the hearts of all who are living a godless life and renew a right spirit within them.

Grant to Thy servants here, wisdom, courage, tact, and, above all, a selfless devotion to the Nation's weal, that out of their mature deliberations may issue the conviction that Thou hast been to Thy people a pillar of cloud and fire by day and night to lead them into paths of pleasantness and peace. In our Saviour's name we ask it. 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 Thursday, February 20, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. 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	Ellender	Murray
Alben	George	Norris
Austin	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gillette	Overton
Ball	Glass	Pepper
Bankhead	Green	Radcliffe
Barbour	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Gurney	Russell
Bilbo	Harrison	Schwartz
Bone	Hatch	Sheppard
Brewster	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Herring	Smathers
Brooks	Hill	Stewart
Brown	Holman	Taft
Bulow	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	La Follette	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Byrnes	Lee	Tunnell
Capper	Lodge	Tydings
Caraway	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chandler	McCarran	Van Nuys
Chavez	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wheeler
Connally	Maloney	White
Danaher	Mead	Wiley
Davis	Miller	Willis
Downey	Murdoch	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of the death of his wife.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, etc., which were referred as indicated:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Arna MacIntyre, of Stratford, N. J., praying for modification of the rule requiring a 30-day lay-off for persons after 18 months of work under the W. P. A.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A letter from Alfred M. Kunze, of New Rochelle, N. Y., on the subject of international law; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Also, a letter in the nature of a memorial from the same citizen, remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 1776, the lend-lease bill; to the table.

Mr. BROWN presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan relative to the Federal-imposed quota for the number of acres to be planted to sugar beets in Michigan for the year 1941; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(The resolution in full appeared yesterday when presented by Mr. VANDENBERG, pp. 1208-1209, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE—INVOLVEMENT IN WAR

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, with the request that I read it in the Senate today. The resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution B

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the State of North Dakota, together with its sister States, comprising our great Nation, are deeply concerned over the dangers which threaten our country by reason of the terrible wars now raging in other parts of the world; and

Whereas the dreaded possibility that the United States may also be involved in these wars has increased to an alarming degree; and

Whereas the President of the United States, speaking at Philadelphia on October 23, 1940, declared:

"We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.

"To every man, woman, and child I say this: Your President and your Secretary of State are following the road of peace. We are arming ourselves, not for any foreign war. We are arming ourselves, not for conquest or intervention in foreign disputes.

"I give to the people of this country this most solemn assurance: There is no secret treaty, no secret obligation, no secret understanding in any shape or form, direct or indirect, with any other nation in any part of the world to involve this Nation in any war or for any other purpose.

"We will not send our men to take part in European wars": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring). That we memorialize Congress that it be guided in its deliberations and acts by these solemn pledges made by the President before his election, to the end

that this country may not become involved in foreign wars.

That we commend the efforts of all Congressmen and Senators who now oppose any action now contrary to these pledges given by the President; be it further

Resolved, That we as representatives of the State of North Dakota renew our pledge of loyalty to our Nation and our flag and to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to whom we pledge our lives and property upon instant call to defend them against any nation which should attempt to attack our shores or invade our land; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, the President of the Senate, and to the Members of Congress from the State of North Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE FAVORING AID TO BRITAIN

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I present to the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Carolina requesting the Senate to pass the legislation extending aid, without stint or limit, to Great Britain and other aggressor-resisting nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be printed, under the rule, and lie on the table.

The resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the United States Senators and Members of Congress from South Carolina to support legislation extending aid, without stint or limit, to Great Britain and other aggressor-resisting nations

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his message delivered to the Congress of the United States on January 6, 1941, renewed the pledge and purpose of this country to support Great Britain and other aggressor-resisting nations by sending them planes, ships, tanks, and arms in ever-increasing quantities; and

Whereas this the Eighty-fourth General Assembly of the State of South Carolina is convinced that every vital interest of the United States demands the victory of Great Britain and her allies over those nations which have torn to shreds international morality; and is further convinced that the defeat of Great Britain and her allies would impair democratic government everywhere and lower the standards of living of the people of this and all other democratic nations; and

Whereas it is believed that the United States can gain the time essential to prepare for the grave possibilities that lie ahead only by providing Great Britain and her allies, generously and ungrudgingly, every material and moral assistance of which this democracy is capable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That we, the members of the Eighty-fourth General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, request and urge that the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives representing South Carolina in the Congress of the United States support legislation providing for Great Britain and her allies aid, without stint or limit, with all speed, all to the end that liberty, freedom, and democracy may not perish from the earth; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the senate is instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to each of our United States Senators and Congressmen from South Carolina, which will carry the seal of the State.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 164. A bill to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended by the act of June 8, 1926, so as to decrease the restriction on the number of enlisted men of the Regular Army who may be detailed as students at educational institutions and other places (Rept. No. 60);

S. 239. A bill to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases (Rept. No. 61);

S. 242. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the act of February 25, 1929, entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes," and the act of July 3, 1930, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1930, and June 30, 1931, and for other purposes" (Rept. No. 62); and

S. 287. A bill to authorize the use of certain lands for military purposes at the Fort McPherson Military Reservation, Ga., and the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del. (Rept. No. 63).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation 11 lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 930. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 931. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Ayers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 932. A bill for the relief of certain former Foreign Commerce Service and Foreign Agricultural Service officers; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES:

S. 933. A bill for the relief of John McAllister, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 934. A bill to facilitate compliance with, and to promote the successful operation of, the Rio Grande Compact of March 18, 1938; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 935. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to commodity loans and marketing quotas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution providing for the postponement of certain orders relative to certain tariffs of freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—AMENDMENT

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House bill 1776, the lend-lease bill, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The reason for this amendment is that if this bill is passed, the already heavily loaded inspection and testing facilities of government will be greatly overtaxed. There now exist in the United States approximately 200 testing and inspection organizations which are capable and eager to do this kind of work and which are now not being utilized by the Government. The adoption of the suggested amendment would make possible the use of this trained industry and would operate to help remove a bottleneck which will be created.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be printed, printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, beginning on line 11, to strike out section 3 (a) (3) and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(3) To test, inspect, prove, repair, outfit, recondition, or otherwise to place in good working order any defense article for any such government, or to procure any or all such service or services by contracting with commercial organizations customarily engaged in such work."

FINANCIAL DATA OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AND CORPORATIONS—PRINTING OF REPORT

Mr. BYRD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the report of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury relative to the financial condition and operations of certain corporations and agencies of the Government, transmitted to the Senate on February 6, 1941, in response to Senate Resolution No. 292, Seventy-sixth Congress, be printed as a Senate document.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BYRD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 78), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-seventh Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee the expense thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER ON THE LEND-LEASE BILL

[Mr. CLARK of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator WHEELER on Thursday, February 20, 1941, on the subject of the lend-lease bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLARK OF MISSOURI ON THE LEND-LEASE BILL

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on February 20, 1941, on the topic Why the Lend-Lease Bill Should Be Defeated, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR OR PEACE—PAMPHLET BY STERLING MORTON

[Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "Let's Think This Matter Through," by Sterling Morton, of Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1776) further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 16, which has heretofore been stated by the clerk.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I believe for the first time in my life I am about to read a public address. I ask the indulgence of my fellow Senators, and make a request similar to the requests which have been made by my predecessors on the floor in this debate, that if they have questions to ask they will reserve them until I shall have finished.

Mr. President, I have asked recognition today for the purpose of stating some of the reasons which impel me to oppose the enactment of the pending bill, H. R. 1776.

Mr. President, this is not a pleasant task. I realize that I could save myself much of turmoil of spirit and possibly much of vituperative criticism, by joining the great majority of my colleagues here in support of the measure now being considered. This would be the easy way, and there are many factors and influences urging me to that course.

The supporters of the measure outnumber those of us who are in opposition, probably in the ratio of 3 to 1. One cannot lightly oppose one's individual judgment against such a force of contradictory opinion without being driven carefully and painstakingly to making inquiry into one's own reasoning and deductions, and also subjecting to the most diligent scrutiny one's own judgments.

Not only do I find such a large percentage of my colleagues in the Senate in support of this measure, but I find among them the chairman of our own Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], whose brilliance of mental equipment has, I believe, no superior in the United States Senate, and with whom I am proud to claim many close associations and bonds.

I find also among the bill's supporters the distinguished floor leader of my party, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], whose leadership I always desire to follow, and for whom I hold a genuine depth of personal affection.

I find myself in opposition to the judgment of that eminent and careful lawyer on the Republican side, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], a man whom I admire as I admire few men in this world, and who, in the first year of my service here, gave freely to me of his interest, his advice, and his guidance.

I find myself in opposition to a measure which has the support of the national administration of my own party—the party to which I have given and will continue to give my political adherence and my political life; an administration which, under the leadership of probably the strongest figure and most dynamic personality in our Presidential history, has written on the Federal statute books a greater wealth of liberal and forward-looking legislation than has been placed there in all the preceding years of our national history combined.

I find myself opposing the expressed judgments of the Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, and his able assistant, Mr. Sumner Welles, both of whom I greatly admire and deeply respect.

I find myself in opposition to a measure which, its sponsors claim, is designed effectively to thwart the world designs of Adolf Hitler and his governmental philosophy, both of which I detest with all the abhorrence of which I am capable. I find my thoughts turning to the unspeakable atrocities initiated by that man against those of Jewish race and ancestry, and to the further fact that my own life partner is of that race and lineage, and all my deepest feelings of bitter resentment are aroused.

No, Mr. President, my present task is not an easy one. If my course could be determined by what GUY GILLETTE as an individual would do, let me say that I would give every dollar I possess in the world, and gladly offer my own individual life in the bargain, if by so doing I could aid Great Britain, China, and Greece in their present struggles with the Axis Powers. To prove that the statement I have just made is not oratorical bombast, I may be pardoned if I state that three times in my life I have volunteered that life and services in aid of other people and other nations fighting for freedom from unjust aggression. I refer to the Spanish War of 1898, the Boer War of 1900, and the World War of 1918.

But, Mr. President, I cannot act, speak, or vote as an individual. I must act, speak, and vote in my representative capacity as a Member of the Senate of the United States, with full knowledge that action taken by me will not react on me alone; but in my capacity as an agent I am trying to perform my public duties in support of the security, welfare, and happiness of the people of the United States of America.

I am fully aware that nothing I may say or can say here will influence the vote of any Member of this body, and I have no such hope or purpose. My sole reason for speaking now is that there may be placed in the RECORD of this debate some small contribution by me as a United States Senator to the definition of the issues presented by this measure as I understand them to be. I am urged to do

this, having clearly in mind that our country is the great citadel of democracy—that democracy is based on the fundamental foundation that the state exists for the individual and not the individual for the state, and that to make the agencies of the Nation responsible in the exercise of all of their delegated powers so that they will function in the general welfare it is primarily essential that in true freedom of expression of individual views, and in freedom of interchange of differing judgments, habits, viewpoints, and opinions a conclusion can and will be reached for action embodying the greatest good for the greatest number, that through these methods and the free interchange of opinions and clear definition of issues these conclusions can be translated into law, and the institutions of democratic government justify themselves as tools, serving human life and happiness.

Throughout the recent months the agencies of public expression have, almost without exception, kept constantly before the American people the tremendously serious import of the wars now being waged abroad and their relationship to our Nation and its future security.

I feel that they do not exaggerate when they assert that the course of American life and the source and security of American happiness for the next 100 years may be determined largely by our own course taken here in Washington within the next 90 days relative to European and Asiatic conflicts.

I subscribe to these statements as to the importance of our national action and position now and in the coming weeks, and I appreciate the burden of responsibility resting upon the executive and legislative departments of our Government.

In no other proper way than as I indicated a few moments ago can legislative and executive agents exercise their delegated authority to give expression to the people's will. To know this will, we in official place must be definitely apprised of the wishes of those whom we represent. To reach their judgments intelligently and effectively there must be given to the people for consideration and discussion a crystal-clear presentation of the issues involved in any specific situation. To mislead the people or to befog or becloud the exact issues is to hamper, if not destroy, democratic processes. I indulge in the hope that I may be able to present today a fairly clear statement of the pending issue which may be of aid to some of our people in their thinking and in their conclusions.

In the first place, I must specifically contradict statements that have been made continually in editorial and official comment to the effect that the people of our country spoke definitely and decisively at the polls last November on the issue of aid to some of the belligerents in foreign wars. An election issue is presented through the party platforms adopted by the respective political parties, as amplified and explained by the pronouncements of the leading party candidates. In the recent campaign, no issue as to war aid was drawn between

the leading candidates in their public addresses or in their press interviews. Excepting in minor details they were in agreement, and both stood for the same general proposition. To point my statement that no issue was drawn by the party platforms, it will be illuminating for me to quote directly from these respective platform pronouncements relative to the international situation.

The Republican platform stated:

The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in a foreign war.

The Democratic platform stated:

We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas, except in case of attack.

Is there an issue or the semblance of an issue drawn by those two statements? On the contrary, they say the same definite thing in but slightly different words. In addition both parties in their respective platforms announced strong support of preparedness, rearmament, and national defense. Still no issue drawn; still in complete agreement.

Now, please listen carefully to the next quotations.

The Republican platform states:

We favor the extension to all peoples fighting for liberty, or whose liberty is threatened, of such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of our national defense.

Now listen to the Democratic platform:

We pledge to extend to these liberty-loving peoples all the material aid at our command, consistent with law and not inconsistent with the interests of our own national defense.

Please observe that the only difference in these two statements lies in the change of two or three words, with no effect whatever on the meaning. So far as the issues of the recent campaign were drawn by the platforms and by the candidates, the American people went to the polls with no opportunity to express themselves relative to war or peace, and with complete agreement that our aid to democracies engaged in war would be limited to such aid as could be given consistent with law and without affecting our own preparations for national defense. It remains, then, for someone, somewhere, to state definitely what the issue is, the decision of which will so seriously affect every American citizen living today and in the generations to come. With considerable trepidation and hesitation I shall attempt to express what I believe the issue to be.

As a preface, I may state at this point that no contribution is made toward intelligent solution of weighty problems by calling names or impugning the motives and purposes of those holding opposing views, and it is one of the finest commentaries on the work of the United States Senate that in this debate, up to the present time—and I hope I shall be able to continue the practice—not one word of suggestion of improper motives or sinister intentions in any way has been directed toward those holding an opposite view by the Senators who have taken the floor upon the pending measure. I cannot state too strongly my personal

disapproval of describing those adhering to one point of view as warmongers, sensation seekers, Anglophiles, and by similar opprobrious epithets, and designating those of another point of view as isolationists, appeasers, pulling pacifists, Hitlerites, "fifth columnists," or other phrases suggesting a lack of awareness of our country and support of her interests. To act and judge intelligently nothing can be gained and much may be lost by resort to vicious and vitriolic vituperation.

To reach the point at issue, let us first state the points of agreement. I believe that every American citizen with the welfare of his country at heart will agree wholeheartedly to the three statements which I shall now make:

First. We all abhor war and will go to great lengths to keep our country at peace with other nations.

Second. We are deeply sympathetic with the struggles of democratic peoples for the preservation and protection of their independence, and we resent and abhor the acts of aggression which throughout history, and especially the history of the past few years, have wiped out the governments and independence of so many of the weaker nations.

Third. We all agree that America must not be permitted to fall a victim to the same fatuous lack of preparation and realization of impending danger which resulted in the destruction of so many European nations, and that all the resources and efforts of our Nation must be directed to complete preparation of our naval and military forces for the protection of America and the Americas.

But after agreeing to these three propositions, the desire for peace, sympathy with the oppressed, and demands for defense, we find that the road of national thinking from that point divides, and that there is marked and serious divergence of opinion as to what should constitute our best method of defense preparation. And on this question the real issue before the American people is drawn.

One large group of our citizens contends that Great Britain, Greece, and China are engaged in fighting our war and are holding in check a triumvirate of aggressive nations, which, if allowed to win in their efforts, will then stride over these prostrate nations to destroy us and dominate the whole world economically, and also politically with a philosophy of government which is alien and destructive to our system and our ideals. The supporters of this view maintain that time for defense preparation can be secured and our safety be far better assured and conserved by aiding these nations fighting the totalitarian states now, with every help that we can give short of military expedition and actual war declaration. They point to the possible loss of the war by Great Britain, with the consequent loss or destruction of the British Navy, which they assert would leave us unable to cope with a simultaneous naval attack in the two oceans bordering our shores, and would leave us probably powerless to prevent the establishment of land bases in the Western Hemisphere, from which airplane attacks could be

launched by hostile powers against us, and particularly against the Panama Canal and our vulnerable eastern seaboard points. These people feel that by this help, now given, we can avoid war involvement.

Another large group of our citizens maintain that such aid given as suggested is not in fact avoidance of involvement in war but actual participation in it. They say that every possible unit of time must be utilized in the stupendous task of converting our industries into war service and preparing ourselves for the defense of America and the aid of our associates here in maintaining the inviolability of the Monroe Doctrine by preventing aggressions in the Western Hemisphere. This group further asserts that by participation beyond the limits prescribed by law we not only take the direct path to war but we divert the resources of our defense needs to possible total and certainly partial destruction, and that we openly oppose one side in the foreign conflict by direct war, with the consequence that if the issue of the conflict should go in their favor we would then be facing them, their resources, and their resentment, without adequate means of defense.

That is the real issue, my fellow citizens, behind all the hazy and nebulous discussion which we have heard, and will continue to hear. We do not want war. We want nazi-ism defeated. We want America to be prepared for defense. Is our better course to prepare our defense as best we can for any probable eventuality by thinking in terms of our own hemispheric interest, or is it better for our security to give all possible aid now to the opponents of dictator nations, in the hope that the aid, timely given, will turn the tide definitely against the aggressor nations and render unnecessary the plans for our future defense?

Mr. President, if I believed, as many profess to believe, that Great Britain is actually fighting our war and is standing almost alone between our Nation and the destruction of all we hold dear, I would vote for a declaration of war tomorrow, and to go to her assistance with all our power, men, and resources. I certainly would not say, "She is fighting to save us, our country, and our homes; so we will send her munitions, tanks, and planes, and loan her money, but on no account will we send our boys or get into the war ourselves. Let the boys of some other nation do our fighting for us, let them shed their blood and have their loved ones destroyed, but let us be careful to participate only by sending munitions or loaning credit. They may spend their flesh and blood, but we will spend our dollars." Did I say "spend our dollars"? We will not even agree to do that. We will just loan or lease our dollar resources and give those who are fighting for us time to pay us back after the war. We will insist that it be repaid, either in kind or in other material. We will not only refuse to send our manpower but we will insist that even our material resources be repaid to us. Mr. President, I do not believe in that attitude, and I do not, and will not, subscribe to it.

During the World War I made a pledge to myself in behalf of the American boys who were over in France with me that so long as I breathed I would speak, act, and work to keep faith with them and the other millions of American citizens in making their sacrifices effective and banishing war forever from our American shores. But, even in the fact of that pledge, I would vote for war once more if I believed that the British Empire or any other nation was holding back armies of destruction from our shores, and I would go to help them win our fight with all our resources in men and material, and gladly include my own life. I would not grudgingly concede help in a limited way and demand the return of even that limited assistance. If there are facts and information available to prove the contention beyond question that "this is our war," we should be willing tomorrow to conscript every factory, industrial plant, transportation facility, and every man-hour of labor, machinery, and executive ability on a 24-hour basis for the production of war machinery and to make every sacrifice without a thin dime of profit to any man.

But I do not hold any such belief, and if we are to gamble the entire resources of the United States on this one throw of the dice, based on the argument "this is our war," the American people are entitled to complete facts and proof beyond doubt that this great gamble is now essential. Under our form of government the representatives of the people in Congress have the sole duty and responsibility for the declaration of war. The burden of proof lies with those who insist that the representatives must take this step without any alternative.

Mr. President, I can see in the outcome of the wars of Europe and Asia the possibility of serious future threat to America. I will work, vote, and speak for every effort and proposal to prepare ourselves as fully as can be done to meet such a possible threat or contingency, and to the full limit of our needs and resources, but I will not support any proposal to dissipate these defense needs and resources now and leave America defenseless or greatly weakened by participation in a foreign conflict which means war involvement now and is war now, regardless of our attempts to disguise the facts by self-deception.

It would perhaps not be amiss at this point briefly to review some historical events, outlining the trend of American legislation to prevent war involvement.

On the 16th day of October 1939 I made a speech on this floor in which I made the following statement:

I have been greatly disturbed, as I am sure millions of other Americans have, over the development in the past few weeks of what might be designated a war psychology, a war hysteria, which may or may not reach a momentum that will have serious consequence in this country.

A few weeks ago, following the wise pronouncement of the President, people were saying, "We are not going to get into this war." Now they are saying, "I hope we can keep out of this war. I hope we will not be forced into the war."

Now, Mr. President, the people are saying, "What has happened to place us in

a situation that either is war or which makes war inevitable?" In 1917 and 1918 several million American boys were sent abroad to European battlefields. Other millions of patriotic citizens at home contributed in their various ways to that war which we waged together with our Allies in Europe. I do not care what assertions are carelessly made by those who say we were sold into the war or that we were dragged into the war. I know that was not the attitude of the men who were participating in the war. They thought they were fighting a war to end war. Those of us who were in active service were told that there was a possibility of the Central Powers winning, and that unless we went over there and helped to defeat them we might have to fight those powers over here, and that we should send a force abroad in order to make the world safe for democracy. The millions who came back to America and the other millions who were here had in their hearts and on their lips two words, over and over again repeated, "Never again, never again, never again."

Notwithstanding the developments of the past few months, that is the burden of what is in the hearts of the American people today; but notwithstanding that unanimity of opinion and hope and aspirations in 1919, there was a difference of opinion as to how the desire could be attained. In the first place, we have sought to maintain what we called the freedom of the seas under international law, and we were compelled to fight four wars—the undeclared war with France, the war with the Barbary pirates, the War of 1812, and the World War of 1917—to maintain the so-called freedom of commerce on the high seas. What we call international law—that volume of precedents which are flouted and thrown aside whenever the national interests of any contestant suggest it—was not effective in keeping us out of any of those wars. It was evident to the American people that we would have to take some other course. The American people knew that they would have to maintain some sort of policy other than reliance on international law, and two schools of thought immediately developed. One school maintained that neutrality and peace could be secured by international cooperation, coordination, and action. The other school said that this was the very antithesis of neutrality, and that such a policy would make us automatically a party to every dispute in Europe or Asia, whether we might wish to be or not. We could not participate unless we were willing to go the whole length. Therefore we could not develop any thought more unneutral in its effect and purpose than international cooperation which must be established by force. Out of that difference of opinion and that clash of viewpoint came the historic League of Nations fight.

In 1920 the American people went to the polls and cast a ballot on the issue drawn between the two schools of thought. By an overwhelming majority the second school was endorsed at the polls, and that expression of the people became a mandate from them to the Congress of the United States to trans-

late into law a national system of neutrality which would be effective against our involvement in future wars. But, Mr. President, it is a sad commentary on the record of the Government of the United States that for 15 years after that mandate was received from the people not only was no system of national neutrality or peace proposed and written into law, but no bill envisioning such a move was even introduced in the American Congress.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GILLETTE. I had asked not to be interrupted, but I shall be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. WHEELER. Is there any question in the mind of the Senator as to whether the people have changed their viewpoint since the time he spoke of a moment ago, when they expressed their opinion with reference to keeping out of European conflicts?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think there has been no change in the viewpoint as to keeping out of European conflicts. I am so thoroughly convinced of it that I am imposing on the Senate by expressing these opinions at the present time.

Commencing 15 years later, in August 1935, and including the present proposal, we have made four attempts toward national legislative policy looking to protection of America from war involvement; and in every case, Mr. President, the motivating element which initiated the proposed legislative forces was predicated on the interest and need of Great Britain rather than on the interest and need of the United States of America. Please do not gain the impression that I harbor resentment of any kind against Great Britain or that I hold any views inimical to her interest. But, Mr. President, I am thoroughly tired of hearing over and over again—even on this very floor within the past week—what ought to be done to implement British-American policy and British-American interests. I am thoroughly fed up with all types of modified, hyphenated, bifurcated, or truncated Americanism with a British-American, Grecian-American, Swedish-American, or any other phrase which defines or limits our interest in America first. Let us make an end of the phrase "and America" and change it to "America and."

In August 1935, when we enacted the first neutrality law, Italy and Ethiopia were engaged in war. England feared for her life line through the Mediterranean, and through the League of Nations certain sanctions were imposed on Italy, aimed at her gas and fuel needs for prosecution of the war. Italy cared little for these sanctions as long as she could turn to the United States for her fuel supplies. This was the immediate situation which started, 15 years after 1920, a move for the immediate enactment of neutrality legislation in the United States, which as first drafted was designed to prevent a belligerent—in this case Italy—from buying from a neutral nation more than the percentage of war

supplies which she had purchased in peacetimes. In the case of Italy and her total fuel purchases, America in peacetimes had been furnishing 6 percent. That meant that Italy could buy only 6 percent of her gasoline and motor-fuel needs in the United States.

When the news reached Italy that the United States was considering this type of legislation for adoption, notice was served by Italy on the United States that such legislation would be considered by her as tantamount to a declaration of war. I know what I am talking about. I was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee at the time. I know who wrote the bill. I know who went to the White House to discuss a compromise with reference to the matter. As proof of this assertion I quote from the late deeply lamented chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Pittman, who stated on April 19, 1939:

For instance, during the Italo-Ethiopian War Mussolini declared that the placing of an embargo by the League of Nations upon the export of oil to Italy would be deemed not only an unneutral but unfriendly act, attended with grave consequences. In fact, he clearly indicated that he would consider such an embargo a casus belli. At the time this matter was under consideration by the League of Nations, when the President indicated that he was considering bringing about an embargo upon the export of oil to both of the belligerents, Mussolini communicated to our Government that he would consider such an act both unneutral and unfriendly. This whole incident was packed with the most sensitive explosives of imminent war.

So we retreated from our proposed legislation and rewrote the Neutrality Act of 1935, which was changed and extended by the act of 1937. The American people were convinced that if we were to have a national system of neutrality it must take into consideration four factors which, rightly or wrongly, we considered as having influenced our drifting into the World War: First, the travel of American citizens on belligerent ships; second, the sale of munitions to belligerents; third, the extension of credit to belligerent nations which gave us a monetary interest in the outcome of their war; fourth, the situation occasioned by American citizens trying to run blockades established under international law by other nations for the purpose of delivery of war materials.

To implement a law which could eliminate these dangers the Neutrality Act of 1935, as extended in 1937, was a compromise between those advocating a mandatory embargo and those supporting a discretionary embargo. As a consequence we wrote into the law what is euphemistically called the cash-and-carry provision. Some of us then maintained, as was maintained so fully on this floor in the debate of 1939—and I shall refer to it in a moment—that there is no logic in embargoing the shipment of arms, munitions, and implements of war to a belligerent and at the same time permitting him to purchase the scrap iron, steel, cotton, and other war materials necessary in their manufacture.

Now, Mr. President, listen: I stated what was the inception and the genesis of the 1935 law as later extended. In

1939 it was found that the embargo on the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war was working inequitably in the war which then broke out in Europe. Because of the fact that England and France had control of the seas through naval power, and were able, if permitted to do so, to secure war supplies here, while Germany could not do so through lack of seapower, a situation was brought about through which our laws then on the books worked no hardship whatever against Germany, which could not secure the supplies anyway, and to the heavy disadvantage of England and France, by preventing their securing vitally needed munitions and arms.

To correct this inequity we passed the so-called Neutrality Act of 1939, repealing the embargo on the shipment of arms, munitions, and implements of war contained in the former law, and permitting any belligerents to obtain these supplies by taking title to them here and transporting them in their own ships. It was asserted over and over again by those who supported that proposal on the floor that it would be a long step in the direction of preventing our involvement in European wars. I want it to be remembered, Mr. President, by those who are doing me the favor of listening to me, that that law is now on the statute books, and the purpose of the pending measure is to abrogate to a certain extent and to nullify to a certain other extent the provisions of that law now on the statute books.

The Neutrality Act of 1939 was entirely a peace measure and not a war measure in any sense of the word. I supported the repeal of the embargo and the enactment of the Neutrality Act of 1939. In connection with the passage of that law in 1939, I again quote from the late Senator from Nevada, Mr. Pittman, in his address to the Senate on the then pending measure:

In my opinion this is the most important legislation that has ever been proposed to Congress or ever enacted into law for the purpose of keeping us out of a European war. If our vessels cannot carry on commerce with belligerents, and the belligerent powers know it, there will be little excuse, if any, for the destruction of American vessels on the high seas with the inevitable loss of the lives of our seamen. Certainly the peace-loving Senators who oppose the proposed substitute are in favor of such mandatory legislation.

I have every confidence in the President of the United States. I have confidence in the declaration that he intends to do everything in his power to keep us out of war. I have confidence that, if granted the discretion with regard to prohibition of our vessels from engaging in commerce with belligerents, that he would exert such discretion.

I am still quoting from the late Senator from Nevada:

However, the policy of our Government is vested in the Congress of the United States, and it should not, in my opinion, delegate such authority, where it is unnecessary, to the President or any other single man or group of men. We know that the delegation of such authority is not only unnecessary but unwise. I fully realize that such provision may be injurious to some extent to our merchant marine. . . . The loss of vessel and the cargo might be compensated for, but there was no adequate compensation for the loss of American citizens on board such vessels. We do not intend that American sea-

men shall be subjected to such dangers. We do not intend to leave that to the discretion of any man, no matter how good and wise he may be. We propose that Congress shall make it unlawful for American vessels to trade with belligerents. . . . It is the most essential proposed law to the preservation of the lives of our citizens and the peace of our country, and therefore no patriotic citizen will oppose making such sacrifice. . . . This commerce must and shall be discontinued during war.

Now, Mr. President, let me quote from another very eminent authority who is now in the Senate Chamber, and whose opinions we value, and in whose judgments we sometimes concur—the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]—who, in a notable address on the floor of the Senate on October 4, 1939, during the pendency of the hearing on the act which is now on the statute books and which it is the purpose of the pending measure to destroy, gave utterance to these words, which I endorse with all the fervor I can summon in endorsing any expression I hear. I quote, and I am continuing to quote from the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], Mr. President, unless I otherwise state:

Senators are afraid we are going to violate international law. Mr. President, while claiming every right we have under international law, we are undertaking in this measure, so to restrict, so to limit, and so to regulate American citizens and American ships that they will not be sunk on the high seas. . . . We are hoping by this measure to prevent the necessity of ever going into another war. . . .

Mr. President, during the World War citizens of the United States were murdered on the high seas, where they had a right to be, in the peaceful pursuit of their vocations. Ships were sunk where they had a right to be under international law. . . . We are keeping our citizens from bringing themselves within the law by keeping them out of danger zones, by keeping them off belligerent vessels—

Listen, Mr. President—

and by not allowing a single American ship to go to a single belligerent power with a thing on earth in it. . . . Anything may move under the Embargo Act except arms or ammunition. Food may go anywhere to neutrals or belligerents; and, unless we repeal the Embargo Act and enact other legislation, as surely as the sun shall ever rise again American ships with food and supplies and other cargoes are going to be sunk. . . . The pending joint resolution—

That is, the 1939 joint resolution—

if legislation can accomplish any such result, will come more nearly keeping us out of war than any other measure that can be devised by the wit or mind of man.

At another point in his superb speech the Senator from Texas said:

A number of people in the country have been led to believe that the United States is to furnish arms and ammunition—that the Government is to do it. Why, of course the Government is not going to spend a nickel for arms and ammunition under this joint resolution. The Government will not furnish a single nation a single bayonet or a single bullet. . . . These arms and this ammunition will not be sold by the Government, or furnished by the Government, or given by the Government. They simply will be sold by our own citizens. They will be sold to foreign governments and foreign nationals, it is true, but they will be sold here

on our own soil. Before they leave our ports the title must be divested out of American citizens. They must be placed, not upon American ships but upon neutral or other foreign ships.

If the embargo law is kept on the books, American ships—not foreign ships but American ships—can carry any or all of these supplies, other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war, to any or all belligerents—to all nations at war. * * * They may carry them right into England or right into Germany or right into France or right into any other warring nation. What is going to happen? How long will the ships be at sea, with American seamen on them and with an American captain on the bridge, with an American flag flying above them and with American goods in the holds? How long will they be upon the sea, under the present Embargo Act, before some submarine, stealthily and slyly, perhaps in the night, in the dark, will submarine them and send them to the depths of the sea? Is there any Senator here wise enough to say that will not happen? Is there any Senator here prepared to deny that that will happen?

Mr. President, * * * what brought us into that war [the World War] was the unrestricted submarine warfare, when Germany announced that she would sink any kind of vessel carrying on commerce with any warring power. * * * Those American ships, not carrying arms, not carrying ammunition, but carrying general cargoes, were sunk. * * * That is why I voted for war—because of the murder of American seamen and other American citizens while they were in the pursuit of their lawful business upon the peaceful highways of the sea. If that could happen in the World War, it could happen in this war. It did happen in the World War, and it will happen in this war.

Then the distinguished Senator set out a long list of ships sunk during the World War and then added:

Ships were sunk so often with the loss of American lives that American patience was finally exhausted. * * * America finally declared the existence of a state of war—a war already made upon it by Germany. * * * Mr. President, I do not want that to happen again. Yet there are Senators who are forced to say—as I would be forced to say—that when a foreign nation attacks our citizens and murders our people and destroys our property, * * * our country, of course, has no other recourse except war. I do not want to have to face that alternative. However, that alternative will be faced unless the embargo is repealed, because American ships will surely be sent from our shores, under the embargo. * * * Our ships were sunk, our citizens were murdered, just as our ships will be sunk now and our citizens murdered if the embargo is kept as it is written now, because our ships are going to sail from our ports. * * * What is our plan? Our plan is to allow American ships to carry no commerce—not merely arms and ammunitions, but no commerce—to the nations at war, not a bite of food, not one arm, not one cannon, not one piece of ammunition, not one piece of clothing to shelter the naked, or one bushel of wheat to feed the hungry, may be sent to the warring nations in American ships. We do propose that all nations may buy the products of our farms and factories, any and everything, if they are carried away in foreign ships.

I quote further from the speech of the Senator from Texas:

Mr. President, the joint resolution not only prohibits Americans from traveling on ships of warring nations; it not only prohibits American ships from carrying any kind of

commerce to the nations at war but, as an added protection, as an increased safeguard, it provides that from time to time the President may lay down combat areas or danger zones, and that after he so proclaims such an area or zone any American ship is prohibited from going into that combat area whether it shall be destined for a neutral port or for the port of the nation at war.

Mr. President, I have quoted at length from the forceful and persuasive statement of the Senator from Texas, which at that time had such an effect on me that, against my will, I voted for the then pending measure in order to obtain the security which he said the provisions of that act would afford.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for giving prominence to my remarks in his speech and giving them naturally a great deal more currency, but so far as he has quoted I think I was stating the truth at the time, and I have no corrections to make in the RECORD. I shall not ask to revise and extend those remarks in any wise.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very much delighted to have that corroboration of the opinion expressed by the Senator at that time and, if the Senator can spare a few more moments, while I will not quote further from him, I will call attention to what has happened since the Senator expressed those remarks which he now endorses.

I have quoted from the speech of the Senator from Texas because of the fact that we have before us now for consideration a measure which proposes radically to change those protective provisions of the National Defense Act of 1939, to which the distinguished Senator has so strongly alluded. The statement is made, and has been made on this floor, that there is nothing in the provisions of the pending act which modifies the Neutrality Act with respect to merchant vessels going into combat or war zones. But I respectfully assert, Mr. President, that such statements do not tell the whole truth, nor fairly state the true situation. A few minutes later, if I have the time, I wish to describe some of the particular provisions of the pending act, but right now I wish to allude to the very question to which I have just referred. The proposed act defines defense articles to include, among other things, aircraft, vessel, or boat. Then it further provides in section 3, subsection (a), that notwithstanding the provisions of the other law—that is, the law to which I have referred—the President may, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of any such defense article; to release for export to any country of any defense article.

The House of Representatives, by amendment to the bill in subsection (e) of section 3, provides that—

Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or permit the authorization of the entry of any American vessel into a combat area in violation of section 3 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

Now may I direct attention to the fact that the Neutrality Act of 1939 has two specific sections dealing with sending

ships into danger areas. Section 2 (a)—not section 3—provides that—

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

That is section 2 (a). Section 3, mentioned in the House amendment, refers to the additional provision pointed out by the Senator from Texas in the speech from which I have quoted.

In addition to this provision, as was pointed out by the Senator from Texas, section 3 (a) of the same law provides—

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall by proclamation define combat areas and thereafter it shall be unlawful except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area. The combat areas so defined may be made to apply to surface vessels or aircraft or both. The President may from time to time modify or extend any proclamation so issued, and when the conditions which shall have caused him to issue any such proclamation shall have ceased to exist he shall revoke such proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply.

Mr. President, that is the portion of the law, section 3 (a), to which the House amendment refers, and not section 2.

You will observe, Mr. President, that section 2 which I have first quoted is a clear-cut prohibition for American vessels after the proclamation shall have been issued to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

While the second provision simply authorizes the President to set up combat areas into which no American boat may enter, the President may modify or change or eliminate these areas by subsequent proclamations in his discretion. It will also be noted that the amendment adopted by the House and approved by the Senate committee simply provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the entry of an American vessel into one of these combat areas in violation of section 3, and the President may change the status of these areas at his will and discretion and under his judgment. There is not one word in the proposal or one word in the bill to the effect that nothing in the act shall be construed to authorize or permit an American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to a belligerent state, as provided in section 2; and, Mr. President, the esteemed gentlemen who claim that such danger does not exist, if they are consistent, could and should support an amendment which would make definite and clear the fact that the pending measure cannot be construed to permit such travel by American merchant ships either under section 2 or section 3.

Mr. President, I shall ask the Senator from Texas to remain in the Chamber for a few moments, and I should like to have his attention.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be delighted to hear the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yet when I proposed an amendment in the Foreign Relations Committee which would make crystal clear this situation and provide that nothing shall be construed to authorize or permit the sending of American ships as provided in both section 2 and section 3, I was met by the same chorus of "noes," including—and I think I am violating no confidence or making no improper statement—the loud, resounding "no" of the Senator from Texas, who refused to allow it to be made clear, and now maintains on the floor that he is of the same opinion still.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for automatically yielding. I did not care to interrupt the Senator.

The Senator from Texas no doubt did vote against the amendment. The Senator from Iowa certainly does not contend, does he, that the present measure in anywise repeals the present law, contained in the Neutrality Act, which prohibits American vessels and American citizens from going into any combat or war zone?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Iowa certainly does assert that and claim that; and a little later in my address I shall give my reasons for it, which I hope will be convincing, but I fear will not be.

Mr. CONNALLY. The reason why I voted against the amendment in the committee was that this bill does not in anywise affect the present neutrality law insofar as it applies to American merchant ships or American citizens going into combat zones. I did say in my remarks here the other day—and it is true—that under the neutrality law the President, if he should see fit, could lift the war zone and abolish it; but that does not reach the point of the Senator from Iowa, because his own amendment, which he says we voted down, simply provided that nothing in this bill should affect the existing neutrality law as to American vessels going into combat zones. So the President could lift the Senator's zone just as easily as he could lift the zone of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no. The Senator from Texas, I may say with all deference, has missed by as much as 8 miles the target at which he aimed. [Laughter.] The proclamation to which section 2 refers is the basic proclamation, under which the provisions of the entire act are put into effect, and not the proclamation designating a combat area, as provided in section 3.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GILLETTE. Surely.

Mr. LUCAS. The colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Iowa and the able Senator from Texas rather intrigues me, and I should like to have a little further information on it.

Am I to understand that the Senator from Iowa takes the position that the amendment he intends to propose, and which he did propose before the committee, would nullify the provision of the Neutrality Act which permits the Presi-

dent to lift the power he now has to prescribe combat zones, and absolutely deny him that privilege?

Mr. GILLETTE. By no means. If the Senator from Illinois so understood me, I regret that I failed to make myself clear. Let me say to the Senator that to effectuate this situation, as so forcefully outlined in the argument of the Senator from Texas a year ago last fall, that sending American ships with material for belligerents was a potent source of war, we enacted into law the Neutrality Act. That act carried two provisions. One of them was as follows:

Sec. 2 (a). Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

In another portion of the same act there was a specific proposal about combat zones.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the Neutrality Act the President has power to issue a proclamation delimiting combat zones where American vessels may or may not go.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; but it has nothing to do with the provision to which I have just referred.

Mr. LUCAS. The President may lift that ban at any time he so desires, as I understand the position which the Senator takes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The question I am concerned about is whether the amendment which the Senator discussed before the committee in any wise takes away from the President of the United States the power to lift the ban from a combat zone, if he so desires.

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall be very glad to try to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that it is very important.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; it is of the utmost importance, and it is for that reason that I have given attention to it, so that the American people may know about it.

The neutrality law provides that when the general proclamation has been issued, or Congress has taken the action which states that a condition of belligerency exists anywhere in the world—that is, the general proclamation—all these provisions shall go into effect; and the first provision is that no American ship shall carry any passengers or any materials whatever "to any state named in such proclamation"—that is, the proclamation of belligerency. That is the first part of section 2.

There is an additional section, section 3, which reads, in part, as follows:

(a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall, by proclamation, define combat areas, and thereafter it shall be unlawful, except under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, for any citizen of the United States or any American vessel to proceed into or through any such combat area.

I direct the attention of the distinguished Senator from Illinois to the fact that the first prohibition is against American ships carrying passengers or materials to the states at war named in the general proclamation. The second one, defining combat areas, prohibits American ships from going into a combat area even to carry to a neutral port. They may not go into a combat area.

When the pending bill said, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any existing law, the President may do so and so," a doubt very naturally arose in the minds of the American people, as it did in the mind of the Senator from Illinois and in my mind and in the mind of every other reasonable man, whether, under the provisions of the bill, the President could nullify those prohibitions against the entry into combat areas of American ships carrying things to belligerents. The House inserted in the bill an amendment which provided that nothing in the bill should be construed as permitting the entrance of American ships into combat areas as provided by section 3, but saying not one word with reference to prohibition of carrying things to belligerents as provided by section 2, and the Senator from Iowa, to make the matter clear and unmistakable, offered an amendment which provided, in substance, that—

Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or permit the entrance of American merchant vessels into danger areas as provided by section 2 or section 3.

The Senators of the majority, with the chorus of "noes" to which I shall a little later allude, said "No, no, no; it is meaningless!"

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret to take the Senator's time, but the question is of such importance to me that I cannot refrain from asking him to yield.

If I correctly understand the Senator now, the House of Representatives adopted an amendment which affects section 3 of the Neutrality Act. What the Senator from Iowa is seeking to do is to place section 2 in the same category as section 3?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is it exactly; and the reason for it, above everything else, is that section 2 prohibits carrying passengers or materials to belligerents. An additional reason is that the assertion that nothing in the act shall be construed to authorize or permit entering combat areas may be easily nullified by the President's issuing tomorrow a proclamation eliminating the combat zone, or prescribing certain lanes through which ships may proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may ask one further question, the only difference between the Senator's position and the position taken by the majority members of the Committee on Foreign Relations is that the Senator's amendment is unnecessary, because they contend that the words "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law" do not affect the Neutrality Act as it exists at the present time, insofar as combat zones are concerned, or insofar as the

shipment of materials and supplies to belligerents is concerned.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is a statement of the argument as presented by the majority of the committee. I failed to follow their argument, I assure the Senator, and I fail to follow it now.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not see how anyone can stand on this floor and contend that the words "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law" do not mean anything, or do not mean any more than the ordinary language that is put into many bills, that "this bill repeals every law in conflict with it." I cannot understand how any lawyer can stand on the floor of the Senate and say that the provision does not mean any more than the ordinary provision, because it states that "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law" the President may from time to time—to what? When he deems it to be in the interest of national defense, he can set aside the provisions of the Neutrality Act. I submit that there is not a lawyer, that it is not possible to find a lawyer of any standing in the United States who has read that provision who can come to any other conclusion than that that is exactly what it means.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Iowa, but I desire to take issue not only with what the Senator from Montana says—

Mr. GILLETTE. Before I yield to either of the Senators, let me say that at the outset of my remarks I requested that I be not interrupted. I did not want a colloquy of this kind to take place. But because I had referred very extensively to and quoted from the Senator from Texas, I yielded to him, as I should have done. I dislike very much to yield further; but having yielded to the Senator from Montana, and he having called into question the judgment, perhaps, of some of the other Senators, I will yield—briefly, I hope—to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I will bide my time; I merely rose to say that the Senator from Montana asked no question; he is, in my opinion, merely dogmatically stating as a fact a thing which is not a fact. I could equally say that I doubt that there is a reputable lawyer in the country, in or outside the Senate, who would say that the words "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law" mean any provision of law which at this time will prevent the President doing what he is given express authority in the bill to do. That is a clear interpretation of it, and that is the universal interpretation of the language.

Nowhere in the bill, it is contended—at least, by those of us who support it—is there the slightest authority for permitting any American ship to enter the port of any belligerent country or to proceed into any declared area of danger. Therefore the attachment by the House of an amendment which is wholly meaningless as the bill stands would be made further

meaningless by the attachment of other amendments declaring that something else was not in contemplation or should be construed to be within the meaning of the act.

I have no objection to anyone's opinion, but the Senator from Montana has a rather unfortunate attitude of dogmatically saying that a thing is true when he might at least preface his assertion with the statement that he contends that a certain thing is true.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say, if I may interrupt, that I am not dogmatically saying anything; I am giving my opinion; and I do not agree with the Senator from Georgia. I wish to say to the Senator that I have submitted the question to some of the ablest lawyers in this country, and they have agreed with the views which I have expressed. As a matter of fact, I have gotten legal opinions and briefs upon the subject, and they completely disagree with the interpretation put upon the bill by the majority.

If the Senator from Iowa will pardon me for a moment further, if there is nothing more to it than what the Senator from Georgia contends, I assume, of course, that he, as the chairman of the committee, would be willing to strike the provision out and insert in its place a provision which is usual in legislation; that is to say, that this law repeals all acts or parts of acts in conflict with it.

Mr. GEORGE. I would have no objection to that, except that the proposed act does not repeal any law. It merely suspends, for the purpose of enabling the President to execute the powers given him, any law which stands directly in the path of the President.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course; that is exactly what I say.

Mr. GEORGE. It does not repeal any act.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, may I, in all kindness, ask Senators to cease the dialogue so that I may proceed?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not wish to trespass on the Senator's time; but since the Senator brought me into the discussion, and it has all revolved around the Neutrality Act, sections 2 and 3, I think he should allow me just a word.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa can yield, but he cannot command the attention of anyone.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from Montana will give me his attention a moment—

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. My reason for addressing the Senator from Montana is that he stands on the floor, as suggested by the Senator from Georgia, and practically reflects upon every lawyer, every so-called lawyer—I do not claim to be anything more than just a cornfield lawyer. [Laughter.] A cornfield lawyer knows more than a good many other so-called lawyers.

I wish to take issue with the Senator from Montana. He says that he cannot

understand how any lawyer would say that the language "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law" does not mean that it wipes out a good many laws without naming them. I make the statement to the Senator from Montana on my responsibility that we could strike from the bill the words "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law" entirely, and we would not change the legal effect of the language in the slightest particular.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Let me answer; then I will yield.

Whenever we pass a new law there is some kind of a law already on the books on the subject covered or we would not be passing a new one. When we pass the last act it has the automatic effect of modifying or suspending or repealing any existing law on the books to the extent the law which we are passing goes. Any justice-of-the-peace lawyer in my State knows that. [Laughter.]

So, in effect, whenever we pass an act we might as well say "notwithstanding the provisions of any existing law we declare this to be the law from now on." We do not have to say, "It is hereby repealed." Does not every lawyer know that when we pass a new act we frequently use the language, "All laws in conflict herewith are repealed"? But whether we use that language or not, the last law would have the effect of repealing or modifying existing law.

As was well said by the Senator from Georgia, who served on the supreme court of his State for many years—and, of course, he is no lawyer, he is no respectable lawyer, he does not know anything [laughter]—

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator, if he will permit an interruption, that the Senator from Georgia has just made a statement with which I entirely agree, and he does not agree with the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say he did. He agrees with what I have just stated, however.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the last statement that was made by the Senator from Georgia—namely, that the President can brush aside any law—I may not quote his exact language—

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is not quoting it exactly. I can tell that from the way he starts.

Mr. WHEELER. If I do not quote the substance of it, I hope the Senator will correct me. In effect, as I understand, the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the committee and as a distinguished lawyer, did say—though perhaps I was unfortunate in my language—that the President can brush aside any law that conflicts with the pending measure when he deems it in the interest of national defense.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no; he did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. WHEELER. I submit it to the Senators present, or I submit it to the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I submit it to the Senator from Georgia. The Senator from Georgia did not say the President

could wipe it out; he said that this act provides that certain things can be done. The President is authorized to do certain definite things written down here in the English language, and that any other law now on the books which would prevent him from doing those things specifically set forth is not repealed but is suspended so as not to prohibit him from doing exactly what he is authorized to do under this bill. That is my construction of what the Senator from Georgia said. The President is not to wipe out anything. The President is simply authorized to do the things set out here, and we say, "We want you to do these things. If there is any existing law that keeps you from doing them, that law, to the extent that you can do them, is temporarily suspended." That is all it means.

Mr. WHEELER. In other words, what it is proposed to do is to give the President the right to suspend any law upon the statute books—

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. WHEELER. When he deems it wise to do so in the interest of national defense.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, that is simply ridiculous and preposterous.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Texas has all the ability.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Montana said that no lawyer could take that position.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a second?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to point out that, in my judgment, the Senator from Iowa is exhibit A of the forgotten man. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Iowa, and I shall not bother him any more.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, under ordinary circumstances I would not only be willing but delighted to have the amplification of my remarks contributed by the distinguished Senators who have spoken, I have a rather lengthy speech, and I should like to get through with it.

I will say to the Senator from Texas, not as a cornfield lawyer but a cow-barn lawyer, that I agree with his statement that the phrase could be stricken out and should be stricken out, and I will give the Senator from Texas and the Members of the Senate an opportunity to vote on an amendment to strike it out, and shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from Iowa agree that it could be stricken out without changing the legal effect of the language?

Mr. GILLETTE. No, no, but I will agree that with that language in there—

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that I always thought I should beware of antagonists bearing amendments. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no. I agree, whether it is in there or not, as stated by the Senator from Texas, that the last law which is passed is the controlling law when there is a conflict, but I have maintained, and I now maintain as a cow-barn lawyer, and nothing else—and I

have not practiced law for 20 years—that there is all the difference in the world between the preliminary phrase, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law," and the usual paragraph that is added at the close of a statute—

All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

Mr. President, without assuming to speak with the eloquence with which the Senator from Texas described the dangers of the entry of American ships into war trade, may I say that if the bill gives the President power to send American ships in order to take supplies to British ports and for British use, or to Chinese and Grecian ports for their use, or for the use of any belligerent, it will follow as night follows day that some of these ships will be sunk and American lives will be lost. If American ships are sunk and American lives are lost, it is likely that American warships will be ordered to escort supply ships, and when submarines try to block the shipments a naval battle will follow with American destroyers struggling with German submarines. If that does not mean war, Mr. President, I do not know what situation might be described as a state of war.

Now, Mr. President, may I refer to another provision in the pending bill which was added by way of amendment in the House and which the proponents of the bill point to with pride as tending to allay the fears of the public as to the powers delegated by the provisions of the bill and as additional security against war involvement. Subsection (d) on page 4 of the pending measure provides that:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or to permit the authorization of conveying vessels by naval vessels of the United States.

That language was added by the House. The distinguished constitutional lawyers, both in the House and in the Senate committees and on this floor, have maintained that this proposal, when adopted, ought greatly to reassure the American people, who know that the use of vessels as convoys either for British or American ships would inevitably result in a state of war. They admit that the words as adopted by the amendment have little force or value. Without exception, they all state that the power to use our naval forces as vessels of convoy now rests with the President of the United States because of his constitutional position as Commander in Chief of the Army and naval forces, conferred by section 2 of article II of the Constitution, which states that—

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States.

But they steadfastly reject all proposals to make the amendatory matter stronger in its provisions, and expressly prohibit such use of our naval vessels in convoy. They contend, with some show of legal authority, that Congress cannot deprive the President of his constitutional power by such suggested provision. But they persistently inform the

public that the proposal which has been adopted is fully effective and should allay all the public fears.

I am not competent, and neither do I propose, to attempt to discuss a question of constitutional law with the able legal minds in the Senate, but I want to take this occasion to direct attention to the fact that the authority of the Commander in Chief, as interpreted by our courts in the provisions of the Constitution, empowers him to act as such Commander in Chief in handling our military forces in peacetimes and in the tactical disposition of these forces in time of war; that the Congress is given the power and the full authority not only to declare war but—and I quote—"to provide and maintain a navy" and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces"; and that the authority of the President as Commander in Chief does not become his power until the Congress shall have performed its duty of raising and supporting armies, providing and maintaining navies, and making the rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Let me also, for the information of my colleagues, call attention to these notations from the Journal of the Constitutional Convention:

On the question of the words clothing the Congress with the power to "make war," Mr. Pinkney opposed vesting this power in the Congress. Its proceedings were too slow. Mr. Madison and Mr. Gerry moved to insert the word "declare," striking out the words "make war," thus leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks. Mr. Sherman thought it stood very well. The Executive should be able to repel and not to commence war.

Let me repeat that.

The Executive should be able to repel and not to commence war. "Make" is better than "declare," the latter narrowing the power too much. Mr. Gerry never expected to hear in a republic a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war. Mr. Mason was against giving the power of war to the Executive because not safely to be trusted with it, or to the Senate, because not so constructed as to be entitled to it. He was for clogging rather than facilitating war. He preferred the word "declare" to "make." On motion to insert "declare" in place of "make," it was agreed to.

Let me advert to some of the discussions which have been had on this floor relative to the extent of the powers delegated by the bill to the Chief Executive. Some of these comments would be amusing if they were not so tragic. The zeal with which some of the proponents of the measure attempt to find phrases of limitation within the provisions of the bill leads them, I fear, to direct attention to extraneous, or at least inconsequential, matters.

The distinguished speakers who opened this debate as proponents of the bill, without exception, referred to the question of extent of delegation of powers. Let me quote from the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, on February 17, said on this very floor:

The claim that this measure sets up a dictatorship in the United States is, in my judgment, without foundation. Under this measure we will still have freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom of speech,

freedom of assembly, and all the freedoms guaranteed to the American people under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution.

That statement, Mr. President, reminds me of a story told of a soldier in the Civil War. Having been taken to a hospital desperately wounded, he was subjected to various amputations, and subsequently was informed that his sight was gone for life, that it had been necessary to amputate both legs just above the knees, and also to amputate the right arm. The soldier replied, "Thank God, I still have my teeth."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] pointed with pride to the fact that the constitutional securities of the Bill of Rights would not be removed by the provisions of the proposed act. In the name of all that is reasonable and American, how could any proposal adopted by the Congress, except by way of constitutional amendment, remove from American citizens the security of these constitutional safeguards?

On the same day the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] interrogated the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] relative to the extent of the delegation of power contained in the proposal. With commendable concern, the Senator from Vermont had been vigorously maintaining that the delegation of authority herein contained did not create any new powers in the Executive, and did not transfer any primary authority which ought to remain in the Congress. The Senator from Illinois asked the Senator from Vermont if, once we should pass the pending bill, we should be turning over to the President of the United States certain powers which would make him a complete dictator over the lives of this Nation. The distinguished Senator from Vermont very properly answered that we should not. And we should not. I wish to state with all the vigor of which I am capable that the bill does not and cannot so provide. All the constitutional safeguards which have been so wisely made part of the organic law of the United States would prevent any transfer or delegation of such authority.

But what the present bill does do is to clothe the Chief Executive with full power to exercise such authority as has never been delegated to any Chief Executive voluntarily by any free people on earth in time of peace, or even in times defined by the President as limited emergencies. It does clothe the Chief Executive with delegated authority to exercise the authority so given, regardless of and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law. By the terms of the bill "defense article" has been defined to mean:

Any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat; any machinery, facility, tool, material, or supply necessary for the manufacture, production, processing, repairing, servicing, or operation of any article described in this subsection; any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in this subsection.

As if that were not sufficient to cover everything the writers of the bill could possible anticipate, the all-inclusive phrase "any other commodity or article for defense" was added. As first drafted

and introduced by the sponsors, plenary power was given to the Chief Executive, notwithstanding the provisions of any law when he deemed it in the interest of national defense to manufacture or otherwise procure—bear in mind the words "otherwise procure"—any of the defense articles for the Government of any country whose defense the President—and he alone—deems vital to the defense of the United States; and to sell, to transfer, to exchange, to lease, to lend, and—as though that did not cover it—otherwise dispose of, on such terms as he sees fit, to any such government as he sees fit to make the recipient of such sales, loans, or gifts, on such terms as he deems satisfactory, and for either direct or indirect benefit of the United States.

Without going into the further powers conferred by the bill, and notwithstanding the statements made on this floor by some of the Members of this body, I believe that no doubt can or does exist in the minds of any citizens of the United States familiar with the terms of this measure that the President of the United States, under the authority of the words "otherwise to dispose of; notwithstanding the provisions of existing law," could sell, loan, lease, or give to the nations to whom he desires to make such disposition the component parts of the Navy of the United States.

It is not enough, I will say to the Senator from Vermont, to maintain and assert, as he did on the floor of the Senate last Monday, that no authority could be read into this or any other provisions for a Chief Executive to destroy the Government institutions of the United States, and that, therefore, he could not give away the entire Navy. The fact of the matter is, and the record is, I will say to the Senator and to the people of the United States, that under existing law the President did dispose of 50 destroyers belonging to the naval forces of the United States by an arrangement made with the Government of Great Britain, and that this was done despite the plain provisions of the law passed June 15, 1917, which provided:

That during a war in which the United States is a neutral nation it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war, or converted from a private vessel into a vessel of war, with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation or to an agent, officer, or citizen of such nation, or with reasonable cause to believe that the said vessel shall or will be employed in the service of any such belligerent nation after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN entered the Chamber.

Mr. GILLETTE. A moment ago I referred to the distinguished Senator from Vermont. He was absent from the Chamber at the time, but I assure him I intended no discourtesy. I know the Senator has to eat, and that eating is more preferable to listening to the Senator from Iowa. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator for his good intentions.

Mr. GILLETTE. I called attention to the remarks which the distinguished Senator made on Monday of this week in

response to the attacks which had been made, or the suggestions which had been made, that under the authority delegated by the terms of the bill the President could dispose of component parts of the Navy of the United States, and the fact that the Senator from Vermont stated at that time that, in his opinion, no such authority could be read into the bill, because no law could be enacted which would delegate power to destroy the basic fundamental institutions of democratic government, and that the Navy thus could not be given away.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I fear I was not quite clear if I made the statement in such manner as to be interpreted that no component part of the Navy could be given away. That was not my intention. I intended to say—and I think I did say—that the President could not exercise the sovereignty of the United States by giving away the United States Navy. I did not intend to say—and I doubt if I did say—that he could not give away parts of it. The degree and the extent to which he might go is a question of strategy, of course, depending upon what is necessary or wise in the common defense.

Mr. GILLETTE. I will say that in my explanation to the Senator from Vermont, after his return to the Chamber, I did not make it as clear as I did, I hope, in my written statement that the Senator said no authority could be given subversively to destroy the basic institutions of America, and that the President could not give away the United States Navy.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. If, however, the President can give away component parts of the Navy, there must be some point the Senator from Vermont would like to find, and I should like to find how further giving would be giving away part of the Navy but would not be giving away the Navy.

I further said in the statement, which, unfortunately, the Senator did not hear, that the President had given away 50 destroyers notwithstanding the plain, absolute provision existing in the law since 1917, which I read.

Now, let me say, Mr. President, that if the President of the United States, in the face of the statutory provision, even on interpretation by the Attorney General of the United States, could and did dispose of 50 destroyers, component parts of our Navy fleet, I, for one, am not going by my own expressed vote to endorse the authority contained in this bill to dispose of vessels on any terms the President deems wise, to such nation as he sees fit, and, under the quoted phrase, "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law." He will not have the authority from me, directly or indirectly, clear or interpreted.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I realize the Senator does not wish to be interrupted, but I desire to call attention

to what the Senator said, that the President can give away 50 vessels today and can give away 50 vessels tomorrow, and can pick out any part of our Navy he pleases to give, until the whole Navy will be gone.

It would seem to me that there cannot be any question about that, under the interpretation of the bill.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, the Senator from Montana and I differ about the interpretation of the bill. I maintain that no man, whether a private citizen or an official, may commit an act which would hazard the sovereignty of the United States. There is no justification in law for such a thing. On the contrary, all our fundamental law prohibits such a thing as that; and this is the type of logic which I fear has led the Senator from Montana to an erroneous conclusion regarding H. R. 1776. It cannot be argued, from the fact that our Government may part with 50 destroyers today, that it may keep on until it has parted with the entire Navy of the United States. Such argument is not logical; and, in my opinion, certainly such action would be a direct violation of our institutions.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish now to refer briefly to the trend of public opinion which made possible the introduction of such a bill as the one now pending and which makes certain its enactment into law. I feel that whatever this measure of public opinion may be, it is not based on a full knowledge of the facts as they have existed from time to time or as they now exist. But whether intentionally or unintentionally fostered, there has been a marked change in public opinion toward fatalistic acceptance of probable war.

I have already referred to the statements carried in the respective party platforms of last fall; but even before the campaign the advocates of intervention in the European war had almost without exception dropped all such slogans as "aid to democracies, short of war," or aid as a "nonfighting ally," or a "nonbelligerent ally" and were taking another and entirely different position. Since the election of last November nobody in a responsible position in the United States has ever officially and publicly mentioned the phrase "short of war"; but before the day of election the two leading candidates, standing on almost identical platforms of "aid to the democracies, not inconsistent with existing laws, national and international, and not inconsistent with our own defense needs," heartily and completely endorsed this position and its purposes.

On October 23 President Roosevelt said:

To every man, woman, and child in the Nation I say—your President and your great Secretary of State are following the road to peace.

We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war.

We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes.

Mr. Willkie, in the city of Cleveland, on October 2 last, said:

The American people do not want war. They have no idea of joining in any conflict either in the Atlantic or the Pacific. They are determined to keep America at peace. In this determination I stand with them. I am for keeping out of war. I am for peace for America. We must not rashly move. Any man who involves us in the risk of war while we are thus unprepared betrays his country.

The American people went to the polls with the firm, implicit, and justified reliance on these statements of platforms and these statements by candidates. Last November neither party and neither candidate dared submit to the voters of America the issue of all-out aid to Britain, or aid regardless of law, or repeal or change of existing law to permit all-out assistance.

Let us review some pronouncements which almost immediately followed the day of election. On November 20 last, Dr. Conant, of Harvard, who was recently called before our Foreign Relations Committee by the proponents of this measure, speaking over the radio at that time said:

We must now consider a fundamental question. Do we agree that the aggressor powers should be defeated? Well, then, the words "all-out aid to the Allies" mean exactly what they say. There are no reservations in our pledge. It then becomes a matter of strategy and strategy only when, if ever, material aid must be supplemented by direct naval and military assistance.

The star witness for the proponents of this bill before the committee, Mr. Wendell Willkie, told the committee that—

If we are going to adopt a policy of aid to Britain, it is above all necessary to make that aid effective. To render ineffective aid would be disastrous.

Now let me quote from the President himself in his fireside chat of December 29:

Thinking in terms of today and tomorrow, I make the direct statement to the American people that there is far less chance of the United States getting into war if we do all we can now to support the nations defending themselves. * * * There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

Listen:

Our national policy is not directed toward war. Its sole purpose is to keep war away from our country and our people.

Near the close of his address the President said:

We have furnished the British great material support, and we will furnish far more in the future.

In a recent issue of the Washington Star—just last week—the following excerpts from editorial comment are quoted:

The assertion that we can give full aid to England by methods short of war has been repeated so often and accepted as a practical program by so many people in this country that a confusion of definition is threatening to obscure the basic realities of our foreign

policy. If the terms "full aid" or "all-out assistance" have any real meaning, they necessarily must imply a degree of assistance which will prevent the defeat of the British and the passage of naval control to the totalitarian powers. The definition and qualification of methods short of war become singularly inappropriate. Full necessary aid—that is, all aid necessary to prevent a Hitlerian victory—more clearly states our national policy, and that policy cannot be more narrowly restricted.

In his address to the Congress on January 6, the week following the fireside chat from which I have just quoted, the President said:

We are committed to full support of all those resolute peoples, everywhere, who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away from our hemisphere.

Also, the President said:

We are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers.

There is not a word in this statement relative to support consistent with law and not inconsistent with our defense. But, further than this, the program commits us to the rejection of any peace which may be negotiated with the Axis Powers; only a peace in which they are defeated and eliminated will meet with our purpose and approval. Full support to peoples everywhere without regard to existing law can reasonably mean the support that one ally in arms must give to an associate in the struggle—ships, planes, arms, money, manpower, and everything else necessary.

It is illuminating in this connection to read the comment of the London Times on January 9, 3 days following the President's address to the Congress. I quote from that great London newspaper:

President Roosevelt's address to Congress, followed by the Budget message of yesterday, marks another stage in the evolution of American opinion and American determination. From "neutrality in deed, though not in thought," the people of the United States have passed through "all aid to Britain short of war" to "all possible aid to Britain irrespective of consequences." Nothing more clearly narrows the increasing total and world-wide character which the world has assumed. No continent is now removed from its scope.

Now I will quote from a columnist. I dislike very much to quote from columnists; they are not popular, as an ordinary thing, with me; but I am quoting from one of the best, Mr. Lindley:

The essential fact remains that the Roosevelt administration seems disposed, if the need arises, to go further than it already has gone in aiding the Allies—even to the length of becoming a belligerent in the air and on the water. If we go that far, we might as well count ourselves all the way in. Some of us can remember the early April of 1917, when it was said, and widely believed, that our entry into the World War meant only that we would lend money, send our Navy, and dispatch, at most, a "token" army just to show that our heart was in the right place.

At this point, Mr. President, I wish to pay my respects and deference to the Members of this body who realize the full

import of these words and their implications. I fail completely to follow the reasoning of those eminent gentlemen who persist in contributing to the delusion of the American people by continually repeating that this bill, designed to implement the assurance and purpose of the administration clearly announced in the fireside chat and in the message to the Congress, is a measure for peace and defense only; that it does not contemplate the risks of war; that it does not envision the sending of our Navy into warlike uses; that it does not contemplate the use of American naval and military forces; that it does not propose to make possible the disposition of American merchant ships or American armed forces. But I can follow without difficulty the clear logic of men like the revered senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who is reported to have advocated that we "send our Navy over and shoot hell out of Hitler," and the incisive logic of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who the day before yesterday asserted that if the passage of this bill implementing our present policy means war, he accepts the situation with all its implications.

What aid have we been able to give to Great Britain under existing law without the changes and authority conferred by this bill? When Congress repealed the arms-embargo provisions in November 1939, and this obstacle was removed, the United States was able to transfer to the British, through private American intermediaries, in the summer of 1940, approximately 600,000 rifles, 80,000 machine guns, and eight .75 mm. field guns of British and French type, as well as a large supply of ammunition. This equipment consisted entirely of surplus World War stock stored by the Army for emergency use. Under a similar procedure the Army and Navy also turned over to the manufacturers for sale to Britain about 240 planes, principally attack and dive bombers. In September 1940, after approval by General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, some 229 World War light tanks no longer in the service were sold to Canada. The repeal of the arms embargo, moreover, permitted American producers to sell aircraft to the Allies on a basis of transfer of title and transport in their own ships. Shipments to Britain became numerically important only with the French defeat, when the British purchasing commission took over unfilled French orders. Between the beginning of September 1939 and the end of June 1940, 940 aircraft were exported to France, 292 were shipped to Britain, 95 to Canada, and 123 to other British territories. After June 1940, deliveries to Britain rapidly increased, raising to a peak of 278 in August. In the 14 months ending in October 1940 we exported to all countries 3,334 airplanes, of which 1,056 went to Britain, 427 to Canada, and 142 to other British areas. In October alone 177 planes were shipped to Britain, 102 to Canada, and 8 to other British territories. My authority for these figures is the United States Department of Commerce figures, published in the *Aeronautical World News*.

Information regarding the proportion in which various types of planes are now being exported is not available to me, but press reports have referred to orders for all the principal combat types—attack, dive, medium, and heavy bombers, observation, fighting, and patrol craft. Neither do I have figures relative to the percentage of allocation of present production which has been going to Great Britain. On November 29, 1940, it was announced in the press that 144 Vulture pursuit ships, originally ordered by the Swedish Government, would be sold to Canada, inasmuch as the United States Government had refused to issue a license permitting export to Sweden. The British have received at depots in this country quantities of the most modern planes, notably Curtiss P-40, Douglas DB-7 bombers, Consolidated B-24 heavy bombers, and Boeing B-17-C flying fortresses. Cargo vessels have been sold to the British. With the approval of the United States Maritime Commission, the following transfers of ships to belligerents took place between September 1, 1939, and December 23, 1940: To Britain, 132 ships, with a gross tonnage of more than 470,000 tons; and 184 ships to British Dominions and to Greece.

Without going further into this statistical matter, I may say that I have referred to it simply to show something of the amount of assistance which we have been able to give to Great Britain in the way of war supplies under existing law and consistent with that law and with our own defense needs. But our friends tell us that that is not enough—that we must go far beyond the possibilities under existing law; that Great Britain's dollar resources will at some undetermined time in the future approach exhaustion; that she ought not be compelled to pay cash for these supplies; and that there must be placed somewhere full and complete authority to give the full measure of effective aid to Britain to enable her to prevail fully in the war, regardless of the limitations in existing law. And that, Mr. President, is the definite purpose of the measure now before us.

At this point I wish to quote from a statement made last Friday evening in Memorial Continental Hall in this city by Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University. Because, Mr. President, of the length of time I have been on the floor, I ask unanimous consent that, without reading, the statement of Dr. Walsh may be included in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks. I make that request, I will say, not because of any lack of value in the statement of Dr. Walsh, but merely in order to save my voice and to save Senators being required to grant me further indulgence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The statement referred to is as follows:

We in the United States are an integral part of Western culture and we survive or perish with it. By force of circumstances not of our choosing we stand here and now

at the crossroads of a great, a momentous decision. As the lend-lease bill emerges from committee to face debate on the floor of the Senate, the intellect and conscience of the American people must answer one imperious, inescapable question. Unless we do so, the encompassing chaos in Europe must remain an inexplicable, vulgar, and brutal brawl on the curbstone of history.

The question to be answered does not concern this or that specific provision of the bill. The issue lies deeper than language or policy. It reaches to the depths of a choice on whose outcome may depend the very form and substance of the future. If the proponents of the bill had the courage they ought to have, they should, in all intellectual honesty, admit publicly what I have heard admitted privately, that the bill, if passed, is legislative condonation of acts of war. By every tenet of the international law to which we have subscribed before and since the Alabama claims, we will become a belligerent, with the status and risks of a belligerent.

For every panel of distinguished authorities appearing in support of the contention that no international law is violated an equally imposing aggregation of experienced jurists is available ruling that it is flagrant violation of international law, at least of the law of nations, which the Government of the United States has so frequently invoked. The Kellogg Pact did not suspend those obligations, since several important reservations made by signatories respecting special circumstances and regional interests practically nullified the high purpose of that agreement and left each signatory free to act exactly as he deemed advisable for his national defense. For that reason I have never been able to follow the logic of accusing any signatory of violating the pact, since he was specifically absolved in advance, should he feel that resort to arms was necessary for his own defense. And each signatory was conceded the sovereign right of judging his own case.

And that is exactly what the Senate committee does in the report made public yesterday. The crux of this question resides in achieving clarity of thought and honesty of definition. The lend-lease bill, by its title and provisions, is dedicated to the defense of the United States, since the legislative jurisdiction of the Congress extends no further. But the language of the bill and the more detailed explanations of its sponsors extend that concept and that definition enormously. The military resources of the United States now certainly become available for England, China, Greece, probably for Turkey and Yugoslavia, possibly for Switzerland and Sweden—in fact for any area on this planet—in the discretion of the President. That is not national defense, but international defense of what we believe to be human liberty wherever outraged and assaulted. I am not arguing against that nobility—God forbid—but against a certain deviousness and lack of straightforwardness in dealing with the lives and destiny of our people.

Hence the query: Are the combatants fighting one of Europe's conventional wars over ancient imperialisms, over trade, strips of territory, political rivalry, or some similar controversy limited to European and Asiatic belligerents? Or are we witnessing a violent social earthquake marking a shift in the rock formation underlying the edifice of habits, ideals, and spiritual conduct which free men have laboriously erected across the centuries of the Christian revelation? Is the world, in brief, passing through one of those periodic transitions cataloged by sociologists from St. Augustine to Spengler, Pareto, and Pitirim Sorokin?

If it is the first of these alternatives—merely another paroxysm in Europe's perpetual war lust—then Senator WHEELER and Colonel Lindbergh are right. We should stay

resolutely out of the arena, as Washington, Adams, and Jefferson did during the Napoleonic wars, at the same time, however, building up our national defense to the maximum possibility. But if it is the second, clearly proved, then every instinct of democracy, Christianity, even of self-preservation, counsels prompt, generous, and whole-hearted assistance to the embattled survivors of aggression, let the German ships fly where they will. And I do not shrink from the dread possibility of war as one of the consequences. If that menace to America is as immediate and specific as the President, the Secretary of State, of War, Treasury, and Navy declare, and Mr. Willkie confirms, then the conscience of democracy is faced with another 1917, and with far greater justification. I for one would be ashamed to take money for it, however disguised as loan or mortgage or lease.

Mr. GILLETTE. What are the immediate needs of Great Britain which the sponsors of this bill believe cannot be provided under existing law? Mr. Willkie, in his evidence before the committee, said that Great Britain's greatest hazard right now is the destruction of shipping, that it was essential that her ports be kept open, and that they be kept supplied with enough shipping to meet the needs of the people and the heavy requirements of the military program. Mr. Winston Churchill said about 10 days ago:

We need most urgently an immense continuous supply of war matériel and technical apparatus of all kinds; we need them here—

Listen to that! This is Winston Churchill. He does not need them over in America.

We need them here and we need to bring them here. We will need a great mass of shipping in 1942, far more than we can build ourselves if we are to maintain and expand our war effort in the west and the east.

The President, in his fireside chat, said:

They ask us for the implements of war, the planes, the tanks, the guns, the freighters, which will enable them to fight for their liberty and our security. Emphatically, we must get these weapons to them in sufficient volume and quickly enough.

There is the picture, Mr. President, with reference to shipping; and that, I believe is one of the first purposes to be secured by this bill—to delegate to the President authority to transfer boats and vessels on such terms of direct or indirect benefits as he sees fit—to manufacture them in American shipyards or otherwise provide this shipping; and, Mr. President, I submit that the authority could be exercised in such a way as to make available to Great Britain the shipping of belligerents or neutrals now interned in our ports.

Mr. Willkie says that the next great need of Great Britain is destroyers. He stated:

Britain needs still more destroyers, and, gentlemen of the committee, she needs them desperately. Merchant ships are making the crossing without nearly enough protection. * * * If we are to aid Britain effectively, we should provide her with from 5 to 10 destroyers a month. We should be able to do this directly and swiftly.

And so Mr. Willkie was supporting the bill.

The honorable Secretary of the Navy is reported in the press to have stated, adhering to our policy of refusing aid inconsistent with our own defense, that we could not spare a single destroyer and he would not approve of such transfer.

Mr. President, I have already greatly exceeded the time which I had expected to use on this floor in the discussion of the pending measure. If this bill has any purpose whatever, it is the purpose of rendering ineffective the restrictions of our present laws, national and international, to enable us to render the full measure of aid to Great Britain and other democracies to enable them to win the present war without restriction or restraint. If the American people want to do this, and fully realize the purport of such action, well and good, Mr. President; but I want the American people to know the import and the implications. I urge an end, Mr. President, to all discussions of "measures short of war," or assertions that the President could not or would not take warlike action under the authority delegated by this bill.

If the safety and security of our country and its institutions is dependent on the complete defeat of Germany and her associates, then, Mr. President, I am ready—God forgiving me—to cast my vote for full and complete participation in this foreign war. But I am not ready to admit that the situation exists, or is in reasonable contemplation, which would require such action.

It is unnecessary, Mr. President, for Senators on this floor or elsewhere to hold up to our resentful eyes the diabolical manifestation of nazi-ism and all that it represents. Senators like my good friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], with his remarkable oratorical power, may paint as lurid a picture of Hitlerism and its atrocities as it is possible to paint. I say to you, Mr. President, and to him, that to every horror he can express I can add additional horror, and every resentful emotion which he can feel I can feel as deeply or even more deeply. For every abhorrence which he can express of the methods of the aggressor, I feel and profess an even deeper abhorrence. For every threat, near or remote, which he can envision to American institutions and freedoms, I can envision still additional dangers for my country. My country's welfare is first, and by every yardstick of value paramount in my thinking, and American safety and security are and will continue to be my first concern.

The pending measure, Mr. President, intends to remove and does remove the restraints and restrictions of existing law from the aid which many men and women feel must immediately be given to the democracies of Europe. Let me ask the gentlemen who persist in arguing that it contains no such provisions or purpose or delegation of plenary power, if it does not do so, why in the name of all that is reasonable and fair and candid is it necessary to pass such a measure?

They gather around this orphan child of a proposed bill, whose fatherhood the Secretary of State disclaims, the pater- nity of which the Secretary of the Treas-

ury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy all refuse to acknowledge; these proponents, I repeat, gather around this misshapen foundling child and steadfastly refuse any correction by way of amendment to assuage or mitigate the fears of the people as to its purposes and the functions which could be exercised under it.

There are those who say that the bill does not permit sending merchant ships into belligerent trade. They say that the bill permits no such thing, but when we propose an amendment to make their assurances doubly sure we are met by a chorus of "No! No! No!" When we tell them that to permit the transfer of our shipping might envision the use of convoys, they point to the House amendment, which they say is ineffective; but when an amendment is offered to make it stronger and more clear there is again the chorus of "No! No! No!" When we say that the bill before us would permit the President to give away the component parts of our Navy they assert that no such authority exists in the bill, and that even if it does exist it would not be exercised; but when we offer an amendment to make sure of this interpretation again arises the mighty chorus of "No! No! No!"

When we say that the phrase "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law" in effect repeals and makes ineffective any existing statute interfering with the exercise of the authorities conferred, the proponents of the bill say that the phrase is an entirely innocuous one, used only for the repeal of acts or parts of acts in conflict with the new statute; but when we suggest that the phrase be stricken out and a new paragraph be substituted, again there arises that chorus of "No; no; no."

The proponents of the bill state that there is no authority in it which would permit sending our planes and our Navy beyond the Western Hemisphere; but when we offer an amendment to prohibit such action they say, "That amendment cannot interfere with the President's constitutional rights. He has the right as Commander in Chief to do it, and you cannot have any such amendment as that." Then, when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] offers an amendment which says that nothing in the bill shall be construed to authorize any additional right to send these instrumentalities beyond the Western Hemisphere, again we have that mighty chorus of "No; no; no; no. There is no such authority in the bill; no such authority is intended to be used; but we do not want you to put it in the bill."

So, Mr. President, every suggestion or assertion that unneeded and dangerous authorities are delegated by this bill is met by a steadfast refusal to amend or correct or make certain that the interpretation of these favored ones is the correct one, and is met by these modern Roderick Dhurs with the repetition of Scott's couplet:

Come one, come all! This rock shall fly
From its firm base as soon as I.

"No, no, no; we are not going to use the powers. We have not delegated any powers. If we have delegated them, they are not to be used." But when we offer an amendment there is not one that will be accepted. Not one will be accepted—"No, no, no."

But, oh, with what pride these gentlemen point to the restriction contained in the House amendment. You know, over there our Democratic shock troops were down in the mess hall, and an unsportsmanlike Republican [Mr. DIRKSEN] offered an amendment that the powers conferred by the bill could be repealed by concurrent resolution; and we poor Democrats, not expecting such unsportsmanlike conduct, found, when we came back, that it had been adopted as part of the bill.

Our legislative Roderick Dhus said, "Leave it there. It is absolutely useless, absolutely worthless, has no effect whatever. You cannot repeal an act of the Congress of the United States by a concurrent resolution which deprives the President of the opportunity of veto and then have it passed by a two-thirds vote." So our legislative wizards changed the phraseology, and now they tell us that that corrects the situation, that it is all right to pass a law with a condition precedent, and to determine the time of its going into effect. That is correct; I agree with that. They say it is proper to pass a law with a condition subsequent which will terminate the delegated authority; and I agree with them.

Oh, I marvel at my temerity at taking issue with these constitutional lawyers; but I do take issue with them, and I say now, as I stated in the committee, that when we are making a condition subsequent an unlawful act, attempting to use legislative authority and powers which the Constitution of the United States prohibits, I do not intend by my vote, in this hall or at any other place, to join in establishing a precedent under which every law we can pass can carry a provision that "this law may be repealed by a concurrent resolution," thus depriving a coordinate branch of the Government of its constitutional right to participate in legislative processes. Yet that is the one thing which gentlemen say secures and retains in the Congress a full measure of control over the delegated authority which we say we have not delegated, and even if we have, that it will not be used.

Mr. President, the bill before us delegates to the President authorities, obligations, and duties which are ours under the Constitution of the United States. Of course it does not delegate constitutional powers which already belong to the President! Of course it does not attempt to destroy our constitutional security under the Bill of Rights! Of course, it does not create powers in the Executive which do not now exist under Federal authority, excepting such delegated authority as now is existent in us as the legislative branch of our Government, and with the expectation and purpose that the authorities so delegated shall be used. Otherwise the measure has no purpose, no right to occupy a moment's time of the United States

Congress. There is aid contemplated which cannot be given under existing law.

There is difference of opinion as to what could be spared from our own defense needs. This bill is designed to place the whole decision in the hands of the President of the United States. Of course, provision is made for certain consultative action, but it need be neither binding nor controlling.

Senators ask, "Where else would you place such power, if not in the hands of the President?" My answer is that the power is in the Congress now; and if 't is the will of the people through the Congress to make changes in existing law, to make possible greater aid to Great Britain than can be given under existing statutes, we, as the Congress, have the right and duty to exercise our constitutional obligations, and I, for one, am not ready to shirk that obligation in its fullest exercise.

I want to defend America. Our own defenses are still inadequate, and production is behind schedule. Our own defenses have been depleted by the aid already given. They will be further depleted by the aid contemplated in this bill. What can we spare? I do not know. But I am willing through the agencies of the two branches of the Congress to learn from the experts who do know, and take such action as is indicated. I do know that every defense article diverted from our tremendous needs diminishes by so much the power of our armament, and delays by so much the preparedness in naval and military strength for which we are expending billions of our peoples' money. I know there is a risk that possibly attack might come before we could make as complete preparations as we might wish to do, but in that connection may I say to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and to the other gentlemen who are willing to accept all the implications of war right now, that he is naive indeed who does not know that if, as the President has said, we are not to acquiesce in any peace which is not imposed on the Axis Powers, those powers must be beaten to a position where a peace can be forced and imposed on them. If we are to spend billions of dollars in the manufacture of articles for Great Britain's use, this action will be useless unless we see that the articles reach them. If we see that the articles reach them, we must protect the ships bearing the articles from attack and loss. If we do this, we are in the war, without restrictions or limitations, and we must aid in its prosecution to an imposed peace in a way, as our President has said, to insure a policy which will secure the four freedoms everywhere in the world. Then we must make the peace negotiations and the settlements effective by restoring every vanquished country and every raped country in Europe and Asia to its former position. We must force Germany to restore Czechoslovakia, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Austria, Rumania, Poland, and to restore Poland we must compel the Russian bear to disgorge the portion of Poland which he swallowed in the dismemberment. We must compel the Soviet Union to restore the inde-

pendent Finland which existed before the unjustified attack upon her and compel the Soviet Union to give up Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, and the portions of the Balkan region which she has absorbed.

Are these Senators ready to carry the implications of war and the progress of war to this sort of a victory culmination, and in addition compel Japan to consent to the reestablishment of an independent and reconstructed China?

If we are not to acquiesce in a peace imposed by or negotiated with the dictators, then we must be ready to go into the war with every resource which the United States of America possesses, and disabuse our minds and our thinking of any false supposition that we can avoid the use of American military and naval strength and American power to the utmost limit of which it is capable to force Germany, Japan, Italy, and the Soviet Republic to accept our terms, and we must also be realistic enough to have before us at all times the possibility not only of defeat ourselves, but the possibility that before American resources can be marshaled for immediate aid, Great Britain, Greece, China, and others may be brought to their knees and compelled to negotiate a separate peace.

Mr. President, it was not so long ago that Great Britain found herself deserted by Belgium, and only by action little short of a miracle was she able to save the major portion of her army, losing almost completely its equipment and matériel. It was but a short time ago that Great Britain found herself abandoned by her ally, the Republic of France—the France that was supposed to have the finest army in the world, and yet was compelled to accept the domination and occupation of the German military might, and may within the next few days be compelled to turn over to Germany the remnant of her fleet. Within the last few hours Great Britain has found herself compelled to readjust her war preparations because of the unexpected abandonment of its former position of support by the Turkish Empire.

The gentlemen who are willing to accept war now and its implications, Mr. President, must be willing to accept the dangers of defeat as well as the responsibilities of victory and the imposition of a policy of world-wide guaranty of the four great freedoms for all nations. For one, Mr. President, I am convinced, from the best evidence we can secure, that our own hemispheric defense needs are so inadequate that only by the utmost exertion and use of all our resources and ingenuity can we prepare for the future. I know, and every other Member of the Senate knows, that we are not in a position to meet any such threat now nor in the very near future. Every proponent of the bill states that its purpose is to aid our defense by buying time to prepare. They want to divert the meager war resources which we now have and the production capacity of America to immediate effective aid to Great Britain, even if, as most of them admit, it means immediate war.

I am not ready to consent to this diversion of our defense needs, Mr. President, unless there is no other way in

which we can prepare for attack. I am not ready to gamble all the future security of America on this exceedingly tenuous hope that our assistance will be timely enough to turn the tide, and there is not a man in Great Britain or in America who has dared to assert that such assistance as can be rendered in the near future, even if this bill is enacted, could give any effective assurance of British victory.

Mr. President, I am ready to perform my constitutional duty and obligation and cast my vote for entrance into this war if there is no other reasonable way or method by which to support and defend America and her institutions, but I want the Members of the Congress to meet the issue squarely and honorably, and I cannot vote to pass any measure which will permit the President of the United States, or any man under Almighty God's heaven to sit in the international poker game of power politics and stake, at his discretion, by his judgment of the value of each gambled play, all the resources of the United States of America and the life, the liberty, the happiness, the security, and perhaps the blood of her citizens. As a Member of Congress I am ready to vote a state of war for my country, if and when it becomes absolutely necessary, but I am not willing to delegate the authority to commit acts of war to any man who breathes the breath of life, however wise, patriotic, and sincere he may be. To quote from an eminent public servant:

No good man should want such authority, and no evil man should be entrusted with it.

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

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

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

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Murray
Aiken	George	Norris
Austin	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gillette	Overton
Ball	Glass	Pepper
Bankhead	Green	Radcliffe
Barbour	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Gurney	Russell
Bilbo	Harrison	Schwartz
Bone	Hatch	Sheppard
Brewster	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Herring	Smathers
Brooks	Hill	Stewart
Brown	Holman	Taft
Bulow	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	La Follette	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Byrnes	Lee	Tunnell
Capper	Lodge	Tydings
Caraway	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chandler	McCarran	Van Nuys
Chavez	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wheeler
Connally	Maloney	White
Danaher	Mead	Wiley
Davis	Miller	Willis
Downey	Murdock	

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I respectfully request that I be allowed to proceed to the conclusion of my formal statement without interruption for the sake of continuity and for the sake of saving time. At the conclusion of my

remarks I shall be very happy to be interrogated.

Mr. President, this extreme legislation which, as has been truly said, "leads to momentous conclusions which inevitably affect the peace, the security, and the free institutions of the United States for generations to come," has no doubt been of tremendous and consuming concern, not only to the Members of this body, but to the loyal citizens of our entire Nation. I am no exception.

I am grateful beyond words for the high honor and the privilege my form of Government and the people of my State have given me—have allowed me—to speak on the question of the passage or rejection of this historic bill, H. R. 1776.

I am opposed to the bill because:

I believe that it is un-American.

I believe that it is not only a step, but a leap toward dictatorship.

I believe that it grants powers which, when placed in the hands of one man, will not only involve us ultimately in a foreign war, but will make the Chief Executive of the United States the overall, all-out director of all the foreign wars which do now, or will, in the near future dissipate and destroy the resources and the liberties of men.

Other Senators in their debate have quoted other men and at the outset I wish to quote the sentiments expressed by another:

We date the words that are to follow. The moment is mid-January of the one hundred and fifty-second American year. We do this for the reason that by the time they are printed the debate may be closed, which would mean that freedom of expression could be no longer defended. On the other hand, we owe it to what we believe, and to the millions who have believed it with us, to hold our position at least until dark.

We speak here of neither war nor peace.

As we write, the news is running that the President has asked the Congress of the United States to abdicate. In the news it is worded softly. The headline in the New York Times reads: "Bill gives President unlimited power to lend war equipment and resources." A triumph of ingenious understatement. The formal title of the bill is softer still. It reads: "A bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes."

Then we look at the bill. Remember, it is the President's own bill. It is what he wants. Therefore it is the authentic revelation of his mind. Taking it from the bill, this is what he wants:

Power in his own discretion, on his own terms, and as he may see fit to conduct undeclared war anywhere in the world.

Power in his own discretion to make friends or enemies of other nations.

Power in his own discretion to employ the total resources of the country to such ends.

Power in his own discretion to make military alliances with other governments; and to lend, lease, or give to other governments any of the military resources of the United States, nothing excepted save manpower, and that only by not being specifically mentioned.

Power to make by edict such laws as he may deem necessary in order to carry out his intentions.

Power to command money in any amount.

Power himself to delegate any or all of that power to whom he likes.

Significantly, and for the first time in the 8-year history of progressive acts of surrender on the part of Congress, there was in this bill no limit of time. It might be forever.

These are the standard powers of a dictator.

There is always the saying that what the Congress gives it can take back. This is to forget, first, that it is the nature of power to entrench and ramify itself; secondly, that the hook with which the executive principle draws tame Leviathan out has a barb. It is much easier for Congress to delegate power than to take it back. To delegate it requires but a bare majority. To get it back, if the President is unwilling to give it up, requires a two-thirds vote.

We do not suppose that the bill will be enacted in the original form. Undoubtedly, Congress will at least give it a time limit. But nothing that the Congress may write into it or out of it, reminiscent of its equal power, can erase the original writing or change its meaning.

In the last great temple of freedom the image of absolute government has been unveiled, and prepared multitudes have cried, Huzza! To be saved from the scourge of the totalitarian principle sinful democracy now must embrace the anointed likeness of it. As a brazen serpent it has been held out to the people by their leader; and among those who have said, "Behold, this will save us," are many who only a little while before were afraid of this very thing, foreseeing that it might happen, and exhorted others to harden their minds against it.

History may say the people were carried away by one of the great leaders of modern times, one who knew how to play upon their fears and passions as upon strings. It is not so simple. They were a believing people. They believed words.

In his message to Congress on the state of the Nation, January 6, declaring it to be the policy of the American Government to defend freedom and democracy everywhere in the world, the President said:

"In the recent national election there was no substantial difference between the two great political parties in respect to that policy. No issue was fought out on this line before the American electorate."

Why not? Because during the campaign both parties and both candidates held rigidly to the formula of aid to the democracies by "measures short of war." The people believed these words. Literally, they believed them.

Immediately after the election, the President jettisoned that formula for what it was—a slogan. Never after he had been reelected did he use it again.

During the campaign these were the words of the President:

"We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack. * * * The basic purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war."

Suppose he had said then:

"If I am reelected we are going to go all out for England. If I am reelected I shall demand that the Congress delegate to me the power, in my own discretion, to conduct undeclared American war anywhere in the world in defense of the democracies, and to employ for that purpose any weapons, munitions, aircraft, vessels, commodities, and facilities whatever; and power, moreover, in my own discretion to make such laws as may be necessary. And then, my friends, we need not waste your time and my time debating whether or not to repeal the neutrality law or the Johnson Act. Let Congress send them out to be framed and keep them."

If he had said these things—if he had told the people what he meant to do—would there have been no issue on this line before the American electorate?

We did not believe it could be done to the American people; and we were wrong. We did not believe they could be moved by suggestion to involve their birthright in this contradiction. The President tells them that America must put its strength forth to save Great Britain, to save China, to defend

democracy of all kinds everywhere in the world, and to destroy out of it forever the principle of aggression, because, for one reason, "In times like these it is immature—and incidentally untrue—for anybody to brag that an unprepared America, single-handed, and with one hand tied behind its back, can hold off the whole world." All in one speech.

The figure of a country with one hand tied behind its back is obviously a reference to the manner in which the parliamentary principle—namely, the Congress—handicaps a ruler. The dictator, with no Congress to worry about, has both hands free. And that is what the President wants.

Whither now, America?

To save yourself you must save the world. To this you have been persuaded. That road, whatever else you may make of it, is the totalitarian road, straight and fast at first, then more and more perilous to the end of the pavement. There is no way back but through futility, confusion, and disaster. There is no going on but with the fantasy to become moral emperor of the whole world.

Mr. President, those were not my words, but the quoted words of an editor appearing in the Saturday Evening Post, February 15, 1941.

It has been truthfully said that:

The only lesson we learn from experience is that we never learn from experience.

People's memories are short, and they forget easily and rapidly the painful mistakes they have made in the past. That is why history repeats itself.

That is why everyone should reread history, particularly the history of the past 25 years, for the past World War contained so many parallels to today's situation that one is shocked.

During the debate I have heard mention on the floor of the Senate of miracles.

If I could perform a miracle in this hour, I would wish to fly and write in great neon lights that could be seen by every citizen day and night across this fair country a warning in the sky. It would be this:

November 1916: A powerful Democratic President reelected on the slogan "He kept us out of war."

November 1940: A powerful President reelected on his pledge that the country would not be involved in foreign war.

January 1917: The reelected President sending to Europe his personal friend, his own personal representative, Colonel House, to talk secretly with the rulers of the British Empire.

January 1941: The reelected President sending to Europe his own personal friend, his own personal representative, Harry Hopkins, to talk secretly with the rulers of the British Empire.

January 1917: The powerful President who said, as he asked Congress for unusual powers:

I am not proposing or contemplating war or any steps that may lead to it. I merely request that you will accord me the authority to safeguard in practice the rights of a great people who are at peace.

January 1941: A powerful President who said, as he asked Congress for unusual power:

To change a whole nation from a basis of peacetime production of implements of peace to a basis of wartime production of implements of war is no small task.

February 1941: That powerful President presenting his own lease-lend bill,

which gives complete authority to him alone to choose our enemies or name our friends, to distribute to the four corners of the earth, according to his sole discretion, the mechanism, the properties, the commodities, and the implements of our entire national defense.

April 1917: War!

April 1941: A question mark hanging high in the sky.

That is what I would do if I could perform a miracle.

How short are our memories; but, somehow, I remember. When on the floor of the Senate I heard the eloquent voice of a Senator shouting, "We will fight," it answered a question that had been in my mind for years. For 23 years I had wondered how that would sound in the Senate Chamber.

On my way to France, back in 1917, I started to wonder how that would sound. I finally heard it. I also heard the words of men in loud denunciation of Hitler. They were going to bring him to his knees, crush him into the ground.

I subscribe to that, if only the men who say they want to do it could just participate in actually doing it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The occupants of the galleries will be in order. There are many people outside, waiting for their places; and those who desire to break the rules of the Senate may retire.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, may I proceed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to no man in my hatred of the aggressor. The record of my life will prove that I have never been an appeaser; but I say to you that the true salt of statesmanship has always been, and now is, the ability to see things as they are.

I often wondered what Senators used to say in this Chamber 24 years ago about the Kaiser. Then I was not old enough to vote, so I had nothing to do with sending anyone here; but those who were here had all to do with ending me across the sea. There must have been some terrific debates then about the Kaiser—the brute, the monster, the unspeakable Hun. I remember the posters, too—the baby on the bayonet, the great-booted, hob-nailed monster tramping down little children, cutting off their hands, burning cities, tramping down civilization. Who said that? Everybody said it. Preachers, priests, and rabbis preached it. Teachers taught it. Singers sang it. Artists painted it. Printers printed it. Orators spoke it. The Government said it. It was war. It was war and war's propaganda.

Then the Germans were not the Nazis. They were the unspeakable Huns—mean, mad, and vicious.

The other people were our friends. As a young soldier in Europe I remember meeting them for the first time—the blue-coated poilu of France, the black Senegalese, the Moroccan soldiers of their colonies, the British, the Canadians, the Australians, the Scotchman in his kilts, the boy from Belgium—yes, and the lad from Italy, too. They were our friends.

Why were we friends? We owed no allegiance to the same flag. We did not speak the same tongue. Our Government said we were friends, and we were. We were going to make the world safe for democracy everywhere, and we were meeting together and training together and drilling together to meet the monster, the unspeakable Hun.

Finally, some of us met him personally. We did not meet a madman. We did not meet a monster. We met another fellow much like we were. He had the same human emotions. He was born of the same human flesh of which we were born. He did not want to die any more than we wanted to die; and he cried when he was hurt, just as we cried when we were hurt.

Why was he there? Because he came from another government, a government in which one man had all power, the kind of government that always sends boys to war; and his government sent him there, too.

We whipped him. Then came the armistice. Hallelujah! Peace on earth. Fat men ran in the streets, shouting and throwing confetti. Factory whistles blew. Church bells rang. The parades started. Our President spoke and said, "Everything America has fought for has been accomplished." We were glad. Then came the Treaty of Versailles, a treaty at the end of the war fought to end all wars.

For 23 years now we have paraded in America, boasting that we fought a good fight, that we gave a good account of ourselves. We had sacrificed 130,000 young lives on Europe's age-old altar of war. We had thousands of men wounded—many of them beyond repair—to settle another of Europe's wars and make the world safe for democracy. We had disturbed our entire economy.

Mr. President, what crimes have been committed in the name of democracy. What tragedies have been enacted under the guise of the greater good for the greater number.

There was a movement for a while away from centralized power. The common man had made advances away from despots and dynasties and kings and royal families and reigning houses, and we, the freest nation of common men on earth, went into the war to make the world safe for democracy, and the common man, Mr. President, was honored for a while.

So far as I know, not a single nation has erected or pays tribute to a single outstanding leader of the last war, but they have pretended to keep alive the appreciation of whom?—their unknown soldier—while they have returned not to the common men but to the dictators and the centralizing of the power. And here we are again in the parade, getting ready to participate again in their wars, and they are at it again over there.

Is this our war?

Mr. President, I want to base everything I say on the floor of the Senate in this debate on the fact that this is not our war.

I want to see England win. I feel that it would be to the best interests of America that she should be victorious. But, Mr. President, she did not do a very good

job with her victory the last time. I should like to see her have a chance to try it again. I do not want Hitler to win. I want England to win.

I wish somehow I could look out into the future and know that I am right in that.

Apparently a majority of the Senate does not see eye to eye with me on this bill. Therefore I have a greater responsibility than ever to speak, for when you stifle or stop the voice of a minority view you kill all hope of democracy, you destroy the representative form of government. The man who attempts to belittle or smear, condemn, or control a minority voice is an enemy of representative government as truly as the aggressors who today trample men down with their war machines.

I heard a distinguished Senator in a magnificent address to the Senate say:

During the World War, before the entry of the United States, President Wilson advanced the idea of a peace without victory.

That was the President's view—my President's view, our President's view—under whose command 130,000 boys sacrificed their lives. I respected him and I respect his memory.

The Senator said that my President advanced the idea that it would be better to have a peace without victory. Then, Mr. President, why, may I ask, all the condemnation now of men who ask for peace without victory?

I have heard asked on the floor of the Senate, "What would I do if we should not pass this bill?" I would continue to aid England. Why? Because I think she is fighting my war? No. This is not our war. England fights for her own life, and she is having a tough job because of the way she handled things after we helped her win the last war. And remember, Mr. President, not so very long ago she was promising to help everybody when she was herself not adequately prepared. She was encouraging people to fight and to resist only to find that she had not herself prepared adequately to help them or sufficiently prepared to guarantee her own safety.

Again, I say, the only thing we apparently learn from experience is that we learn nothing from experience.

Why would I aid England, you ask?

First, because I think it would be better for us if she should win, but I do not subscribe to any fear propaganda that we will fall if she falls. Second, because it is the spirit and the heart of America to reach out and help all those, whether they be Jew or gentile, Catholic or Protestant, Greek or British or Chinese, when they are, unfortunately, under attack.

How would I help them? By giving them whatever we could spare out of our present production from now on—short of war—and not dissipate another ounce of the already inadequate defense of America.

I want it quite definitely known that while I am for helping them I am for America first.

My ancestors, Mr. President, were largely British. The call to go back into the Old World 24 years ago to save it for our ideals reached deep into my home.

When men say, "We'll fight for England," my answer is: I have already done that. My older brother, with whom I volunteered and enlisted in 1917, lies buried in his uniform of the United States Marines in England—a sacrifice 24 years ago. My younger brother also served, a volunteer in the United States Marines, and my father was overseas in the Y. M. C. A. service as well.

Mr. President, the Brooks family responded with its all to the call of the President of the United States to defend England and France and democracy. We contributed a father and three sons to that cause.

No one can want to keep democracy alive more than I do. But we differ, apparently, on what our responsibility is to the future of liberty and how far it shall be extended.

What would I do?

I would quit cringing in my boots as a coward and stop telling the world I was afraid of Hitler. I would make this Nation so strong that Hitler would never send a boat headed this way, or I would prepare to sink his ships as fast as they came.

May I remind the Senate that Mr. Hitler, whom so many seem to fear, took command of Germany in 1933, the same year the present administration took command of America; and Hitler took over only a totally bankrupt, demoralized, confused, and distracted people; and when I hear Senators in the United States Senate standing and cringing and saying, "Oh, my; Hitler is going to conquer the world," I wonder how they can boast of their service during the last 10 years.

Hitler announced in 1935, in his speech to the German Reichstag, which he printed and published and sent to the world, that he would no longer abide by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles; that he was going to rearm Germany and demand its return to a place in the sun. That was a warning—a tragic warning—to France and England and Belgium and to the United States.

Somebody has failed somewhere, Mr. President.

May I quote an amazing statement of a distinguished Senator in the present debate on this floor?

Mr. President, there has never been a time under the sovereignty of Napoleon or Charlemagne or anybody else when the whole of the continent of Europe has been integrated into a single economy, when one part has been designated as the part to furnish the food and another the manufactured commodities, one to perform the labor and another to render the skilled service; the whole economy being built around the superior skill and technical ability of the German nation and its superior industrial organization.

What an admission from a Senator of the United States.

What would I do if we should not pass this bill?

I would make democracy work. I would build her defenses so strong that if there should be a challenge to this order, the challenge would fail and this order would live. I would not give it up

or diminish my forces by spreading them across the earth.

That is what I would do.

How would I do it?

I would encourage the American people, under the leadership of our tremendously powerful President, to turn to and build—build to defy the world and defeat any aggressors who might challenge my form of civilization on this hemisphere.

You say, "We will fight."

I insist that we might better say here on this floor, "Our boys will fight."

Mr. President, I no longer have any illusions about the glamor or romance or fun of war. There is no glamor, romance, or fun for the men who fight.

The glamor of war is for lady radio speakers and their men counterparts, who wage war by means of radio talks and at dinner parties.

The romance of war is in knitting sweaters and in collecting bundles for other people to need.

The fun of war is far behind the lines. For the men who do the fighting and have nothing to say about the declaration of war, there is only hardship, suffering, and death.

If the men who cause or declare war had to fight, there would be much less war in the world. I say America will fight to defend America in this hemisphere.

I have heard about promises. I made a promise, too. I promised to help keep America out of foreign wars, and so did you; and our people sent us here to do that job.

Mr. President, we represent America.

America—thank God—is the amalgamation of all the creeds and colors and nationalities known to men, with a creative genius that comes from a free spirit, with a restless, heaving energy that has produced the civilization that we enjoy—and we can defend it. We need planes. I say to you that a nation that can turn out millions of automobiles can turn out millions of airplanes. Our boys have the same fighting heart as our ancestors, and they will fly planes like meteors and dive them like demons if you give them the training and equipment to defend America.

If we can make a million trucks, we can build a million tanks that will dash and spit fire as fire has never been spat in history—and they will be spitting fire in the name of liberty on this hemisphere. But, Senators, that spirit will die, too, if you put it under a lash.

What would I do if we did not pass this bill?

I would build confidence in America. I would stop preaching fear. I would face the future, proud and unafraid. I would produce as fast as America can produce; and whatever the fighting men in our forces on land, sea, and air told us we could spare I would make available to do what America has always done—help unfortunate people protect themselves.

But, Mr. President, I cannot wipe out hate in Europe, and you cannot wipe out hate in Europe.

I heard a distinguished Senator on this floor say, in discussing methods of peace:

But if it be said that the Treaty of Versailles was a dictated peace, it is equally true that the treaty which terminated the Franco-Prussian War, out of which it was said the World War grew, was also a dictated peace.

Mr. President, that statement is tragically correct.

After the Franco-Prussian War, Bismarck went into the king's palace at Versailles and there, in the grand ballroom called the Hall of Mirrors, made France sign over Alsace-Lorraine. So, after we had sacrificed the lives of 130,000 men, wounded many, many thousands more, disturbed our whole economy, and helped Britain and France win their war, they made Germany come back into the same grand ballroom, at Versailles—the Hall of Mirrors—and sign back Alsace-Lorraine.

Now, 22 years later, Hitler has again conquered France, and he has taken to Germany the famous boxcar in which the armistice was signed 22 years ago. Twenty years from now, if they have good luck, and they raise a good crop of boys, and teach them enough hate, they will go back and get their boxcar, and we shall be invited to help save democracy again in Europe.

You cannot stop this thing over there. Why destroy democracy here?

Mr. President, some persons do not seem to understand. This is a continuous fight over there. It may last forever. You cannot stop it. Neither can I. But if we work together, we can save civilization here.

Senators who vote for this war bill—I do not challenge their motives—but I make this prediction—will vote to change the future course of free men in America. We know what our traditional American course has been. It has given us the highest standard of living with the greatest liberty and the greatest joy ever known to men.

What would I do if we should not pass this bill?

I would cling to the ideals that made America great. I would keep the powers of the Government divided as they were intended to be divided under the Constitution, under which we became the leading nation in the world.

I do not regard it as the responsibility of the United States of America to police the world now or tomorrow. I regard our form of government as a sacred heritage. If we keep it, we are now and we can continue to be the hope of the human race. I would save it here. That is what I would do.

Seventeen hundred and seventy-six is the year that marked the beginning of this kind of government; 1776 is the number of the bill that may see its end.

This bill is a war bill. It asks for the same powers that would be asked for if we were actually fighting, shooting, marching, defending our own shores.

May I requote the words of the Chief Executive, whose bill this is, who asks for this unusual power? I quote from the address of the President to the Seventy-seventh Congress:

In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded

upon four essential freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression * * * everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way * * * everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want * * * everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear * * * which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millenium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation.

That language, in connection with his further statement—"To change a whole Nation from a basis of peacetime production to a basis of wartime production of implements of war is no small task"—gives a proper insight into the purpose of this bill.

This, then, is the authority for the complete wartime production of the implements of war by which he is going out to guarantee the freedoms of all people everywhere in the world.

I have heard distinguished Senators on the floor of the Senate talking about crushing Hitler and grinding him into the ground, and I wonder if they have honestly translated to the people of America what this means.

This means arming to the teeth; giving one man complete and full authority to lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of our military resources; to engage in every present or possible conflict in the whole world if he believes that it is for the best interests of America to do it.

The minute he proposes to lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of 50 more ships, 50 more airplanes, 50 more tanks, 50 more cannon, this resourceful Chief Executive is certainly going to ask them how they are getting along with their war. And we are going to contribute to and become thereby involved in their war.

Not only that, but the minute that the Chief Executive makes a suggestion prior to, or as a condition precedent to the loaning, leasing, or giving of our implements of our national defense, and that suggestion is followed, we start then to be responsible for the final outcome. And there is no turning back until the end of the war.

When this power is voted to one man, I predict today that it will—sooner than we expect—involve us in active, personal, fighting participation in war; and you cannot shirk your responsibility by turning over this authority to any one man. The blood of the American boys will be on your hands whether they wear khaki, forest green, or navy blue.

Mr. President, this is a war bill, with war powers, with the deliberate intention to becoming involved in other people's wars.

We have heard of pledges. I have a pledge to keep also. It is no accident that I am privileged to speak as one of the Senators of a great State. I made a pledge to the people of my State not to vote to send their sons to die in another foreign war. We do not need any declaration of war. All we need to do is carry out the intended provisions of this bill and we will be in the wars. I want to

keep my pledge to them now, I intend to do so, and so I will vote "No" on this bill.

Earlier I said the people believed words that were spoken by their officials. The other day, as reported in the Washington Post, Secretary of Commerce Jones said while testifying before a House committee:

We're in the war; at least we're nearly in the war. We're preparing for it; when you do that, you've got to throw money away.

And the Chief Executive said, according to that same report:

To say that the United States is "nearly in the war" is to mouth a lot of words that don't mean anything.

But they do mean something in the light of this war bill, in the light of these war powers, in the light of the statement that we are going to guarantee liberties of men all over the world, and, in the light of the statements that the Congress must delegate this power to lend, lease, or otherwise dispose of any article of our Army, Navy, or air force, to any nation, anywhere for any consideration that the Chief Executive personally decides sufficient for the welfare and defense of our country.

I should like to make myself perfectly clear. I despise dictators, whether it be Hitler, riding with his war machine across Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, France, and attacking England, or whether it be Mussolini, bombing poor, helpless Ethiopians, or Stalin, crushing helpless Finland.

Much as I dislike to see the ruthless dictatorships in Russia, Italy, and Germany, I would hate more than ever to establish one here in trying to right the wrongs imposed by dictators everywhere in the world, and I cannot and will not vote for legislation that takes this broad leap toward dictatorship or this double-time march toward becoming involved in foreign wars.

May I remind you, Mr. President, that Mr. Mussolini started out as a premier in 1922. He asked the Parliament to give him extreme and unusual powers to face an emergency, and he declared emergency after emergency, and continued to fill the departments of his government with his own appointees until by 1927 he finally informed the Chamber of Deputies that he did not see how he could relinquish his present position as dictator for another 10 or 15 years.

Thus we see the road that leads to dictatorship.

May I remind the Senate that Hitler started out in January 1933 as Chancellor, and in March of the same year, when his party government had won by only 52 percent of the popular vote, he appeared before the newly elected Reichstag and demanded unusual powers for 4 years for their emergency, which finally resulted in his having all powers except the right to diminish the rights of the President or abolish the Reichstag as an institution. A series of emergencies followed there also, and he appointed to the various positions of government men of his sole selection, and thus we find a road—not just a leap—to permanent dictatorship.

To say that Congress reserves the right to declare war and appropriate the money is of little consolation, for once we start helping the nations of the earth under this bill, we will soon become so involved that there will be no turning back; and once we authorize the Chief Executive, under his sole discretion, to lease, lend, or give away parts of the Navy and defense articles, and he asks for further money in the name of so-called national defense, a man who declines to give it would probably be burned in effigy.

Mr. President, near the close of the historic Constitutional Convention, when those wise men, knowing the tyranny and the oppression that always accompany centralized power, were signing their names to the Constitution of the United States—which, by the way, created this body in which you and I are privileged to serve—old Dr. Franklin, then more than 80 years old, made this prophetic remark:

In these sentiments, sir, I agree to this Constitution with all its faults, if they are such; because I think a general government necessary for us, and there is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered; and believe further that this is likely to be well administered for a course of years and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupt as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other.

I had hoped that prediction would never come true within my lifetime. Seventeen hundred and seventy-six is a sacred number in the minds of those who love America. It denotes its beginning. That same number is at the head of this bill, and this bill, if enacted into law, may prove to be the final step toward despotic control of our people.

I have heard men say that Britain is fighting for her life and that, if she goes down, the Germans, the Nazis, Hitler will have her Navy.

I would reply to those who make that statement, "You desecrate the courage of the heroic seamen of Britain."

The British have boasted for a long time that the sun never sets upon their Empire, and that their Navy rules the waves. I thought they had a tradition that captains go down with their ships. I cannot believe they would surrender their Navy to the enemies of liberty and leave Canada and Australia and India and the 450,000,000 people who have helped contribute to and maintain that Navy at the mercy of the wolves.

I say to Senators that if they believe the British would surrender their Navy, it would be better for us if we quit them now. If England, after what we did for her in her last war and have done so far in this, would surrender her Navy to be used against us, we would surely find the planes we have sent them and the ships we have sent them being used against us as well.

I have too great a respect for the courage of the British soldier and seaman to contemplate that sort of cowardly surrender. I deny that that will happen.

I believe that England's survival will be tremendously beneficial to America and to liberty-loving people everywhere; and I want to pay my tribute to the dogged, determined heroism of the Brit-

ish people. England is fighting for her life, and a heroic fight she is making. God grant that she may win.

I have heard it said also on the floor of the Senate that if she falls her islands will be in the hands of the Nazis; her securities in South America will be in the hands of the Nazis; but, strangely enough, I have not heard one suggestion advanced, either through her agents or by a single proponent of the pending bill, that she turn over her islands or her securities in escrow to us, while we pour out our poor taxpayers' money to pay for her war.

What would I do?

I would help England if she would help herself and prove that she is interested in our future by turning over to us these islands and securities to hold until the end of the war, so that if she should fall, we then would move in our own right, not as an aggressor but as a defender of our own property and our own liberty.

I have heard Senators say that if England falls all the resources, all the abilities, all the energies of their conquered people will be used to build monster machines of war to conquer us.

Mr. President, do you honestly believe that they have lost all their love of freedom and would work finally to destroy freedom throughout the world. If we believe that to be true then we had better build our own defenses faster than ever here at home, and do it now.

I hear much talk about "fifth columnists." Are all the "fifth columnists" on one side? Do you think for 1 minute, Mr. President, that free men, now conquered, would not soon become "fifth columnists" against their conquerors? Do you think the fighting spirit for liberty is completely dead? Do you think that, because a country is overrun every former free man would dedicate his life to destroy freedom everywhere? How, then, can they ever be restored?

What would I do?

I would quit talking about crises and emergencies and settle down to the solemn fact that we in America must now devote our energies, as a matter of course, to production and the building of the defense materials so badly needed ourselves, and so badly needed by those we choose to help.

I would stop creating hysteria.

I would stop this talk of fear. I would stop enacting legislation by which delegated officials might harass our people. I would build America strong by the voluntary energies of free men. I would tell the people the truth.

I hear discussion, Mr. President, about England's crisis in 90 days, and that is why we must enact now this proposed legislation giving one man all power. What does the bill do that can change the situation in 90 days? What is there so secret about what this crisis may be? Why cannot we be told what it is? Perhaps from among our 131,000,000 still free people we can find an answer and a remedy.

What would I do if we should not pass this bill?

I would do what you said you would do before the last election:

We will not participate in foreign wars.

I would do what I promised to do before the election.

I will not vote to send American boys to die in foreign wars on foreign shores.

I would redeclare my faith in America—valiant America—standing unafraid. I would tell the world we constitute and represent the freedom-loving people of the earth, and that the blood of America consists of the blood of the nations of the earth. The blood of America belongs to America, and to her defense to the last drop; for the defense and safety of her people, the peace of her people, and for the ideals for which she stands.

I would be for America first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] as a substitute for the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 16, which has heretofore been stated by the clerk.

Mr. VANDENBERG. 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	Ellender	Murray
Aiken	George	Norris
Austin	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gillette	Overton
Ball	Glass	Pepper
Bankhead	Green	Radcliffe
Barbour	Guffey	Reed
Barkley	Gurney	Russell
Bilbo	Harrison	Schwartz
Bone	Hatch	Sheppard
Brewster	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Herring	Smathers
Brooks	Hill	Stewart
Brown	Holman	Taft
Bulow	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	La Follette	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Byrnes	Lee	Tunnell
Capper	Lodge	Tydings
Caraway	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chandler	McCarran	Van Nuys
Chavez	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wheeler
Connally	Maloney	White
Danaher	Mead	Wiley
Davis	Miller	Willis
Downey	Murdock	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, it has been the custom for Senators to ask not to be interrupted. In the few remarks I desire to make I trust Senators will treat me with that courtesy. I observed that when the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] was speaking that order was not followed. I trust the Chair will protect me, as I am for peace and do not want to become involved even in verbal combative arguments with any Senator. [Laughter.]

It is difficult for a common, ordinary man to follow the two distinguished Senators who have delivered excellent addresses this afternoon. I do not intend to compete with them in any way. However, I desire to make a few homely remarks.

Let me preface my remarks with the statement that I have no illusions that anything which I might say would in any way affect the final action on the pending

bill. The only reason I beg the indulgence of Senators at all is that I want the permanent record of our labors here to show to future generations the battle that some of us made to keep the United States out of another European War.

THIS ISSUE IS NOT A PARTISAN QUESTION

This is not a partisan question. This issue is not between the Democratic and Republican Parties. The decision of this issue will affect all Americans. This battle is a fundamental fight between a democratic philosophy and a totalitarian philosophy striking at the very foundation of our Republic. I want the record to show some of the reasons why I cannot follow the present leadership of my party in this so-called emergency.

Mr. President, to me it is not an easy task to break with the leaders of my party. I was reared in the Democratic faith, and in that faith I expect to die. Thomas Jefferson became the author of our Democratic faith when he penned the tenets of a new concept of government among men—the then new doctrine that all men were free, that all were capable of self-government, that all men stood equal before the law of that government, that the government which governs least is the government which governs best, and that the authority of all government is derived from the consent of the governed.

INTOLERANCE HAS NO PLACE IN A DEMOCRACY

In the democratic faith there is no place for intolerance. I hope that it is still possible in this democracy of ours, in this great country of ours, to disagree with our President and still be classed as a good American citizen. My conception of democracy does not permit me to conclude that it is proper for a President in his attempt to shape the destiny of this Republic to bring about disunion of our people and promote disturbing hatreds by giving his blessings to all those who agree with him and refer to them as patriots in a program for national unity and withhold his blessing from those who do not agree and class them as being members of an unholy alliance and indicate that they are not good citizens. As I see it, in a democracy the rights and privileges of a minority should not only be safeguarded but should receive consideration in working out democratic processes. In this democracy there will be no question of national unity if war should come to this country. Every citizen will then obey the order of our Commander in Chief and do his full duty in the winning of that war, but while at peace and at a time when our sovereignty is not being attacked by any foreign foe, it is entirely proper that men should differ in their opinions as to the best methods of remaining at peace, and it is entirely proper that such differences of opinion should be freely expressed.

The very essence of democracy is freedom of thought and freedom of expression and in it there is no place for intolerance. In walking down the democratic road there are certain signals that flash warnings of danger that ought not to be unheeded and that should cause us to stop, look, and listen. One of these danger signals is the centralization of

too much power in the hands of one man. The present Executive has requested and been given more power than was given to, or requested by, any other President. Our country has passed through many emergencies before—some real and some fancied—but the history of the last 8 years is unique in Executive requests and grants for more and more Executive power to deal with so-called emergencies.

Mr. President, the proponents of this measure seem to be alarmed over a little delay and are insisting upon hasty action and that the President must immediately have the power proposed to be granted in order to meet any emergencies that might arise. For several years I have heard a great deal about emergencies. At first I was much alarmed when Senate leaders would rise on this floor and proclaim an emergency and insist that proposed legislation had to be immediately passed so that the President could deal with the emergency and save the country. I say for a time I was much alarmed and voted for almost every proposal in order to settle the emergency, but emergencies kept coming, kept increasing, and kept multiplying. We did not seem to be able to do anything about them.

LET'S LEAVE "EMERGENCY MAKERS" ALONE

Let us take a concrete example. Last summer there was an emergency in Europe so great that we would not let our President get more than 12 hours away from the White House and would not let him stay away from home overnight for fear we would lose control of the European emergency; but later in the fall, after the harvest was garnered and the votes were counted, when the European emergency was greater than it ever was, we permitted our President to sail the seven seas for about 2 weeks, and none of us knew where he was. We discovered the emergency went on about the same as it would have gone had our President kept a daily and nightly vigil at the White House. "The smoke went up the chimney just the same." It may be that these emergencies would settle themselves if we paid no further attention to them and quit trying so anxiously to compose them.

Now we are told that we must pass this bill immediately or the emergency will get us. It kind of looks to me that the emergency makers in Europe do not pay any attention to what our President tells them. It seems to me, if I were President, I would quit telling them anything. I would not talk to them any more. The best way to treat troublemakers is to ignore them and never let on that you are looking. Let them alone, forget about their emergency, and attend solely to our own business. If we do this, they will soon get it settled and we will not be hurt any. It is contended that this bill must be passed immediately and then Congress can repeal it if it is found that a mistake was made. Experience has demonstrated that it is much easier to pass a law than it is to repeal one. Besides, the passage of a law can be accomplished by a majority vote, and it takes a two-thirds vote to override a Presidential veto of a repeal bill.

NO ONE MAN SHOULD HAVE BOTH "THE POWER OF THE SWORD AND PURSE"

I am not alarmed because of any delay that may accrue by a full and complete discussion of all angles of the pending proposed legislation and its careful, deliberate consideration by many minds, but I am alarmed at hastily granting to the Executive such powers as no other President has ever had. I am alarmed at placing the destiny of my country in the hands of one man to determine when and where an emergency arises and let that one man handle that emergency for 130,000,000 human beings in any manner he desires. No one man ought to want that job, and certainly it ought not to be granted to any one man. A republic—a democracy—if it wants to survive, ought never to place the power of the sword and the power of the purse in the hands of any one man, no matter how great and good that man may be. A careful analysis of human history demonstrates without exception this to be a fatal step to a free people.

How did Hitler become a dictator? He requested of the German Reichstag the power of the sword and the power of the purse. The Reichstag by voting him that power consented to their own destruction and placed the destiny of the German people in the hands of one man. When the legislative branch of the German Republic complied with the request of Herr Hitler for this one-man power to deal with the then German emergency, it was a sad day for the German people.

The German people are an enlightened and intelligent race, but today neither the Reichstag nor the people are consulted as to their government. They are told what to do—all because they surrendered the power of the sword and the power of the purse to one man in a time of emergency to deal with their distress.

ONLY THE DICTATORS ARE NOW MORE POWERFUL THAN THE PRESIDENT

Mr. President, let us pay attention to some of the lessons which history records. I do not want anyone to conclude that I am attempting to draw any comparisons between men. I am simply attempting to point out incidents of human history as to what has happened when the people placed too much power in the hands of one man. The President already has more power than any other one man on earth, except dictators. Under the Constitution, he has the power of the sword. He is Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. Under the Constitution Congress has the power of the purse, and that power should not be surrendered by the legislative branch to the executive branch of our Government.

It is argued that we should trust our President. That is not the question that confronts me. The question that confronts me is, Do I want to do the best I can under the oath I took on taking my seat in this body to carry out the processes of our democratic form of government under the provisions of the Constitution adopted by the people, or do I want to disregard the plain provisions of the Constitution because someone says there is an emergency that cannot be handled under the democratic process laid down in the Constitution? The President has

the biggest and most trying job that any man ever had. I do not want to add to his burdens by placing upon his shoulders legislative problems vested in Congress, even though he requests such authority and says he can and wants to do the work. It is not fair to the President to place the sole burden upon him to determine the peace or war policy of the country, even if he is willing and wants to assume that burden. Above all, it is not fair to the people of this country to give one man the power to determine for 130,000,000 people their policy for peace or war.

OUR PEOPLE WANT NO WAR

The vast majority of our people want to stay out of war, and the safeguarding of this wish can better be trusted to their chosen Members of Congress, comprising different views, than to trust that important question to the single mind of one individual. Experience has taught us that no man is infallible; that every man is liable to be mistaken, and that the considered judgment of many minds will best shape our destiny. I will not make the assertion that the President has ever made a mistake, but we all know that he occasionally changes his mind. We all know that good men are more or less emotional and are prone to act upon the spur of the moment without due and mature consideration. Emotionalism is no fault in any man but is a limitation upon the human mind and often causes error of judgment. Many good men have erred in judgment and have done the wrong thing, but the mass mind of the American people when properly informed has never erred and never gone wrong.

When I started the study of law about the first thing I read in Blackstone was that the King can make no mistakes, and the King can do no wrong. That nearly floored me. I could not understand it, but the way Blackstone explained it, it became clear as day. Our form of government is based upon the experiences for centuries of the Anglo-Saxon race. We have no king in this country, but under our jurisprudence the President stands in the shoes of the king. I am not going to say that our President ever made a mistake or did a wrong, but, in accord with law, I am going to assert that our President never can make a mistake and never can do a wrong. Franklin, Herbert, and Calvin may make mistakes and do wrong, but our President never. Neither a king nor a President can do a wrong, but Blackstone permits them to change their minds as often as they want to, and we all know that our President frequently exercises that right.

WILL PRESIDENT "LEND-LEASE" OUR WARSHIPS

Today the President says he does not intend to trade off any more battleships, but tomorrow he may change his mind. I want him to have the right to change his mind. Tomorrow's sun may paint an entirely new mirage upon our landscape, one that we never even dreamed of today. I want the President to be free to deal with the mirage when it comes. What I am objecting to is that before 50 more battleships are traded off I want more than one man to see that mirage. I want the President to point out that mirage to

Congress. If a majority of 435 Representatives and 96 Senators also see the mirage, then it is time for us to start dickering off the ships of our Navy, if we think that will banish the hideous vision. I want more than one man's eyes to see the vision of the "man upon the stair" before we cause 130,000,000 people to become excited, load their muskets, and start shooting. I do not want to chart destiny's course of this Nation through the eyes of one man, no matter how good the eyesight of that man may be or how well qualified he may be to deal with the situation. It is not only unwise, but it is dangerous, fatally dangerous, to trust the shaping of the future policy of this Nation to one mind, no matter how brilliant that mind may be. It is not only unwise but it is dangerous to trust the shaping of the destiny of 130,000,000 souls to the hands of one man, no matter how experienced or competent those hands may be in the shaping of human destiny.

Mr. President, it is argued that Congress is too cumbersome; that it cannot meet an emergency in a timely manner; that the Senate is likely to filibuster and fiddle while Rome burns. Heretofore the Senate has staged some historic filibusters, but, if I read my history aright, every one of those filibusters has done more good than harm, and not a single filibuster staged by the Senate has ever been harmful to the best interests of the people of the United States. The same thing cannot be said about the hasty passage of legislation. Many bills have been forced through Congress under whip and spur, without due consideration, under the pretext that immediate passage must be had to save the Nation from destruction, from some so-called pending danger.

ENGLAND NOW RECEIVES ALL WE CAN PRODUCE

I do not uphold a filibuster, but I am for complete discussion and ample consideration, no matter how long it takes. There is no present emergency in this country that requires the immediate passage of this bill. There is no present emergency in this country that cannot be handled without the passage of this proposed legislation. At the present time England is receiving most of the war supplies we are now manufacturing, and I cannot see how the President could furnish more aid to Britain than he is now furnishing. I am not so sure but that a so-called Senate filibuster, continuing the debate upon this bill until Europe settles its own war, would be very beneficial to the people of the United States. It might keep us from getting into that war and it would keep the Nation out of bankruptcy.

The President has said that this Nation cannot hide behind a Chinese wall and see civilization's march—the rest of the world go by. I am not in accord with that view. Personally, I would rather stay behind that wall than to jump over it and get into the kind of a civilization's march that the world is now staging. Some may say this is cowardice. I answer that I would rather be a live coward than a dead hero. Some may say that this is appeasement and that we cannot do anything in the way of appeasement

with dictators. I answer again that I would prefer an appeasement peace rather than total war. Some may say that we cannot be an appeasing nation. I answer again, but we were an appeasing nation when our ships were forbidden the freedom of the seas for which we once fought a war. Some Members of this body contended that our ships had a right to sail the seven seas, a right that a victorious war gave us. We no doubt had that right, and we were appeasers when we surrendered that right, but that appeasement is the best thing our foreign policy has yet done to keep us out of war. Nations are like individuals and must sometimes use discretion and good common-sense judgment.

When I used to drive automobiles I occasionally met a driver on the road who had paid his respects to John Barleycorn and who thought he owned all the road. I knew that I was entitled to my half, but when I saw him coming I surrendered my half of the road and pulled off to the side. As it were, I hid behind the Chinese wall until that "civilization's march" had gone by. I was an appeaser, but I kept from going to the graveyard. What is true of individuals is true of nations.

A NEGOTIATED PEACE IS ALWAYS BETTER THAN A GOOD WAR

When I was practicing law I always had the idea that a poor settlement was better for my client than a good lawsuit. A negotiated peace is better than a good war for any nation. All the wars that have thus far been fought have always ended in some sort of a negotiated peace for everybody concerned. England and Germany can patch up a better peace now than can be obtained after both nations are exhausted and one of them is licked.

Mr. President, we are told that the time is not ripe for peace but that the war must go on to total destruction; but I say to you that the time is always ripe to patch up a peace if men will use reason and common sense; and the time will not be more ripe to make peace when the contesting nations become bankrupt, their countries in ruins, and many more millions of their citizens sacrifice their lives upon the altar of war. I do not know what terms could be agreed upon; but I do know if human greed, human ambitions for power, and human desires to rule could be eliminated from the picture the common people of the respective countries would have no difficulty in ending the war, patching up a peace that would be satisfactory to everybody.

DO THE PEOPLE KNOW WHAT THEY ARE FIGHTING FOR?

The war lords of Britain say that the war must not end until nazi-ism is destroyed in Germany. Hitler tells his people that they are fighting for their lives and that Britain desires to wipe their fatherland from the map; so the battle goes on. If the people who are doing the fighting and who are spilling their blood for what they believe to be a holy cause of self-preservation were correctly informed of the real aims of the war, the war would end. If the

people knew the truth and were not misinformed by false propaganda, there would be no war. Patriotism and love of country can be stirred in the hearts of any people until they will make any sacrifice in response to what they think is loyalty to their flag.

WHAT ARE ENGLAND'S WAR AIMS?

I do not know what the situation is in Germany. I have no correct information. I have been hoping that the German people would revolt against Hitlerism. The Germans are an intelligent people. They have played an important part in civilization's march. I cannot conceive of them being ruled permanently by a dictator. If England would announce her war aims and assure the people of Germany that those aims were not the destruction of the German people but that the battle was against Hitlerism, in my opinion, it would not be long until the German people themselves would take care of Herr Hitler. There soon would be a revolution in Germany; but just so long as Britain proclaims to the world that Germany and her people must be destroyed, just so long will the German people be united and rally under the swastika flag for the preservation of their fatherland. It is false propaganda that stirs the breast of the German soldier; and, if we are not very careful, false propaganda will stir the American heart and cause American men to answer the bugle call.

OUR SYMPATHIES ARE WITH OPPRESSED PEOPLES EVERYWHERE

The mass mind of America does not want to go to war, and the mass mind of America does not want to take any steps that will lead to that involvement. Men have different ideas as to how that involvement can be avoided. The sponsors of the pending legislation contend that one mind can map a better program than can many minds. I do not agree with that philosophy. Of course, my heartfelt sympathy goes out to the downtrodden and oppressed in other lands everywhere. I wish that all people, everywhere, might adopt our form of government, but I would not vote to force our democratic form of government on any people anywhere against their consent.

Mr. President, the keystone of the arch upon which this Republic rests is the fundamental democratic doctrine that the power of government is derived from the consent of the governed. This is democracy's cardinal principle. It is said that the people of Germany would rather salute a uniform than to cast a vote. I should not want to live under such a philosophy, but if they want to do so, that is their business. I do not want to take any chances on wrecking this country by going over there in an attempt to forcibly keep the German people from saluting uniforms. The great mass of the German people are intelligent and capable of selecting such a government as they desire. If they want to continue to salute uniforms, so far as I am concerned, they can continue to do so until they get tired.

Oh, some may say we have to go over there and kill Hitler off before he comes over here and kills us off. Well, let us

oil up the old musket, keep our powder dry, get ready, but wait until we see the whites of their eyes before we waste too much of that powder.

HITLER WILL NOT CROSS ATLANTIC

Some are aroused by the fear that if we do not stop Hitler in Europe he will come across the Atlantic Ocean and take us on, and that he has his plans all outlined. They say he is not going to attack us direct from Europe but that he will go to Mexico or South America and establish military bases and attack us from there. Some even seem to have the fear that he will do that during the nighttime, under the cover of darkness, and we will not know anything about it until he has us completely covered with his shooting irons. I cannot be alarmed by that kind of fear. If he should undertake to move his army to Mexico or South America, we certainly would know it before he got settled down to do some shooting. Harry Hopkins or Wendell Willkie certainly would give us a little advance information; but even if they should not, even if we should wake up some morning and find that during the night, while we were asleep, Hitler had moved into South America and was pitching his tent there, we would just eat a good breakfast of ham and eggs, put on our boots, and go down there and kick him back into the Atlantic Ocean before he could cook any coffee or fry any "speck" for his breakfast. [Laughter.]

I do not know anything about army tactics or mechanics, but I do know that if I were going to fight Hitler I would not tire myself out by going 3,000 miles to the fight. I would let him use up his strength in coming that distance, and then when he stepped into my front yard, exhausted from his travels, I would step out and knock the "stuffin'" out of him. [Laughter.]

I do not know anything about military strategy, but I do know that we can lick Hitler easier in Mexico or in South America than we can lick him in Germany.

ONLY ANOTHER OF EUROPE'S "POWER POLITICS" WARS

Mr. President, let us not become too alarmed because the people of Europe are engaged in their usual occupation, that of fighting one another. It is the same old battle that has kept the people of Europe in a turmoil for centuries, and will no doubt keep them in a turmoil for centuries yet to come, regardless of what we do, and regardless of who wins the present fight. We found out definitely that we cannot settle wars over there; so what is the use of our becoming excited about it, regardless of the fine phrases of the spokesmen of England and Germany? They are not fighting a war for any great fundamental cause—to establish human rights and human liberties. Their battles are being fought to see who shall control the power politics of Europe. Our liberties are not involved. It will not make one bit of difference to our liberties where the border lines of nationalities in Europe are put, unless we try to help place them. No matter where they are placed as the

result of this war, the next generation will fight the battle all over again. If we take care of the interests of our own country, we need not be afraid of the victor over there, no matter who the victor is. The victor will be so exhausted that he will want some breathing spells. The victor will have all he can do to hold on to his victory, and settle the trouble in his own country, and prepare himself for the next fight in his own dooryard, without coming over here and attempting to knock any chips off our shoulders.

Mr. President, let us prepare well the defense of this country against any emergency, but let us not mix in the power politics of Europe. We did that once before, to our great loss and sorrow; and about the only thanks we got for our sacrifice was a severe criticism from the lips of Winston Churchill for our meddling in that war. Mr. Churchill was right in that criticism, and he is wrong now in asking us to meddle again. The great British Empire controls one-fifth of the earth, and has ample resources to fight any war in which that mighty Empire chooses to engage. We ought to be neither soft-hearted nor soft-headed enough to take our republic down the road to bankruptcy to help finance a war in which the sovereignty of this Republic is not concerned.

It is contended that we, as a nation, cannot live alone; that we must join in and keep pace with the other nations of the earth in civilization's march; that modern invention has made the world so small that nations cannot exist as they once did. We hold a very fortunate position in this regard. We are a self-sustaining nation, and can supply the needs of our own household without contributions from the rest of the world. No other nation is so fortunate. Of course, we should have to forego some of our luxuries; but in the necessities of life we are a self-sustaining nation, and there is no need for us to get into any kind of a foreign war in order to live.

Some contend that we must get in and fight, or we will lose our share of world trade; that we must have a world market for our surpluses. One of our greatest philosophers, the late Will Rogers, once remarked that he never heard of a bunch of monkeys starving to death because they had too many coconuts. This Nation is not going to starve to death or die because of its surpluses. Our commerce is more than 95-percent domestic and less than 5-percent foreign. If we should lose all our foreign trade we would still get along better than if we were to go into this war. Let us not become too much disturbed about the loss of the 5 percent. That will not destroy the other 95 percent. The tail is not going to wag the dog to death. [Laughter.]

Of course, I want us to maintain world relations and world trade; but I am not willing to have us sacrifice the lives of a million American soldiers upon the altar of war in order to maintain our world trade. Let us let the trade go until the fight is over, and then make the proper effort to get our share. We shall survive the loss of trade, and it will not hurt us much; but we may not survive if we plunge into total war. At least

millions of the best young men of this country will not survive.

We may have to change our economy a little. It may be that the new order of things will place men and material first and money second. Perhaps Germany has taught the world a valuable lesson. Germany had no money and no credit, yet she had men, material, and energy; and in a few years, without money and without credit, she built the greatest military machine the world has ever seen.

There are a few men in this country who want us to get into this war, but there are very few. The great bulk of our people want to stay out. As an individual, I never wanted to get into a fight; and I have discovered that the best way to stay out of a fight is to stay out. This thing of getting into or staying out of a fight has always been a matter of my own choice. I have seen a few fights in which I could have participated, but I never stuck out my neck to get into the mix-up. I have never monkeyed around with that buzz saw. If we want to stay out of the European fight we can do so, but we shall have to quit monkeying around with the European buzz saw. Experience is a great teacher if we profit by it. Let us not again monkey around with that buzz saw. We may think we can handle it, but we cannot. The idea of keeping the buzz saw going by just sending material over is not going to work; and if undertaken, as the pending legislation provides, we shall soon be sending men.

WE CAN'T GO IN WITH MONEY AND STAY OUT
WITH MEN

We cannot get into the war with our own money and expect to stay out with our men. This country is making every effort to build a national defense to protect the sovereignty of our people. I am for that; I am for making our defense so strong that no other power will dare to attack us; but I cannot quite see the philosophy of those who advocate that we should turn over all our war material and equipment to England in order to keep England going until we can build up an adequate defense. If we turn our war equipment over to England as fast as we can build it, I do not see how we shall ever be able to get ready in our own defense.

Mr. President, we are told that our Navy is inadequate, and we are moving heaven and earth to build ships to make the Navy adequate. While we are working day and night to build more ships for our Navy, I cannot see why we should trade off 50 of the ships of the Navy. The statement that the ships were unseaworthy and no good in our defense is not a satisfactory answer to me. If the ships were no good in our defense, they were no good in England's defense. They must have been seaworthy, because every one of them sailed across the Atlantic Ocean. That is what I assume they did. Perhaps I am wrong in that assumption. Perhaps in this modern method of warfare those "unseaworthy" ships were taken across the ocean in an airplane and parachuted into an English harbor.

ONE-SEVENTH OF OUR NAVY ALREADY GIVEN AWAY

In any event, when the people were told that those ships were unseaworthy and no good, the country was misinformed. Those 50 warships were a respectable Navy in themselves and could have protected a considerable distance of our shore line against invasion. The trade was made on the theory that it was in the interest of national defense. Perhaps the people wanted the trade made, even though none of them had been consulted. To trade off one-seventh of the warships of our Navy was no small deal, especially at a time when we were trying to build the greatest Navy on earth. Had Congress been consulted, they might have suggested some amendments to the trade agreement. Some Representative or some Senator might have discovered that a fee title to a piece of real property is better than a lease. Some Representative or some Senator might have discovered that even a 99-year lease of a portion of an island is not so very valuable if, under the exigencies of war, the island might be transferred to other sovereignties.

At a press conference some time ago, when the pending measure was being discussed, and someone expressed a fear that under its terms our entire Navy might be traded off, it is reported that the President ridiculed the idea and said he had no intention of doing so; that that was Mother Goose jump-over-the-moon stuff; that he had no intention of standing on his head; and that perhaps Congress should pass a law stating that the President should not stand on his head in the White House. Some of us are deeply and seriously concerned as to what the President will or will not do under this measure. We are not concerned about his personal habits in the White House. [Laughter.] If he stands on his head, that will not hurt anybody else, and does not concern a public policy; but some of us are disturbed and alarmed as to what he is going to do with the ships of our Navy. A reply in ridicule, designed to detract from the alarm, is not a satisfactory assurance or answer in the face of the fact that he had already traded off 50 ships; and there was not any Mother Goose jingle, "hi diddle diddle, cat-and-the-fiddle" business about that trade. That was trading off 50 actual warships.

Yet, so far as I am concerned, a trade of 50 warships is just a sort of Mother Goose jump-over-the-moon affair to me. Those are more ships than I ever saw in my whole life, and I can hardly imagine what kind of a picture it would make to round up 50 warships in 1 corral and trade off the whole shooting match in 1 deal. I have trouble in getting myself straightened out on this whole lease-lend program so as to know whether I am on foot or on horseback. My knowledge and experience are so limited that I become tremendously confused. The thing is just too big for me to realize what it is all about.

I have sometimes found that I can get a clearer view by whittling a big thing down to my size, where I can see it, and

then comparing it with things I know something about. I do not know anything about ships of the Navy, but I do know something about farms, hired men, and mules; so I am just supposing that I have a big farm out in South Dakota, and have a hired man to run it, and on that farm I have the same number of mules that we have ships in the Navy—350 mules—and the hired man trades off 50 of those mules without asking me anything about the trade. After that he submits to me a little agreement and asks me to sign on the dotted line. I say, "What is this about," and he says, "Why, that is just a little agreement for me to trade off the other 300 mules." [Laughter.] He sees the look of consternation on my face and says, "I have no intention of trading any of them off, but I just want this authority to make the trade if I want to." That hired man might be the best hired man I have ever had. I might never be able to replace him with anyone half as good. He might be absolutely reliable and trustworthy in every respect; yet, even if he promised me, with his right hand on a whole stack of Bibles, that he did not intend to trade off any of those mules, I would not sign that contract. It seems to me that is about a parallel case.

STOP "MONKEYING AROUND" EUROPEAN HORNETS' NEST

Mr. President, some contend that the Executive should have these powers because he is better informed and has a better knowledge of world affairs than has anyone else. I concede that if our Government is to be conducted by one individual, Mr. Roosevelt is the best-qualified man in the United States to tackle the job. What alarms me is that he is too well qualified, knows too much, and is too wise. When I was a boy I had a few battles with hornets, and from those experiences I learned a valuable lesson. I learned that the boy who knew where the hornets' nest was and kept monkeying around there and thought he knew something about hornets was the boy who got stung, and the boy who did not know where the nest was and did not know anything about hornets never got stung. This proved to me that too much knowledge might be a dangerous thing.

I wish that our President did not have quite so much knowledge about the world situation or about world affairs. If he knew nothing about them, he would not keep monkeying around that hornets' nest and probably get all of us stung. [Laughter.] Knowing too much is sometimes a dangerous thing.

IT'S ALWAYS EASIER TO BE A "YES-YES MAN"

Do not misunderstand me. I have no quarrel with the President. So far as I know, he and I are the best of friends. There is nothing that I enjoy more than visiting with him. This is not a personal matter. Personally, I would be better pleased if I could go along with him in carrying out all policies he advocates. It is much easier to be an agreeable man—a "yes, yes" man—than to get into any kind of a controversy, especially when

that controversy is with the Chief Executive, but the people who sent me here expect me to render some service in the shaping of legislation that determines the future policy of this country. They expect me to use my best judgment and to do my full duty in helping to shape that legislation. I would be a faithless and unworthy public servant if I neglected that duty. In the case of the pending proposal the President's views and mine are not in accord, and upon this occasion I must follow my own conscientious judgment and do the things which to me seem best for our common country.

Mr. Roosevelt, as a citizen and as President, has a perfect right, under our system of government, to advocate the things which to him seem best. On the other hand, I, as a citizen and as a Senator, have a perfect right to disagree with him. That disagreement ought not to affect personal friendships, and ought not to be the subject of intolerant criticism.

I regard Mr. Roosevelt as a great American; I regard him as the foremost citizen of the United States. I am just selfish enough to want to keep him as our own foremost citizen of the United States, and I do not desire to have him become the foremost citizen of the world. The President has a lovable personality, a keen and marvelous mind, delights to match wits with all comers, has a pleasing voice, and as a convincing public speaker has few equals and no superiors. Much as I personally like the President, much as I should like to walk with him, I cannot follow him down the road which I believe will lead to war. I will do anything humanly possible and go all the way with him in helping to make good the promise that he will never lead this Nation down the road to war, but I will not hesitate to part with him when I am morally certain he is taking the wrong road. I will not go down the road to war to make any other country safe for democracy except our own. I am first, last, and all the time for keeping the people of the United States out of foreign entanglements and for keeping them out of all wars except in defense of our own sovereignty.

LET'S NOT LET OUR HEARTS RUN AWAY WITH OUR HEADS

Mr. President, I know that the sympathies of our people are with England. It makes our blood boil with righteous indignation when we hear about the awful things happening in the European conflict. The emotions of the human heart are touched by the heroic defense of the men and women in the Battle of London. I fully realize that many human hearts in this country are stirred with deep emotions and with a desire to avenge wrongs now being done, and a desire to go over to Europe and burn Hitler at the stake or boil him in oil or quarter him inch by inch. I would get some satisfaction in helping to do that job myself. But we must give some consideration to stern realities and reckon the cost of doing that job. I am not willing to pay the price in blood and tears of human suffering of our people in order that I may satisfy my hatred of Hitler.

I know many persons think that unless we go over there and kill Hitler he will come over here. I am not at all disturbed by that. Even if Hitler should win the war—which I do not think he will—even if he should, he would have the impossible task of controlling the power politics of Europe. Even during this good hour there are rumors of unrest, and the fires of revolution are beginning to burn in every country he has conquered, and even in Germany itself. Hitler may win the war, but he can never conquer the people of Europe and hold them in subjection for any length of time. He would not undertake the conquest of the United States, because during the rest of his life he would have all he could do in Europe and would not take on an impossible task.

I know that a great many people are alarmed and fear that, if England goes down, Hitler will immediately undertake the conquest of the United States. If I were as certain of a place in Heaven as I am that Herr Hitler will never invade or attempt to invade the United States, I would feel very safe; I would feel just as good as if I were already in God's pocket. Let us remember that no dictator ever conquered the world, although many have tried, and no dictator has ever conquered a people and kept them enslaved for long. The end of Hitler is in sight. No matter what else may happen in Europe, the handwriting is on the wall, and to me it is as plain as the noonday sun.

Mr. President, I have read and considered the testimony of the men and women who testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations in respect to this bill, and I know that much of that testimony expresses a different view from that I hold. I would not be so presumptuous as to attempt to match my opinions with the opinions of these estimable men and women. I concede their superior intelligence, knowledge, and ability, but the road which I have traveled during my three score years and ten has taught me a few fundamental things upon which it is safe for me to rely. One of those fundamentals is that no human being is all-wise, and no man or woman on earth can tell with certainty what tomorrow will bring forth. Another fundamental is that the fact that a man is elected or appointed to office and placed in charge of a governmental position does not add one jot or tittle to his human intelligence. Prophecies of wise men as to what the future holds have often failed to come true, and, therefore, are not always a safe guide to be relied upon. Sometimes the prophecy of a layman is better than the prophecy of a priest. One man's judgment in predicting the future is about as good as another's, and there are no infallible men when it comes to predicting or mapping the future.

WE CANNOT FINANCE WARS ALL OVER THE WORLD

With pardonable pride we boast of being the richest nation on earth. We will not be able to make that proud boast after we finance another war in Europe, the war in China, and finance wars for so-called democracies all over the earth. Already the administration is planning a

road-building and public-works program for inauguration after the war is over; but if we convert this land into the greatest of all war arsenals, and finance these wars, at the end of the wars we will be a bankrupt nation, and will have no money to pay for a road and public-works program, or to pay for surplus commodities to feed the needy. Our wealth was not accumulated by conquest; it was not accumulated by a mighty war machine. Our wealth is a product of our peace-loving people, accumulated by the pursuits of peace and not of war. That wealth will soon be destroyed if we carry out the administration's program and turn thumbs down on continued achievements of peace, and direct our energies toward furnishing the whole world with instruments of warfare, which only destroy, and never create.

Some object to this measure because they think it is in violation of international law. I do not object on that ground, as I do not know what international law is, and I do not think anyone else knows. International law is what victorious nations say it is. It is written by the sword and changed by the sword, and interpreted solely by victorious conquerors. I am not concerned about international law. My sole concern is to do that which is best for the 130,000,000 people who live in the United States. I am not pro-German or pro-English, but I am totally and wholly pro-United States. I am for peace first, last, and all the time, and not for any kind of a war except for defense of the people of the United States and their sovereignty. I shall not vote for any measure which I think will involve our people in war in any cause save their own.

Those who builded this country were the men and women and the descendants of men and women who left the lands of their birth to get away from the turmoils of war and builded here a mighty nation, where they could follow the teachings of the Prince of Peace and where they could emulate the example set by the Man from Galilee.

AMERICANS SEEK ONLY PEACE

Mr. President, a citizen of the United States is a distinctive citizen. There is no other like him in all the world. No correct definition of an American citizen has yet been written and none can be written that will plainly distinguish him from all others. He is a distinctive citizen, a composite citizen, whose image bears the likeness of men from every corner of the earth. To this land of ours have come men and women from everywhere; men of every hue and color, of every belief and creed. Men have come from under every flag and sought shelter—the peaceful shelter—under the Stars and Stripes. Here in this great human melting pot of ours has been formed and fashioned the composite citizen of America. His flesh and bone is made up of all nationalities that have come from every clime. Through his veins courses the blood of every race and every creed. All civilizations have played their part in the building of an American citizen. It is this citizenship that here in the United States has always

maintained the traditions of its flag and made it the most beloved flag in all the world, and has safeguarded it as a sacred emblem of a free, liberty-loving, and peaceful people. Never has this citizenship engaged in a war of conquest. Never before has this citizenship concerned itself with a desire to conduct the affairs of other nations. Never before has it ever attempted to assemble a mighty army to fight in a cause that was not its own. Never before has this citizenship in peacetimes or any other sounded the bugle call, calling men to arms to force its mode of life upon other people. Never before has it felt that it could shape the destiny of other lands. Never before has it thought of mixing in the power politics of the world. Never before has it dreamed of establishing democracies everywhere. This citizenship has formed the best government and builded here the most beloved land on all the earth by attending to its own business and letting other people handle their own affairs as to them seemed best.

The thing that is so disturbing to me is what will the future hold for these citizens if we depart from this time-honored tradition of attending to our own business and embark upon the ideology that we must protect or establish democratic forms of government everywhere. The ideology is all right, but in a realistic world it is not a safe undertaking for the citizens of this Republic, and, if undertaken, can only bring ruin and disaster to our people. With reasonable defense preparation we can defend ourselves against any and all invasions, but we learned a quarter of a century ago that we could not then make the world safe for democracy, and we cannot make it safe now and ought not to make the attempt. We should pay less attention to foreign affairs and more attention to domestic problems.

Mr. President, our flag will never be hauled down by an invading foreign foe, but it may be made to bite the dust by being hauled down by our own hands in bungling our domestic affairs. The danger to this Republic is not in Europe. It is right here in the United States. That danger is not by reason of the few "fifth columnists" that Hitler may have sent over here, but the danger lies in a domestic, economic condition which creates "fifth columnists" and upon which they feed and thrive.

LET'S LOOK TO OUR DOMESTIC PROBLEMS AND DEFENSE

Mr. President, we should direct our energy toward a solution of our own domestic affairs, and let foreign affairs alone. Our problem is not the wars in Europe or in the rest of the world. Our problem will come when the war in Europe is ended. Our problem will be a problem of peace and not of war, and that peace problem will be one which will test the stability of this Republic as it has never been tested before. No human mind can now visualize just what that problem will be. I am not alarmed and afraid that we cannot handle that problem when it comes if our resources are not then exhausted, but I am alarmed about handling that problem if we are then a bankrupt nation. If we pass this

lend-lease bill, and the President carries out his announced intention—makes this the greatest war arsenal in the world and finances the wars in Asia and Europe—when peace comes we will be a bankrupt nation, and God only knows what then will happen to the people of the United States.

Just now a war hysteria is sweeping the country. Many people are not properly informed as to the true situation. Bitter hatreds are developing. The dragon of intolerance is rearing his beastly head. Men who do not agree with the administration program are accused of disloyalty, of being "fifth columnists," of being pro-German, are held up to ridicule and scorn, are accused of being unpatriotic and destroyers of national unity, and of being common enemies of this country—all because they are opposed to financing the wars of the world, and because they are opposed to converting this peaceful Republic into the greatest war arsenal the world has ever seen.

Perhaps when the historian writes the final historic record of this day it may be that those of us who are attempting to preserve the traditions of this Republic and attempting to avoid entanglements in a war-mad world, and whose efforts are directed solely toward the preservation of democracy in the United States in order that our flag may continue to float over every home in this land—perhaps those of us who are primarily concerned in the welfare of our own people will be recorded by the historian as just as patriotic and just as loyal to our flag as those who wanted to carry that flag half way around the world and dip it in human blood on the other side of the earth.

Last year in one of the President's messages to the Seventy-sixth Congress, he pointed out the danger of foreign invasion, and among other things he requested that Congress appropriate a fund of \$200,000,000 for the executive department, to be used by the President in such a manner as he might think best to safeguard the Nation. I thought at the time it was a tremendous sum and doubted the wisdom of complying with that request. I went along, but without any enthusiasm. I had no conception of what \$200,000,000 really was, but I did know that it was only two hundred million, and was limited to the spending of a definite amount. That request had a ceiling to it. When that amount was spent there was a red stop light beyond which the President could not go. The pending measure has no ceiling—the sky is the limit—and there are no effective stop lights anywhere in the bill. Some amendments have been added, but they are window-dressing amendments far above the stratosphere where there is no sky, so the sky is still the limit.

NO BLANK CHECKS TO FINANCE WORLD'S WARS

I am not in favor, and I believe that most of my people are not in favor, of giving a blank check to the President not only to finance a war in and for this country, but also to finance wars in and for other countries. I realize and feel, and most of my people realize, that during the past 8 years the President has

plainly demonstrated to the country that he has no conception of the value of a dollar, and that his efforts are directed toward the spending of money without any serious concern as to how the money is raised. It is unwise to turn the purse over to a person whose spending habits are unlimited and who does not concern himself about replenishing the purse.

I am in hearty accord with the high ideals the President expresses as to the conditions which he desires to bring to all people everywhere, but the road down which I have come plainly teaches me that that is simply a magnificent, ideal dream that cannot be realized in a realistic world.

The most serious objection I have to the passage of this proposed legislation is based on something that would not appear from a casual reading of the bill, nor from language therein expressed, but is because of a fear I have—I think a well-considered fear—of the dangerous road down which the enactment of this legislation will ultimately lead the Nation. Our sympathies at present are with England, and they are emotional and compelling sympathies. We do not want to see England defeated in the present war. Most of our people want to extend all aid to England that we can without endangering their own safety. It is not altogether the things that are written in the bill that alarm me, but more alarming to me are the pronouncements the President has made defining the policy of the United States with respect to our duty and obligation as a nation in world affairs.

It seems to be the announced intention of the President not only to protect our democracy here, but to see to it that democracies are protected everywhere. If the bill is passed, and the President undertakes to carry out his announced national policy, it will mean a coalition with the British Empire, in which Great Britain and the United States will join hands in the fighting of a great war to dominate the rest of the world. The handwriting is on the wall of our intention to form a compact with the British people to become masters of the world. To me the things that are written into the bill are not as disturbing as is this handwriting on the wall.

NO FOREIGN ENTANGLEMENTS

Mr. President, I am unalterably opposed to taking any steps leading to any compact with any other nation on earth. My doctrine is, let us look solely to our own country, to the welfare of our own people and let the rest of the world go by. I am not going to vote for any measure that will cause my country—these United States—again to become a colony of the British Crown. I do not want to see England go down; I do not think she will; but I am not one of those who think that the perpetuity of this Republic is dependent upon the result of the battle now being fought on the British Isles.

I never believed that our first line of defense was on the Rhine, nor that it is now on the shores of the English Channel. I am not in favor of impoverishing our own people by extending unlimited credit or by leasing or loaning unlimited

supplies of our own war material and holding out a false hope to our people that we shall ever get it back. If England loses the war, she will not be able to pay us back; and if she wins, she will not pay us back. Whatever war material we furnish England in addition to what she buys and pays for we might just as well give to her and thus avoid future headaches.

THE ENGLISH EMPIRE IS NOT BROKE

Proponents of this lease-lend bill argue that we must pass it because England's finances are exhausted. I cannot conceive that to be a fact. Great Britain is a mighty empire, with far-flung dominions. Her possessions consist of more than one-fifth of the surface of the earth. Her ships of trade sail the seven seas and visit every port to gather the wealth of nations. For centuries she has made the proud boast that she was mistress of the sea, and that the sun never set on her possessions. The total population of the earth is approximately 2,000,000,000 souls. Those living in British dominions are approximately one-half billion souls. Five hundred million people live under the British flag. One-fourth of all the people on earth join in singing God Save the King. Do not tell me that the resources of this mighty Empire have been exhausted in 1 year's battle with the German Reich for control of the power politics of Europe. I do not want to see England go down, but neither do I want her to shift the financing of Europe's war upon the people of the United States.

Mr. President, some persons say that if England goes down our ship of state will not be able to ride out the storm. Our democracy has weathered several first-class storms, and we never before have turned over control of the ship to one man without the help of shipmates. The storm has not approached anywhere near our shore, and there is no likelihood that it ever will. It is spending its fury on the other side of the earth. Our danger lies in having our captain sail our ship into the tornado on the other side. If we keep our ship in our own harbor until the cyclone has spent its course, our boat will be in no danger. Of course, we have injustices everywhere, and some of our people feel that on high moral grounds we should sail the ship ahead into the storm and take a hand in settling the atrocities with which the people of Europe are now cursed; but the thing that should guide our policy in this regard, it seems to me, should be, when we consider the humanitarian problem, "Is it wise to engage in a policy that will bring carnage, destruction, and disaster to our own people, in order to settle injustices in Europe, when we know that anything we may do in that regard will have no permanent or lasting effect?" We know that these injustices and atrocities will break out again with renewed fury, no matter what we do.

We seem to be confronted by two questions: First, How will the President keep the people out of war? Second, How will the people keep the President out? An answer to the second question is the more important at the present time.

The President by Executive order establishes war zones, and the people are not permitted to travel in those danger zones. The President can keep the people out; but how are the people going to keep the President out? How are the people going to keep the President from sending his special emissaries into those danger zones to explore the field forbidden to all other Americans and come back and advise us what we have to do?

I DO NOT WANT TO TAKE ANY STEPS THAT WILL LEAD TO WAR

Mr. President, the passage of this legislation is not a safe answer to that question. I want to take every step that will keep this country out of war. I do not want to take any steps that lead to war nor any steps that will lead the Nation to bankruptcy.

I know we get jittery and much concerned about the horrible things now taking place in Europe, and all have a desire to do something about the matter. Our thoughts are centered in the horrible things that are now taking place, and we give but little thought to the things that actually started the war. What started the war and why is it being fought? We are disturbed about its awfulness, and rightly so; but what is the war about? A couple of years ago Hitler started to move some border-line fences on the continent of Europe. England heard about it and notified Hitler that if there were any border-line fences to be moved she would boss the job. Hitler did not want England to boss the job, and kept on digging post holes and setting posts. England moved an army across the channel on to the continent of Europe and declared war on Germany, and said, in effect, "If there is going to be any fence moving it will have to be done according to English survey and the job will have to be bossed by England." Hitler, being a bullheaded German, would not let England boss the job, and the fight was on.

Radios and newspapers are flooding the country with propaganda, so that we have become much confused; but, after all is said and done, and we get right down to rock-bottom facts, this war is not being fought to establish any great human cause, nor does it involve any basic principle of human right. This is solely and only a dispute between Germany and England for power, and to determine who shall boss the job of establishing national boundary lines on the continent of Europe. This is primarily a problem for the people who live upon that continent. The people of England would be far better off if their statesmen did not interfere with the people on the continent, and let those people settle their own difficulties. England is not primarily a European nation. England is an island kingdom. The great British Empire is not of Europe, but is an empire of the world. The best thing that could happen today to the people of that empire would be for them to say to the people of Europe, "We will retire from our attempt to boss the job as to how you shall divide up your territory, and let you settle your own affairs."

That would end the war so far as the people of England are concerned; and the people of Europe would soon get together and take care of Herr Hitler and settle Europe's war for the time being. The question is, Do we want to join hands with England and help boss the people of Europe as to how they shall divide up the territory on their own continent, which is no concern of ours? Do we want to tell the people of Europe what their Monroe Doctrine shall be, and thereby take a chance on losing our own Monroe Doctrine; or do we want to attend to our own business and see to it that our own Monroe Doctrine is not destroyed?

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE BEHIND THIS MEASURE?

Mr. President, it is difficult for me to figure out why the administration demands the passage of this bill. Any one who has power to trade to England 50 of our warships certainly has power to extend immediate aid by furnishing England with everything we have, and needs no additional authority.

To call this an aid-to-England bill is a misnomer. There is nothing in the bill that says anything about aid to England. Amendments were proposed to limit aid to England, Greece, and China; but the administration objects to any limitation. The intent and purpose of the bill is to give the President power to mix in every war on the face of the earth, if he so desires, and make binding commitments for the people of the United States to supply war material and aid to any and all nations if he so desires.

Oh, it is said, this bill has a limitation and does not permit the President to convoy merchant ships with battleships in the danger zone. I am not for that limitation. The Constitution gives the President that power. As Commander in Chief of the Navy, he may send our battleships to any place on earth that he chooses, and Congress cannot limit that authority by legislative act. Proponents of the bill urge its instant passage so that the President may go to the immediate relief of England. They contend that next week may be too late. I should like to be informed how the passage of the bill will speed the production of ships, tanks, airplanes, and war material. We are already turning over to England most of the war material we are producing. As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] said in his excellent address, what aid will the passage of the bill give to England now, in addition to what England is already getting? She is getting about all the defense articles we are manufacturing. What more can we give her?

If the bill is passed what can the President do in the way of furnishing to Great Britain aid that is not now being furnished? The President cannot do the impossible, even though we give him that authority.

Some say the situation is so desperate that England will go down in 30 to 60 days unless we furnish her with fighting material. We have not the material, and we cannot make it in 30 to 60 days. The passage of this bill will not speed the making of that material.

I have been asked, "Do you not trust the President? Have you not faith and confidence in him?" Of course, I have faith and confidence in the President. I do not challenge trust in him. I have full faith and confidence in every Senator here; yet I would not want to turn over the duties of the Senate to any one Senator, no matter how much faith and confidence I had in him. Ninety-six Senators can do a better job in legislating for the people than any one Senator could possibly do. I shall not decide this question upon the trust and faith I have in any man. I shall make my decision as to my duty upon my conception of what is the best public policy for me to adopt, regardless of the faith and confidence I have in any man, and regardless of the ties of friendship that decision may break.

The future destiny of the Republic is at stake, and I shall not by my vote make it possible to change our democratic form of government into that of a totalitarian state.

The President at press conferences declines to answer what he terms "if" questions, and rightly so; but it seems to me this whole program is based upon "if" assumptions that are highly speculative, and people have become excited about these "ifs." It is argued that if Hitler takes on England and Asia and Africa and South America—if all of these things happen—we shall be in danger. These are too many speculative and impossible "ifs" for me to get excited about. There are too many speculative "ifs" for me to vote to bankrupt this Nation to head off imaginary "ifs."

OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE IS A SOLVENT TREASURY

Our first line of defense is to have a solvent Treasury. If war should come to our country, we can win the war if we are not then financially broke. There is a powerful plea on the part of the administration for national unity. When war comes to this country, be that war right or wrong, there will be national unity to win the war; but there will be no unity on any effort to get into the war, nor will there be unity to take steps which many of us believe will lead a peaceful people into another European war. There can be unity of our people to prepare the defense of this Nation to meet any emergency, but there can be no national unity to convert our country into a great war arsenal to supply the fighting nations of the earth with instruments of death.

There can be unity in building an adequate Navy for our defense, but not for turning over our battleships to any foreign power. There can be unity among our people to appropriate fabulous sums to carry on a war in defense of our own sovereignty, but there can be no unity on appropriating the wealth of the Nation, impoverishing our people, and bankrupting the Nation to finance the wars of the earth and to engage in battles that are not our own. There can be unity among our people to keep this the greatest Nation on earth, but there can be no unity in any effort for us to dominate the rest of the earth.

In making important decisions on problems confronting me I have found

that it is not always safe for me to rely upon the opinions of other men. Along the road I have traveled, to me the best guidepost has been the conscience with which a wise Creator has endowed all human beings.

Whenever I have had an important decision to make, my conscience has always, without exception, pointed the right road. I have not always obeyed, and disobediences have brought regrets; but I have never walked with any fear of remorse a road that conscience dictated. I like to walk this road with friends, but friends are of my own choosing. I can get rid of them if the occasion requires, but my conscience walks with me to the end.

The vote that I cast upon this measure must be a vote that is satisfactory to myself. I am thoroughly convinced that the passage of this measure will lead the country to war and disaster, and that the bill ought to be defeated for the common good of the people of the Nation. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I present for the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Industrial Union Council of Detroit, Mich., speaking for 300,000 industrial workers against the passage of House bill 1776, the lend-lease bill, and ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution on lend-lease bill

Whereas bill H. R. 1776, S. 275, known as the lend-lease bill, has been introduced into Congress by the Roosevelt administration, which would virtually set up a one-man dictatorship in this country, concentrating all powers in the hands of the President, and would mean in effect, complete surrender by Congress of all legislative powers, and

Whereas by the provisions of this bill, all other laws in conflict with it would be set aside, thereby not only in effect, repealing laws such as the Johnson (no foreign loans) Act and the Neutrality Act passed by Congress at the demand of the American people; but also destroying the various laws protecting the working people, such as the Wagner Labor Relations Act and Wages and Hours Act, thus striking a crushing blow to the living standards of the American people and to the very life of the labor movement, and

Whereas the passage of this bill, which climaxes a series of similar warlike measures, would not only give the President power to regiment labor by destroying its right to strike, and establish a Fascist rule of this country, but would also invest in him the absolute power to take us into war, to which the majority of the American people are strongly opposed: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Greater Detroit and Wayne County Industrial Union Council, C. I. O., representative of some 300,000 union members, strongly condemns the lend-lease bill measure as the most dangerous threat to the liberties and peace of our Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we organized men and women of the labor and progressive movement believe that by preserving and extending our civil liberties and improving the living standards of the entire population, our country will be most effectively protected from the threats and encroachments of fascism from both without and within.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio

[Mr. TAFT] what his program is with reference to proceeding further.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, tomorrow, after the reading of Washington's Farewell Address by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]—I trust with great emphasis and eloquence on the points which are relevant to the present measure—the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] informs me that he will speak for about 45 minutes. After that I expect to address the Senate for about an hour and a half.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me that after the reading of Washington's Farewell Address the burden of carrying forward the proof should go to the other side, because that will be the best speech made in the whole debate against the bill.

Mr. TAFT. On Monday the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] will speak, and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] will follow him. I think two other Senators will be ready to speak on Monday. If not, I see no reason why we should not proceed with the amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. My particular inquiry was as to whether any Senator is ready to proceed this afternoon, at least for a while, or whether the Senator would prefer to recess at this time.

Mr. TAFT. I should prefer to recess at this time. I think my address would be too long to conclude this evening. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is not yet ready, but he has advised me that he will be ready tomorrow. I hope the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] may also be ready tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the circumstances, 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 MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably the nomination of Brig. Gen. Brice Pursell Disque, Reserve, to be brigadier general, Reserve, from February 17, 1941.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the nomination of Lt. Col. Omar Nelson Bradley, Infantry, to be brigadier general with rank from February 20, 1941 (temporary appointment in the Army).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leslie Frazer to be First Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Conder C. Henry to be Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That concludes the calendar.

THE ARMY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two Army nominations reported by me today be confirmed, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the nominations referred to will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Col. Omar Nelson Bradley, Infantry, to be brigadier general with rank from February 20, 1941 (temporary appointment in the Army).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Brice Pursell Disque, Reserve, to be brigadier general, Reserve, from February 17, 1941.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmation of these two Army nominations.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, February 22, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of February 13), 1941:

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Pierre de L. Boal, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and counselor of Embassy at Mexico, Mexico, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nicaragua.

Wesley Frost, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and lately counselor of Embassy at Santiago, Chile, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from March 1, 1941:

TO BE A CHIEF MACHINIST

Machinist Ludvig V. T. Sieck.

TO BE A CHIEF CARPENTER

Carpenter Joseph L. Temple.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL WITH RANK FROM FEBRUARY 20, 1941

Lt. Col. Omar Nelson Bradley, Infantry.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of February 13), 1941:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Leslie Frazer to be First Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

Conder C. Henry to be Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

GENERAL OFFICER

Brice Pursell Disque to be brigadier general, Reserve.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Omar Nelson Bradley to be brigadier general.

POSTMASTERS

MARYLAND

John L. Thompson, Oxford.

PENNSYLVANIA

William T. Means, Brookville.

Seth W. Bloom, Clearfield.

Lena M. Cole, Coal Center.

Thomas A. Friel, Crum Lynne.

Gordon Stella, Edge Hill.

Marcella T. Pawlowski, Glen Lyon.

Wilda E. Sickles, Houston.

Llewellyn Angstadt, Kutztown.

Kathryn H. Eaton, Lawrenceville.

Daniel E. Walter, Lebanon.

John L. Crowley, Lenni Mills.

Frank C. Swoyer, Mohrsville.

Luther A. Fry, Reiffton.

Ralph Blaine Althouse, Sharon Hill.

James H. Wales, Templeton.

SENATE

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1941

(Legislative day of Thursday February 13, 1941)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Creator and Preserver of all mankind: We beseech Thee to incline Thine ear unto our prayer as today our thoughts range far beyond ourselves, beyond our friends and kindred, to the founding fathers of this Republic. As we commemorate the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country, we yield Thee most humble and hearty thanks for the great soul of this man of light and leading, who, though sleeping now in the dust of earth, yet ever lives in the hearts of all true patriots.

Again we thank Thee for the generations of growth through which we have

come; for the discipline received in dark times of trouble and adversity to fit us for even greater things. In the temper and disposition of our minds let us never run contrary to Thee, but do Thou keep us upright, ever seeking to aid progress, ready to leave the things that are behind for the things that are before, emulating in our lives the noblest conduct, always trusting in the hidden power of right.

Teach us so to live that our little good may live after us, that when our earthly task is o'er we may hear Thy voice saying to each one of us, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Friday, February 21, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. 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	Ellender	Norris
Austin	George	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gerry	Overton
Ball	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Russell
Barkley	Harrison	Schwartz
Bilbo	Hatch	Sheppard
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Brewster	Herring	Smathers
Bridges	Hill	Stewart
Brown	Holman	Taft
Bulow	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	La Follette	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Byrnes	Lodge	Tunnell
Capper	Lucas	Tydings
Caraway	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chandler	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chavez	McKellar	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Mead	White
Danaher	Miller	Wiley
Davis	Murdoch	Willis
Downey	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of the death of his wife.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is absent on official business.

My colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.