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

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

That completes the calendar.

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 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, November 1, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 31 (legislative day of October 27), 1941:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. David Phillip Hardy, Coast Artillery Corps (National Guard of the United States).

Lt. Col. Harry Hubbard Johnson, Cavalry (National Guard of the United States).

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Col. Myron Cady Cramer, Judge Advocate General's Department, to be the Judge Advocate General, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, with rank from December 1, 1941, vice Maj. Gen. Allen W. Gullion, the Judge Advocate General, whose term of office expires November 30, 1941.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. Allen Wyant Gullion (colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), the Judge Advocate General, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 127a, National Defense Act, as amended by an act of Congress approved September 9, 1940, with rank from December 1, 1941.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Russell Peter Hartle (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Walter Hale Frank (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. William Hanson Gill (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Dorst Patch, Infantry.

Col. Frank Cadle Mahin, Infantry.

Col. Harold Francis Loomis (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Dale Durkee Hinman (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Lt. Col. LeRoy Lutes, Coast Artillery Corps.

Col. John Shirley Wood (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. John Breitling Coulter (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Vincent Meyer, Field Artillery.

Col. John Benjamin Anderson (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul John Mueller (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Ambrose Robert Emery, Infantry.

Col. Otto Frederick Lange (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Thompson Lawrence, Infantry.

Col. Edwin Pearson Parker, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Waldo Charles Potter, Field Artillery.

Col. Charles Morton Milliken (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Lt. Col. Elmer Edward Adler (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 31 (legislative day of October 27), 1941:

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Edgar C. E. Kinderman, Avondale.
Lucye L. Horan, Inspiration.
James E. Harris, Mayer.
Pratt E. Udall, Springerville.

KENTUCKY

Mary S. Chaffin, Grayson.
Emma L. Lucas, Manchester.

MAINE

Edwin M. Moore, Ellsworth.
Ethel B. Batson, West Jonesport.

PENNSYLVANIA

Leslie A. Edinger, Emlenton.

SENATE

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, October 27, 1941)

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

Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, minister of the Foundry Methodist Episcopal Church, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O, Thou Eternal Father of us all, for this dedicated moment we would lift our lives, our duties, and our tasks into the white light of Thy presence. In this revered chamber of national deliberation and decision we pray for clean hands, pure hearts, unbiased minds, and wise action that this Nation, amid confusions and perplexities, may find its way to better and juster days.

Keep us from selfish living in a dangerous and difficult time. Save us from the hatred and prejudice that blow like a tempest across the world. For every echo of the world's evil tempers within our own hearts we repent in sackcloth and ashes. Save us from the mean excuses of expediency, the cheap defenses of self-deceit, when we fall short of our own ideals. Broaden the areas of our sympathies exposed to the world's woes. May we blaze with indignation at selfish strength that strangles weakness and coercive might that crushes freedom.

Deliver us from discouragement and cynicism by the radiant faith that the way of the Republic is down no fatal slope but up to sunnier heights and wider vistas of an illumined freedom which shall yet flame as a beacon of hope for the whole world. Thou who through storm and night art still guiding and guarding our national destiny, to Thee aloud we cry, "God save the state." We ask it all in that name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, October 31, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	George	Nye
Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Peace
Ball	Guffey	Pepper
Bankhead	Gurney	Russell
Barbour	Hatch	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Smathers
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bunker	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lee	Truman
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wallgren
Connally	McNary	Walsh
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Murdock	White
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PUBLIC LANDS IN CALIFORNIA AND NEVADA FOR INDIANS OF FORT MOJAVE RESERVATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain public domain lands in California and Nevada for the use

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

and benefit of the Indians of the Fort Mojave Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

AMENDMENT OF ACTS AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATION OF NATIONAL FOREST RECEIPTS FOR PURCHASE OF LANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 13, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorize the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national forest receipts, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Reading, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A petition of sundry citizens of Mount Pleasant and vicinity in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the marketing penalties on the products of American agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of the council of the city of Lincoln Park, Mich., favoring the prompt enactment of legislation to provide for the development of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution of the Greater Detroit and Wayne County Industrial Union Council, Detroit, Mich., favoring the infliction of proper punishment upon such persons and governmental units as are responsible for the lynching, beating, etc., of certain soldiers on active duty in various States of the Union; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the board of supervisors of Chippewa County, Mich., favoring the taking of certain necessary steps for the protection of the Soo locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition of sundry citizens of Saginaw, Mich., praying for repeal of the neutrality law and the extension of full aid to the Allies; to the table.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against repeal or modification of the existing neutrality law; to the table.

A resolution of the Senate of Michigan; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 61

"Resolution for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the American farmer in the event any ceiling is placed upon farm prices

"Whereas the constantly mounting cost of living in America, resulting from the inflationary tendency of the economic structure of this country, has created a threat to the agricultural economics of the Nation; and

"Whereas newspaper reports and official communications from the National Capital indicate a possibility that Federal action will be taken to place a ceiling upon the prices of products produced on the American farms without placing compensating ceilings upon the prices the farmers and others will be required to pay for labor and commodities; and

"Whereas any such inequitable distribution of the burden of supporting the economic structure of the Nation would be highly detrimental to the American farmer and would result in his being compelled to produce farm products at prices below the compensating standard of production costs: And be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the senate memorialize Congress to safeguard the interests of the American farmer by requiring that in the event any ceiling is placed upon farm prices that similar ceilings be placed upon the commodities and labor the farmer must purchase to properly produce food for the American people; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Michigan Member of Congress and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate on October 10, 1941."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Michigan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 66

"Concurrent resolution urging the national leadership of both political parties to give full aid and assistance to those countries fighting Hitler

"Whereas it is clearly recognized by the people of the State of Michigan that freedom throughout the world will not be possible until forces of Adolf Hitler and his partners in crime are completely smashed; and

"Whereas to accomplish full production toward this end it is necessary that the fullest degree of national unity be realized; and

"Whereas it is necessary that all those engaged in dividing the people by acts of antisemitism and discriminations and by disrupting the production of the country by antilabor acts of employers and unnecessary strikes by labor, should be condemned and exposed as tools of Hitler: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That on this 10th day of October 1941 urge the national leadership of both political parties do everything in their power to give full aid and assistance to those countries fighting Hitler and that we urge the citizens of Michigan, the hub of national defense, to outproduce Hitler as production is the key to modern warfare; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge the people of this State to remember the American slogan, 'E pluribus unum.' In unity there is strength by dropping all their petty differences and working together to maintain freedom as did our early American forefathers in their fight for freedom; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we condemn antisemitic propaganda and that we condemn all those engaged in disrupting the production by unfair acts of either labor or management; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, our Senators and Representatives, and that this be published as a proclamation of public interest.

"Chas. C. Diggs, Ben Carpenter, M. Harold Saur, O. W. Bishop, Joseph A. Baldwin, Geo. P. McCallum, Chester M. Howell, Earl L. Burhans, Carl F. DeLano, William C. Birk, Elmer R. Porter, James T. Milliken, D. Hale Brake, H. F. Hittle, Don VanderWerp, Stanley Nowak, Joseph A. LaFramboise, Charles S. Blondy, James A. Burns, E. C. Brooks, Robert B. McLaughlin, Leo. J. Wilkowski, Ernest G. Nagel, D. Stephen Benzie, Clarence A. Reid, J. T. Hammond, Earl W. Munshaw, J. T. Logie, Herman H. Dignan, Gilbert Isbister, Leonard J. Paterson.

"Adopted by the senate on October 10, 1941.

"Adopted by the house of representatives on October 10, 1941."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS FOR FREEDOM

Mr. HILL presented resolutions adopted by the final session of the Continental Congress for Freedom, at Washington, D. C., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1

Our mightiest armament is the idea that is America—the concept that men are created equal. This idea has been the birthright of all in our land, the goal of all in many lands. It has lighted the way of mankind for more than a century and a half. It is a moral force greater than any army or armada. Brought to bear, it always has and always will make tyrants blanch.

We assert that unflinching allegience to this concept of freedom is our certain way of crushing the Nazi onslaught upon it. Allegiance to it means willingness to fight and die for it. There is not cut-rate choice between freedom and slavery, and we know by the grief we witness that half the world is already enslaved.

As delegates to the Continental Congress for Freedom, we pledge ourselves, our hearts, our lives to the preservation of the American idea, and pray that it will pervade the world.

We rededicate ourselves to the proposition that our democracy at home must ever be strengthened by practical devotion to its principles. We declare that this is a two-front struggle in which our example in the practice of democracy is as vital as our share in the actual conflict. We say that we cannot oppress our neighbor at home, impose unjust burdens upon the weak, seek material advantage in this emergency, allow politics to sway us, or permit religious or racial prejudices to divide us, without sharing part of the guilt for the plight of mankind. We will tolerate no touch of the fascist spirit in America.

We therefore call upon all our fellow citizens and upon the Congress from this moment forward to bear these high considerations ever in mind. We call especially upon our representatives in Congress to be representative in truth in both this sense and in the sense of showing courage in facing the awful facts of our time. We submit these considerations to our Commander in Chief and pledge to him our support in his leadership of the fight for freedom.

Resolution 2

We ask for the immediate repeal of the Neutrality Act because it is helping Hitler to win this war. We have never urged action against Hitler by saying such action would keep us out of war because we honestly feel that any effective resistance against nazism means war. Now in urging the repeal of the Neutrality Act we know that when our ships loaded with American goods are taken into belligerent ports by the American Fleet, Hitler will fight back. This will mean war and a declaration of war will and should follow. We believe that unless we act soon it will be forever too late, because Hitlerism cannot be beaten by halfway measures and the fight for freedom cannot be won by the half-hearted.

Resolution 3

Let it be the sense of this congress that we declare war on Nazi Germany.

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 37 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.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. REYNOLDS) introduced a bill (S. 2026) to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROCEEDING RELATING TO SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. HATCH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 186), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 81 and Senate Resolution 167, seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to on March 10, 1941, and September 15, 1941, respectively, relating to the proceeding now pending before the Committee on Privileges and Elections to determine whether WILLIAM LANGER is entitled to retain his seat in the Senate, is hereby increased by $5,000.

FERDINAND AUGUST FRIEDRICH

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution felicitating Ferdinand August Friedrich, managing editor of the Paterson Morning Call, of Paterson, N. J., upon his service of 50 years in the newspaper field, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM OF REGULAR VETERANS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. SCHWARTZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the educational program adopted by the Regular Veterans' Association at its fifth national convention, which appears in the Appendix.]

MODIFICATION OF NEUTRALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREEN obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be compelled to leave the Chamber, probably, before the day's business is concluded. I ask unanimous consent that when the business of the day shall have been concluded, the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; there is an objection, though I do not know whether it will be of any consequence.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator object to my unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senator's request was that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock on Monday?

Mr. BARKLEY. That the Senate recess until 11 o'clock on Monday at the end of the day's business; yes. A number of speakers wish to address the Senate on Monday, and the Senate shall have to meet a little early in order to accommodate them, unless it runs later at night than the Senator from California probably would desire. In view of the fact that we have been all week on this matter, I think we ought to begin an hour earlier on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that, of course, an earlier meeting can be brought about by motion if the Senator objects to my request. At the conclusion of the day's session a motion will be made to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very well, sir. I shall object to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may vote against it, but——

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But it will be only one vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. Very well. We will let the matter go over until the end of the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the people of this country do not want to go to war, and neither does the Congress, and neither do those who are in favor of amending the Neutrality Act. The question is not, however, Shall we go to war? The question is rather whether the war will come to us. In other words, if we do not want war here in America, we must make every effort to keep it away from here.

There has been a good deal of talk here about keeping out of war. Almost all of us want to keep out of war; yet here on the floor of the Senate, as well as elsewhere, anyone who disagrees with a proposal for keeping out of war accuses the proposer of trying to get us into war. There is no more reason for the so-called isolationists making this accusation against those who make such a proposal than there is for their opponents making the same accusation. In fact, there is less reason, because in the present state of the World War we shall run a greater risk by doing nothing than by doing something to avert it.

The most effective means of keeping war away from America is to prevent Germany from completing her list of conquered European countries; and this can best be done by rendering aid to the countries that are fighting Germany on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. So, we should give all material aid to any nation fighting Germany and her allies. That means not only producing war materials for them, but also making certain that the materials reach them. It is no help to them, and a loss to us, if, after producing by the sweat of our brow these war materials, they are sunk in the Atlantic Ocean. They are sent to Germany's opponents to help them resist the invasion of their countries and to prevent the complete conquest of Europe. When that continent is completely conquered, Hitler's attention will be directed to another continent, and America will doubtless be that one.

Hitler's friends, supporters, and defenders in America seek to lull the American nations in both North and South America into a false sense of security. They seek to convince us that he has no idea of extending his conquest into this hemisphere. They have not read, or, if they have, they do not understand what he has written and spoken on the general subject of German world domination, or his occasional references to America in particular.

Dr. Rauschning, the former president of the Senate of Danzig, and an intimate friend of Hitler, has written:

The present war, in the Hitler view, is not a final event. It is one of a series of wars and uprisings in which no corner of the world will be spared by the internal and external blows of this revolutionary dynamism. Not even America is safe from Hitler's threat. In 1933 I dined at Hitler's table and heard his views on the United States. He began with the idea that, owing to its great social antagonisms, the United States was on the verge of a bloody revolution. He intimated that it would be easy for him actually to stir up this revolution or to stimulate its outbreak. Then the United States would never again be in a position to help the western democracies of Europe.

Hitler went still further: National socialism and its fuehrer had the mission of making a real nation out of America's conglomeration of races. He, Hitler, would take over and continue Washington's task and transform a corrupt moneyed democracy into a true people's democracy. At the same time the German character of the United States would be reestablished. All the German blood that has streamed into America would wake up to its origin. North America would become a German state, closely connected with the German Empire in Europe. (See the American Mercury for December 1939 on p. 386.)

At another time Hitler went still further into the subject with Dr. Rauschning, who reports that he said:

National socialism alone is destined to liberate the American people from their ruling clique and give them back the means of becoming a great Nation. * * * I shall undertake this task simultaneously with the restoration of Germany to her leading position in America. (See the American Mercury for August 1940 at p. 398.)

Listen to Hitler's own words:

Latin America—we shall create a new Germany there. We have a right to this continent. * * * We require two movements abroad, a loyal and a revolutionary one. Do you think that's so difficult? I think we are capable of it. We should not be here otherwise. We shall not land troops like William the Conqueror and gain Brazil by the strength of arms. Our weapons are not visible ones. It will be a simple matter for me to produce unrest and revolts in the United States so that these gentry will have their hands full with their own affairs. We shall soon have storm troopers in America * * * we shall have men whom degenerate Yankeedom will not be able to challenge. (From Hitler's Mein Kampf; as cited by Rauschning in The Voice of Destruction. See The Nation, March 22, 1941, p. 343.)

The New York Times is authority for the assertion by Virginio Gayda, one of the Axis' satellites, that Italy and Germany were forced "to consider their frontiers to be the Panama Canal." (See New York Times, February 3, 1939.)

This statement about frontiers fits in with Hitler's statement in his book, Mein Kampf:

Nature does not know political frontiers. She first puts the living beings on this globe and watches the free game of energies. He who is strongest in courage and industry receives, as her favorite child, the right to be the master of existence. (See Mein Kampf, complete edition, New York, 1939, p. 174.)

And later in the same book—

Just as the German frontiers are frontiers of chance and temporary frontiers in the day's passing political struggles, so are the frontiers of other nations' domain of life. * * * State frontiers are man-made and can be altered by man. (See same work, p. 949.)

These ideas are summed up in his book in the general phrase—

Germany will be either a world power or will not be at all. To be a world power, however, it requires that size which nowadays gives its necessary importance to such a power, and which gives life to its citizens. (See same work, p. 950.)

Last week Mr. Cudahy, our former Ambassador to Poland and Belgium, appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and reported a conversation he had had with Hitler when he went to see him as a correspondent of an American periodical. Mr. Cudahy stated that he had told Hitler:

That there were two main reasons why the American people were hostile to the Nazi regime and to himself. One of them was that we felt the Nazi conquest threatened our security on this hemisphere, and the next was that American business and international markets could compete with Germany's international output. * * * But Mr. Cudahy reported that "he laughed at this and he said it was fantastic—as fantastic as an invasion of the moon." (See Hearings before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, pp. 143-144.)

This remark of Hitler's is in entire accord with his speech before the Reichstag on January 30, 1939—about 2 years previously—wherein he stated:

The assertion that national socialism in Germany will soon attack North or South America, Australia, China, or even the Netherlands because different systems of government are in control of these places, is on the same plane as the statement that we intend to follow it up with an immediate occupation of the full moon. (See Washington Post, January 31, 1939, p. 6.)

You will note that the Netherlands was included and that an attack on North America and the attack on the Netherlands were equally as fantastic as an invasion of the moon. Yet the Netherlands was wantonly attacked, invaded, and destroyed.

Later in the same speech Hitler said:

Actually the assertion that Germany is planning an attack on America could be disposed of with a mere laugh * * * The German Nation has no feeling of hatred toward England, America, or France; all it wants is peace and quiet. (See same reference.)

Germany has given "peace and quiet" to France; and, according to our isolationist friends, he may give it to England, but never to America. We all wish we could have peace and quiet, but not the kind which descends on a land after Hitler's conquest. The isolationists have no interest in Europe, but Hitler is no isolationist, and has a real interest in the Western Hemisphere. In the same speech he said:

Germany refrains from any intervention in American affairs and likewise decisively repudiates any American intervention in German affairs. The question, for instance, as to whether Germany maintains economic relations and does business with the countries of Central and South America concerns nobody but them and ourselves. (Same reference.)

I do not know whether our isolationist friends believe that Germany's doing business with the countries of South and Central America is of "no concern to us." If they do, they agree with Hitler in repudiating the Monroe Doctrine. If they do not agree with him, are they prepared to defend the Americas, North, Central, and South, against Hitler's economic or military attacks on them?

Hitler ended up this notable speech by offering some advice to the Members of Congress. He said:

Germany at any rate is a great and sovereign country and is not subject to the supervision of American politicians. Quite apart from that, however, I feel that all states today have so many domestic problems to solve that it would be a piece of good fortune for the nations if responsible statesmen were to confine their attentions to their own problems. (Same reference.)

Obviously some isolationist Senators have accepted his advice and passed it along to their hearers at "America First" meetings. In spite of all this and much more which I might have quoted from Hitler and his standard bearers, we keep hearing the advice given us to mind our own business, that Hitler has no interest in America, and if we show no interest in him, he will let us alone in peace and quiet. Unfortunately, that would be the peace and quiet of occupied France.

Let me conclude this part of my remarks by one more quotation, taken from Rauschning's book, The Revolution of Nihilism—Warning to the West:

Thus at the back of Germany's continental empire stands the will to absolute dominion in the world, the technical means of which are no longer lacking as hitherto. * * * And America is already at the outset of internal convulsions produced by a war of ideologies. Here, too, a change may easily come, incredible as it seems as yet, which will convert American opposition into willing discipleship. In the National Socialist view the political situation in America is unstable and can be developed into an outright revolution; to do this is both a tactical aim of National Socialism, in order to hold America aloof from Europe, and a political one, in order to bring both North and South America into the new order. By its ubiquity and its tactics of universal menace, National Socialism is preparing to occupy the key positions for colonial domination, for domination of the great sea routes, and for the domination of America and the Pacific. (See New York edition, 1939, p. 226.)

Mr. President, the amendment of the so-called Neutrality Act is proposed so as to make possible the delivery of war materials to nations fighting Hitler. The act was a voluntary restraint placed by this country upon itself, lest some untoward incident provoke it to go to war against its will. The act proclaimed to the world that this country would not enforce its undoubted rights under international law, rights which the United States had asserted for 150 years and had at times fought to enforce. Its passage, therefore, emboldened the aggressor nations.

The preamble of the act itself declared that this abrogation of the right was temporary. It gave no foreigner any additional right. It was simply a self-imposed restraint to be lifted whenever this country deemed it to its own best interest to lift it. It was an act of appeasement toward Hitler in the hope that, if we were not only neutral but also willing to give up some of our rights as a neutral, he would respect our remaining rights. The hope has proved futile. On the one hand, Hitler has failed to recognize the remaining rights. He has, time and time again, sunk American vessels wherever they happened to be. He has even sunk an American ship carrying an American flag and without cargo off the coast of Africa outside of any combat zone defined by the President of the United States or by Hitler himself. He has even attacked American warships, torpedoed them, and killed members of their crews. The appeasement policy has failed in the case of every country which has tried it. The extreme case was that of the Soviet Union, which not only tried appeasement, but formed an alliance with Hitler, only to find that without warning he turned and struck would be vital blows at his nominal friend and ally. So the appeasement policy has failed here, too, and that reason for the act has gone.

On the other hand, the American people have not shown that emotional weakness on which the act was based. They have not clamored for war when our ships have been sunk and the crews killed. They have been aroused to action, but they have remained calm. Hitler will not attack us, no matter what the provocation may be, until he is ready to strike, and when he is ready he will strike, no matter whether our actions have been friendly or hostile. America should show the same self-restraint. So that reason for the passage of the act has gone also.

In the meanwhile, our hands have been tied in our efforts to help both ourselves and those who are fighting the dictators both across the Atlantic and across the Pacific. We cannot exercise our rights under international law, and only because we have promised ourselves that we will not do so. We have by this promise to ourselves declared to the world that we will not go to the limit of our rights in opposing the aggressors and helping their victims. The proposed amendment to the Neutrality Act merely restores those rights. We will, so far as the repeal of sections 2, 3, and 6 are concerned, simply restore the rights which we have always exercised under international law and under American law. We will again be free to act as free men and assert and enforce our rights to the freedom of the seas. This does not mean going to war. It means simply a reassertion of our rights. War may follow, but it is less

likely to follow if we repeal these provisions than if we keep bound by them.

But those who oppose the repeal say, in effect, that the rights which we have not exercised are of no particular value to us. What good is the freedom of the seas? They claim that this abandonment of our historic doctrine of freedom of the seas has cost us nothing and that it will cost us nothing. They claim that this Nation does not need to export to or import from or have any communication with the rest of the world. It is self-sufficient. This is the fundamental theory of the isolationists' program. It seems to me, therefore, important to give illustrations of the falsity of this theory. Here are a few:

a. There is at the present time considerable chrome now at Port Said, Egypt, awaiting shipment to the United States. We have American flag ships proceeding as far as Suez which are unable to proceed to Port Said to load the chrome because of restrictions imposed by the Neutrality Act. The chrome, therefore, must be shipped on foreign flag ships to some port where American ships can pick it up, or it must be shipped from Port Said to the United States in foreign ships.

b. At the present time there is a supply of cork in North Africa which could be shipped to this country from Casablanca, Morocco. We want the cork, but American ships are not permitted to go to Casablanca because of the restrictions imposed by the Neutrality Act.

c. American-flag ships handling defense material for Egypt, which is neutral territory, cannot handle commercial cargoes for Capetown, Union of South Africa, and other similar ports on the route there because American flag ships with defense materials for neutral countries cannot call at ports which are in territories associated with any of the belligerents on account of the restrictions imposed by the Neutrality Act.

d. American flag ships cannot carry defense materials to Australia, and so foreign flag ships have to be used instead because of the restrictions imposed by the Neutrality Act. The same ships bring back ores and wools. So they come in foreign flag ships instead of American flag ships.

Here are a couple of illustrations nearer home:

e. American flag ships cannot carry cargo from the United States to Halifax, Nova Scotia, or St. Johns, Newfoundland, because of the restrictions imposed by the Neutrality Act. However, cargo for Halifax can be sent by rail originating on American railroads.

f. There is an air base at Clarenville, Newfoundland, which is used largely by the American and Canadian forces. American flag ships cannot carry supplies to that base because of the restrictions imposed by the Neutrality Act.

But these illustrations of what has happened are of minor importance in comparison with illustrations I should like to give of what may happen in case the restrictions of the Neutrality Act are not removed, and events bring about other restrictions imposed by either Germany or Japan, which may extend the combat zones farther into regions from which we derive the great bulk of our strategic and vital materials. Both those nations understand better than do we what a source of economic power lies in the possession of vital strategic materials which America needs. Both of them have suffered from the fear, more than the fact, that other nations might withhold such strategic materials without which they could not wage this war. For years they have piled up great reserves of such materials as copper, nickel, chrome, tungsten, and other war materials. When Norway offered a possible barrier to the delivery of iron ore she was conquered. The same thing would have happened to Sweden if she had not complied with Germany's demands, and, as a result, Sweden is reduced to a state of dependence. The war in Russia has already resulted in Germany getting control of 60 percent of the latter's iron production and a large part of her reserves of manganese.

We need manganese here in our great steel industries. The great bulk of it before the war came from Russia as well as from India, from Africa, and from the Philippines. We need chromium and we are relatively almost as deficient in chrome as Germany was before the war. Without these our effort to build up a national defense cannot be successful. If we lose control of the seas, we may be cut off from them altogether. So we are building up reserves, but they cannot be built up to last long enough. These two materials essential for our defense would be insufficient if we could not keep American vessels sailing through the Indian Ocean. If Japan can control the Malay Peninsula and the naval base which protects the straits at Singapore she will control the Indian Ocean. So Singapore is in a sense a key to our national defense. Yet I have heard people express indifference as to whether the control passed from Great Britain to Japan.

We usually associate Singapore with the two valuable materials, tin and rubber. It is unnecessary to emphasize the importance of both of these in our defense production, and also in our ordinary peacetime industries. Supposing, however, we were cut off from them both; we are piling up a stock, but it is a great question whether it will be sufficient.

The other day in Fall River, a few miles from my own city of Providence, a million and one-half dollars' worth of crude rubber was destroyed by fire. The danger of fire had been foretold by experts and the manner of storing the rubber had been adversely criticized, but apparently nothing was done to prevent this almost irreparable loss. I trust that an official report will be made justifying this apparent neglect. Just as it is important to deliver the war materials we manufacture and not have them sunk in the Atlantic Ocean, so it is important not only to bring from around the world these essential materials but also to protect them from destruction after they get here. Our Government is preparing to manufacture rubber substitutes, but they will supply only a small part of what we are using each year. If these raw materials should be cut off from the Dutch East Indies and the Malay States, both of which are now threatened by Japan, there would be a serious reduction in our supplies, which, if continued long, would seriously cripple both wartime and peacetime production here.

As to tin, it is true that we import a certain amount from Bolivia, but the amount contracted for is only about one-fourth of what we normally use. So for both these and other materials we must keep the sea lanes open to Singapore.

There are other materials vital to some of our industries which we largely import from overseas, such as minerals like graphite and mica, which come to us from across Ceylon and Madagascar, and so are tied up with the fate of Singapore. There is also tungsten, which we need for our high-speed steels, and which comes down the Burma Road, already threatened by Japanese occupation of Thailand. Not only do we need these and other metals from far off Asia, but we also need kapok for life-preservers, leather tanned by mangrove extracts, palm oil, tapioca, and, humorous as it may seem, pig bristles, which go into paint brushes of every kind.

Suppose Japan should strike north against the Russian Vladivostok, or south against the Dutch East Indies, or against the English Singapore itself; under the terms of the Neutrality Act, the President would have to declare the nearby waters a combat zone, and under the restrictions of that act none of our flagships could enter that zone, and we would be deprived of many basic materials necessary not only to our ordinary peacetime life but also to wartime production.

The same thing is true of some other materials in some other parts of the world. The point I am making is that we are deeply interested in the fate of the places whence come these materials, because America is not self-sufficient. Without regard to wars or rumors of wars and without regard to any political considerations, we are vitally interested in places far overseas and must protect our interest in them for the benefit not of the people of those countries but of the people of the United States of America.

Notwithstanding our dependence in these respects on foreign nations we have ourselves incomparably rich reserves of many other materials. These, with our unparalleled industrial plants, must tempt plunderers. Our traditions of liberty and our free institutions serve as a constant threat to the ideals of Hitler and other aggressors like him. For both these reasons, apart from anything they may have said or done, or may say or do in the future, we must realize that we are a natural target for totalitarian aggressors. Therefore, we must make an all-out effort to prepare an adequate national defense; and I believe that the repeal of sections 2, 3, and 6 of the present misnamed Neutrality Act is a part of such defense.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri obtained the floor.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	George	Nye
Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Peace
Ball	Guffey	Pepper
Bankhead	Gurney	Russell
Barbour	Hatch	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Smathers
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bunker	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lee	Truman
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wellgren
Connally	McNary	Walsh
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Murdock	White
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, so far as I can recall, in the something over 8 years I have been a Member of this body, I have never declined to yield to any other Senator who desired to interrupt me while I had the floor, for questions or otherwise; but the question before the Senate today is of such importance, and my desire to present my views upon this matter in as brief and orderly a manner as possible is such that I request that I be not interrupted until I shall have concluded my prepared remarks, at which time, of course, I shall be very glad to yield to any Senator for any question he may desire to ask.

Mr. President, never within the memory of any of us now living has the Senate of the United States been confronted with a question so momentous and so far reaching as the question which is now before us for consideration. It is no less than the dread issue of peace or war—war not in defense of our homeland—an issue upon which any true American would gladly shed the last drop of his blood and his children's blood—but war around the globe, war for people who are not our people, war for territorial occupation and aggrandizement in which we have no interest and want no interest, war for gods which are not our God, war for ideologies which in some cases we abhor and have the most poignant reasons for abhorring. Today we face the culmination of that long succession of "small decisions" which have steadily led us down the path to war.

While I speak with very great feeling on this question, involving as it does the whole future and the complete destiny of this great Republic, which has afforded, and still affords, the greatest opportunity for free government and social progress ever vouchsafed by the Almighty to any of the children of men, I also speak with great solemnity for the occasion and with great compassion for those who differ with me on these transcendent issues. I know that every Senator who casts his vote must do so with the certainty that events either immediate or ultimate may prove him wrong. I pray that every Senator may fully realize that none of us as patriotic Americans can afford to give any consideration whatever to his personal political fortunes, but must be governed with an eye single to the welfare of our beloved country. It is in that spirit that I approach the discussion of this great question.

"These are the times that try men's souls," as was said by one of the greatest patriots of our Revolution, Thomas Paine. The issues presented to us today are so vast and so incalculable in their effect upon the future of our people and our free institutions that they should be decided not upon partisan adherence, not upon real or simulated devotion to a glamorous chief, not upon considerations of personal political safety or expediency, not upon anything other than each Senator's own independent judgment as to the very best measures to be taken for the preservation of those great institutions which have come down to us as a precious heritage from our fathers.

I cheerfully, therefore, accord to every other Senator the right and solemn obligation which I claim for myself, of making up his own mind as to his own constitutional duty in this crucial decision of our Nation's history after consultation with his God, his conscience, and the impressive oath of office which each of us has taken on that rostrum every time any of us has been sworn in as a Member of the Senate. Therefore, I do not wish to engage in personal recriminations with those who differ with me, strong as in some cases that temptation might be.

So it is, Mr. President, that after most careful and prayerful consideration, I proceed to state the reasons for the faith which is within me, the reasons which will actuate me in my vote against the pending resolution, and more particularly why I shall oppose the Senate committee amendment which so greatly amplifies and so vastly changes the scope and intent of the measure as it originally passed the House.

I oppose this resolution, with or without the committee amendment, because I know, as all must know who face the facts, that it is intended to be and can only be an authorization for a state of war—declared or undeclared. The mere declaration, a formal declaration, of war may only be a lame attempt to comply with the Constitution after an actual state of war has been created by extraconstitutional means.

Let me say very frankly, at the outset, that I was not one of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate who on last Saturday claimed "surprise"—to use a legal expression familiar to every trial lawyer—upon the introduction of the Barkley-Connally-George amendment, frankly designed to gut the whole Neutrality Act, instead of merely authorizing the arming of American merchant ships as provided by the House. As a practical realist in parliamentary affairs, I realized from the beginning that it was the intention of the proponents of this measure to emasculate completely the Neutrality Act and let down any legal restrictions to the creation of an actual state of war. I realized that the controlling element as to the course to be pursued would be a purely tactical one as to whether, taking into consideration the many pledges made by many people, the objective could be accomplished at one fell swoop, or whether, in order to save certain faces, it would be necessary to attain the objective in one, two, or three bites.

I was fully aware that it was the intention of the administration to gut the Neutrality Act, either piecemeal or at one gulp, as the situation might develop. I knew that only two things held back the effort to do it at one bite—one, the pledges originally made to the leadership of the House not to put their membership in the hole by extending and essentially changing the proposition as acted on by the House; the other, a doubt as to the position of a very eminent and important Member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, whose vote they correctly conceived to be decisive. These two things were never brought together until last Friday. But when the House leadership agreed to let them go, and one particular Senator agreed to go with them, the result, so far as the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was concerned, was inevitable. We lost in the committee by a single vote, although on the extension amendment we received one vote which we did not expect to get.

As I say, Mr. President, I claim no surprise at this action of the committee. Certainly, I make no complaint as to the action of the committee or of any member of the committee. No one in the Senate or out of it has the right to complain or cavil as to the action of any Senator, sworn on his own oath, in casting his vote in any way his conscience leads him to act on a matter of this vast importance. I would certainly be the very last to do so.

For myself, I welcome the larger issue. I believe that it is far more candid and far more honorable for those who favor the complete reversal of the foreign policy of the United States as expressed by the Congress and the President in the Neutrality Act to advocate frankly the complete emasculation of that act than to approach it by cringing steps of repeal of a section at a time. I would have regarded it as still more candid and more honorable if the majority of the committee, instead of disemboweling the neutrality law, leaving only its number and title, a preamble made utterly misleading by the adoption of this committee amendment, and a few completely innocuous sections, had been willing to put aside sparring for partisan advantage, and had frankly accepted the Willkie amendment for outright repeal, which has been sponsored by three of Mr. Willkie's satellites in this body. That would be at least a frank, open proposition that all may understand. So far as I am concerned, bitterly as I am opposed to both the Barkley-Connally-George amendment and the Willkie-Bridges-Austin-Gurney proposition, if the latter is offered as a substitute for the former I shall

unhesitatingly vote for repeal rather than emasculation.

The real purpose of the committee amendment was disclosed a few days ago when the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was quoted in the public press—so far as I know, without denial—as having made a very frank statement to the effect that he was in favor of "leaving a few little gadgets in the act, chiefly for purposes of ornamentation." If we are to destroy the great basic principles of the Neutrality Act for the prevention of the occurrence of incidents which might lead us into war, we should at least be willing to do so frankly and openly, instead of leaving a mere shell to save the face of Representatives and Senators who have to face the people next year by permitting them to say that they did not vote for the repeal of the Neutrality Act, but only for its modification.

The American people in this great crisis are at least entitled to frankness. When they are about to be called upon to make unparalleled sacrifices of blood and treasure and of civil liberties, far dearer and harder bought than either blood or treasure, the very least that they have a right to demand is to know the truth. Yet never in our history has there been such deliberate and effective obfuscation of the truth to the great body of the people. A distinguished Senator the other day quoted a brilliant summation of the situation by a brilliant newspaperman—himself an interventionist—to the effect that "never in our history has so much been withheld from so many by so few."

Therefore, believing as I do that this measure is the exact equivalent of a congressional authorization for the pursuance of an undeclared war, that this is the last chance the Congress will ever have to pass upon the determination of foreign policy as between war and peace, that if we pass this act with the committee amendment our next vote will be upon the official recognition of a state of war already in existence. I think it would be far more eligible, far more candid, far more honest to the American people if, instead of either the committee amendment or the Willkie amendment, we were called upon to vote upon an open declaration of war, either upon Germany alone or upon any of the other nations upon which Secretary Knox daily declares war.

We hear much of national unity. We all desire national unity—none more than I. But national unity can be achieved only under constitutional processes—not by reckless usurpation of power leading to totalitarian government.

Mr. President, I believe in the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence with a devotion and respect secondary only to the humility and reverence which I feel for the Supreme Being. Next to God Almighty, who in His infinite wisdom has made our fathers and ourselves the recipients of greater blessings than have ever been bestowed on any other people, we owe devotion to the institutions which have preserved to us these priceless gifts. It matters not whether an American be descended in a straight line of Americans since the early 1600's or whether he be an American personally born overseas, the touchstone of our devotion to our country must always be those twin documents, which I shall always regard as one, the very ark of the coventant of our liberties—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Yet today we have Secretary Knox, like one suffering from rabies, without any constitutional authority whatever, declaring war on nation after nation, and solemnly announcing a hundred-year alliance with Great Britain—merely a precursor of Union Now, which simply means our reentrance into the British Empire on terms yet to be determined.

If the United States of America is to be plunged into this eternal, infernal conflict of European power politics, the American people should at least be permitted to know what they are doing, and at least, through their chosen representatives, have some voice in making the decision.

So, in all candor I pose this proposition with regard to national unity: If the President of the United States, in the high responsibility of his great office, believes that the safety and welfare of this Nation demands that the United States should enter this war and be forced to send expeditionary forces abroad—as it will if the highest British military authorities are to be believed—then he should send a message to Congress asking for a declaration of war. If he has made pledges to any foreign power, such as he somewhat ambiguously intimated in his Navy Day speech, the Congress should be promptly advised. He should not approach the great issue by such steps of indirection as the nullification of the Neutrality Act. If this Nation feels that it is our duty or our interest to be at war, and the Congress so votes, then all Americans must loyally adhere to that decision and be willing to make any sacrifice of blood or lives or treasure to insure the success of that war. That would be the honest thing to do. That would be to pursue the American theory of government. That is the only way in which the wishes of our whole people may be tested in the absence of any provision for a referendum of the people on a declaration of war—a measure which I have long favored and supported.

If such a message should be sent and a resolution for a declaration of war should be offered, or if one of the proponents of this measure should be frank enough to offer that issue, many millions of loyal Americans would oppose it. I, from my place on this floor, on my solemn oath as a United States Senator, will oppose it with every fiber of my being. We will oppose this course because we passionately believe that our entrance into this war is neither necessary or justifiable from the standpoint of our national interest, but, on the contrary, is suicidal. But if our constitutional representatives, the Congress, shall see fit to declare war, I think I have a right at least in some small measure to speak for the millions of Americans who now oppose war. Certainly I have a right to speak for myself. I say that when national policy has once been declared by constitutional measures in favor of our participation in this bloody cataclysm, no Americans will outdo us who have opposed the war in eagerness to bare our breasts to the storm to win the war, no matter what our previous views might have been. That would be national unity, and I cannot possibly be too emphatic in the statement that no one, here or abroad, should ever have the faintest doubt of American unity once the die is cast for war. If we once go into this war, we must burn all bridges behind us and go in to win, even if it takes our last man, or, what is far more likely and far less important, our last dollar.

On the other hand, it seems but fair to propose that if the President should recommend a declaration of war—as the whole tenor of his Navy Day speech would indicate that he should—and the Congress should reject it, as I believe that it would, then in the undoubted interest of American unity, the President should desist from his efforts to edge us into the war by small steps and indirection, by a constant effort to create incidents by which he would be able to inflame the people so as to justify a declaration of war. If the Congress, as the representative of the people, will not declare war, then in all good conscience the President should muzzle Knox and Stimson and the others of his henchmen who constantly agitate for war, not one of whom has any personal standing or following among the American people, except exactly insofar as the President's appointive power has given it to him.

And the President himself should abandon those practices calculated to clandestinely edge us into war. That would be an American method of procedure. That would be national unity. Let us resolutely face that issue—national unity. Let me express my solemn conviction that under our form of free government, as it at least temporarily still exists, national unity does not spring from a ukase from on high, or from the mouthings of such as Knox or Stimson or Wickard. It can only result from the brave hearts of the American people, united in a common purpose. Four-fifths of the American people are, I believe, opposed to war, and yet it is deliberately proposed by the highest in Government that we be dragooned into war without any further action by Congress or submission of the issue to the people. I shall presently show that in the only opportunity which the people have had to pass on the Neutrality Act, they believed the President's protestations in its behalf as a means of keeping us out of war in his pleas for reelection by shattering tradition and electing him to the Presidency of the United States for a third term.

Mr. President, the open and deliberate purpose of the neutrality legislation, beginning with the temporary act of 1935, continuing through the act of 1936, and even in the act of 1939, the destruction of which is before us today, was to keep this country out of war. Just as the intended and successful effect of that legislation has been to keep the Nation out of war, the inevitable effect of its repeal or destruction by removing the safeguards

therein contained will be to get the country into war.

Has the Neutrality Act been successful insofar as its spirit has been carried out in keeping the country out of war? On this point we have testimony from the highest quarter. Only so short a time ago as the very end of his last campaign for reelection, on October 24, 1940, in an eloquent defense of his first two administrations, constituting a vibrant appeal for reelection and a pledge to the American people as to his conduct in the event of his reelection, President Roosevelt gave chief credit to the Neutrality Act for keeping us out of war. He said:

> By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps, we made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on ships belonging to countries at war. Was that right? We made it clear that American investors who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right?
>
> We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent, and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right?
>
> In all these ways, we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid becoming entangled through some episode beyond our borders.

And that included Iceland. The President continued:

> These were measures to keep us at peace. And through all the years of war since 1935, there has been no entanglement, and there will be no entanglement.

No more forceful statement of policy, no more definite pledge for the future, was ever made by any American public official or candidate for office. And if, as the President asserted in 1940, "these were measures to keep us at peace," how can it be questioned that their repeal in 1941 are measures to get us into war?

In his message to Congress on September 21, 1939, on the repeal of the arms embargo, the President said:

> I say this because with the repeal of the embargo this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict—I believe that American vessels should, as far as possible, be restricted from entering danger zones.

This wise expression of policy is now to be cast upon the ash heap by the adoption of the pending measure.

Only so lately as October 4, 1941, less than a month ago, in an article in Collier's Magazine, the President said, in referring to the act of 1939:

> This time, after a protracted debate, the recommendations were adopted, and a new neutrality law was passed on November 3, 1939 * * * a month and a half after my appeal.
>
> The adoption of these recommendations offered greater safeguards than we had before, to protect American lives and property from destruction and in that way tended to avoid the incidents and controversies likely to draw us into the conflict, as they had done in the World War.

Now, it is proposed by the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee—that thin red line of one majority—to wipe out the "greater safeguards" to which the President referred and thereby to promote those "incidents and controversies" to which the President also referred as "likely to draw us into conflict, as they had done in the last World War."

In his testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on October 13, 1941, the very bellicose Col. Frank Knox, who is so much bedazzled by the transitory effulgence of his present position that he counts that day lost when he does not, with the most reckless abandon, declare war on somebody and create new enemies, either foreign or domestic, said in referring to the Neutrality Act of 1939:

> In the interest of straight thinking and straight doing, we should put a period to this piece of national hypocrisy.

I wonder if this modern Lord Nelson of naval strategy meant to include in his blanket denunciation of a great national policy, the vehement defense of that policy by the President of the United States in 1940 or the pledges contained in the President's message of 1939. If he meant to accuse President Roosevelt of advocating in 1939 and 1940 a policy of national hypocrisy, it seems to me to be a truly shocking thing.

As an item of history, Mr. President, it may be proper to set it down at this time that in truth and fact the source of inspiration of the original Neutrality Act of 1935 was the President of the United States himself. I honor him for it.

While it is true that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and I were the actual draftsmen and introducers of the three resolutions, which taken together essentially constituted the Neutrality Act of 1935, it is also true that in assuming that responsibility and that honor we were to all intents and purposes acting as the agents and representatives of the Senate Munitions Committee. It is also true that the inspiration, indeed the inception, of the resolutions, came from the President himself at a conference between the President and the members of the Munitions Committee, held at the White House offices and summoned by the President himself shortly before we introduced the resolutions. I may add that the reason for the introduction of the resolutions by the Senator from North Dakota and myself, individually and jointly, rather than their inclusion in the recommendations of the Munitions Committee, was the desire to avoid any possible conflict with the Committee on Foreign Relations on questions of committee jurisdiction.

At any rate it seems to me quite late in the day for the egregious Secretary Knox to attempt to stultify as "national hypocrisy" a series of legislative acts originally inspired by the President, passed by an almost unanimous vote in both Houses in 1935 and 1936, and signed by the President in both instances, amended in exact accordance with the President's wishes in 1939, and championed and exalted by the President during his candidacy at the end of October 1940 as a chief means by which the Nation had been kept out of war.

I should like to have it of record, Mr. President, that if in this connection I have confined myself to quotations from the President of the United States and have omitted for the present the eloquent protestations in favor of existing law from such able and distinguished Senators as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the sagacious and urbane chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee, whom I am happy to count as my very dear friend; the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the efficient and magnetic majority leader, whom I have known and loved for many years; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] whose towering intellect and high character we all respect and love; the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], one of the ablest and finest men I have ever known; the able and erudite Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]; those brilliant young warhawks from Florida and Oklahoma, Messers PEPPER and LEE, yearning for leadership; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and many others—I say, Mr. President, that if I have omitted from my brief remarks at this time actual quotations from their passionate and cogent exposition of the outstanding merits of the Neutrality Act of 1939, now sought to be destroyed, I do so through no lack of respect for their opinions in 1939, but only through a disinclination unduly to detain the Senate at this particular time. These records are, of course, easily available, however, and upon the request of any of these Senators I shall be glad to produce and insert in the RECORD the remarks they made in 1939 for the purpose of refuting Secretary Knox's charge that they were guilty of foisting on the Nation in 1939 an act of "national hypocrisy."

Mr. President, the most outstanding circumstance of the whole course of events since the beginning of the present conflict in Europe, so far as our own affairs are concerned, is the astonishing similarity of pattern between the unhappy train of procedure which led us into the last war—to my mind, one of the most tragic calamities in its ultimate effects which ever befell any free nation—and the steps by which we have been approaching the awful implications of participation in the present conflict. This progress toward the shambles has been delayed, impeded, even averted, as the President indicated in October 1940, by the existence on the statute books of the Neutrality Act. Now it is proposed to destroy that act.

I do not wish to discuss at length the subject of armed merchantmen because that question has now been merged into the larger question of the complete repeal of the Neutrality Act and because the question was so ably discussed on Monday by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and on Wednesday by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. I can add nothing to their complete discussion on the subject. At the risk of tedious repetition, however, I desire merely to emphasize again a few historic facts which go straight to the heart of the question both of the efficacy and the desirability of arming merchant ships.

We all know that in February of 1917, President Wilson having been recently reelected on the slogan "He Kept Us Out of War," suddenly revoked his former

policy and advocated the arming of merchant vessels. That measure was defeated in this body. President Wilson, after denunciation of the Senators who had defeated the armed ship bill, proceeded to get an opinion from the Attorney General of the United States that he had not needed any congressional sanction in the first place—an opinion which to this day does not reflect any credit upon the memory of Attorney General Gregory, but which still stands. Thereupon the President proceeded to put into effect the measure for which he had sought congressional authority but which he had not obtained. Less than a month later I sat upon the rostrum of the House of Representatives and heard President Wilson frankly admit the complete failure of his armed ship policy and ask for a declaration of war.

No one upon this floor or elsewhere will have the hardihood to deny that the very last step on the part of our Government before the active and avowed entrance into war was the measure for arming merchant vessels, thereby divesting them of their character of merchantmen and making them ships of war, subject to all the hazards and responsibilities of ships at war.

We are all familiar with the deliberate conclusion of the most distinguished American naval officer of the last war, Admiral Sims, after the conclusion of the war, a man who undoubtedly had more opportunities for information than any other person alive at that time, when he said:

> All of the experience in this submarine campaign to date demonstrates that it would be a seriously dangerous misapprehension to base our action on the assumption that any armament on merchantmen is any protection against submarines which are willing to use their torpedoes.

In this connection it is but fair to state that Admiral Stark testified that while he served on Admiral Sims' staff he did not agree with the conclusions of his renowned wartime commander, then officially and universally regarded as the ablest naval officer sailing under the American flag. I make no pretense whatever to being familiar with technical matters concerning the Navy, but until someone else has proved his superiority to Admiral Sims as a naval technician I am perfectly willing to accept the conclusions of that great seaman as to technical matters with which he had more opportunity than anyone else to be familiar.

It will not be disputed that on the incontrovertible record no submarine is known to have been sunk by armed American merchantmen in the last war, while many armed merchant vessels were sunk by submarines.

It was testified before the Foreign Relations Committee by Admiral Stark that it will take 4 months to arm approximately 200 out of 1,200 merchant vessels. With the order to shoot on sight issued by this Government, it will become virtually impossible for submarines to come to the surface to ascertain whether or not the merchant vessel is armed, thus placing in tragic jeopardy the crews of the thousand vessels which will still be unarmed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article appearing in yesterday's Washington Star, by Commander Louis J. Gulliver, United States Navy, retired, on the subject of the efficiency of armed ships in sinking submarines.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 31, 1941]

SUBMARINE PERISCOPE, SHOWING ONLY BRIEFLY, MOST DIFFICULT TARGET FOR NAVY GUNNERS

(By Commander Louis J. Gulliver, United States Navy, retired)

Orders issued to commanders of United States naval vessels to capture or destroy Axis raiders found on the sea lanes from the Atlantic Coast to Iceland give point to recent warnings, addressed by a United States naval officer to his brother officers, that "the submarine danger be looked at with a cold and calculating eye and that the surface Navy be prepared for the worst."

This and what follows is taken from the April number of the United States Naval Institute: Modern Submarine Versus Major Warship, by Lt. S. D. Willingham, United States Navy.

The author adds: "It is not too much to suppose that there are several foreign navies who are very proficient in the submarine branch of their services."

What is this submarine danger "to be looked at with cold and calculating eye"? It arises from the fact, according to Lieutenant Willingham, that it is practically impossible for lookouts on warships—and merchant ships also—to see the periscope of an enemy submarine during the few periods of about 10 seconds it is exposed while the submarine is making her approach to attain the best range for firing. Even if the periscope be sighted, it disappears from sight so quickly that the lookout finds it most difficult to convey the knowledge of what he has seen and where he has seen it to the gun crews to enable them to shoot and hit.

SMALL PERCENTAGE OF HITS

The percentage of hits to be made on a submerged submarine, states Lieutenant Willingham, "will probably be very small. At the depth at which submarines operate nowadays, they will suffer little embarrassment from surface-ship gunfire unless flat-nosed and nonrichocheting shells are used, and even then the percentage of hits will probably be very small."

The author limits his discussion to "undamaged submarines" which leave no wake or tell-tale oil slicks and which never will willingly come to the surface except when driven into very shallow water.

A modern submarine may be discovered only by sighting her periscope; she may be approximately located by the sound emitted by her propellers.

Contrary to popular belief, "it is futile to look for a submarine by searching for such things as shadows, discolored water, oil slicks," says the author.

Airplanes for locating submarines are a snare and a delusion, according to Lieutenant Willingham. "Even when the submarine's position is almost exactly known, the submarine is extremely difficult to see from airplanes. This has been repeatedly shown by experiments.

"Aircraft can, of course, see the periscope exposures fairly well. But the great unsolved problem in this connection is: How transfer this sighting from the brain of the man in the plane effectively to the brain of the man at the gun on the surface?"

DIFFICULT TARGET FOR PLANE

Can aircraft effectively bomb a submarine? "The problem of so doing," writes Lieutenant Willingham, "has not yet reached even the experimental stage.

"The difficulty of a plane in getting set for an attack on and aiming at so small and elusive a target as a periscope intermittently exposed for short periods is very great. The pilot of the plane will probably not be able to draw a bead even with the best bomb sight before the periscope disappears and is lost to him."

It is to be inferred from what Lieutenant Willingham has written that surface-ship commanders must place exclusive dependence on their own broadside battery guns to combat attacking submarines. The crews of these guns must fire instantly at hostile periscopes—not wait for orders and not wait while the fire-control system "works out the range and deflection."

Lookouts for submarines have become outmoded, it is implied by Lieutenant Willingham, and in their places are the men composing the crews of the broadside batteries—trained men of the gun-pointer group, accustomed to daily use with telescope sights for searching assigned areas inside the 4,000-yard range.

Battle lookouts high up on masts for submarine periscope detection became a thing of the past when modern submarine attack technique fixed the range for firing torpedoes at not more than 1,500 yards; not less (for safety) than 500 yards.

CAN FIRE UP TO 10 TORPEDOES

Is any type of warship strong enough defensively to stand up to modern submarine torpedo attack? Lieutenant Willingham answers this: "A submarine can hit a battleship repeatedly in the same spot until her back is broken * * * a submarine can and does fire her entire nest of torpedo tubes in rapid succession with as much accuracy as she can fire one tube.

"She can deliver 4, 6, or even 10 torpedoes in rapid succession."

What are the chances of a surface warship to escape if the submarine can get within 1,500-yard range or less; can it, for instance, avoid being hit by dodging (changing course) on seeing the wake of an oncoming torpedo?

Lieutenant Willingham writes: "The chance of the warship escaping destruction is almost nil * * * zigzagging to avoid submarines has now become nearly a useless device due to the facility with which the modern submarine torpedo-control problem is speedily solved." It is only necessary for the submarine commander to ascertain the ship-target's range, bearing, target angle, and speed.

"In time of war," states Lieutenant Willingham, "submarine captains will drive in close to ranges at which a miss will be almost impossible; few ineffective shots will be fired."

If a submarine can get to a 1,500-yard range, her torpedo will traverse this distance in 75 seconds—insufficient time for the surface vessel to swing her bow or stern around for the purpose of reducing the size of target even if her lookouts have sighted the periscope exposure immediately before the shot was fired.

SUBMARINE HAS ADVANTAGE

Lookouts for submarines on surface ships should not expect to see the "feather" caused by the exposed periscope to travel fast. Whenever a submarine captain has commenced an approach, he will never make exposure of his periscope at a higher speed than 2 knots. He will never make exposure at more than 6 knots unless his distance from lookouts is such as to make detection unlikely.

While it is a fact that the slow speed of the periscope makes the submarine easier for gun pointers, yet the advantage of this low speed is all with the submarine. "The short exposure of the periscope at low speeds makes it harder to be sighted by lookouts; it creates a feather very much like an ocean whitecap and of the same approximate duration."

Lieutenant Willingham asserts that "to date the score is heavily in favor of the submarine. It is a mistake to continue with the hopeful attitude that somehow, when the time comes, the submarine situation will take care of itself.

"If guns are to be depended on for defense against submarines, they should be required to demonstrate their ability to defend. Similarly, planes and destroyers should demonstrate their ability."

As a means to a desired end, Lieutenant Willingham advocates required training of all gunnery and ship-control personnel in particular in this phase—hostile submarine—of their duties to an unprecedented extent to bring their proficiency as submarine detectors and submarine destroyers up to a point which will give surface vessels a fighting chance against modern submarines.

"There are no instructions or exercises now available to train personnel to shoot at a periscope. Nor is there a gunnery practice anywhere which gives any idea as to the ability of a shipboard gun to hit and damage a submarine. Such a practice might demonstrate a glaring weakness in surface vessel defensive ability."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly to say it, but it is true, and must be said, that our whole foreign policy since the beginning of this war, has been a succession of steps toward war.

In his great speech at Chautauqua, N. Y., in 1936, when he was a candidate for a second term, in the ringing pledge to keep out of foreign wars which brought him such widespread support, the President said:

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations.

I wish I could keep war from all nations, but that is beyond my power. I can at least make certain that no act of the United States helps to produce or to promote war.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions—

Mark that phrase—

of each day do not lead toward war, and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war. * * * At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the great war of 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

I have quoted these majestic words before in this body, as have other Senators. They cannot be repeated too often. To use the President's own expression, I shall repeat them "again and again and again" so long as freedom of expression is still permitted in this Chamber.

Ah, Mr. President, those "small decisions of each day" to which the President referred at Chautauqua have brought us to the very brink of war or, according to one very reasonable interpretation of the President's Navy Day speech, actually into the war, without the constitutional sanction of Congress.

Two years ago I predicted in the Senate the steps by which we would be drawn down the pathway of participation in foreign war. I said at that time:

And do not forget that it will be done by small steps, no one of which by itself can be said to be a direct cause of our getting into war. But mark my words, when we take the first step we have set our compass. When I was a boy I used to hear my father quote the words from Virgil: "Facilis descensus averni"—easy the descent into hell. I fear that the small steps which we may take in this crisis may eventually be steps which will land this country in the bottomless pit of war. From then on it is farewell to freedom, to liberty, to all of the cherished privileges we have enjoyed under our democracy, at least during the course of the war, and possibly for a long time afterward.

Unhappily I have seen this melancholy prediction fulfilled, until today there remains only the final step—in all probability contained in the pending measure—to plunge us into war. When our feet were once set upon the path leading to war, when successive demands have been made and acceded to under the whip and spur of emergency, each step has been easier, dispassionate discussion has been more difficult. Commitments made even clandestinely without authority of law, form matters of national policy which cannot be retreated from without national dishonor. We found that out with the last war, although we did not learn the full details until 20 years after our involvement in the war. We have been going through the successive steps of extending loans and credits and then of outright gifts, of denuding our own military and naval defenses, already inadequate and scanty for the protection of our own land, of permitting entry to our ports of armed merchant ships and finally of ships of war for repair, of imposing conscription upon our youth in time of peace, of largely submitting to the Army's industrial mobilization plan even in time of peace, which frankly and openly means dictatorship. Now our Navy, by the sole order of the President, is in the opening stages of an undeclared war.

The American people do not want war. In every way in which they have ever had the opportunity of expressing themselves they have so indicated. Their last opportunity was just a year ago, in the election of 1940.

Only 1 year ago we had a national campaign, involving not only the Presidential succession, but the future destiny of this Republic. At the Democratic National Convention of 1940, as the chairman of the Missouri delegation, I helped adopt the declaration of my party upon foreign policy, to which I was and still am passionately devoted. Upon this declaration we solemnly appealed to the country for support:

We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces—

Mark those words—

to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine. The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been and will continue to be the defense of our land and the maintenance of its peace.

This plank was unanimously adopted by the Democratic Convention with the specific approval of the President of the United States. The Republican platform was only slightly less specific and binding.

No less striking were the forthright declarations of our candidate—declarations which enabled him to break the Nation-old tradition and be sworn for a third term. He was direct, explicit, eloquent.

During the campaign, in addressing the Teamsters Union convention at Washington on September 11, the President said:

I hate war now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all that I can to keep war from these shores for all time. I stand with my party upon the platform adopted at Chicago: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

This was a solemn pledge made to the American people by the President as a solemn consideration for his reelection. Yet today, little more than a year later, an American expeditionary force is in Iceland under general supervision of a British general as the senior officer of joint control of a partnership with a belligerent state.

Again at Boston on October 30, 1940, the President said:

I have said this before, and I shall say it again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

I take it that applies to sailors as well as soldiers.

And at Philadelphia, in the very crisis of the campaign, the President said:

To Republicans and Democrats, to every man, woman, and child in the Nation, I say—I repeat I stand on the platform of our party. It is for peace I have labored; and it is for peace I shall labor all the days of my life.

On the basis of the specific pledges I, in company of millions of other Americans, supported the President for reelection. It is but fair to say, however, that Mr. Willkie's pronouncements, though less eloquent and bearing less evidence of sincerity, were to the same effect.

Yet within 6 months of the election I lived to see the exact words of the Democratic platform upon which the President and our party appealed to the country and won the election, voted down by a partisan majority in the United States Senate when I offered it word for word as a declaration of national principle in connection with the lease-lend-give bill.

So, we come to the lease-lend bill, or the Lenin-lease bill as it now appears to be. No condition existed at the time of its introduction and passage which had not existed during the national campaign and been known both to Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie. Neither made any suggestion of any such measure during the campaign. If either had advocated such a proposition he would, in my opinion, have been decisively defeated. After the election both candidates ardently supported the bill for dictatorial powers and

for paying the expenses of the defense of the British Empire—ostensibly as a peace measure. I do not wish to discuss that measure today in more detail than to remark that its already admitted effects will be to increase the national debt to the point of bankruptcy, certainly to double, in most cases treble, and in many cases multiply by 7 to 10 our taxes for the next and many succeeding years—I am now referring only to the expenditures already authorized—and by increasing indirect and unseen taxes on the poorest classes of our citizens, to increase the cost of living to the point where it will be intolerable. We are already having the dance. Soon we shall have to pay the piper.

The present situation abroad, Mr. President, once more illustrates with bitter clarity the age-old picture of the instability of Old World alliances and friendships and the danger of our participation on any side. In the last war we had many allies—or associates, which means the same thing—including England, France, Italy, Russia, Japan, Portugal, Rumania, Serbia, Greece, and a score of others. If now we enter this war to wage a contest in the Eastern Hemisphere, we could count, and count for the present, only on the British Empire, "Red" Russia, and China.

Even the names of places and locations of battles which are now appearing in the press despatches and have appeared since the war began have been the scenes of battle and carnage since the dark ages. The Crimea, scene of so much bitter recent fighting, once was the scene of bloody warfare where English and French and Italian and Turkish troops as allies faced the great armies of Russia.

We all know that during centuries there has been combination after combination as to the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe, that wars have recurred time after time as a result of these alignments. We know that Great Britain, continually fishing in troubled waters, has been first on one side and then the other of these combinations. Even in the most modern history it is difficult to place two allies today who have not in the most recent times been bitter enemies, or two enemies who have not within the memory of all of us been sworn friends. We need go back no further than the outbreak of the present war. France and Great Britain were sworn allies, bound by pledges of mutual faith and action which could never be dissolved. Solemn mutual obligations had been entered into as to the conduct of each in the then unbelievable event that either should be forced to capitulate. France fell, and the fall of France led to mutual recriminations as to good faith which have led to battles between them around the world.

In America we idealized LaBelle France and we rushed to her war materials which were badly needed at home, some of which have since been used against Britain and some of which will be used against us if we enter the war. Italy turned on her old allies on the ground that she had never been paid the purchase price for her alliance in the last war. Russia, expected to be the great enemy of Germany, traded with Hitler, participated in the rape of Poland, subdued the Baltic States, and made an unprovoked and partly unsuccessful attempt to ravish heroic Finland. Russia seized part of Roumania and acquiesced in Hitler's stealing the rest and to all intents and purposes seizing Bulgaria. Now Hitler and Stalin are at each other's throats—a case of dog-eat-dog- if there ever was such a case in the history of the world. Now Hitler has started again on what were probably originally his real objectives—the rich food and mineral resources of the Ukraine, that vast granary where only a few years ago under the beneficent rule of Josef Stalin 2,000,000 people literally starved to death in the midst of the greatest wheat producing country in the world.

So today we are confronted with the bitter question of peace or war—not war in the defense of our own shores and the shores of this hemisphere, but war around the world, war in Europe, war in Asia and Africa and the South Seas, war in defense of other lands, some of which we may not be able to defend and some of which we ought not to defend, war in which we will vastly weaken our ability to defend ourselves at home against any aggressor.

Let me make it as plain as I possibly can that I am by no means a pacifist, I have seen war; I hate war—offensive war, unnecessary war. But in defense of this land and of our institutions, I would shed every drop of my blood and every drop of my children's blood.

Let me repeat what I have said before on this floor as to why I do not think it is to the national interest of this great nation which we all love so much to orient its policy toward participation in the struggles of the old and new empires pushing each other around on the European Continent, and in Africa and Asia.

It is primarily because I have in my head and in my heart a dream of America—a great and lofty belief in the future of our America, which I do not wish to see gassed to death on ancient and everlasting battlefields in a quarrel about lands and power unworthy of being the death place of American men and ideals. I do not wish to see our boys come back home not only wracked with wounds but shocked and poisoned by the revolutionary excesses which every expert and student expects to signal the end of this war—no matter who wins the war.

I do not think that the United States should participate in this war, because I do not think we require the help of the British Navy or the help of the military power of the far-flung British Empire or the Red Army to defend this nation or this hemisphere. I think there would be far less damage to the hopes of our young men, the oncoming generation who are the hope and heart of our future, to their belief in our nation, to their respect for us as their elders and advisors, if we do not peddle their blood in return for military or naval help, which, in the first place, might never be given us, and, in the second place, under the changed techniques of modern warfare, might not be of any use to us, and which, in order to have at our disposal, would obligate us to fight in Europe or around the world, wherever the imperial interests of far-flung empires might demand, to take such allies as Russia whenever it serves the British interest.

Further, I do not believe that we should orient the fortune of America into the old, old, age-long quarrels of Europe, because I think that if we once get over there again, we will never get our boys back. Vast numbers of them will die, of course, and I think of that fact very solemnly. More of them will come back but will wish they had died, a fact which I think of even more solemnly. I think also of the fact that at the end of another long war, no administration that got us into it could face the people without attempting some huge world-reforming organization of which American soldiers, policing all the defeated nations and propping up all the victorious nations, would be an integral part. I think this certainly is one of the inevitable implications of our participation in this war.

Mr. President, let no one in or out of this Chamber hug the delusion to his bosom that once we get into this war we can foresee or control the extent or character of our participation in it. War knows no limit. Once in, for our own preservation we must take any measures necessary or advisable to win.

A few days ago I saw an eminent Senator quoted in the public press to the effect that he was willing to go into the war and then expressed the conclusion that it will be a war in which only our naval and air forces would be engaged but not our armies.

But that will be beyond our control. Congress can declare war, but it cannot successfully conduct one. The nature and extent of our participation will then be governed by strategic and tactical considerations and we will all vote, where votes are necessary, for the recommendations which the President may make on the advice of the technical, military, and naval authorities. And I make the further melancholy prediction that once we are in the war we will all perforce acquiesce in the surrender of any of our civil rights that the President may see fit to demand.

No, Mr. President, we cannot control or predict the extent or the duration of our struggle, once we have entered the war.

As I said a moment ago, in 1917 I sat on the rostrum of the House of Representatives and heard President Wilson deliver his memorable War Message to the Congress. In the debate which followed, it was repeatedly said, and almost universally believed, that our effort in the war would be confined to naval action and that the sending of troops would not be necessary, save possibly a small token force. Yet within a week after the signing of the resolution declaring war, frantic cries were raised by the Allies: "Help us, help us, save us or we sink." By November of 1918 we had 2,000,000 men in Europe and 2,000,000 more on the way. In October 1918 I saw in the line boys who only 6 or 7 weeks before had been inducted into service, some of whom had never even fired a rifle. We left tens of

thousands of graves in France and Russia, we filled our hospitals with the maimed and disabled, the gassed and the insane, we incurred billions of dollars of debt, which will not be paid off in the time of our remote descendants.

I know that if we go into the war we will go in all the way.

So, Mr. President, believing, as I firmly do, that the pending measure is but the immediate precursor to our entrance into war, believing, as I do, that our participation in this war is a tragic, mayhap a fatal mistake for our national welfare and our institutions, I oppose this resolution and the proposed amendments thereto with every fiber of my being.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	George	Nye
Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Peace
Ball	Guffey	Pepper
Bankhead	Gurney	Russell
Barbour	Hatch	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Smathers
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bunker	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lee	Truman
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wallgren
Connally	McNary	Walsh
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Murdock	White
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BALL obtained the floor.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask to have read into the RECORD a telegram I have received today from Westinghouse Local 601, in Pittsburgh, representing 17,000 members, asking for the immediate passage of the legislation now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the telegram, as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *October 31, 1941.*

Senator GUFFEY,

Washington, D. C.:

We the members of the executive board of Westinghouse Local 601, representing 17,000 members, wish to express our deepest sympathy to the wives and families of the members of the crews of the destroyers *Reuben James* and *Kearny* who have lost their lives in submarine attacks on the United States Navy. We condemn this as a cowardly attack on our national independence and the freedom of the seas.

We urge the immediate repeal of the Neutrality Act, and such other measures as will halt these cowardly attacks on our ships and the taking of American lives.

EXECUTIVE BOARD, LOCAL 601,
U. E. R. M. W. A.,
CHARLES NEWALL, *Business Agent.*
JOHN A. METCALFE, *President.*

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Earlier in the day I asked unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until 11 o'clock on Monday. At that time the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] objected. I have since consulted the Senator from California, and I think there is no objection to that course at this time.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky how long he intends to have the Senate continue in session this afternoon?

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I know, we shall recess at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then I shall have no objection to the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think it is quite appropriate at this time that I read a short statement on the subject of neutrality which was made by Vice Admiral William S. Sims, retired, United States Navy, on May 8, 1935, and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, volume 79, part 7, pages 7451–7452, in which the admiral says:

> From history it is clear that treaties and international law will be violated whenever a nation has its back to the wall.
>
> Suppose, for example, a nation were fighting for its life. And suppose the United States were sending vast quantities of goods to that nation's enemy, by way of trade through neutral countries. It is quite certain that the nation fighting for its life would stop as much of such trade as it could.
>
> And no mere provision of any trade treaty or of international law would prevent this. In the face of disaster the treaty would become a scrap of paper.
>
> That is, no nation at war can respect a treaty made in peace if compliance with it would cause defeat. Under such conditions armed insistence upon the freedom of the seas would simply mean war. Such insistence on our rights would be the way to get into a war, not the way to stay out.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations on the executive calendar be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations of yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be immediately notified.

MODIFICATION OF NEUTRALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the great principle of freedom of the seas is involved in the issue before us in connection with Joint Resolution 237. That aspect of the issue has been discussed completely here by men whose knowledge of the subject and its history makes their statements authoritative.

Maintenance of freedom of the seas for the United States, with its thousands of miles of shores on the two great oceans of the world, appears to me essential for our future growth and development and prosperity. It is clear that Hitler challenges that principle by his unrestricted submarine warfare. It is clear, also, that in the self-imposed restrictions of the Neutrality Act, the United States does sacrifice some of its rights under that principle and by so much bows to the will of aggression.

But I am more concerned with the effect of repeal of the Neutrality Act—and repeal of sections 2, 3, and 6 is tantamount to complete repeal—I am more concerned with the effect of repeal on our foreign policy, and its effect on the prospect of peace or war for this Nation.

I find myself in agreement with the opponents of this resolution in their contention that its passage will mark a significant change in the direction and the objective of our foreign policy insofar as Congressional action is concerned.

When Congress passed the Lease-Lend Act last March, I interpreted, and I believe the majority of people in the United States interpreted, the foreign policy underlying that act as committing this Nation to furnish all possible material aid, short of shooting, to those nations resisting Nazi aggression, with the objective of helping them to halt Hitler's world-conquering march before England fell and the Nazis won free access to the oceans of the world.

I believed then, and I believe now, that this policy offered the best chance for the United States to remain at peace. If by reason of our failure to assist those nations resisting him Hitler had been able to overrun and conquer all of Europe, including England and the British Navy, the United States would have faced two alternatives. Either we could in such an event play Hitler's game and submit supinely to whatever rules for world commerce he chose to lay down, or we could resist further Axis aggression with every probability that resistance would mean all-out war—war with the United States alone fighting enemies in both the Atlantic and the Pacific. And so, while recognizing that the lend-lease policy did involve risks of war and shooting, it appeared to me that in the long run that

policy held out the most hope for real peace for the United States.

In the 7 months since the Lease-Lend Act was passed, many events have darkened the world picture and increased our danger.

The brutal and mass reprisal executions in France and the slaughtering of hundreds of innocent men and women in Norway, in Czechoslovakia, and in Yugoslavia by the Gestapo because they did not collaborate enthusiastically with the Axis, have furnished new evidence of the barbaric cruelty and inhumanity of the Nazis, and their ruthless disregard of every rule and ethic of our civilization in their determination to conquer and impose their slave system on the entire world.

Hitler's invasion of Russia, his erstwhile ally, in violation of his pledged word, and the intensified efforts to force France, whose leaders thought they could make an honorable peace with the Nazis, back into the war on the side of the Axis, demonstrated more forcibly than any arguments could demonstrate how futile would be a negotiated peace which left the Nazis in power.

The frequently reported and undenied efforts of Nazi emissaries to persuade Japan to go to war against the United States in the Pacific gave us new proof, if any were needed, that the United States and the Americas are not exempt from Hitler's plan for world domination.

This evil force that has spread its black rule over most of the continent of Europe is the sworn enemy of everything that we in America hold dear—freedom, education, equal opportunity, and those spiritual and ethical values which constitute our western civilization. It has become increasingly clear with the passing months that so long as the Nazis hold sway in Europe; so long as there is a single Czech or Norwegian or Greek at the mercy of the Gestapo, no man here in America who values the freedom our fathers fought for, and who wants to preserve that freedom for his children and their children, can feel any sort of security. In order that the world, and the United States with it, may resume its march of civilization and progress, that evil force must be crushed.

No individual and no nation can afford to stand on the sidelines in this worldwide fight to the finish between the democratic way of life and the slave system that Hitler calls his new order.

In recent months there has taken place a significant change in American foreign policy, brought about by the pressure of these events. Whereas our policy under the Lease-Lend Act was to lend all possible material aid, short of shooting, to the democracies in order to stop Nazi aggression, today our policy is to do whatever may be necessary to defeat Hitler and nazi-ism. That is the conclusion which I draw from the actions of the administration and the President's utterances in recent months. It is significant that in his recent speeches the President has omitted the phrase "short of war," and has spoken of our determination, not merely to halt aggression, but to smash Hitlerism. I could wish that the President had stated the new policy earlier and more bluntly and more frankly to the American people, but I believe that this new policy is clearly revealed in his recent speeches.

It is primarily Executive action and speech, rather than Congressional action, which has brought about this change in the direction and the objective of our foreign policy. In the issue now before the Senate, Congress has an opportunity either to ratify this fundamental change in the direction and objective of our foreign policy or to reject it. I, for one, intend to support it with my vote. I shall support it, first, because I believe it is the right policy, the policy which best guarantees the future security and freedom of the United States, and, second, because I believe that to turn back now would be disastrous, would invite war in the Pacific, and would encourage Hitler to continue his march of conquest.

I agree with the opponents of the pending resolution that its passage, which presumably will be followed by the arming of our American-flag ships and their sailing loaded with tanks and guns and airplanes, to ports of our belligerent allies, unquestionably means shooting on the ocean. Perhaps that question is academic, because in self-defense we are already shooting in the Atlantic. We are shooting because we were shot at. Defeat of the resolution presumably would amount to a repudiation by Congress of actions taken by our Government and our Navy. Whether it actually would stop the shooting, I doubt, but its defeat certainly would leave the responsibility for our more aggressive foreign policy resting exclusively on the shoulders of the President. Those who sincerely believe that the future welfare and security of the United States will be better served if Congress repudiates these actions of our Government and this change in policy and refuses to share the responsibility, should honestly vote against the resolution. But I, for one, believe the policy to be right, and I am willing to assume my small share of responsibility for that policy.

Mr. President, aside from this fundamental issue involved in Joint Resolution 237, there is a more urgent and immediate reason for its passage. The present cumbersome method of delivering the munitions we are making to the nations resisting the Nazis is not fully effective at present and is virtually certain to break down when our production of the needed weapons begins to increase as rapidly as I am confident it will increase in the next few months. That situation may become particularly critical if Hitler succeeds in stabilizing his lines in Russia in the near future and is able to turn his entire energy to the battle of the Atlantic and his efforts to choke England to death. I believe we should be forehanded and cut away now any restrictions which might hamper speedy and effective action by our Government when the need arises.

The chief argument against the resolution, which we have heard reiterated over and over again on this floor, is that its passage is certain to mean shooting, that shooting will lead to war, and that war will mean another American expeditionary force. I agree that its passage probably will increase the shooting which is already going on in the Atlantic. But whether it means all-out war, whether it means another A. E. F., depends upon whether such measures will be necessary to achieve our objective, which is the defeat of the Nazis. I do not believe that any man living can say for certain whether such steps will be necessary. I hope that the assistance of our merchant marine and the participation of our Navy will be enough to do the job. If not, I am prepared to cross that bridge when we come to it. And I would remind the Senate that there can be no expeditionary force to Europe without further action by Congress, and we will have an opportunity to pass on that issue if it comes before us.

But to go further, the issue before this Nation is not quite so simple as a clear-cut choice between peace or war for the United States. The opponents of the pending joint resolution have concentrated entirely on the probabilities of shooting involved in it, but they have devoted little attention to what might happen if they prevail, if this measure is defeated, and if the Government of the United States as a result reverses its present policy and leaves to their fate the nations in Europe that are resisting Nazi aggression. I should like for only a moment to explore that side of the picture.

Defeat of the joint resolution and reversal of our policy of doing whatever is necessary to defeat Hitler will not launch the United States down any path strewn with the olive branches of peace. If we withdraw our aid to the nations resisting Nazi aggression, or if we decline to take measures necessary to make our aid effective, then one of two things must happen: Either we shall have a stalemate in the European war with a negotiated peace of some sort, or else Hitler will be victorious, and that will be the signal for Japan to launch new aggressions in the Far East. In view of the events of the past 2 years, no thinking person can believe that a negotiated peace, leaving the Nazis in control of most of Europe, with their tremendous military machine intact and their dream of world domination still driving them, could be more than a breathing spell while the whole world prepared for a new war which would be inevitable. That would mean a continuation for years, and probably for decades, of a tremendous defense program here in the United States. The only way we could be sure of any measure of security or peace within our own boundaries would be to maintain a tremendous standing Army and air force and a two-ocean Navy greater than any now contemplated. Even then, there would still be a strong probability that we would have to fight. If the alternative should occur, and Hitler should be victorious in Europe, and Japan in Asia, then I think there is no question that the United States eventually would fight, would go to war. We would go to war against both Japan and the Nazis, and we would fight alone and in both oceans. Possibly we could win such a war. I have great faith in the spirit and the courage and the enterprise of the American people once they are aroused, and I believe we might win

such a fight, even with all the rest of the world against us. But the odds would be heavy, and the chances strong that we might lose.

So, until Nazi aggression is smashed finally and completely, I cannot see any hope of any real or lasting peace for the United States or for any other democratic nation in the world.

Mr. President, we have heard over and over again here comparisons between our present policies and actions and those which preceded our entry into the first World War. The idea seems to be that it was incidents, sinkings of ships and shooting at sea, which caused the United States to enter the first World War. It is upon that idea that the present Neutrality Act was based. I do not believe that this Nation ever has gone to war or should go to war because of incidents. I think we went into the first World War because our right to use the ocean highways was challenged and because we as a nation became convinced that an imminent victory for Germany would have upset the balance of world power and endangered our national security. I believe our mistake was not in going into the first World War, but our mistake was that after we had helped win that war we did not follow through and utilize our full power and influence toward establishing and keeping a permanent world peace. Our mistake was in trying to withdraw from the world and insisting upon an unrealistic isolation for this great Nation.

I have the highest regard for the sincerity and integrity of those persons here and elsewhere who are on the other side of this issue; I believe that I hate war and would dislike as much as any of them to see this Nation involved in an all-out war; yet I believe there are some things worse than war; and one of them is the obliteration of the freedom and dignity of civilized man which has taken place in Europe. I know that all of us would rather have the United States go to war than see that system imposed here.

It is my profound conviction that until Nazi aggression is smashed finally and completely, our freedom in America cannot be secure and our democracy cannot grow and develop. In the light of that conviction I have supported and shall support whatever policies and actions are necessary on the part of this Nation to assure the survival and continued progress of freedom. Because the passage of House Joint Resolution 237 constitutes such an action and approves such a policy, I am supporting it.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate take a recess, in accordance with the order heretofore made, until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, November 3, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 1 (legislative day of October 27), 1941:

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Rhode Carl Myers, Afton.
Max L. Barton, Salem.

MICHIGAN

Ralph H. Premo, Amasa.
Waldo Whitehead, Atlanta.
Orva W. Murphy, Auburn.
Joseph Schneller, Calumet.
Audrey J. Filley, Michigan Center.
William J. Faircloth, Onaway.
Vera P. Ramsey, Pinconning.
Homer Edwin Wassam, Temperance.

TEXAS

Walter G. King, Bogota.
Tilden B. Armstrong, Sunray.

WISCONSIN

Harvey E. Wanish, Boyd.
Theodore J. Helmke, Hamburg.
Grace R. Miller, Shiocton.
Grover T. Pace, Stanley.
William R. Collins, White Lake.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, October 27, 1941)

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

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

O Thou who with infinite patience and wisdom beyond our earthly comprehension workest out Thy vast designs into which our lives are woven: We rejoice that by Thy providence over-ruling our ignorance and our mistakes we are daily saved from peril and from ruin by Thy knowledge and Thy tender care.

We bless Thy holy name that in all the world's afflictions Thou art afflicted; that in all our conflicts with temptation we are not alone, for Thou art our succor and defense against the enemy, and in sorrow, disappointment or failure, Thou dost not give us over to repining, but art ever teaching us to play our part with fortitude as men.

Remove all foolish fears, all sinful discontent, that we may see clearly the path which Thou wouldst have us take and by Thine own indwelling find strength to walk therein. Thus may we do Thy will to the glory of Thy name and the fulfillment of our duty, 'til we come to the land where there are no shadows and no cares; 'til we and those that we have loved long since and lost awhile are all safe in the keeping of Thine everlasting love.

In the Saviour's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, November 1, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Peace
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Schwartz
Bridges	Hughes	Shipstead
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lee	Truman
Chavez	Lodge	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Vandenberg
Connally	McFarland	Van Nuys
Danaher	McKellar	Wallgren
Davis	McNary	Walsh
Downey	Maloney	Wheeler
Doxey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Murray	Wiley
George	Norris	
Gerry	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RETIREMENT OF JOSEPHUS DANIELS AS AMBASSADOR TO MEXICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the last of the week just past brought the intelligence that Hon. Josephus Daniels had resigned as United States Ambassador to the Republic of Mexico.

Upon his appointment in 1933 his was a difficult task. For many years he carried forward that task with dignity and honor to himself and this great country. He was the first Ambassador who actually understood the idea of hemispheric solidarity and the policy of good neighborliness amongst fellow freemen, and he acted in his official and personal capacity accordingly.

Those of us in this country who understand the greatest characteristic of the American, which is fair play, those who believe in the democratic way of life in Latin America and among the people of Mexico, will not forget the wise course of conduct he pursued in administering