

tory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 6014. A bill to make the workman's compensation laws of Alaska and Hawaii applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territories; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 6020. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. Con. Res. 57. Providing for the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives on the bill H. R. 5479; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 337. Resolution to set up a committee of five members of the House of Representatives to study and report upon the suggested changes in tax rates and benefits under the Social Security Act, as amended, and all acts relating thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. Res. 338. Resolution to create a committee to investigate the activities of so-called dollar-a-year men employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 6015. A bill for the relief of Truscon Steel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. R. 6016. A bill for the relief of Michael-Leonard Seed Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 6017. A bill granting a pension to Inez Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 6018. A bill granting a pension to Alva A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 6019. A bill for the relief of the Home Insurance Co. of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2042. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Journeymen Barbers Union, Local No. 295, Los Angeles, Calif., recommending that defense housing projects be placed in the hands of local housing men who are acquainted with the territory, instead of setting up additional organizations to handle the work; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2043. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, No. 2223, requesting joint Army and Navy board to consider San Francisco Bay project proposed by John Reber, in connection with consideration of proposed low-level bridge from Hunters Point to Bay Farm Island; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2044. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 2223, passed by Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, requesting joint Army and Navy board to consider San Fran-

cisco Bay project proposed by John Reber, in connection with consideration of proposed low-level bridge from Hunters Point to Bay Farm Island; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2045. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Polish Czechoslovak Alliance, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2046. Also, petition of the National Small Businessman's Association, Akron, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supply of materials required for defense production, including lend-lease and other exports; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2047. Also, petition of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and the omnibus rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1941

Chaplain Henry R. Wescott, Jr., United States Army, Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us allow a poet to lead us toward prayer:

The woods were dark and the night was black,  
And only an owl could see the track;  
Yet the cheery driver made his way  
Through the great pine woods as if 'twere day.

I asked him, "How do you manage to see?  
The road and the forest are one to me."  
"To me as well," he replied, "and I  
Can only drive by the path in the sky."

I looked above, where the treetops tall  
Rose from the road like an ebon wall,  
And lo, a beautiful starry lane  
Wound as the road wound and made it plain.

And since, when the path of my life is drear  
And all is blackness and doubt and fear,  
When the horrors of midnight are here below  
And I see not a step of the way to go,  
Then, ah, then I can look on high  
And walk on earth by the path in the sky.

Let us pray: Eternal Spirit, so help us who are in this place of potent influence that we shall walk on earth this day and all the days by the path in the sky. Lead, Kindly Light, amid the gloom encircling the world. Incline the citizens of our Nation and those who legislate for them to follow Thy leadership. Then shall we aid in overcoming the brutalities of life; then shall we gather to our companionship in effort the many who by their selfish independence are delaying the perfecting of Thy Kingdom in the world.

Make us willing to banish minor loyalties for the sake of a larger and more valuable loyalty; swerve us in national and international matters from what would lead to unfortunate actions and unhappy sequent memories. Guard us against having to undo some actions, against having to admit in the confessional of God and of world relationships that we were unfair and unjust. So guide and reinforce our Nation that it shall fulfill the ancient prophecy, "My servant art thou through whom I shall break into glory." To this end impel us

to give the arts of peace priority over all else.

Withhold not Thy benediction from our President, the Vice President, the Cabinet, and the Congress. Reinforce them physically; refresh them spiritually daily; enable them to be equal to their heavy responsibilities.

And to Thy name shall be the praise. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 10, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### REGULATION OF SIZES AND WEIGHTS OF MOTOR VEHICLES—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, composed of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and myself, I desire to give notice, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I have called a hearing to consider Senate bill 2015 entitled "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of the sizes and weights of motor vehicles engaged in transportation in interstate or foreign commerce," the hearing to be held at 10 o'clock a. m., December 8, 1941, in the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee room.

This notice is given for the convenience of the many interested parties who desire to appear and be heard. In the future it will be convenient for Senators and Representatives to refer inquiries as to date of hearings to the page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where this notice is inserted.

The committee will convene from day to day until all interested parties have had a chance to be heard.

As the correspondence from parties concerned in the various States of the Union has become so voluminous that it is difficult to handle, I make this statement and give this notice to every one who may be interested.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5553) providing an appropriation for additional members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5553) providing an appropriation for additional members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and for other

purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

##### AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

##### SALE OF LANDS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

##### LANDS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, MURFREESBORO, TENN.

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to Rutherford County, Tenn., for highway purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

##### SEPTEMBER REPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for the month of September 1941, including statement of loan and other authorizations made during the month, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented, and referred as indicated:

##### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Old Age Pensioners, of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for a living pension to old-age pensioners; to the Committee on Finance.

Memorials of several citizens of the United States remonstrating against modification of the Neutrality Act; to the table.

##### By Mr. ELLENDER:

The petition of Mrs. William G. Neely (chairman, etc.) and sundry other citizens of Morehouse Parish, La. 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.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a statement addressed to me by the Iowa Manufacturers Association with reference to national policy in regard to social-security legislation.

There being no objection, the letter containing the statement was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IOWA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,  
Des Moines, November 11, 1941.

GUY M. GILLETTE,  
United States Senator, Senate Office  
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting of the executive committee of this association, on October 29, 1941, after considerable discussion, the following statement was adopted as the expression of the opinion of more than 1,000 Iowa manufacturers, and I was instructed to forward a copy to you, and to each of the Iowa congressional delegation:

"The people of the United States, in these trying times, are being asked to lay aside their normal rights and privileges, to accept a reduced standard of living, and to place their whole energies behind a vigorous and all-out program to defend the security of this Nation.

"The executive committee of this association approves this policy 100 percent. Defense must come first.

"In our opinion, those in Government should likewise put aside many plans and programs which in normal times might receive more careful consideration.

"It would be fatal to the security of this country if those in Government should attempt to use the defense emergency as a means of fostering the permanent centralization of control over the lives of the American people.

"The simple way out, in a time of emergency—a time of impatience—may be to assume powers first and inquire into their necessity afterward.

"This is what appears to be happening today in the social-security field.

"For 6 years America has been developing a system of social security which has been generally recognized as being basically sound and sensible. Citizens in all walks of life are helping to build this program into one that will best satisfy the needs of our country, not merely today or tomorrow but for decades to come.

"In the opinion of this executive committee, the defense emergency should not be made an excuse for changing the direction of this development.

"We believe that, with minor exceptions, Federal legislation in this field should be laid aside for the duration of the emergency.

"Efforts to distort the permanent social-security system to meet the needs of an unusual emergency can result only in wrecking the system and saddling the Nation with liabilities which it may be unable to meet when the emergency is over.

"Specifically, we urge our Representatives in Congress to oppose any effort to extend the controls now exercised by the Federal Government over State unemployment-compensation systems. In our opinion, the States are competent to develop their own unemployment-compensation systems without dictation from Washington, and we believe that the most constructive move that could be made in this field would be the restriction of Federal authority.

"We oppose the establishment of any Federal system of unemployment compensation. In our opinion, there can be no justification for any further action in this field by the Federal Government, either toward usurping the powers of the States, confiscation of the reserves built up by the States, or superimposition of any general Federal "dismissal wage" plan.

"We urge our Representatives to oppose any proposals to increase the liabilities of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to employees now covered by this system. Tinkering with the basic benefit formula at this time would be most unwise.

"We recommend that taxes collected to support the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system be restricted to the amount

necessary to meet the current benefits provided by the system, with a small contingency reserve.

"If the Federal Government is to impose new taxes, either for the purpose of producing needed revenue or for the purpose of curtailing purchasing power to control inflation, we recommend that such taxes be levied for this purpose directly and independently of the social-security system.

"At the present time the American people are concerned with defending their national security. We do not believe that this is the time for consideration of legislation to establish any new form of social security.

"We believe that the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System should be modified in order to protect the benefits of those now serving in the military forces and to provide coverage for these men and protection to their families and dependents in the event of death.

"We believe that all States will make the necessary adjustments in their unemployment-compensation systems to protect the accumulated benefit rights of those serving in the military forces, without Federal intervention in this field."

Very truly yours,

EDW. A. KIMBALL,  
Manager.

#### DECLARATION BY RILEY, KANS., COUNTY MEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, resolutions I have received from the Riley County Men's Republican Club, of Manhattan, Kans., embodying a declaration of Republican principles, setting forth their views with respect to the national defense and the European war. They ask me to bring this statement to the attention of the Senate. This group goes on record as strongly opposed to sending American troops to fight in a European war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions are as follows:

##### DECLARATION OF REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES

The Republican Party stands foursquare for national defense and condemns the blundering inefficiency, the waste, and extravagance of the present administration which has delayed proper progress. We stand for America first; America before any and every other nation on earth and demand that American interests be placed first and foremost in the administration of national affairs and not be the tail of the kite of other nations. We believe in the defense of all our national rights and that none should be surrendered or abrogated from the fear of, or for the benefit of other nations. We believe in protecting our national rights to the use of the high seas against unlawful interference, but we do not believe that such protection leads us to European battlefields.

We denounce the efforts of the administration to involve this country in the European war, and we denounce those Americans who place British interests first, and we resent their efforts and the efforts of British leaders and press to induce America to send another army to Europe to fight in their war, under any pretext. We declare such efforts un-American, contrary to our true interests, dangerous to American defense, and leading to the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of American youth in a war which is not our war.

We pledge eternal opposition to all efforts at home or abroad to send an American



Army to Europe as deadly dangerous to American interests and a crime against American youth.

As against Hitler, our sympathy is with the British Empire, and we do not begrudge aid that does not interfere with American defense. The doctrines, the tyranny, and brutality of the Hitlerites is abhorrent to the civilized world. As against Russia, our sympathy is with Finland, but we deprecate her alliance with Germany. We regard communism as un-American and the conduct of the Communists as a menace to the American way of life. As against Japan, our sympathy is with China, and we think a sterner policy toward Japan long ago would have prevented assaults on American citizens and their rights under international law. The policy of appeasement and of continuing to supply Japan with the sinews of war is in vivid contrast with the policy of Theodore Roosevelt when American citizens abroad were denied their rights.

But these wars are not our wars and our business is to take care of America first.

We believe that as Americans for America we may defy the world. That we need not fear any power or combination of powers in war, nor their competition in peace, if we choose to look after the interests of the people of this country first. Those weak or wicked souls who say we must go to Europe to fight to save our liberty merit our contempt for their ignorance or their lies.

If we do not permit our strength to be weakened by bad leadership in high places, by involvement in outside wars, or by waste, inefficiency, and extravagance, or by false and evil theories of "fifth columnists," new dealers, and others out of harmony with American tradition and the American way of life, this country can retain her leadership in the world, on land and on sea, whether it be in the struggle of war or the arts of peace.

We particularly endorse the efforts of Kansas Republican Senators and Representatives for their efforts to prevent this country from being involved in the European war, and ask for constant reiteration of the thought that no American Army shall be sent again to fight in a European war.

RILEY COUNTY MEN'S  
REPUBLICAN CLUB,  
C. A. KIMBALL,  
J. F. MUSIL,  
CLYDE K. RODKEY, *Committee*.  
H. L. MILLER, *President*.  
H. O. DENDURENT, *Secretary*.

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter embodying a resolution of the delegates of the business and professional departments of the Young Women's Christian Associations of Wisconsin and Northern Illinois, urging support of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices.

There being no objection, the letter embodying the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN  
ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO,  
November 7, 1941.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Delegates of the business and professional departments of the Young Women's Christian Associations of Wisconsin

and Northern Illinois, meeting in Chicago on the 1st and 2d days of November, passed the following resolution:

"Whereas we believe that discrimination against workers because of race, creed, or color is against the principles of democracy: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That this conference go on record as favoring support of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices, and that this conference request Congress to set up a board empowered to enforce standards established by this committee."

We urge you to support the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices and to work for the establishment of a board with power of enforcement.

Respectfully,

RUTH KINNEY,  
*Chairman, 1941 Business and Professional Conference, Wisconsin-Northern Illinois.*

#### OLEOMARGARINE STANDARDS—RESOLUTION OF BROWN COUNTY, WIS., BOARD

Mr. WILEY presented a resolution of the Brown County, Wis., board, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEN BAY, WIS., October 28, 1941.  
*To the Chairman and Members of the Brown County Board of Supervisors:*

##### GENTLEMEN:

Whereas the dairy farmers of Brown County are in complete accord with the Federal administration in meeting requirements of national defense; and

Whereas the promotion of an orderly diversion of milk that will protect the best interests of the industry following the emergency period is fully approved of by the producers: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we protest the present oleomargarine standards as set up permitting this so-called substitute to masquerade as one of America's most important food products—butter; further,

That the Federal Security Agency at once submit to reopening the question of the definition and standard of oleomargarine, further,

That we hereby petition and urge Senator LA FOLLETTE, Senator WILEY, and Congressman JOHNS to lend support on the above and that the county clerk be asked to submit a copy of this resolution to our two Wisconsin Senators and Congressman JOHNS, as well as a copy to be sent to Ralph Ammon, with the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, and Paul V. McNutt, of the Federal Security Administration.

Respectfully submitted.

ALPHONSE CAELWAERTS.  
VIC BREDAL.  
FRANK EHNERD.

#### RESOLUTIONS RELATIVE TO FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY presented resolutions of two organizations in the State of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a duly convened meeting of the American Polish Czechoslovak Alliance, held at the city of Milwaukee, Wis., on the 20th day of October 1941, the following resolution was duly and unanimously adopted:

*Resolved*, That the American Polish Czechoslovak Alliance go on record as favoring the outright repeal of the Neutrality Act; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the following:

"Speaker of the House, United States Congress.

"President of the Senate, United States Congress.

"The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, the United States Senate.

"The Honorable ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., the United States Senate.

"The Honorable THADDEUS F. B. WASIELEWSKI, House of Representatives, United States Congress."

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN POLISH  
CZECHOSLOVAK ALLIANCE,  
YOLANDA MAJKOWSKA, *Secretary*.

Whereas the safety and independence of the United States is threatened by the continued ruthless aggression of the Nazi regime, which, in its plan to dominate the world, has already struck down and enslaved almost every independent country in Europe, either by means of "fifth column" appeasers or by means of unprovoked military attacks; and

Whereas every power which is fighting against this common enemy of mankind—Hitler—is thereby defending the United States; and

Whereas the future of labor is inseparably bound up with loyalty to our country, with its independence and the maintenance and expansion of its democratic institutions: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we endorse the announced policy of President Roosevelt of aid to those countries fighting Hitler and urge the greatest and swiftest mobilization of lend-lease and all other aid in every form to Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, and the Free French forces, and all peoples fighting Hitler, to the end of the speediest destruction of Hitlerism.

#### RESOLUTIONS RELATIVE TO THE BEET SUGAR INDUSTRY AND TAXATION

Mr. WILEY presented resolutions of several organizations in the State of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN  
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,  
Green Bay, Wis., November 5, 1941.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: At a meeting of Brown County sugar-beet growers, attended by over 100, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the sugar-beet industry is of vital importance to Wisconsin; and

"Whereas Brown County being one of the leading sugar-beet growing counties in the State, has a large acreage devoted to the growing of sugar beets which would be thrown into the growing of other competitive crops should the price of sugar beets drop; and

"Whereas the Sugar Beet Act expires this year: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That Brown County sugar-beet growers, at a meeting assembled in Green Bay on Thursday, October 30, go on record as being unanimously in favor of the continuation of the sugar-beet payments; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman JOSHUA L. JOHNS, Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY."

The sugar-beet growers of Brown County are very much interested in having the sugar-beet payments continued.

Yours sincerely,

J. N. KAVANAUGH,  
County Agricultural Agent.

Whereas owners of real estate have long recognized that permanent solution of the Nation's tax problem is dependent upon more equitable allocation of taxpaying responsi-

bility, which can be finally achieved only by redefining the fiscal relationship among the three levels of government—local, State, and Federal; and

Whereas the compilation of facts and studies of the problem and the charting of a new course must be done on a Nation-wide scale and can best be done by a national agency; and

Whereas a measure known as H. R. 5196, to accomplish this through a congressionally created agency, to be known as the Commission on Taxation in the United States, has been introduced by the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL and is now pending before the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Association of Real Estate Brokers does urge the House Ways and Means Committee to take immediate action on H. R. 5196, to the end that its passage may be expedited; and, further, be it

*Resolved*, That notification of this action be reported to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Treasury, with due recognition of their long-time advocacy of these principles; and, further, be it

*Resolved*, That each Senator and each Congressman of the State of Wisconsin be informed of this action and be urgently requested to use every means at his disposal to expedite action on this measure.

Whereas the right of private ownership of property needs protection against the threat of tax confiscation, and the financial stability of government needs greater strength than can be provided by continuing dependence upon real property as the major source of this stability; and

Whereas agreement upon a program to provide this protection and to bring about this greater financial stability of government has been reached by national organizations representing real-estate ownership interests, including the National Association of Real Estate Boards; and

Whereas there has been formed a Nation-wide alliance of these organizations under the name of the National Council of Real Estate Taxpayers to assist in achieving these objectives: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Association of Real Estate Brokers does reaffirm its conviction that basic readjustments are essential in the tax structure, and particularly reaffirms its endorsement of the program, including these points:

1. A congressional commission on taxation in the United States.
2. The over-all limitation of property taxes.
3. The relation of assessed values to the productivity of property.
4. Broadening the basis of financial support of government.
5. The equitable taxation of all forms of wealth, including Government-owned income-producing properties.
6. Expenditure control agencies in each State.
7. Longer period of time for the liquidation of estates to pay Federal inheritance taxes.

And further be it—

*Resolved*, That this association pledges its most potent support for an organized effort in Wisconsin to achieve these objectives, and urges upon all similar associations of real-estate ownership interests to take similar action and to make a similar pledge.

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BROKERS.

#### PROTESTS AGAINST DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. WILEY presented identical resolutions adopted by Fond du Lac County Pomona Grange, No. 25, Rising Sun Grange, and Rosendale Community

Grange, No. 697, all of the Patrons of Husbandry in the State of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and one of the resolutions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a movement on foot to legalize daylight-saving time; and

Whereas, after careful consideration, it is the opinion of the members of this Grange that the farmers of this locality would not benefit by such a change, but that it would cause inconvenience and even hardship: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this Rosendale Community Grange, No. 697, go on record against this daylight-saving movement and that we register a vigorous protest.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri for Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

S. 1623. A bill to suspend the export tax prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a period of 1 year commencing July 1, 1941, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 828).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 4932. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Kemmerer, Wyo.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 829).

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 217. A bill to authorize the town of Jupiter, Fla., to lease certain land patented to such town pursuant to the provision of section 3 of the act of July 3, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 830);

S. 328. A bill confirming the claim of Patrick Morgan and Daniel Clark to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. 97 in Report of Commissioners dated May 1, 1815; with amendments (Rept. No. 833);

S. 673. A bill authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse, with amendments (Rept. No. 835);

H. R. 2587. A bill confirming the claim of Patrick Morgan and Daniel Clark to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. 97 in Report of Commissioners dated May 1, 1815; with amendments (Rept. No. 834);

H. R. 2611. A bill to release all the interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the right-of-way granted to the Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of July 1, 1862, as amended and supplemented; with an amendment (Rept. No. 836); and

H. R. 3193. A bill validating certain conveyances heretofore made by the Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the city of Tracy, in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and in the town of Elk Grove, in the county of Sacramento, State of California, acquired by Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 489), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 356); with an amendment (Rept. No. 837).

By Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 828. A bill to increase the period for which leases may be made of public lands granted to the State of Idaho for educational

purposes by the act of July 3, 1890; without amendment (Rept. No. 831).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 950. A bill for the relief of Dora Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 832).

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on November 10, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 633. An act to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or on certain lands owned or leased by or under the partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; and

S. 1840. An act to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 2043. A bill to effectuate the recommendation of the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry submitted to the Congress pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 (52 Stat. 1452), as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2044. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into lease agreements with farmers in order to provide for the management of their forest lands and the marketing of their forest products in accordance with proper forestry and marketing practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2045. A bill to prevent the sale of unwholesome food in the District of Columbia;

S. 2046. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the Code of the District of Columbia to provide for the organization and regulation of cooperative associations, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1940; and

S. 2047. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia to provide for the organization and regulation of cooperative associations, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2048. A bill for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2049. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. DAVIS introduced Senate bill 2050, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 2051. A bill for the relief of John F. Patterson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2052. A bill granting a pension to Ida Wilson McCabe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 2053. A bill relating to travel allowances of certain members of the volunteer forces of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. HERRING introduced Senate Joint Resolution 114, which was referred to the



Committee on Education and Labor and appears under a separate heading.)

#### PREPARATORY SCHOOLS FOR MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill for the establishment and operation of preparatory schools for the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, which I ask to have referred to the Naval Affairs Committee.

The bill provides that preparatory schools of high-school grade shall be made available under the direction of the War and Navy Departments, in which special emphasis shall be placed on vocational and mechanical courses of instruction.

The bill further provides that each Representative may select one person each year for admission to the first-year class at each of such preparatory schools. Each Senator may select each year for such admission a number of persons equal to the number of Representatives from his State divided by two, if such number is an even number, or the number of Representatives from his State plus one, divided by two, if such number of Representatives is an odd number. Each Commissioner of the District of Columbia may select one person each year for admission to each school.

Persons completing the course of instruction at the preparatory schools for the Military and Naval Academies shall be eligible for appointment by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively. After 4 years from the date of the enactment of the bill, all vacancies occurring at these academies shall be filled only by persons who have completed the course of instruction in these preparatory schools.

Mr. President, I believe the enactment of this or similar legislation is necessary to maintain the highest quality of leadership in our national-defense program. To oppose Hitler with anything less than the best of military training and leadership is to invite wholesale slaughter of soldiers and civilians alike.

I ask that the bill be printed in full as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2050) to provide for the establishment and operation of preparatory schools for the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That this act may be cited as the "Military and Naval Preparatory School Act."

SEC. 2. (a) There are hereby established a preparatory school for the United States Military Academy and a preparatory school for the United States Naval Academy. The preparatory school for the United States Military Academy shall be under the supervision of the Secretary of War. The preparatory school for the United States Naval Academy shall be under the supervision of the Secretary of the Navy.

(b) The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall each provide for the operation and maintenance of the preparatory school under his respective jurisdiction.

(c) The training and instruction of persons attending such preparatory schools shall be of high-school grade. The courses and

methods of instruction at such preparatory schools shall follow, insofar as deemed practicable, the courses and methods of instruction at approved high schools in the several States, but shall give emphasis to vocational and mechanical courses of instruction and shall provide for such military and naval instruction and training as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, shall deem appropriate.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are each authorized (1) to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by purchase, gift, or otherwise, a suitable site for the preparatory school under his respective jurisdiction, (2) to have constructed on such sites such buildings and appurtenances (including living quarters for persons attending such preparatory schools and for administrative personnel instructors, officers, and other employees or persons employed or assigned for duty at such preparatory schools) as each may deem necessary for the purposes of such preparatory schools, and (3) to provide for the proper furnishing and equipment of such buildings and appurtenances.

(b) For the preparatory school under his respective jurisdiction, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are each authorized—

(1) to assign for duty at such preparatory school such officers and enlisted men of the United States Army and of the United States Navy, as the case may be, to act as instructors or otherwise as may be necessary;

(2) to appoint and prescribe the duties and compensation of such administrative personnel, department heads, instructors, and other officers and employees as may be necessary for the operation of such preparatory school;

(3) to cooperate with other departments and establishments of the Government and with public and private agencies in respect of matters related to such preparatory school and to accept donations of property and voluntary and uncompensated personal services for the benefit of such preparatory school;

(4) to issue certificates of graduation to persons completing the prescribed course of instruction at such preparatory school; and (5) within the limits of appropriations made by Congress for such preparatory school, to make such expenditures, and for such purposes, as are deemed necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. (a) Persons to receive training and instruction at such preparatory schools shall be limited to male citizens of the United States between the ages of 13 and 19 years, except that no person shall be admitted to either of such preparatory schools who would not be eligible for admission to a high school in the State wherein he resides.

(b) Each Representative may select one person each year for admission in the first-year class at each of such preparatory schools. Each Senator may select each year for admission in the first-year class at each of such preparatory schools a number of persons equal to (1) the number of Representatives from his State, divided by two, if such number of Representatives is an even number, or (2) the number of Representatives from his State plus one, divided by two, if such number of Representatives is an odd number. Each Commissioner of the District of Columbia may select one person each year for admission in the first-year class at each of such preparatory schools.

SEC. 5. Persons completing the course of instruction at the preparatory school for the United States Military Academy shall be eligible for appointment by the Secretary of War to the United States Military Academy. After 4 years from the date of the enactment of this act, all vacancies occurring at such academy shall be filled only by persons who have completed the course of instruction at such preparatory school. Such va-

cancies for any single year shall be filled by persons completing such course of instruction during such year whose scholastic standing is highest.

SEC. 6. Persons completing the course of instruction at the preparatory school for the United States Naval Academy shall be eligible for appointment by the Secretary of the Navy to the United States Naval Academy. After 4 years from the date of the enactment of this act, all vacancies occurring at such academy shall be filled only by persons who have completed the course of instruction at such preparatory school. Such vacancies for any single year shall be filled by persons completing such course of instruction during such year whose scholastic standing is highest.

SEC. 7. The President is authorized to reduce the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy and the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to 3 or 2 years, as he deems advisable, and to graduate classes which have completed such reduced courses of instruction.

SEC. 8. All other acts or parts of acts which provide for appointments or nominations of candidates and alternates for admission to the United States Military Academy as cadets or for admission to the United States Naval Academy as midshipmen are hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

#### STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution which I desire to introduce, and which I should like to have referred to the proper committee. I should also like to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The joint resolution provides for mediation in labor disputes. In my opinion, it would, if enacted, permit men who wish to work to continue to work, and to anyone. It would also not compel men to work who do not wish to work.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to discourage stoppage of work in defense industries. It should be noted that the provisions of this measure apply solely to those employed in defense work, directly or indirectly, and that the act shall terminate with the termination of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941.

Briefly, the measure provides the usual procedure in labor disputes, including appeal to the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor and certification to the Mediation Board. If the dispute remains with the Mediation Board for adjudication, a period of 30 days from the date of the decision of the Mediation Board is provided, after which, if requested by either party, a secret ballot of all employees in the plant affected is to be conducted under Government supervision and regulation, and if a majority of those employed in such unit desire to quit work they may do so, but mob or mass picketing is prohibited and definite penalties are provided against violence, threats, or intimidation of any kind.

Also during this entire period all officers, employees, or other representatives of all organizations are prohibited, under penalty, from urging, suggesting, or in any way fomenting stoppage of work. The joint resolution also provides that from and after its effective date no indi-

vidual workman shall be by any method required to join or pay dues to any organization in order to obtain work in any defense industry. There is a further provision for arbitration; if requested by both parties, the Mediation Board shall appoint a national-defense arbitration tribunal composed of one representative of each of the following: Employee, employer, and the public.

When once voluntarily arbitration is accepted, provision is made to compel, through the courts, the acceptance by both parties of the arbitration award.

All findings of fact before the Mediation Board are to be made public at the conclusion of its consideration of the issues.

The measure is founded upon the concept that no man should be compelled to work against his will, but an equal right exists that any man who may find employment shall be permitted to work without coercion, threats, or the payment of tribute to any other man or organization.

I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and without objection printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 114) to expedite the national-defense program by providing a method for the settlement of labor disputes in defense industries, to prevent strikes in such industries which are not desired by the affected employee, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas industrial disputes have led to strikes being precipitately called, in many instances against the will of the majority of workmen, thus seriously delaying necessary and vital defense work; and

Whereas the natural public reaction is that labor as well as industry in many cases is attempting selfishly and wrongfully to profit by reason of the national emergency and obtain an uneven and unwarranted advantage; and

Whereas such conduct by labor will ultimately militate against its real interest, and may well cause it to lose many fairly acquired rights and privileges; and

Whereas already existing legislation appropriately provides remedies applicable to employers in such instances, including Government seizure and operation of the plant of any person or firm failing or refusing to produce for national defense; and

Whereas jurisdictional strikes place an intolerable burden upon the public and employers who have no means of adjusting the disputes leading thereto; and

Whereas existing legislation provides for compulsory military service; and

Whereas it is only fair to require both employer and employee to contribute proportionately to provide arms and equipment for our selectees now in and about to be called for service; and

Whereas temperate legislation now enacted will serve not only to avoid such harmful interruption of defense, but to avert reprisal legislation detrimental to labor: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.,* That this joint resolution may be cited as the "National Defense Labor Act of 1941."

#### DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. When used in this joint resolution—  
(a) The terms "employer," "employee," "representative," "labor organization," and

"labor dispute" shall have the same meaning as such terms have when used in the National Labor Relations Act.

(b) The term "national-defense contractor" means an employer who has a contract—

(1) with the United States for the construction, erection, reconstruction, installation, transportation, production, manufacture, repair, storage, or handling of property, or the furnishing of property or services, for use by the land or naval forces of the United States or for disposition under the provisions of the act entitled "An act further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 11, 1941; or

(2) with the United States for the construction, reconstruction, or repair of any vessel; or

(3) whether or not with the United States, for the construction, erection, reconstructing, or installation of any building, structure, machinery, equipment, or facility for use by the land or naval forces of the United States or for use by any person in the production, manufacture, repair, storage, or handling of property for use by the land or naval forces of the United States or for disposition under the provisions of such act of March 11, 1941; or

(4) whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, repair, storage, or handling of any article described in Proclamation No. 2237, promulgated by the President on May 4, 1937; or

(5) whether or not with the United States, for the construction, erection, reconstruction, or installation of any building, structure, machinery, equipment, or facility for use by any person in the production, manufacture, repair, storage, or handling of any article described in Proclamation No. 2237, promulgated by the President on May 4, 1937.

(c) The term "Mediation Board" means the National Defense Mediation Board created by the Executive order of March 19, 1941, and shall include any division of said Board or any arbitration tribunal performing its functions under this joint resolution.

#### CONCILIATION AND MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever a labor dispute in which a national-defense contractor or any of his employees is involved arises it shall be the duty of the parties to the dispute to endeavor in good faith to settle such dispute by conference or by utilizing the applicable procedures specified in the collective-bargaining agreement, if any, between the parties. If after conference or after utilizing such procedures any party to the dispute is of the opinion that such dispute cannot be settled in such manner, such party may, in such manner as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, request the services of the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor in the settlement of such dispute. The Secretary of Labor shall, within not more than 24 hours after receipt of any such request, give notice thereof to the parties to such dispute, and thereupon each party to such dispute shall give, within 24 hours after receipt of such notice, to each other party to such dispute and to the Secretary of Labor a statement in writing of his claims, contentions, and demands with respect to such dispute. It shall be the duty of the parties, with the assistance of the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, forthwith to endeavor in good faith to settle such dispute.

(b) If an agreement settling such dispute is not reached with the assistance of the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, any party to such dispute may, upon the expiration of at least 10 days from the date upon which the Secretary of Labor gave notice to the parties to such dispute that the services of the Conciliation Service were requested, request the Mediation Board to endeavor to mediate such dispute. The Mediation Board shall forthwith give notice of such request to the parties to such dispute

and shall fix times and places for conferences with the parties upon the matters involved in such dispute. The Board shall first hold separate conferences with the respective parties to the dispute, at which initial conferences the parties shall submit statements of their respective claims, demands, and viewpoints to the Board. Thereafter the Board may fix times and places for further conferences with the parties jointly or severally. It shall be the duty of parties to disputes before the Board to make every reasonable effort at such conferences to adjust and settle such disputes. The Mediation Board shall, if requested by both parties, assist the parties in negotiating and drafting agreements for the adjustment and settlement of all matters in dispute, and shall also take such steps as it may deem expedient for the purpose of investigating such dispute and preparing a report thereon. It shall be the duty of the parties to such dispute to attend at the joint or separate conferences at the times and places fixed by the Mediation Board, and to be available for such conferences until excused by the Board, such obligation to remain available, however, being limited to a period of not more than 20 days from the date of the first conference, unless by mutual consent of the parties such conferences are continued for a longer period.

(c) Within a period of not more than 20 days after receipt by the Mediation Board of any notice under subsection (b), or within such longer period as the parties to the dispute consent to by mutual agreement, the Mediation Board shall render a report to the public upon such dispute, if such dispute is not settled within such period. Such report shall be published in the Federal Register. Such report shall contain a statement of all the facts in connection with such dispute, a statement of the efforts made to settle such dispute, and such recommendations as the Mediation Board deems are warranted, subject to the limitations of section 8 (b) of this joint resolution.

#### SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES BY ARBITRATION

SEC. 4. (a) At any time during the efforts to settle a labor dispute under this joint resolution, but before the Mediation Board shall have rendered its report as provided in section 3, the parties to such dispute may voluntarily submit the issues involved in such dispute to a national defense arbitration tribunal for settlement. Whenever the parties to any such labor dispute agree to submit the issue involved in such dispute to a national defense arbitration tribunal for settlement, they shall give notice thereof to the Mediation Board. Upon receipt of any such notice the Mediation Board shall forthwith appoint the members of such tribunal and they shall proceed to consider the issues involved in such dispute, summoning such witnesses as they deem necessary and hearing such testimony as they may deem relevant. The tribunal shall make and file its decision with the parties to such dispute and with the Mediation Board as expeditiously as possible. Such decision shall be published in the Federal Register. The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories shall have jurisdiction, by appropriate proceedings in law or in equity, to enforce any such arbitration decision or award. Said courts may, notwithstanding any other provision of law, if appropriate to enforcement of such arbitration award, include in their orders or decrees provisions enjoining any party to the arbitration proceeding and his or its officers, agents, or representatives from initiating, supporting, advising, urging, or in any way participating in a strike, stoppage of work, or lock-out where such stoppage would defeat or be inconsistent with the provisions of the said arbitration award.

(b) Each national-defense arbitration tribunal appointed under the provisions of subsection (a) shall consist of three members, one of whom shall represent labor, one of



whom shall represent employers, and the third of whom shall represent the public. Members of such tribunals shall receive compensation fixed upon a per diem basis by the Mediation Board at a rate not in excess of \$25.

#### INVESTIGATORY POWERS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE MEDIATION BOARD

SEC. 5. For the purpose of this joint resolution—

(a) The Mediation Board may prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions at any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The Board, the Chairman thereof, any division of the Board provided for by section 5 (g) hereof, and any arbitration tribunal authorized by section 4 hereof shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relevant to any matter under investigation by the Board or under submission to any duly constituted arbitration tribunal appointed hereunder. Any member of the Mediation Board or any agent or agency designated by the Board for such purpose may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States at any designated place of hearing, provided that the times and places fixed for hearings shall give any party or witness reasonable opportunity of being present and being heard. At any hearing or proceeding before the Mediation Board, an agency thereof, or an arbitration tribunal any party shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel who shall have the privilege, subject to such reasonable rules as may be promulgated by the Mediation Board, to cross-examine witnesses and otherwise participate on behalf of the parties they represent.

(b) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person under subsection (a), any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Mediation Board shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Mediation Board, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(c) Process and papers of the Mediation Board may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of the same, and the return post-office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Mediation Board, its members, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(d) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpoena of the Mediation Board, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual

shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

(e) All process of any court to which application may be made under this joint resolution may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(f) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Mediation Board, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Mediation Board, provided that no agency shall be required to furnish to the Mediation Board any records, papers, information, reports, or returns which have been made to such agencies in pursuance of statutory provisions assuring their privacy.

(g) Any power, function, or duty of the Mediation Board may be exercised or performed by any division of the Mediation Board designated by the Mediation Board for that purpose, except that not less than three members shall be assigned to any such division and each of the three groups represented on the Mediation Board shall be represented in any such division.

#### DEFENSE INDUSTRY STRIKE BALLOTING

SEC. 6. At any time not less than 30 days after the rendition by the Mediation Board of any report upon a labor dispute which it is required to render under subsection (c) of section 3, any representative of the employees affected by such dispute or of any group thereof may request the National Labor Relations Board to conduct a plebiscite, by secret balloting, of the employees affected by such dispute upon the question of whether or not they should strike. Upon receipt of any such request, the National Labor Relations Board shall notify the employer of such request and shall, as promptly as possible thereafter, conduct a plebiscite, by secret ballot, among the employees affected by such dispute upon the question of whether or not they should strike. The National Labor Relations Board shall, as promptly as possible after the conducting of such plebiscite, certify to the employer and to the employees affected the result of such plebiscite.

#### UNLAWFUL STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

SEC. 7. (a) It shall be unlawful for any labor organization, or any officer or agent thereof, to instigate, promote, further, or in any way support a strike or organized stoppage of work by the employees, or any group thereof, against any national-defense contractor unless (1) a plebiscite of such employees upon the question of whether or not they should strike has been held pursuant to section 6, (2) the National Labor Relations Board has certified that a majority of the employees voting in such plebiscites voted in favor of striking.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any labor organization, or any officer or agent thereof, by force or violence or threats and in furtherance of an effort to compel any person to become or remain a member of such labor organization or to pay dues thereto, to prevent or attempt to prevent any employee or person seeking employment from working in the employ of a national-defense contractor.

(c) No labor organization found by the National Labor Relations Board, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing, to have violated the provisions of subsection (a) or subsection (b), and no officer or agent of any such labor organization shall be entitled for a period of 1 year after the date (as determined by the National Labor Relations Board) of such violation to be recognized or bargained with as the exclusive representative for collective bargaining purposes of the

employees in any unit. The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to any such labor organization regardless of whether or not such labor organization has been certified by the National Labor Relations Board as the exclusive representative for collective bargaining purposes of such unit.

(d) In the event of a strike or stoppage of work among the employees of a national-defense contractor, no persons other than bona fide employees of the particular plant or premises of said contractor in which the dispute arose shall be permitted to engage or participate in picketing or patrolling activities at or adjacent to such plant or premises. Any person convicted of a violation of this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or both.

(e) In the event of any strike or stoppage of work among the employees of any national-defense contractor it shall be unlawful for any person directly or indirectly, personally or through agents or accomplices, to use force, violence, or intimidation against said national-defense contractor or any agent or employee of said contractor, to destroy any property of said contractor, or to seize or occupy any portion of his premises against his will. Any person convicted of a violation of this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or both. Any employee of said contractor who engages in acts of force, violence, or intimidation against said contractor or any of his agents or against fellow employees or against applicants for employment or participates in the destruction of his employer's property shall be subject to discharge for such conduct, irrespective of his membership or nonmembership in any labor organization, and if discharged shall not be entitled to reinstatement by order of the National Labor Relations Board or any other Government agency.

(f) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories and possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject to the provisions of section 20 (relating to notice to opposite party) of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 381), to restrain violations of subsection (a) or subsection (b) by any labor organization or the officers or agents thereof. Such jurisdiction to restrain such violations and the jurisdiction exercised by any such court in enforcing any order restraining any such violations shall be exercised notwithstanding and without regard to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., 1924 ed., supp. VII, title 29, secs. 101-115).

#### PROHIBITION OF CLOSED-SHOP TYPE OF AGREEMENT

SEC. 8. (a) It shall be unlawful, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for a national-defense contractor, by discrimination in regard to hire, terms, or tenure of employment, to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization, unless such discrimination is required by the terms of a contract or agreement with a labor organization entered into prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution which complies with the provision of section 8 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, or by the terms of any renewal of a contract or agreement with the same labor organization made prior to the effective date of this joint resolution.

(b) No department or agency of the Government shall, in its efforts to settle any labor dispute, encourage or discourage member-

ship in any labor organization; nor shall any such department or agency include in its recommendations for settlement of any labor dispute any recommendation that the employees of the employer affected by such dispute be required to join or remain members of any labor organization or to pay dues or initiation fees to any labor organization.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution is hereby authorized.

#### EXPIRATION DATE

SEC. 10. This joint resolution shall become inoperative and cease to apply upon the termination of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941.

#### IMPORTATION OF PHILIPPINE LABOR INTO HAWAII

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will read.

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was read, as follows:

Whereas because of an alleged labor shortage the sugar planters of Hawaii have requested permission to import 5,000 Filipino contract laborers; and

Whereas in the interest of national defense and for other reasons it is undesirable to add to the already top-heavy Oriental population of the Territory of Hawaii; and

Whereas, according to available information, there are still millions of unemployed in the continental United States and other thousands are likely to become unemployed in the near future because of priority rights which will make it impossible for certain industries to continue operation: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Commissioner of Work Projects is requested to cause an investigation to be made immediately for the purpose of determining whether or not there are sufficient American workers available for employment in the Territory of Hawaii to satisfy the demands for labor in such Territory.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the power to allow the importation of Filipino laborers into Hawaii is lodged in the Secretary of the Interior. On behalf of certain American Federation of Labor groups and other groups in California I lodged a protest with the Secretary of the Interior against the granting of the application referred to in the resolution, stating to the Secretary that I believed there were on the Pacific coast and elsewhere millions of American laborers who could do this work in Hawaii, and that it would be a much sounder national policy to increase the proportion of white people in Hawaii than to import additional Orientals.

The Secretary asked me to have some governmental agency make an investigation to determine whether we have in the United States a volume of laborers who could do this work in Hawaii, rather than to import Filipinos. I conceived that the proper thing to do would be to request the Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration to make such an investigation, and all my resolution provides is that the Commissioner shall make the investigation and report to the Senate. In view of the fact that it is a matter which requires expedition, and there is some urgency, I am asking unan-

imous consent for the consideration and adoption of the resolution at this time, so that an investigation may be made.

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

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. There is no objection on my part to the resolution, but I think that if the Senator will take the matter up with the Secretary of Labor, he will find that a report was made some time in the 1920's by the then Secretary of Labor covering a similar matter, as the result of an investigation by a commission appointed by the Secretary. The investigation was referred to by the then Secretary of State as one of the best studies that had been made on the subject of oriental labor.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator, and I certainly shall have recourse to the report to which he refers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution submitted by the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the resolution considered and agreed to.

#### DEFENSE OF PACIFIC COAST, ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATES, HAWAII, AND ALASKA

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 194), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Whereas there exist in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain areas of the United States special and unusual problems relating to the national defense; and

Whereas it is particularly important that adequate defenses be provided for such areas, and that the resources of such areas be properly developed and the characteristics of such areas be most effectively utilized for national-defense purposes; and

Whereas it is essential that there be made a comprehensive study and investigation of the problems, resources, and characteristics of such areas in relation to the national defense: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, to consist of seven members of the committee who shall be appointed by the chairman thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to matters relating to the national defense in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States and in Hawaii and Alaska. For such purposes, the subcommittee shall study and investigate, among other things, (1) the protection of seaports and their improvement for military and commercial purposes, (2) the development and improvement of navigable streams and the utilization of their waters, (3) the construction of strategic highways and bridges in connection with the development of seaports or navigable streams or otherwise, (4) the protection of the domestic water supply of cities and the development of alternative sources of supply when necessary, (5) the forest-fire hazard, particularly in relation to the possibility of military attacks, and means of safeguarding against such hazard, (6) the development of a domestic source of rubber supply from guayule or other plants, and (7) racial and nationality problems in their relation to the national defense. The subcommittee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the subcommittee, or any duly authorized sub-

committee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to call upon the various departments and agencies in the Executive branch of the Government for such facilities, information, and assistance, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the subcommittee.

#### ALLOCATIONS AND PRIORITIES AFFECTING BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which, under the rule, I understand will lie over until the next meeting of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and lie over under the rule.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask that the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 195), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Office of Production Management is hereby requested to submit a report to the Senate as soon as practicable with respect to (1) the general policy which has been established for the Office of Production Management in connection with the administration of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended (relating to assignment of priorities), (2) the methods and plans which have been adopted or are contemplated for the allocation or distribution of materials to which priorities have been assigned pursuant to such section 2 under contract arrangements or otherwise, and (3) the program which has been formulated or is being followed by the Office of Production Management for the purpose of protecting to the fullest practicable extent the various business enterprises the operations of which are interrupted or interfered with because of a shortage of materials to which such priorities apply, and for relieving the hardships caused to small business enterprises by the application of a priorities or allocation system to materials deemed to be essential for national-defense purposes.

*Resolved further*, That upon the receipt of such report the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit a copy thereof to the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the resolution simply calls for information as to a policy and certain data.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly.

Mr. McNARY. Why does not the Senator ask for immediate consideration? What is the use of having the resolution lie over?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I thought, in the first instance, of doing that.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me suggest that now is a pretty good time to get action



on the resolution because, if the Senator will look around the room, he will discover that he need not be bothered about a quorum, and if the resolution goes over some Senator may kick about it later on and delay it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I presume there will be no protest with respect to the resolution. It is simply a request for information.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Am I correct in understanding that the Senator asked for immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was not my purpose when I originally offered the resolution, but the Senator from Oregon has suggested, since it is merely a request for information, that it might be desirable to obtain immediate action on the resolution.

Mr. McNARY. I merely supplemented the remark of the able Senator from Wyoming, for the reason that it has been the practice in the Senate for years when a resolution merely seeking information is offered to ask for immediate consideration. It is a courtesy extended to Senators, and is the practice of the Senate, and I wondered why the Senator desired the resolution to go over, and take the other route under the rules of the Senate, to come up on a future day. I have no interest in the proposal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly; I understand that. It is merely a matter of acting in accordance with the general procedure.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will allow the resolution to lie on the table until Monday, until the Senator from Kentucky returns. I am confident there will be no objection to it then.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The absence of the Senator from Kentucky was one reason I asked that the resolution go over.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the presentation of the resolution will attract the attention and notice of the authorities to whom the inquiry is directed and, no doubt, will elicit some information.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My purpose in asking that the resolution be read to those assembled here was with the hope that it might provoke a little interest in the questions which are propounded by the resolution.

The truth of the matter is that a very fundamental change is being made in our economy. A policy is being adopted by the O. P. M. which affects business enterprises throughout the country very vitally, very deeply, and in a manner which in all probability will completely revolutionize our economic system. I think it desirable that the people of the country should be fully advised as to the effect of the policies which are being adopted from time to time. It was for that purpose, and in the belief that the officials of the O. P. M. will desire to cooperate in laying this matter fully before the country through presenting a report

to the Senate, that I submitted the resolution.

The only information which the country has with respect to these important matters is that which is obtained through press releases and press conferences. It might very well be said that we are governed today by press conferences and press releases. The program which has been recently set up by the O. P. M. and the S. P. A. B. is a very complex and involved program. I have no criticism to make at this time of its purpose or of its operation. I know it is being adopted in the best of good faith, and it may be completely desirable; but I also know that the Senate and the House know practically nothing of the system except that which they gain from headlines and a few brief quotations which the city editors of the country are willing to allow to go to their readers. This is an industrial and economic policy which affects the business life of every community in the land.

So, Mr. President, I shall not press for immediate action, but shall allow the resolution to lie over; and at the next meeting of the Senate I shall undertake to address myself to the subject matter.

#### FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD NATIONAL STEAMSHIP COMPANIES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, on October 13, the Senate referred a petition of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos., together with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims in connection with Congressional Case No. 17764.

Certain affidavits and documents accompanying that petition and named in the body thereof, were intended, under the terms of the petition, to be transmitted to the Court of Claims as evidence in this case. However, when the Senate entered its order it failed properly to instruct the court that such papers were to be received as evidence and not merely as papers.

At the request of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who is necessarily absent from the Senate today, I submit on his behalf a petition from the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos., and ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Court of Claims under an order attached thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the petition will be referred as requested.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its labors today it stand in adjournment until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in connection with the request of the Senator from Texas, may I submit a question to him?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator tell me what is contemplated to be taken up on Monday?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I cannot give him that information. The Senator from Kentucky will return by that day. I am simply acting temporarily for him, and I am not advised as to what will be the business to be considered on Monday until the meeting of the Senate on that day.

Mr. McNARY rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Perhaps the Senator from Oregon can inform the Senator?

Mr. McNARY. I may say for the information of the able Senator from Michigan that in discussing the program a few days ago with the Senator from Kentucky, it was agreed that after we disposed of the calendar, which was done at the last meeting of the session on Monday, there would be nothing really to come up until the price-fixing bill, which is now on the House Calendar, should come to the Senate. So far as I know, and so far as I may speak for the Senator from Kentucky, there is nothing in sight for the present.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I inquire what is the program with reference to the price-fixing bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say, in connection with the comment of the Senator from Oregon as to the price-fixing bill that the Senator from Kentucky told me that it was not his wish that the Senate take up that measure, even in committee, until the House shall have concluded action on it. So, if that be so, there will probably be no major legislation considered on next Monday.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was not speaking of Monday; I was speaking of the future. I understand the price-fixing bill will not reach the Senate for some time. I may say, after conference with the able Senator from Kentucky, that it was thought after the bill arrived in the Senate it would be referred to a committee and, probably, action would not be taken until the next session of Congress, which will be in January.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be; I was simply volunteering to the Senator from Michigan such information as I had.

Mr. McNARY. I am glad the Senator did so. I did not have in mind Monday or any other specific date.

Mr. CONNALLY. At the moment, I know of no major matter which will claim the attention of the Senate on Monday.

#### REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN BILL

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the adjournment following today's session, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive from the House of Representatives any message relating to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes, and that the Vice President be authorized to sign any bill examined and found truly enrolled by the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I really do not understand the purpose of the proposal. I am not sure of the form the joint resolution will take when it is returned

to the Senate; it may be defeated in the other House, it may be postponed, it may be modified. The House may vote to reject the Senate amendment and rely upon the original House proposal. I do not want any agreement to be made that would commit the Senate to any specific action; and I think we had better let it remain in abeyance for the time being.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Oregon that the order would only be effective in case the House passed the joint resolution by the route of concurring in the Senate amendment. If the motion to concur should fail the joint resolution then would have to go to conference, and, of course, the Senate could not agree to a conference until it was notified of the action of the House. There is nothing in the request authorizing the Senate to agree to a conference until the Senate has another meeting. The request is presented only on the theory that if the House should concur in the Senate amendment that would be final action so far as the two Houses are concerned, and there would be no delay then about the Vice President signing the joint resolution; that is all.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I always try to accommodate myself to the wishes of the majority. The joint resolution will have to be voted upon by the other House. It is possible, according to the noon newspapers, that it may be postponed. In view of the unfinished status of the joint resolution, I do not want at this time to make any agreement with respect to its final disposition.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well, Mr. President. I am always glad to be as agreeable as possible to the Senator from Oregon. It is a very pleasant task.

#### CONVEYANCE OF COAST GUARD STATION, TWO RIVERS, WIS.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, on Monday last the Senate passed, with an amendment, the bill (S. 1916) to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis. It has since been discovered that there was an error of a clerical nature in the committee amendment. The bill is still in the possession of the Senate; and for the purpose of correcting the error, in order to conform to the recommendation of the Department, I ask unanimous consent that the votes on the passage of the bill, its engrossment, and third reading, and on agreeing to the committee amendment, be respectively reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the respective votes are reconsidered.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I now ask unanimous consent to amend the committee amendment by restoring, in the part proposed to be stricken out, the following language, in lines 7 and 8 on page 1, namely, "at Two Rivers, Wis., upon condition that such building", so that the part proposed to be stricken out would read as follows:

Is promptly removed from the site of such Coast Guard station, without expense to the United States.

The part to be inserted in lieu of the matter stricken out is not changed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Without objection, the committee amendment as amended is agreed to, and the bill is passed.

#### COMPACT WITH RESPECT TO WATERS OF THE REPUBLICAN RIVER BASIN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 190, submitted by Mr. NORRIS on the 10th instant) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1361) granting the consent of Congress to a compact to be entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation held a meeting this morning. At that meeting the committee unanimously rescinded its previous action in favorably reporting the bill. I presume the committee had a right to take such action. Therefore the bill is not suspended in midair as it was at the time I offered the resolution. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the resolution be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Before the Senator makes that request let me ask him a question. Technically the Senate bill is on the calendar, is it not?

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. What has happened to it?

Mr. NORRIS. It was ordered to be favorably reported by the committee, but in fact it was not so reported.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that be true, the previous committee action can be rescinded.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate Resolution 190 will be indefinitely postponed.

#### FINNISH-RUSSIAN WAR

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, sometime ago the newspapers carried information that the Secretary of State had issued a warning to the Republic of Finland referring to messages he had sent and requests he had made of the Government of Finland in the present controversy. Today there is an article in the Washington Post, accredited to Mr. Hull, stating that the Finns evade the real issue involved in their continued belligerency with the Government of Soviet Russia.

I have not seen what the Secretary of State has communicated to Finland except in the form of excerpts in the newspapers; neither have I seen any reply made directly to the Secretary of State. Therefore I do not know what they are, but I have here an article printed in the

New York Times for November 3. It is a dispatch from Helsinki, written by Henry J. Taylor, an American newspaper correspondent for the North American Newspaper Alliance. He sends a dispatch quoting his questions in writing to the President of Finland—questions seeking to develop the position of Finland. The President of Finland answered in writing the questions addressed to him in writing. For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have this dispatch printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I also have here, and ask to have printed in the Record, another North American Newspaper Alliance dispatch from Mr. Taylor, sent for release on November 5, explaining the position of the Government of Finland in this controversy. I ask to have printed in connection with these two dispatches Senate Resolution 192, which is now on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the Record an article in this morning's Washington Post, by Hedley Donovan, referring to Secretary Hull's position. It is not as clearly stated as I should like to have it, but it is the only article along that line that I have.

I ask that all these articles and the resolution be printed in the Record for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

[From the New York Times of November 3, 1941]

**RYTI DENIES LINKS OF FINNS TO NAZI—PRESIDENT SAYS FRONT OF 460 MILES IS HELD ENTIRELY BY HELSINKI'S TROOPS—TERMS MANNERHEIM CHIEF—DEARES THERE IS NO REICH MILITARY DIRECTION OR TIE TO BERLIN IDEOLOGY**

(By Henry J. Taylor)

**HELSINKI, FINLAND, November 2.**—With Finland's troops standing tonight before Leningrad, Risto Ryti, President of Finland, gave me the first direct answers to specific questions since the beginning of hostilities.

I wrote the questions without suggestion, and after dinner last night we went into President Ryti's study and I asked him to answer only the ones he pleased.

He answered them all. He did not change a word in them. He initialed a copy for the Cabinet meeting tomorrow and gave the original to me.

Here are the questions and answers:

**Q.** To what extent is Finland's war being prosecuted by German forces?—**A.** The entire front south from the Louhi district in the north of the Gulf of Finland, a distance of approximately 460 miles, is held entirely by Finnish fighting men, veterans of last winter's war and new recruits from our population. There are no German officers or soldiers in the Finnish units nor have there ever been.

(The President's description of a front running to a point 460 miles north of the Gulf of Finland leaves him uncommitted as to the Murmansk front, which is considerably farther north than that.)

**Q.** Are German officers directing any operations whatever at Helsinki or at Finland's military headquarters?—**A.** No.

**Q.** Is Marshal Mannerheim's authority over the Army supreme and complete?—**A.** Yes. Marshal Mannerheim is in sole command.



Q. Are there any German minorities in Finland?—A. No. We are possibly the most homogeneous country in the world.

Q. What percentage of the population are Lutherans?—A. Our official census shows over 98 percent of our people are adherents of this one denomination.

Q. Is there any alignment in Finland with Germany's ideological and totalitarian policies?—A. No. The Finnish people are interested only in developing the historic, political, and social order of this republic.

Q. Independent of Germany's possible strategic interests to the contrary, considering Germany's war with Russia, will Finland's advance stop at Finland's old borders except to include the new Russian fortifications?—A. Finland's advance will stop at a strategic line independently selected by her in her own defensive interests of security. The location of this line obviously must remain a military secret at this time.

Q. Will the termination of the Soviet-Finnish war terminate Finland's military action?—A. Certainly, we are involved only in the war against the Bolsheviks.

Q. What solution is there for the conspiracy of circumstances through which Finland's war against Russia, with German assistance, has caused Finnish-American relations to suffer in the United States?—A. A realization by America of the continual and very old problem of Russian aggression against Finland and our repeated attempts to defend ourselves as best we can.

#### BRITISH WAR DECLARATION WOULD FORCE FINLAND INTO PERMANENT AXIS ALLIANCE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

HELSINKI, November 4.—The news from London that Great Britain is considering a declaration of war against Finland comes at the worst possible time.

Finland's war with Russia is being liquidated. This country, as President Risto Ryti told the writer a few days ago, will stand on a strategic line independently chosen in Finland's own interest of defensive security.

Finnish troops have never at any time been at the disposal of the Germans and Finland is prepared once again to set an example for the world by immediately demobilizing as much of her army as she safely can. President Ryti told me that approximately 16 percent of Finland's population is serving with the army, which he believes is the highest percentage of any country at war.

President Ryti will justify in every way his basic position and demonstrable contention that Finland is involved only in a war of defense against Russia and that when Russia's threat is removed, Finland will take no further military action anywhere with anybody unless her boundaries are again attacked. Every element in Finland's national purpose is bound up in this point.

But now flares the prospect of England declaring that Finland is an enemy at war with her. Immediately Finland is forced into a permanent alliance with Germany, come what may. Instead of being repaid for her heroic determination to be rid soon of Germany's military assistance, even limited as it is, Finland would be forced against her will to amalgamate her army with Germany's in permanent protection against the English threat from the northern seas. Thus in one fell swoop this cruel blunder would obtain for the Germans everything they have been unable to obtain for themselves.

In the face of such an inexorable pattern, it does not seem possible that the die would be cast. But the chances are it will unless some restraint is exercised, and exercised quickly, against invoking the fatal theory that this country, which is not and cannot be against Germany, is against England.

Since England broke off diplomatic relations with Finland—even cutting telegraphic communication between London and Hel-

sinki—powerful forces of circumstance and availability have been pulling on the Finns to bring them into the German orbit. But the Finnish Government, soldiers, and people have dedicated their hopes, their prayers, and their lives for freedom—against Russia or Germany alike. If such hopes and prayers and valiant actions are to be answered by no imagination, no sympathy and no encouragement, all the free people of the world will pay heavily and permanently for the bankruptcy of democratic sponsorship and the liquidation of the democratic ideal.

#### Senate Resolution 192

Whereas the Secretary of State, through the columns of the press, appears to have stated that he has threatened the Republic of Finland with loss of the friendship of the United States unless Finland cease all acts of war on Soviet Russia; and

Whereas it is common history that within the period of the present so-called World War No. 2 the said Soviet Government has invaded the Republic of Finland and waged unprovoked war on Finland—destroying thousands of lives, destroying Finland's property to an amount estimated at \$1,000,000,000 and taken forcible possession of Finland's territory for an area of 16,135 square miles, a republican area equal to that of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Jersey combined, and thereby has given the Republic of Finland every ground for war on Soviet Russia, regardless of all other issues of World War No. 2; and

Whereas no authority appears to have been conferred upon the Secretary of State, either by the Constitution or by Congress, or by mandate of the people of the United States, to dictate the foreign policy of other friendly nations and threaten them when they seek redress for national wrongs: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested to lay before Congress forthwith a complete record of his recent official acts as relates to his recent threat and/or ultimatum to the Republic of Finland; be it further

*Resolved*, That he cease and desist from such threats to the friendly Republic of Finland until he has given the Congress of the United States full knowledge and opportunity to exercise its constitutional functions relating to said potential casus belli; be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States hereby assures the friendly Republic of Finland that no act of Finland with relation to that country's foreign policy and participation in war to secure redress for wrongs has caused, to the knowledge of the Senate, the loss of the friendship of the United States at any time of recent memory; and further be it

*Resolved*, That, in view of the statements of the Secretary of State, both as relates to the Republic of Finland and as relates to the recent so-called Tripartite Agreement in Moscow, it is fair to the people of the United States and to all concerned here and abroad to inform them that the United States, contrary to apparent assumption, is not at war, nor allied with Russia or any other power, nor does it assume to dictate, through constitutional procedure, the foreign policy of any other country.

#### FINNS EVADE REAL ISSUE, HULL DECLARES— FURTHER ADVANCE WOULD BLOCK AID TO SOVIET, HE SAYS

(By Hedley Donovan)

The United States yesterday applied new pressure on Finland to come to a truce with Russia, as Secretary of State Hull asserted that continued Finnish advances would furnish Hitler extremely valuable aid in his effort to blockade British and American war-aid shipments to the Soviets via Murmansk and Archangel.

Hull, commenting at his press conference on the Finnish Government's rejection of an American suggestion for Soviet-Finnish peace negotiations, did not conceal his disappointment with the reply from Helsinki.

While pointing out that he had not yet seen the full text of the Finnish note, the Secretary said press reports indicated that the Government of Finland was evading the real issue and added significantly that he still hoped the Finnish people were not irrevocably committed to collaboration with Germany.

Hull asserted that Nazi propaganda in this country was largely responsible for the fact that many Americans had failed to understand what he called the extremely important and valuable contribution the Finnish forces are making to Hitler's cause and the damaging effects their aid to Germany has had on the nations resisting Hitler.

The Finnish note, whose full text was made public by the Legation here yesterday, said Finns could not understand how the operations of their troops could threaten the United States, "a mighty power, protected by two oceans and secured by numerous bases, of which some are situated thousands of miles beyond the frontiers of the United States."

#### GERMAN SPOKESMEN QUOTED

Hull told reporters the negotiations between the United States and Finland were not a matter of words, but of real issues, and that he believed the issue had been clearly stated in an Associated Press dispatch from Berlin Tuesday.

The dispatch quoted German military spokesmen as crediting combined German and Finnish operations in the Leningrad area with making it "extremely difficult" for American and British supplies to move from north Russian ports to the Moscow front and the Caucasus.

Indicating that he accepted this German interpretation of the significance of Finland's present military operations, Hull said the dispatch showed clearly that Finland is moving into a new phase of hostilities against Russia.

Hull said the vital question for this Government, in formulating its policy toward Finland, is whether Finland, over and above the security requirements of her own borders, is going to continue military operations to the extent desired by Germany so that she will be in the general war as an active partner of Germany.

#### ATTITUDE OF STUDENTS ON PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN WAR

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Ohio State Lantern, published by the Ohio State University School of Journalism, Columbus, Ohio, the issue being that of Monday, November 10, 1941. The headline of the article is "Students do not want war, Lantern campus poll indicates."

Ohio State students are overwhelmingly opposed to United States participation in the European war, a random survey conducted on the campus last week indicated.

These are some of the percentages we find presented in the article:

	Percent
Should the United States declare war on Germany now?	
Yes.....	13
No.....	83
No opinion.....	4

Do you think the United States should at this time send part of our Army to Europe to help Britain?

	Percent
Yes.....	11
No.....	88
No opinion.....	1

Do you think we should at this time send some of our warships, manned by American sailors, to Europe to help Britain?

	Percent
Yes.....	23
No.....	73
No opinion.....	4

Do you think the United States should at this time send part of her air force, with American pilots, to Europe to help Britain?

	Percent
Yes.....	19
No.....	78
No opinion.....	3

I repeat my request that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Ohio State Lantern, Columbus, Ohio, of November 10, 1941]

#### STUDENTS DO NOT WANT WAR, LANTERN CAMPUS POLL INDICATES

(By Martha Saenger)

Ohio State students are overwhelmingly opposed to United States participation in the European war, a random survey conducted on the campus last week indicated.

Not only is opinion heavily weighted against an outright declaration of war on Germany, but also against the more aggressive steps "short of war," if they involve sending soldiers, sailors, or airmen abroad. The greatest indication of noninterventionist sentiment is the 88 percent registered against the sending of an American expeditionary force.

The percentage distribution of answers to leading questions is as follows:

	Percent
Should the United States declare war on Germany now?	
Yes.....	13
No.....	83
No opinion.....	4

Do you think the United States should at this time send part of our Army to Europe to help Britain?

	Percent
Yes.....	11
No.....	88
No opinion.....	1

Do you think we should at this time send some of our warships manned by American sailors to Europe to help Britain?

	Percent
Yes.....	23
No.....	73
No opinion.....	4

Do you think the United States should at this time send part of her air force, with American pilots, to Europe to help Britain?

	Percent
Yes.....	19
No.....	78
No opinion.....	3

#### POSSIBILITIES CITED

Perhaps it indicates an acceptance by some isolationists of the fact of the use of the Navy in convoy or patrol duty and the employment of American flyers in delivering war planes to Britain. Again, the variation might be interpreted as a belief that the Army is less prepared for combat service than is the Navy or air force.

Answers to questions pertinent to the economic consequences of the war situation disclose a majority in favor of certain economic controls, and a still greater majority opposed to certain other economic controls. Thus 65 percent would compel stabilization of prices, and of wage and salary rates, while

75 percent would oppose a law making it compulsory to buy defense bonds or stamps.

A new law in Canada keeps prices from going higher than they are now, and also keeps wage and salary rates from going higher. Would you approve, or disapprove, of such a law in the United States?

	Percent
Approve.....	65
Disapprove.....	30
No opinion.....	5

Would you favor a law which would make it compulsory for everybody to buy defense bonds or stamps in proportion to income?

	Percent
Yes.....	22
No.....	75
No opinion.....	3

Students polled generally admitted ignorance when asked the amount of interest paid on defense bonds. Sixty-seven percent said that they did not know, 33 percent thought that they did, and 13 percent quoted the correct figure.

#### ARMISTICE DAY ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President on Armistice Day, at the Arlington National Cemetery Amphitheater, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE ACADEMY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Production for Victory," delivered by the Vice President before the annual meeting of the Academy of Political Science, New York City, November 12, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR NYE BEFORE AMERICA FIRST RALLY AT NEW YORK

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator NYE before an America First rally at New York City on August 27, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ARMISTICE DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on Armistice Day in connection with the services at the Second Division Memorial, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ARMISTICE DAY ADDRESS BY GENERAL MARSHALL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army, on Tuesday, November 11, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PRIORITIES AND LITTLE BUSINESS—EDITORIAL FROM PORTLAND (OREG.) JOURNAL

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of November 6, 1941, entitled "When Little Business Needs a Friend," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### FINLAND'S JUST CAUSE BEFORE THE WORLD—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Journal-American of November 9, 1941, entitled "Finland's Just Cause Before the World," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NAZI PROPAGANDA—ARTICLE BY DILLARD STOKES

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Letters From Nazi Propagandists Torment Family of Boy Who Died for United States on Kearny," written by Dillard Stokes and published in the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE FLIGHT OF FARMERS—EDITORIAL FROM GEORGIA MARKET BULLETIN

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Story of Farmers' Plight," written by Tom Linder and published in the Georgia Market Bulletin of November 12, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WILLIAM E. THOMAS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 768) for the relief of William E. Thomas, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$330.75" insert "\$500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,  
JAMES H. HUGHES,  
ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. McGEHEE,  
ROBERT RAMSPECK,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

#### FRED WEYBRET, JR., AND OTHERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1852) for the relief of Fred Weybret, Junior, and others, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$1,200" insert "\$1,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$3,000" insert "\$3,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$924.29" insert "\$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$1,545" insert "\$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-



ment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$1,045" insert "\$1,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
ARTHUR CAPPER,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

DAN R. MCGEEHEE,  
SAMUEL A. WEISS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

#### CONTROL OF RENTS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some time ago the House passed what is known as the rent-control bill for the District of Columbia. That bill has been under careful study by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. The bill is now on the Senate Calendar, after having been amended to some extent by the Senate District Committee. I therefore at this time move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5890, known as the rent-control bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5890) to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have long realized the wisdom, yes, even the necessity, of rent-control legislation in the District of Columbia. I rise, but not in opposition to the bill, for it is a good bill, and I am in favor of it. I want a tight bill. But I wish to propound a question. Does not the Senator from Nevada think that when the Senate considers proposed legislation of such great importance, which doubtless affects every Member of the Senate, there should be a quorum present?

Mr. McCARRAN. It may be we should have a quorum present, if we can obtain a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. I think we can obtain a quorum. There are ways of doing that.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wonder if the Senator would permit the bill to be taken up for consideration by the Senate, and then let the suggestion of an absence of a quorum be made.

Mr. McNARY. I am simply appealing to the good judgment of the Senator on that point. I am not insisting on it. I am sure we should have a quorum present, unless the Senator from Nevada, who has the bill in charge, has some other plan. I am not familiar at all with this measure.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say that the bill has had several weeks of study by the Committee on the District of Columbia, and comes before the Senate by unanimous action of that committee, if that means anything to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; that means considerable to the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may suggest to the Senator from Oregon, that the Senator from Nevada proposes that the bill be taken up for consideration, and that then the suggestion of no quorum be made.

Mr. McNARY. Yes. I wish to make it clear that I am not obstinate in the matter. I suggest to the Senator the wisdom of such action. I am appealing to the good judgment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill considered by the Senate and to have it become a law. It is exceedingly essential that some law of this kind be enacted promptly. I therefore wish to proceed with the consideration of the measure now. Unless some other Senator insists on a call for a quorum I shall not do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the question is on the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; to consider it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5890.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before that question is put I wish to make a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Nevada is not debatable at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5890.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5890) to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the effect of the action just taken is to make the bill the unfinished business of the Senate, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. The bill is debatable now, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was particularly interested in the little colloquy which occurred between the Republican leader and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] about obtaining a quorum. There seems to be some doubt as to whether a quorum is obtainable at this time. There is no doubt that there is not now a quorum physically present. The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate has established a new precedent which the Senate ought to follow. When the committee takes action with less than a quorum of the committee present, and the point of no quorum is not made, everything is lovely, and the committee adjourns; but sometimes a Senator who was not present, and who finds out that, as a matter of fact, there was not a physical quorum present when the committee acted, may call that situation to the attention of the chairman of the committee or the acting chairman, and the bill which was favor-

ably reported by the committee is held up. Then a meeting of the committee is called at which a quorum is present.

This morning before that committee I called attention to a situation similar to that with which we are now confronted in the Senate. I think I am in favor of the bill which the Senator is sponsoring, but I cannot help but call attention to the possibility that, if we follow the precedent set by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, next week some Senator may discover that there was not a quorum physically present, although no point was made, and therefore the action may be nullified and set aside, and we may have to commence again at the beginning. If we are to follow that precedent, I am wondering whether it would not be wise to commence in the Senate with a quorum every time a motion is made to do anything. If the RECORD is silent as to whether a quorum is actually present, the old doctrine of the courts, which have gone into the question many times, is that the RECORD cannot be disputed. If the RECORD is clear, the action is perfectly legal, assuming that the action was taken by a legal body, called into session at a legal time, and under legal procedure.

I do not wish to defeat this bill, and I do not intend to make the point of no quorum; but in these matters it depends on whose ox is gored. If a Senator ascertains, after a committee has adjourned, that some action was taken without the physical presence of a quorum, although the record shows that everything was regular and the point of no quorum was not made, according to the precedent which the committee has set, notwithstanding all that, its action can be nullified. A great committee of the Senate has now taken that position. If the precedent is to be followed, and if action taken can be nullified at any time unless the record affirmatively shows that there was an actual quorum present at the time the action was taken, it seems to me questionable whether we ought to do anything without a quorum actually being present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is always presumed to be present unless a roll call demonstrates to the contrary.

Mr. NORRIS. I have always considered that to be the rule. The courts say that is the rule; but it is not the rule promulgated by one of our great committees.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, by way of brief explanation of the pending bill, let me say that it is evident that the United States Government has called to the District of Columbia many thousands of persons who are to serve the Government during this great emergency. It is exceedingly difficult for those employees of the Government and others to secure suitable places in which to live—or, indeed, any places. There has been evidence of abuse by those having living quarters to rent, and those engaged in the apartment-house business or businesses of similar nature. The bill seeks to protect those who must come here and serve the Government during this hour of emergency.

It has been thought wise to fix rent conditions so that abuses shall not be permitted. With that in mind the House considered the question of fixing a ceiling for rentals and rental services. In that connection the House, as well as the Senate committee, looked upon the 1st day of January 1941 as a reasonable date to which to relate rents in establishing a ceiling, with certain limitations and certain conditions and modifications. For example, if since the 1st day of January 1941 any place which is rated as a hotel, apartment house, or rooming house, has had brought upon it, by reason of the new situation, new charges and new conditions, the operator of the apartment house, rooming house, or hotel might make a showing to the Administrator provided for in the bill, whereupon he, having made an investigation of the circumstances, might permit a change in the rates and an increase in the charges.

With that brief explanation at this time, I ask that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator is measurably brief. Perhaps I feel that way because I am not at all conversant with the provisions of the bill. What is the base period or time provided for in the bill for the fixation of rents?

Mr. McCARRAN. The 1st day of January 1941, if at that time the accommodation—the apartment, room, or place—was rented. If at that time it was not rented, the time dates back to the last date on which it was occupied and rented and the landlord was receiving compensation for the services rendered.

Mr. McNARY. Is it not true that the impulse of these feverish times, which extend back at least 2 years, caused an increase in rentals on January 1 over and above those of preceding years?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator may be to some extent correct in that statement; but hearings held in the House, extending over some 2 months, were very comprehensive. They indicated that January 1, 1941, would be as fair a date as could be set to which to relate the rent ceiling. If we should go back too far prior to January 1, 1941, we would arrive at a condition which would not be fair. If we should go forward subsequent to the 1st day of January 1941, we would find a condition that might be unfair. So the 1st day of January 1941 was chosen. If on that date an accommodation was rented and occupied and the landlord was receiving rent for it, it was regarded as a fair date to which to tie the so-called rent ceiling.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, I would not dispute the hearings. We have all heard of experiences of others which would not run parallel with the statement made by the Senator from Nevada. There may be exceptional cases. I am speaking wholly without personal reference.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say in that connection that much leeway is given to the Administrator provided for by the bill. The landlord may come forward and make a showing that by reason of certain conditions he should be per-

mitted to charge a different rate, or curtail or extend services. On the other hand, the tenant also is permitted to come before the Administrator, or an examiner under the Administrator, and show why a different rate should be set up.

Mr. McNARY. Is there anything in the bill which would permit the Administrator to decrease the rental below the base established as of January 1, 1941?

Mr. McCARRAN. If on that date the accommodation was not rented, and if on a prior date it was rented, then the prior date would govern. There might be a decrease from what was claimed by the landlord to be the proper rental for January 1, 1941.

Mr. McNARY. I have in mind another inquiry, brought about by reading in the press, which I always follow in seeking information. The statement in the press was to the effect that the so-called price-fixing bill which is now pending before the House contains a provision giving the Administrator under the terms of that bill, if it should ever become a law, the power to fix rents in the District of Columbia. If that bill should pass in such form, would it impinge on the bill now being sponsored by the able Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McCARRAN. The pending bill would be specifically for the District of Columbia, and would apply entirely to the District of Columbia. I should say that if the rather general price-fixing law had such a provision in it, it might—although I am not familiar with the language of it—impinge on this measure; but this, being specific, in my judgment would prevail.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the Senator is referring to a statutory rule of law with which all of us are familiar; but in the bill to which I have seen reference in the press, Washington, the District of Columbia, is specifically designated.

Mr. McCARRAN. That may be true. I am not advised as to that.

Mr. McNARY. I wondered whether the Senator is at all disturbed by the fact that two bills now under consideration may do the same thing.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not particularly disturbed. Under the rule I should say that this measure would apply; and it has been made the subject of study in keeping with the needs of the particular District, namely, the District of Columbia.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator, being an able lawyer, is also familiar with the rule that the last act supersedes the former act if they are in conflict.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. So I am calling that matter to his attention also.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Will the Senator from Nevada give us an explanation of how a ceiling is arrived at for apartments and hotels built since January 1, 1941?

Mr. McCARRAN. There is in the bill a specific provision with reference to that matter, and I shall refer to it for the Senator in a moment. It provides, in general terms, that the rental shall be

in keeping with the rental for similar accommodations in the locality.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I thank the Senator. That explanation is satisfactory.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, perhaps I shall have to make further explanation. However, I should like to have the amendments of the Senate committee considered first.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. Is there any limitation in the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; 1945. It would terminate automatically in 1945, or by action of the Congress, of course.

Mr. GERRY. I should like to ask the Senator another question.

I notice on page 10, subdivision (3), a provision to the effect that if a landlord wishes to sell a piece of property, he shall have a right to do so if he has entered into a contract of sale with someone who will occupy the property as a dwelling for his personal use.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is referring to subdivision (3) on page 10?

Mr. GERRY. Yes; on page 10.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. GERRY. I was wondering whether the landlord could not sell the property for use as a store, or anything of that sort. Perhaps the Senator will explain that point later.

Mr. McCARRAN. The intention is to get away from fraudulent transfers which might be resorted to for the purpose of defeating the purposes of the bill.

Mr. GERRY. I understand that; but the language used would seem to require the landlord to sell the property to someone who would occupy it as a dwelling.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. GERRY. Is there any question, for example, about the landlord's right to consummate a bona fide contract to sell the property for use as a store?

Mr. McCARRAN. The next provision may cover that matter:

(b) No action or proceeding to recover possession of housing accommodations shall be maintainable by any landlord against any tenant, notwithstanding that the tenant has no lease or that his lease has expired, so long as the tenant continues to pay the rent to which the landlord is entitled, unless—

(4) The landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession for the immediate purpose of substantially altering, remodeling, or demolishing the property and replacing it with new construction, the plans for which altered, remodeled, or new construction having been filed with and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GERRY. Does the Senator think that provision covers the point?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is the committee's idea that it does cover the point the Senator has raised.

Mr. GERRY. I read the section, and I wanted to know if the chairman thought it covered that point.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think it does.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia was, follow-



ing the words "Sec. 2. Maximum Rent Ceilings and Minimum Service Standards," on page 2, line 18, before the word "On", to insert "(1)."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not want to intrude unnecessarily, but I should like to have a question cleared up and answered. I understood the able senior Senator from Nevada to say, in response to a question I propounded, that if a building were not occupied on January 1, 1941, there could not be a reduction of the rental.

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. McNARY. If the building were occupied, and the tenant complained, there could be a reduction of the rental?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. That is correct, is it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; if, on the showing made, a reduction were warranted.

Mr. McNARY. The jurisdiction to act would be within the power of the Administrator?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. In other words, let me say to the Senator, the bill would place in the hands of one man wide authority, wide latitude, and wide opportunity to administer, and also would give the opportunity to administer it on the facts pertaining to any one particular unit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 22, after the word "accommodations", to insert "excluding hotels", so as to read:

Sec. 2. Maximum Rent Ceilings and Minimum Service Standards: (1) On and after the thirtieth day following the enactment of this act, subject to such adjustments as may be made pursuant to sections 3 and 4, maximum-rent ceilings and minimum-service standards for housing accommodations excluding hotels, in the District of Columbia shall be the following:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

(2) On and after the thirtieth day following the enactment of this act, the landlord or other person in charge of and conducting any hotel in the District of Columbia shall post in a conspicuous place in each room thereof used for living or dwelling purposes, a card or sign plainly stating the rental rate per day of such room, and a copy of such rates for each room shall be filed with the Administrator. Subject to such adjustment as the Administrator may determine to be necessary in order that said rates shall conform to the standard set forth in this section and to such adjustment as may be made pursuant to Sections 3 and 4, said rates when posted and filed with the Administrator, shall constitute the maximum-rent ceiling for the housing accommodations specified: *Provided*, That the transient rates so posted shall not exceed the established or standard rate charged by the landlord as of January 1, 1941, except that after written notice by the landlord to the Administrator such landlord may make such addition or deduction to or from such rate as will compensate for (1) a substantial change since January 1, 1941, in maintenance or operating costs or expenses, or (2) a substantial capital improvement or alteration made since Janu-

ary 1, 1941, and such addition or deduction shall be subject to review by the Administrator, and he may by order adjust such maximum-rent ceiling to provide the rental rate generally prevailing for comparable housing accommodations as determined by the Administrator. Posted rates shall conform to the following:

(a) In the case of apartment units, the rental rate shall be that which the landlord was entitled to receive on January 1, 1941, except in those instances where it is shown that a special rate less than the established or standard rate charged by the landlord as of January 1, 1941, was being charged, a rate may be posted at such established or standard rate: *Provided*, That the rate being charged the current occupant shall not be increased.

(b) Where apartment units are changed from furnished to unfurnished, or vice versa, the rate shall be that charged by the landlord for comparable housing accommodations on January 1, 1941: *Provided*, That no such change may be made without the consent of the current occupant, if there be one.

(c) Where housing accommodations are changed from permanent to transient use, the rate shall not exceed that posted for comparable accommodations.

(d) In the case of a hotel not in operation January 1, 1941, the rental rates posted shall be the rates generally prevailing for comparable housing accommodations.

(e) For the purposes of this section, the term "hotel" means an establishment operating under a hotel license and having in excess of 50 rooms used predominately for transient occupancy, that is, for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short-time basis.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at that point, somewhat in answer to the query of the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], let me say with reference to this amendment and all the amendments recommended by the Senate committee that every word was gone over carefully with the Office of Price Administration, with their representative present; and this particular provision was gone into not only with the Office of Price Administration but with the hotel men's organization, each represented by counsel present, on two different occasions, before the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment following line 10, on page 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 4, to strike out:

Sec. 4. Petition for adjustment: (a) Any landlord or tenant may petition the Administrator to adjust the maximum-rent ceiling applicable to his housing accommodations on the ground that such maximum-rent ceiling is too high compared to the investment value of the property rented and the value of the services rendered; whereupon the Administrator shall by order adjust such maximum-rent ceiling to provide for a fair and reasonable rental.

And to insert:

Sec. 4. Petition for adjustment: (a) Any landlord or tenant may petition the Administrator to adjust the maximum-rent ceiling applicable to his housing accommodations on the ground that such maximum-rent ceiling is, due to peculiar circumstances, affecting such housing accommodations, substantially higher or lower than the rent generally prevailing for comparable housing accommodations; whereupon the Administrator may by order adjust such maximum-rent

ceiling to provide the rent generally prevailing for comparable housing accommodations as determined by the Administrator.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the amendment was read rapidly, but clearly. Will the Senator from Nevada briefly enlarge upon it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Let me say in this regard that section 4, on page 6, which was stricken out by the Senate committee, was for convenience known as the Patman amendment, which was offered on the floor of the House when the bill was being considered by that body. The Senator will notice that it would have caused the process of valuation for investment purposes to be undertaken by the Administrator or whatever authority might have the duty of carrying out the provisions of the bill. The Senate committee did not favor—and, indeed, it was opposed by nearly every agency—the so-called Patman amendment. On the other hand, the committee of the Senate inserted and made a part of its recommendations section 4, under the heading "Petition for adjustment."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, paragraph (c), on page 7, line 18, after the word "accommodations", to insert "but in the case of a hotel, is less than the established or standard service supplied as of January 1, 1941", so as to make the paragraph read:

(c) Any tenant may petition the Administrator on the ground that the service supplied to him is less than the service established by the minimum-service standard for his housing accommodations, but in the case of a hotel, is less than the established or standard service supplied as of January 1, 1941; whereupon the Administrator may order that the service be maintained at such minimum-service standard, or that the maximum-rent ceiling be decreased to compensate for a reduction in service, as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 10, paragraph (4), line 12, after the words "by the", to strike out "authorities having jurisdiction in such matters", and insert "Commissioners of the District of Columbia", so as to make the paragraph read:

(4) The landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession for the immediate purpose of substantially altering, remodeling, or demolishing the property and replacing it with new construction, the plans for which altered, remodeled, or new construction having been filed with and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, right there, may I, for the purpose of explaining to those who may be interested, say that it has been the policy of the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate since he took that office, and it will continue to be his policy henceforth so long as he shall occupy that office, to constitute, whenever possible, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the source from which all other groups, committees, or commissions in the District of Columbia shall take their power and authority. So, with that

thought in mind, the Administrator under the bill is to be appointed by the Commissioners, and the bill goes even further than that, for it provides that such rules and regulations as the Administrator may promulgate shall first be approved by the Commissioners.

I, for one, believe that there should be one head to the District of Columbia government. That head is the Commissioners, appointed by the President; they should be held responsible, and they should hold all others responsible to them. So, as I have said, the bill provides that the Administrator shall be appointed by the Commissioners, and his rules and regulations must be reviewed by the Commissioners before they become effective, thus to protect property owners within the District and at the same time protect the public as well.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 10, line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, in section 6, page 10, line 25, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "or its immediately contiguous territory"; on page 11, line 6, after the word "personnel", to insert "subject to approval by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, without regard to race or creed"; in line 10, after the word "submit", to strike out "an annual" and insert "a semiannual", and in line 12, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert "for transmittal to the Congress of the United States", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. Administrator: There is hereby created in and for the District of Columbia the office of Administrator of Rent Control. The Administrator shall be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and shall be a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia for not less than 3 years prior to his appointment. He shall devote his full time to the Office of Administrator and shall receive a salary at the rate of \$7,500 per annum. The Administrator shall establish offices, acquire supplies and equipment, and employ such personnel, subject to approval by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, without regard to race or creed, as may be necessary in the performance of his functions under this act. The Administrator shall submit a semiannual report to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for transmittal to the Congress of the United States.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 12, line 17, at the beginning of paragraph (b), to strike out "The Administrator may, from time to time, issue, amend, and rescind such regulations and orders as he may deem necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act, or to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof. For such purposes the" and insert "The Administrator shall have authority to promulgate, issue, amend, or rescind rules and regulations, subject to approval by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and to issue such orders as may be deemed necessary or proper to

carry out the purposes and provisions of this act or to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof. The"; on page 13, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "by regulation or order issue or"; and at the beginning of line 7 to insert "or in a hotel", so as to make the paragraph read:

The Administrator shall have authority to promulgate, issue, amend, or rescind rules and regulations, subject to approval by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and to issue such orders as may be deemed necessary or proper to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act or to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof. The Administrator may require a license as a condition of engaging in any rental transaction involving the subletting of any housing accommodations or the renting of housing accommodations in a rooming or boarding house, or in a hotel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10, paragraph (b), page 17, line 23, after the words "by the", to strike out "United States Attorney for the District of Columbia" and insert "Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or an assistant, on information filed in the police court of the District of Columbia", so as to make the paragraph read:

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, and any person who willfully makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed thereunder, and any person who willfully participates in any fictitious sale or other device or arrangement with intent to evade this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, shall be prosecuted therefor by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia or an assistant, on information filed in the police court of the District of Columbia, and shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

The amendment was agreed to.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** That completes the committee amendments.

**MR. McCARRAN.** Mr. President, if there are any questions which any Senator wishes to propound, I will try to answer them.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5890) was read the third time, and passed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

**MR. McCARRAN.** I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

**THE VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By **MR. McKELLAR**, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:  
Sundry postmasters.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of **Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr.**, of Pennsylvania, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece now established in London.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

**MR. McCARRAN.** With respect to the nomination of **Mr. Biddle**, I ask that the President be immediately notified of its confirmation.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of **Charles Fahy**, of New Mexico, to be Solicitor General.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of **Chester M. Foresman** to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of **Chrissie T. Redditt** to be postmaster at Columbia, Louisiana.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of **Herbert H. King** to be postmaster at Flanders, N. J.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

**MR. McCARRAN.** I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all nominations acted on today.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations.

The call of the calendar has been completed.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

**MR. CONNALLY.** Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously made, I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under



the order previously entered, until Monday, November 17, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 13, 1941:

##### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Louis T. Rocheleau, of Woonsocket, R. I., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R. I., to fill an existing vacancy.

##### APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

##### MARINE CORPS

Col. Charles D. Barrett to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 7th day of November 1941.

Col. Joseph C. Fegan to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 7th day of November 1941.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 13, 1941:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary near the Government of Belgium and as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Governments of Norway, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia, now established in London, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation also as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece also now established in London.

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Charles Fahy to be Solicitor General.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Chester M. Foresman to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

##### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

##### TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Michael James Clarke  
William Flynn Powell  
Ray Howard Vanderhook  
Dean Brooks Jackson  
David William Scott, Jr.  
Linden Edwin Johnson  
Palmer Leiter Auker  
Bruce Cominole

##### POSTMASTERS

##### LOUISIANA

Chrissie D. Redditt, Columbia.

##### NEW JERSEY

Herbert H. King, Flanders.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.  
Rev. Augustine C. Murray, of Los Angeles, Calif., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

May the most just, most high, and adorable will of God be in all things done. Praise and magnify, now and forever.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come.

LXXXVII—557

Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. Amen.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter addressed to the press of the country by Senator BYRD.

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

There was no objection.

#### REDUCTION OF NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURES

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is part of my undertaking to call attention as frequently as possible to the effort that the Committee on Economy in Non-defense Items is endeavoring to make to reduce nondefense expenditures. There will be a meeting of that committee tomorrow. We are ably led by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I am extending my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by printing a letter from him addressed to the press of the country, advocating very definite reduction in nondefense items of expenditure. The copy I have asked to have printed in the Appendix appeared in the Berkshire Eagle, of Pittsfield, Mass.

#### COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a very, very important message for the House. The great Labor Committee of the House met this morning, and they are going to consider a bill about post-war planning. I hope you gentlemen all get a copy of that bill and read it.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 118]

Anderson, Calif.	Hendricks	Ramsay
Blackney	Hinshaw	Satterfield
Bland	Imhoff	Schaefer, Ill.
Cartwright	Jacobsen	Schuetz
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Clason	Kee	Secrest
Collins	Kilburn	Sheridan
Costello	Kleberg	Smith, Wash.
Culkin	McArdle	Snyder
Day	McGranery	Vinson, Ga.
Disney	May	Wheat
Douglas	Mills, La.	White
Eaton	Nichols	Wolfenden, Pa.
Faddis	O'Connor	Zimmerman
Flaherty	O'Day	
Fulmer	O'Leary	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighty-two Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON PRICE-CONTROL BILL

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 57.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives is authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of the hearings held before such committee during the current session, on the bill (H. R. 5479) to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes.*

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and a table in reference to the civilian-pilot-training program.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING THE NEUTRALITY ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 237.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will adopt these Senate amendments without change. Such action will reaffirm the doctrine of the freedom of the seas, permit arming of our own vessels for defense, increase the flow of supplies from the United States to those nations which are resisting aggression and thereby strengthen our own defense efforts. It will strengthen and implement the strong foreign policy which this administration has adopted in dealing with the aggressor nations and, finally, it will give encouragement to all the nations of the earth to resist the aggressions of Adolf Hitler.

I realize that there are risks attendant upon this course. No one can say whether or not this means war. No one in this House or in this country can guarantee that we will not become involved in this war, even though we reject these Senate amendments. Those who resist the Senate amendments can not guarantee that if we bring our battle fleet into our home bases, remove our ships from the high seas and permit them to rust, we will not become involved in this world conflict.

This is no time for irresolution, for delay and defeatism. This is a time for bold and resolute action. To delay to display a lack of unity at this time may mean disaster for all of us.

I did not promise my people I would not vote for war, as so many of my colleagues have stated here. I did pledge to them I would resist with voice and vote the aggression of Adolf Hitler. I did pledge to them that I would vote and that I would work to make this Nation secure. I did pledge to them that I would fight for the retention of our free way of life. I did pledge to them that by whatever means possible I would assist the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States in resisting Adolf Hitler and everything that he stands for.

I know there can be no peace, there can be no happiness, there can be no security for the people of America or for the members of the human family until Adolf Hitler and all that he stands for has been utterly destroyed. If reason will not prevail, if tolerance will not prevail, if all other means fail in the effort to crush him, then I am prepared for the consequences. I, for one, am prepared, if it is necessary at long last, to vote for war or take whatever steps are necessary to remove this menace to world peace and to happiness and the way of life that the people of my country hold dear.

Ah, my friends, there are some things that are worse than war. Slavery is worse than war. The right of free speech

and a free press, the right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of your conscience, the right of peaceful assembly; all of these rights are precious rights, and to defend them and to retain them I would fight. I hope and I pray to God the time has not come in the affairs of this Nation when Congress will fail to take bold and resolute action when that way of life is threatened.

I would remind my colleagues that bold and resolute action in the War for Independence brought forth our independence and liberty; that the same boldness and resolution in the War of 1812 brought recognition for the doctrine of the freedom of the seas; and that out of the tragic War between the States came an indissoluble union of sovereign States inhabited by free men and women of every race and creed. All of these gains for our Nation and the cause of humanity were made because bold and resolute men dared to do and die for the right. Not one of these gains was made by appeasers or defeatists. Not one was made by irresolution and disunity.

No one knows what the answer will be to our efforts to remain out of this conflict, but we do know, as never before, when a representative of a member of the Axis group is arriving in this country on the wings of the wind to present us with an ultimatum, that the time has come when we must speak in no uncertain terms. We should back the Chief Executive and our people in preserving the four freedoms and our rights upon the high seas. Wherever the swastika floats today I know that tyranny and oppression reign; I know that liberty and security is a myth. So, for my own part, I take my stand by the side of my three brothers who now wear the uniform and the precious son I have who is taking military training, with your sons and brothers, to defend our way of life; the way of freedom, liberty, and Christianity—against the aggression of Adolf Hitler.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I take these 10 minutes because I am very desirous indeed that my own constituents may know what attitude I take upon this legislation. I am amused at the argument, if I may call it that, which so many will assert today—that they voted for the lease-lend bill and other such measures but cannot go quite this far. I was interested to note that many speeches made yesterday were almost identically the same as those on the repeal of the embargo, namely, that such step was tantamount to war. I have taken the other view because I believe that those steps taken would prevent war from reaching our own shores and would obviate any necessity of sending any expeditionary force abroad. I want to help those people who are fighting for us. Some of you may not like that expression, but they are fighting for us when they struggle to preserve liberty and freedom in the world. I am interested in those who take the floor and proclaim that we are the greatest nation on the face of the earth and prate about our great love of liberty and freedom. How-

ever, it distressed me yesterday—not only the words, but the applause that followed the words—when it was declared that Great Britain is a slacker, and that when she is ready to go in it might then be time for us to go in. I am not speaking in an attempt to arouse your emotions. I am appealing to your reason only. But Great Britain a slacker? We, the greatest nation on the face of the earth, looking on while a world conflagration is engulfing liberty and freedom. The Almighty, looking down upon us, well knows which the slacker nation is. We claim to be the most important member of the family of nations. I am not an interventionist. I certainly would not now vote for a declaration of war. Many of you say that this is tantamount to a declaration of war. If today we were faced with the proposition of making such declaration, there would be a far different atmosphere here than now prevails. Yesterday the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] of the Foreign Affairs Committee—I was glad to read his speech—said that no man knows whether this means war or not; that it is a matter of judgment. Of course, he is right.

I voted for the embargo in 1935, hoping that the noble experiment would keep nations from making war simply because we would not furnish them with the implements of war. That noble experiment has miserably failed. I want now to free ourselves from those self-imposed shackles so that this great Nation may be free to act and that no such comfort may be given to Hitler and at this critical moment to Japan. We must now have a free hand to meet contingencies as they may arise. I have had very great difficulty in explaining to my audiences our attitude toward Japan. The Congress is seemingly ready to fight Japan, but I have very great difficulty in explaining just what Japan has done, that we should be so ready to fight her. It is hard to do. You try it. I have little difficulty in stating what Hitler has done and we know what his intentions are. Some want a negotiated peace with this devil incarnate now. The Great Master, whom so many of you profess to follow, would not like to have you negotiate a peace with the devil. You may wish to enter his domain to talk peace, but you are warned that it is a hot place. Let us not allow this monster to win because our aid was too little and too late. This particular legislation resolves itself simply into a question of whether we unshackle ourselves and restore to this great Nation its former freedom of action.

Many say there is no politics in this. I do not know whether there is or not. I have disagreed for so many years, and so violently, with the domestic policies of this administration, that you must all know that I do not wholly trust the leaders of the administration. But I often think, if we Republicans had won the last election, where we would be today. Would we not have been in a fine position? Would this large Republican majority have followed their President? It would have required a great change of heart. That is evident.



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

Mr. GIFFORD. With the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. SHORT. It really pains me to disagree with my friend—

Mr. GIFFORD. I hope it does.

Mr. SHORT. But we certainly agree with the last statement that he made, and I say let us save America and let God save the King.

Mr. GIFFORD. All of which reminds me of the story of the two Irishmen and the upset boat. The boat was overturned. Pat swam to shore. Pat could swim, but Mike could not. Pat swam to the shore and then turned and went back and rescued Mike. Someone asked him why he did not bring Mike back with him in the first place, and Pat said, "I wanted to save myself first." We want to save ourselves first. We want to build up a mighty armament and then 2 years from now we will be ready. For what? Someone may answer.

Some of you yesterday criticized Mr. Churchill. If there ever was a man who would take a chance—recall what he did in the last World War—if there is one man that cannot be criticized for being unwilling to take a chance, it is Churchill. Do not blame him on that score. The fear is lest he take a chance before his nation is ready and have another Dunkirk.

Now, sometime I would like to portray the real Englishman to you. I think he is generally the most patriotic person on the face of the earth. Graft is practically unknown in England. Is it thus in our own Nation, proud as we are of it? Do not let us throw stones like those thrown here yesterday. That message going to Britain is a disheartening one. The applause, I am glad to say, could not be printed in the Record. Do not give way to that sort of demonstration again, I pray you.

My politics, as I have often stated before, stops at the water's edge.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. With the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. BARRY. Yesterday Churchill said in a speech to the Commons:

It seems to me the freedom-loving powers will be possessed of large quantities of ships in 1943, which will enable overseas operations to take place utterly beyond British resources at present time.

My question is, Do you not think Churchill owes some duty to his ally, Russia, who has been carrying on this war for 5 months, and do you not think he should make some effort before 1943?

Mr. GIFFORD. Do you think he is not making all efforts within his power? Would you like to know military secrets and parade them here? Some prefer to stigmatize recent policies as "devious methods to get us into war." It is indeed a pity that such methods must needs be adopted. What can Churchill do for Russia more than he is doing? None of us know. What are we ourselves doing for Russia in view of assurances made? We know but little of the military aid contemplated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. How many people take refuge in witticisms relating to granting aid to Stalin? If witticisms answer it, my friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] answered it the other day when he said he would enjoy pushing a rattlesnake up the pantaloons of Hitler. So would I. If a cutthroat is after you, my friend, would I not pay another cutthroat to get after the first one to save you? Of course, I would. That is only common sense. Why indulge in these nasty insinuations that we are now allies of or believe in communism? I think we had better forego that pleasure in the future. We will welcome the new cutthroat, if you want to call him that. Do not think that Stalin is fooled by our attitude. He knows full well how we feel about him and his ideology.

I read with great care speeches made yesterday. I have here many clippings from them. I regret that some will try to defeat this measure because they are dissatisfied with something the administration has not yet done and ought to do. That they will not further support the President until he does something that you wish to demand of him, such as to "strangle John L. Lewis before they will vote for this measure." Has it come to that? Does that line of reasoning appeal to you? It does not appeal to me, although I will join in any appropriate action that may be made on John L. Lewis at any proper time.

I sympathize with the President of the United States if his own administration in this hour will not support his foreign policy. In the hearts of the American people as a whole there is a great love of liberty and freedom and they sympathize deeply with those nations now being destroyed in this world conflagration. They want us to succor them in nearly all ways short of war. My message is, unshackle yourselves from these self-imposed restrictions that make us the butt of ridicule throughout the world, which bring aid and comfort to the enemy, and at this critical hour assure Japan that we will not dare enter those seas in which she may decide to carry on war. Are we to give her the go-ahead sign and retire within a shell of fancied security? The defeat of this measure would be the forerunner of really disastrous consequences. Can anyone doubt it?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arnold].

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, it has not been an easy matter for me to make up my mind with respect to voting for the Senate amendments to the measure passed in the House recently. For a number of days I have been giving the matter serious thought. Up to this time I have voted for the measures that now constitute the foreign policy of this administration. By so doing I hoped to keep this Nation out of war. I am thoroughly convinced that they have produced that result.

Oh, some will say that we are already at war. But the fact of the matter is, the Navy is shooting to protect our right, under international law, to the freedom of the seas. They did not shoot until our rights had been violated, outside combat zones, by Hitler. I vividly recall that many isolationists predicted in 1939, when we lifted the arms embargo, that we would be in a shooting war within 90 days. With each succeeding step the same prediction has been made. Yet, we are not at war. Had we not followed the course of our present policy, I am convinced that before now Britain would have fallen and that rapid infiltration would have occurred in certain South American countries and that we would really be at war, and alone, with Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan. I am not making the promise now that we will be able to remain at peace, whether this resolution is voted up or down. No one knows. We have no control over that.

I listened with interest to the speeches of yesterday, and, to hear some talk one would have thought the adoption of this amendment is an open declaration of war. As a matter of fact, it only restores the inherent rights we have always possessed, under international law, to send our ships wherever the need exists. Specifically, it is now necessary to rapidly and continuously transport from the Far East a number of vital materials necessary to our armament program. They cannot be obtained in sufficient quantity elsewhere. On Monday I made the prediction to a constituent that if this amendment is not accepted today, before February 1st it will be necessary to repeal sections 2 and 3, and that the people of this Nation will be demanding it. Why not do the job now?

Others on this floor, who probably love Britain better than I, yesterday castigated her for not placing an army in France while Russia is engaged. I have also given that matter much thought and, in my opinion, Britain is following exactly the right course. If she can concentrate all her strength toward placing an army in the Caucasian Mountains to prevent Hitler from securing the oil he will so urgently require to continue his mad march against the remaining nations of the world, she will be performing the greatest possible service to mankind. My earnest hope and opinion is that the Axis Powers may become stalled in Russia and by increasing activity of the allied air force (a blackening of the skies over Germany) an overthrow of Hitler and his regime will occur and permit a peace. This will be a distinct service to mankind everywhere, including the German and Italian peoples themselves.

If this provision of the Neutrality Act is retained, events could happen within a week that would force us to discontinue necessary importations. Really, what we are doing is not voting to send our ships into danger zones of Europe, but only to replace an outmoded domestic law by international law.

In 1922, international legislation was adopted by us and other nations whereby we scuttled a large portion of our Navy. At that time it was believed in the best interest of peace to do so. Suppose we

had clung to that laudable but mistaken legislation and had refused to rebuild our naval strength. Would we not be in a pitiful position today? If all those Members who are convinced in their minds that the enactment of the neutrality law was a mistake, in view of subsequent events, will vote today to remove this last vestige of that mistake, there can be no question as to the result. My belief is that when an individual or a nation makes a mistake they should have courage enough to correct it. That is what we are called upon to do now. Let us face the issue squarely and vote our convictions.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, if we could get rid of personalities, questions of state would not be so hard to solve.

Personalities too often distort our reason, warp our judgment, deaden our patriotism, and color our vision until the dark paths of danger glitter with all the alluring charms of avenues of safety.

Sitting here listening to the debate, I have heard so many reckless and misleading statements, so many appeals to prejudice, so many expressions of ill will and hatred and vituperation, brought about largely by personalities, that I could scarcely restrain myself from getting up and exclaiming, "Come, now; let us supplant ill will and hatred and vituperation with love of country; substitute an open mind for prejudice; bury the personalities in the graveyard of unity and solidarity, and sit down and reason together."

Why should not we, when we all have the same objects in view, the peace, happiness, safety, and security of our country? Those are the ends, I know, to which we all look.

First, let us get our bearings. Just where are we in this crazy, uncertain world? Our position is not of our own choosing, rather it was forced upon us by events over which we had no control. A mad man in Europe, preaching a strange and dangerous philosophy, and bent upon world conquest, started the conflagration that we have been trying to keep away from our shores. With this end in view, we passed, back in 1939, what is commonly known as the neutrality bill. In this bill we prohibited the carriage of goods to belligerents in American vessels and the passage of American vessels through combat zones, thus surrendering our right to the freedom of the seas. Our peace bid through, neutrality, however, proved ineffectual. We found Nazi agents invading South America, Mexico, the Canal Zone, our large cities and industrial centers—yea, our very Capital—sowing seed of dissension and committing untold acts of sabotage. Passive action, we soon realized, was not sufficient. To maintain our national safety and security and the safety and security of the Americas, we found that positive action was necessary. That we would have to arm. And, so, we launched our great armament program, the greatest program of its kind ever inaugurated in the history of the world;

and, as an incident thereto, on the theory that by strengthening the hands of the nations battling the Nazi power we would be strengthening our own national defense and promoting our own security, we passed the lend-lease bill. We were determined, if possible, to stop the conflagration over there before it got over here. Under the lend-lease bills—finding the appropriation in the first insufficient, we passed a second—we have appropriated billions upon billions to provide armament to the nations battling the dictators. That armament has been coming out of American factories and mills in ever increasing quantities; and, unless we assist in getting it over there, much of it will remain over here or be used as flagstones by Hitler to pave the Atlantic. Moreover, if we are not committed, we are morally bound to see that the armament goes over. These are cold facts, my colleagues, and if we leave personalities out of the picture we can understand their significance.

If you love your country, and I know you do, if you are sensible men, and I know you are, what are you going to do?

There is but one answer America can make and keep her self-respect. There is but one answer America can make and preserve her safety and security. Repeal the ban in the neutrality bill prohibiting American vessels from carrying goods to belligerents and the passage of American vessels through combat zones and thus create a delivery service from here to Britain, from here to China, and from here to Russia. The sea lanes from here to Britain, from here to China, from here to Russia are the world's life lines today. In the name of democracy, in the name of the peace, happiness, and security of our people, keep them open.

Oh, you say, it means war. Probably it does. No one knows what tomorrow will bring forth. If it does, we will have allies. If we wait we will have to fight alone, and instead of using the armament over there, our boys will have to use it over here. O my colleagues, my fellow Americans, something deep down in me says the way to keep our boys over here is to send the armament over there.

Oh, do I again hear you say it means war? Again I frankly answer, probably it does. But it means something else. It means the downfall of the dictators. It means freeing the world from the scourge of infamy and slavery. It means that freedom and liberty and equality live on to be enjoyed by our children. While I hate war, I say to you it is a cheap price to pay to guarantee to our children that they will enjoy the same freedom, the same liberties, and the same equalities that a merciful God gave their ancestors.

But what assurance do we have that peace will be our portion if we fail to take favorable action on this bill and remain neutral? Belgium remained neutral, and where is Belgium? Holland remained neutral, and where is Holland? Norway remained neutral, and where is Norway? God forbid that American neutrality and passiveness will bring her to a similar end.

My colleagues, in closing I am compelled, though distasteful it may be, to

make reference to statements I heard upon this floor on yesterday, statements that caused me to bow my head in shame. I heard certain of my colleagues, many of them my close, personal friends, whose patriotism I dare not question, give expression to the thought that they could not support this bill because they do not subscribe to the labor policies of this administration. Can it be possible that we have reached the point where madness is the better part of valor and patriotism? Can it be possible that personalities have so warped our judgment that ill will and hatred are to play an important part in deciding the fate of our Nation? God forbid that we live to see the day when the fate of the land we love is measured by such a yardstick.

The American laboring men are patriotic. They have boys in the Army alongside our boys. I am not afraid of them failing those boys, nor am I afraid of them failing America in her time of need.

America, yea the whole world, is looking to us for leadership. Let us acquit ourselves like Americans.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will assume, of course, that in this matter which so vitally affects the international situation every Member of this House will cast aside personalities, will weigh the facts and the arguments on their merits, and with his hand over his heart and a prayer on his lips vote the way he thinks he should vote to discharge his duty as a Member of this legislative body.

In my humble judgment, the defeat of these Senate amendments would be a major catastrophe. I yield gladly to any gentleman who has a contrary idea, but that is the way I feel about it.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I prefer not to, if the gentleman please.

Mr. KEEFE. I thought the gentleman said he would be glad to yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am glad to yield in opinion; but I have only 5 minutes. I will, however, yield to the gentleman if he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to ask the gentleman a question. If these Senate amendments are of such tremendous importance, will the gentleman indicate his thoughts as to why the House committee did not submit the same amendments when they brought this bill originally before this House?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know, but I know in this situation in which we are dealing now, which changes not from day to day, but from hour to hour, no man has the divining power to stand here today and say what the international situation will be tomorrow. We know that we are sitting on a keg of dynamite, and yet here we are quibbling, we are making arguments based upon narrow personalities, we are trying to get back at a leader because he has done something else we do not like. It is unworthy of us. Maybe it would be not amiss to tear aside the page of the future and look to tomorrow, 24 hours from



now, if we have any doubt about what we ought to do.

Let us say that these amendments are defeated. What is going to be the situation tomorrow? There will be some sad hearts. The President of the United States will be heavy-hearted. Now, if any of you gentlemen feel that here is an opportunity to spank the President for something he has done or not done that you did not like, and that by defeating this you will make him feel badly, you will have accomplished your purpose. Undoubtedly the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, and Sumner Welles will be sad, because they have made a valiant fight to uphold the rights and the traditions of American freedom and protect us. The Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, and Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, will shake their heads in disappointment. The armed forces of the Nation, the Army and the Navy—and I remind you, gentlemen, that from the highest to the lowest in this country every man individually and collectively to whom you and I would have to look in the case of a great emergency—if war should come—will be saddened, will be disappointed, and will be disheartened because of this blow at American prestige. But there will be some people who will be very happy. There will be extra newspapers on the streets of Berlin saying how the American Congress has slapped the President of the United States, this arrogant man over here who has been trying to help Great Britain stop the Nazis. I imagine that in the frozen regions of Russia, where they have been making a valiant fight to defend their homeland, there will be disappointment; and I am quite confident there would be summoned in extraordinary session the military and naval leaders of Japan, with renewed assurance and renewed encouragement that they might proceed with whatever plans they have. We have, of course, some fellow citizens here in America who would be happy. I will not name them.

But I make this point: To all intents and purposes, we are at war. Every man who has sense enough to serve in this body knows that from the day that Adolf Hitler threw down the gage of battle to the democracies we were on defensive warfare to protect our country and what we stand for. In that warfare we have a Commander in Chief and his aides and his assistants who have been leading us. I am just a private. If I have any doubts about what ought to be done in this crucial hour I am going to stand squarely by my Commander in Chief.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] just advocated a course which not only approves the war on the high seas but which will lead us into war on land—in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Now listen to what he said on June 28, less than 5 months ago. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, page 5674:

The idea of this country going off now and trying to settle the conflicting emotions and

ideologies of Europe to me is ridiculous, even if we were prepared to do so, and we are not. There are many reasons why we should not go abroad. It is only necessary to state one, and that is we have not the troops nor the equipment.

Mr. Speaker, if anybody has a notion in his head, either in the War Department or in any other department, that they can come up to this Congress and get any sort of declaration that will put us aggressively into the European war, or that will send American expeditionary forces abroad, I think the sooner they get the idea out of their heads the better it will be.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] must know that what he just said today can only be construed as approval of an aggressive war on the sea. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, there was one group the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] did not mention that would be extremely pleased not to have the House agree to the Senate amendments on this measure. I refer to the thousands of fathers and mothers whose boys will very likely be called into the service if these amendments are agreed to. Let us listen to their plea as much as we do to the appeal of officials of the Government, who I think are being misled at the present time.

I dislike very much to disagree with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]. He started his speech by saying how much he was amused at some of the remarks that were made yesterday. Mr. Speaker, I can see nothing in the existing situation to amuse anybody. This is the most solemn moment we Members of Congress could ever face. Our vote today may determine the entrance of this country into the war. The contemplation of such a contingency is solemn beyond words to describe.

#### NEUTRALITY BILL

Mr. Speaker, during my whole congressional career it has been my policy to keep in close touch with the viewpoint of a large cross-section of my constituents. I have cultivated and urged correspondence, feeling that a Member should be governed by the views of those he represents as well as by his own opinions and convictions.

I find some difficulty, however, in attempting to apply this method of procedure in connection with the vote on accepting the Senate amendments to the neutrality bill, which as passed by the House was limited strictly to the arming of our merchant ships. The Senate amendments would allow our ships to go directly into the war zones.

On this latter question I, like all other Members, have been deluged with mail from my district and elsewhere. Opinions seem to be almost evenly divided between those who favor the Senate amendments and those who oppose them. Under the circumstances, there is only one course for me to pursue, namely, to study the question with the utmost care and then be guided by my conscientious conviction as to what is for the best interest of my country. This I have attempted to do.

In every vote I have cast on matters of foreign policy, I have brushed aside all considerations of partisanship and have approached each problem with an open mind, striving at all times to do that which would help to keep this country out of war and at the same time protect our national interest. I have many times said that I was opposed to sending our boys to fight on foreign battlefields. This was no mere empty campaign promise on my part, to be later forgotten, but a definite and sincere pledge to my constituents. Likewise, I have opposed all steps which I felt would likely involve this country in war. On the other hand, I have supported the two lend-lease appropriation measures, feeling that however great the cost of such a policy in dollars and cents, it would be well worth the price if it succeeded in keeping the hostilities from our own shores and thereby prevented the sacrifice of American lives in another World War.

The present so-called Neutrality Act, for which I voted, has now become a misnomer, because we as a country have not been neutral as between the opposing nations now locked in a deadly struggle. It was originally passed in 1935 as a means of helping to keep this country out of any future wars that might arise. Up to the present time it has succeeded in that purpose, although it appears that we are daily being brought closer and closer to actual conflict by events both within and beyond our control.

When the ship-arming proposal was before the House some weeks ago I spoke and voted for the measure, being of the opinion that it was largely an act of self-defense on the part of this country which we, as a so-called neutral, had a right under international law to undertake. Nor did I feel that it in any way involved a breach of neutrality, if it can be said that any vestige of that policy still exists. However, I very positively stated that if the ship-arming bill should be returned from the Senate with amendments allowing our ships to go into the actual war zones I should vote against the bill on final passage. While, as I say, I regard the arming of our ships as largely a defensive measure, I would regard our sending such armed ships into the actual war zones as an act of belligerency on our part which must inevitably lead to a full-fledged shooting war. Already American blood has been spilled by reason of sending our Navy into the war zones, but the public has remained surprisingly calm, evidently feeling that we had run that risk by pursuing such a policy. Of course, if these instances are multiplied, it may be that the war spirit can be aroused in America; but I am opposed to taking any further step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, there are 15 Members of the present House who were Members of the Sixty-fifth Congress at the time President Wilson, early in April 1917, advised the Congress to declare war against Germany. Those 15 Members can recollect as plainly as I do today the appearance of this Chamber on that fateful night. Little did we realize then what such a declaration would mean to the American people. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUM] gave statis-

tics in his speech yesterday wherein he stated there were over 39,000 American boys killed in action on foreign battlefields and over 14,000 more who died of wounds, making a total direct loss of life of over 53,000 of the flower of our manhood.

For what purpose? Nothing was accomplished by that great sacrifice of life. Over 192,000 men were wounded in the service, and 100,000 have died since that time with service-connected disabilities.

We promised the parents of the disabled veterans that they would be properly cared for. That promise this country has endeavored to keep, but we were not able to relieve the suffering of the parents and relatives of the boys who did not come back. The debt we owe to the heroic dead of the last war is one that we can never repay. Let us not cause another such obligation to be assumed at this time.

The contrast between the methods of 1917 and the present day are very striking. President Wilson openly urged Congress to declare war. This vote today is equivalent to a war declaration, to which President Roosevelt has led up step by step. The President and the Members of this House know that had he asked for an open declaration of war at any time, Congress would have refused it. It should do the same today to this left-handed and underhanded proposal, which is equivalent to a declaration of war.

The sending of our merchant ships into the actual war zones involves a needless sacrifice of American lives and a needless risk of actual involvement in the war. It has not yet been demonstrated that Britain lacks the necessary transports to carry our lend-lease supplies. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the Lend-Lease Act was itself enacted as a measure which was avowedly designed to help keep the war away from America. It was provided that title to the lend-lease goods should pass to the foreign country concerned upon their leaving our ports, and we in no way undertook to transfer the goods themselves across the seas into belligerent ports. In fact, specific language was inserted in the act to the effect that nothing contained therein should be construed to authorize convoys. Also, sections 2 and 3 of the Neutrality Act, which prevented our ships from going into the war zones, was left in full force and effect.

So far as I am aware, there has not yet been any call from Great Britain for the use of our ships in sending lend-lease supplies to her. True, some of our supplies have been sent to the bottom by Axis submarines and surface raiders, but this would be just as likely to happen if they had been transported in our own vessels, either armed or unarmed. If the justification for the Senate amendments is based on the need for shipping, it would be much better to lend-lease our ships to Britain as we have in the case of other material, rather than send our own seamen to death in the icy waters of the North Atlantic.

If our supplies have not been getting to Britain fast enough, the reason is to be found more in the domestic strike situation than in any lack of shipping.

According to the O. P. M. Labor Division, approximately 2,349,000 man-days of work have been lost through strikes in defense industries, and it is very likely that our supplies to Britain could be speeded up more by curtailing defense strikes than by using our ships to carry the output of our present production. The time for the administration to take a strong hand in the strike situation is long overdue. Running the risk of war by using our own ships to carry existing supplies to Britain is no substitute for increased production.

The people demand action on the part of the President in keeping defense production up to the maximum. Continued strikes are in a large measure the result of the weakness of the administration's labor policy. Instead of accepting defiance from labor leaders the defiance should be reversed. He should not bend his knee as a supplicant at the throne of labor leaders, but where the protection of America is involved the labor leaders should bend their knees to him as President of the United States. I am satisfied in my own mind that the great majority of the workers of America are not in sympathy with all these defense strikes, but would gladly stay at their jobs if given the opportunity.

Congress is urged to act in regard to the strike situation, but successful and effective action in matters of this kind can only be secured through the vigorous leadership of the President himself.

The issue presented here today is, to my mind, a very simple one. We have the choice of taking a further unnecessary step toward war or showing our continued desire to remain at peace. That, as I see it, is all that is involved. All the arguments being made for the Senate amendments might just as well be directed in support of a declaration of war. That is what we are actually voting on, and the issue ought to be presented directly instead of involving us in war through the back door by indirect means. It must be obvious to all thinking people that when we send armed ships, both merchant vessels and warships, into the actual war zones, we cannot escape the fact that we will then be in an actual shooting war, which will necessarily involve the sending of troops, with all that that implies.

Many of the men who were in the service in 1917 and 1918 are now the parents of boys who would be sent overseas should we enter the present hostilities. I have it on the authority of one of the outstanding war veterans in this House today that those men are practically unanimous against another American expeditionary force. This is confirmed by my own correspondence from war veterans.

We should learn from experience. The experience of World War 1 teaches us to do everything in our power to not be a participant in World War 2. I therefore urge my colleagues in this House to vote against the motion to agree to the Senate amendments and to keep as far as possible away from active participation in the present world conflict.

On Tuesday we celebrated Armistice Day. Are the lessons of 25 years ago so soon to be forgotten? Are we to honor

the memory of the heroic dead of the last World War by preparing to send another American expeditionary force to fight on foreign battlefields? It seems to me that we should think twice before taking this further step toward war, which it appears would be the last step in that direction. I shall therefore vote against the adoption of the Senate amendments, which I regard as a backhanded declaration of war.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as one who sought to do his bit in the World War and as a Member of the House, I am conscious of my responsibility in this hour. My vote—the vote of one Member—may determine the issue having to do with the lives of millions of our people, the destiny of America.

Therefore, as one humble Representative, I have searched my mind and conscience, and I have prayed for guidance as I have never prayed before. I want to be right.

Bear in mind, I voted for the lend-lease appropriation, spoke out for the seizure of Axis ships immobilized in our harbors, and supported the House bill to arm our merchantmen.

I have now come to a conviction as to my duty.

Reviewing the months of consideration and debate on our foreign policy, I can recall only one occasion when a Member of Congress openly declared for an A. E. F. Consistently, everyone has either affirmed his opposition to sending American troops to Europe, Asia, or Africa, or has pointed out that Great Britain does not want or cannot use an A. E. F.

I am convinced that our approval of the measure now before us would give the green light not only for an A. E. F. but for all-out total war, contrary to the wishes of the American people, at a time when we are sadly unprepared. Not only do the Senate amendments mean the sending of our ships into the English Channel and every war port of the world; they portend the logical follow-up, the sending of men.

The Japs appear to be awaiting a signal.

South America is rumbling, despite the hundreds of millions we are spending there to purchase good will.

Let us not jump from the frying pan into the fire.

Our job, that which we have undertaken, is to produce and produce—make those assembly lines go faster—so that we will be the real arsenal of democracy, able to beat Hitler at his own game of production by furnishing Britain the promised supplies, and assuring our own country of equipment now seen in almost every land but our own. As Britain announces she is overcoming shipping losses, according to Mr. Churchill on yesterday, let us speed up the job of making America impregnable.

When I was in the Army of the United States we had a phrase "Don't kid the troops." I say to you today, "Don't kid America."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MORT] as much time as he may desire.



Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an excerpt from my speech in the debate upon the resolution when it was in the House last month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon? There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, on October 17 the House passed House Joint Resolution 237, which provided for the repeal of section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

Section 6 of the Neutrality Act provides that "whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation that there exists a state of war between foreign states it shall thereafter be unlawful, until such proclamation is revoked, for any American vessel, engaged in commerce with any foreign state, to be armed."

I vigorously supported House Joint Resolution 237 to repeal this prohibition and to authorize the immediate arming of our merchant vessels. The necessity for doing this was, and is, in my opinion, plain and imperative. In my speech in the debate upon this resolution I recite the series of incidents which led up to the introduction of House Joint Resolution 237, the sinking of our ships by German submarines and raiders on the high seas and the attempt of Hitler to control those seas by proscribing areas into which our ships might not enter except on peril of being sunk.

In this connection, and in order that there may be no possible doubt, so far as I am concerned, as to the issue upon which House Joint Resolution 237 was decided when it was before us last month, I am going to repeat here my own statement of the issue upon that occasion. I quote the following excerpt from my remarks in the debate of October 16:

Whatever may be the views of Americans as to certain specific phases of our foreign policy, and whatever may be the difference in views as to the best methods of carrying out that policy, there is one point on which I think all are agreed; and that is, that no nation has the right to tell the United States that it cannot sail its ships upon the high seas and carry on commerce with other nations, whether those nations be neutral or belligerent. No nation has the right to map out areas of the high seas, far removed from the location of any actual blockade, and tell us that we may not enter those areas with our ships except on peril of having them sunk. No nation could permit this and at the same time hold the respect either of its own people or the people of foreign lands.

We have the right, if we desire to do so, to put upon ourselves whatever restrictions we may please in this regard, and we have in fact done this by way of numerous provisions of the Neutrality Act, which is still the law of the land. But this is our own act. It was passed for our own protection and with the fervent desire to avoid those incidents which might tend to involve us in foreign wars. By the Neutrality Act we voluntarily place certain restrictions upon ourselves. But no other nation has the right, either under international law or any other law, to put such restrictions upon us; and the American people, I am sure, will never tolerate any such pretended or attempted restrictions to our right to use the seas without employing every means at their command to repel them.

One means of repelling these acts of lawlessness and violence upon the part of the German Government is to arm our merchant ships so that they may protect themselves against the Nazi submarines and raiders which not only infest the seven seas but also all of those waters the protection of which our Government in its considered judgment has deemed to be necessary to the protection of the United States.

To enable us so to arm these merchant vessels for the protection of their crews and their cargoes is the purpose and the only purpose of this bill. House Joint Resolution 237 does not undertake, either directly or by implication, to repeal any other provision of the Neutrality Act. Our ships are still prohibited from entering zones of combat which have been proclaimed to be such by the President under authority of the Neutrality Act, and our nationals are still prohibited from entering those zones on vessels of either belligerents or neutrals. It has been contended that this bill is but the forerunner of the complete repeal of the Neutrality Act. No official proposal to date, in my opinion, warrants that conclusion and, so far as the argument here is concerned, I think it is sufficient to say that if such a proposal should be made to the Congress in the future it will be the Congress itself which will decide the question after full and free debate and in accordance with the traditional and prescribed system of democratic procedure in this body. In the meantime, the repeal of other portions of the act is not a part of this bill, and argument upon that point is therefore not germane to the debate upon the bill.

That, I think all will agree, was a clear statement of the issue, and it was upon that issue that the House considered, debated, and adopted House Joint Resolution 237.

Now this resolution comes back to the House from the Senate with amendments repealing two other sections of the Neutrality Act, namely sections 2 and 3, which prohibits American vessels from entering those areas which the President by proclamations heretofore made has declared to be zones of combat, and delivering goods and passengers through those combat areas to belligerent ports.

The issue involved in the Senate amendments has nothing whatever in common with the issue involved in House Joint Resolution 237, as it was adopted by the House on October 17. In the House at that time the question was whether it was to the best interests of the United States and of the national defense to arm our merchantmen. We decided, and by a very substantial majority, that it was to our best interests to arm them and that by so doing we were giving proper and necessary implementation to the national and foreign policy which has been established by the Congress and with which we all generally agree.

The issue involved in the Senate amendments, however, is whether, having armed these merchant ships, we should send them into and through those waters which the President himself has declared to be zones of actual combat to discharge contraband of war at belligerent ports under actual blockade.

I oppose the Senate amendments because I believe that the inevitable result of carrying them out will be war, and because I am convinced that the best interests of the United States and its defense will not be served by our entering the war as an active belligerent at this

time. I am convinced, on the contrary, that our participation now as a belligerent ally would work to the very distinct detriment not only of ourselves, but of Britain, Russia, and China, which countries we are now, in pursuance of our declared and established policy, endeavoring to supply with the implements of war to the fullest possible extent of our productive capacity.

At the present time we are devoting something more than 80 percent of our total war-production effort to supplying these nations with the things they need to carry on the war against Hitler. We are doing this in ever-increasing volume and with ever-increasing speed. The reason we are able to do this, and the only reason, is that we, ourselves, are not engaged in actual fighting in that war. But the moment we come into it as a fighting ally then, obviously, we must reverse the situation and devote the whole, or at least the greater, portion of our war-production effort to the augmentation and equipment of our own fighting forces, both on land and sea.

Our two-ocean Navy, which every naval expert agrees we require if we are to fight a two-ocean war, is not completed; while as yet we have scarcely begun to equip our Army in the way which every military expert agrees it must be equipped if we are to fight on equal terms with the highly mechanized and modernized armies now engaged in the war.

Understand, Mr. Speaker, that I am not here criticizing what some have called the slowness with which our fighting forces are being created and equipped. There is sound reason why faster progress has not been made in this field. A year ago, and after thorough consideration, both the President and the Congress decided, and the decision became a part of our national policy, that, for the time being at least, it would be to the best interests of our own defense to defer, if we had to, the complete equipment of our fighting forces, in order that we may produce and furnish the very maximum of war material to the forces which then were and now are actually fighting Hitler.

I think this policy was sound then. I think it is sound today. If, however, we now decide to go to war through the back-door method which the Senate amendments propose, we will then have lost every advantage which has accrued and which is still accruing to us and to Britain, Russia, and China by keeping out of the war and by thus enabling us to supply those nations with the necessary sinews of war. And not only that, but if we go in now we will have entered the war in a state of unpreparedness which everyone who knows anything about it freely and frankly admits to exist. This proposition, it seems to me, is so obvious it needs no extended argument to support it, because no one, so far as I know, contradicts these facts.

But it is contended by some who are supporting the Senate amendments that the sending of our ships through combat zones which have been defined and declared to be such by Presidential proclamation does not in itself mean war. The distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for example,

the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Johnson], declared in the debate on yesterday that the whole opposition to the Senate amendments was based upon the assumption that their adoption meant war, when there was no basis in fact for that assumption.

I wish to discuss that point, because it is one of the most important, in my opinion, that has yet been advanced by those who are supporting the Senate amendments, and because it was made by one whose opinion is entitled to the highest respect. There is no Member of the House for whose learning and for whose honesty and sincerity I have a greater regard than the gentleman from Texas. Because he said it, I have not the slightest doubt that he most sincerely believed it. And in this connection let me say parenthetically that I believe every Member, whether he be Democrat or Republican, or whether he be for or against the Senate amendments, is absolutely sincere and honest in his position on this question. I know that everyone has reached his conclusion only after the most thorough and exhaustive study that he has been able to give it. I know that the conclusion of every Member has been arrived at wholly without consideration of politics or partisanship and that each will vote for or against the adoption of these amendments accordingly as he believes them to be in the best interests of his country and of its defense. It may be contended otherwise by some politicians and by some prejudiced and uninformed persons outside of the Congress. But at least we of this body have the satisfaction of knowing that none of our colleagues so contend, and that they never have so contended, in the consideration of this or any other measure involving the national welfare.

And so I want to make it plain that when the gentleman from Texas and other supporters of the amendments declare that it is merely an assumption on the part of opponents to say that sending our merchant ships through zones of actual combat into blockaded belligerent ports means war, I do not contend they are not sincere. I contend simply that the actualities and the facts are against them.

If we send these American merchant ships with war material into belligerent ports we will, of course, convoy them with our warships. Not to do so would be suicide whether the merchant ships are armed or not, and the testimony of the Secretary of the Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Operations, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, who sponsored House Joint Resolution 237 in its original form before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and in its amended form before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, is that we will convoy them. In no other way could a merchant ship loaded with war material pass through a zone of actual combat and approach even in sight of a blockaded belligerent port. We intend to take these ships through the blockade and into those ports under the protection of the guns of the United States Navy. There is no speculation about this. It is a fact, and it was most definitely and positively stated as such by the official sponsors of this measure to whom I have referred.

Now, I believe we can do this. In that regard I concur in the opinion of the naval experts. I am not a naval expert myself, but after several years of very active and continuous experience as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, I have learned something from the experts about naval strategy and naval warfare. I believe that with a sufficient naval force as a convoy we can get most of our merchant ships through the combat zone and into the belligerent ports. But neither I nor the gentleman from Texas, nor the Secretary of the Navy, nor the Chief of Naval Operations believe that we can do this without engaging the enemy fleet in battle when we take the merchant ships through. The mission of our fighting ships in convoy is to see that our merchantmen get through the fighting zone, if possible, without being sunk. The mission of the enemy fleet of submarines, surface craft, and aircraft is to prevent us from doing this. This inevitably is engaging in war, a fighting war, in which we either sink or disperse the enemy craft or the enemy craft either sinks or disperses our own. Is there any room for assumption here? Our assertion that sending merchant ships loaded with war matériel through a combat zone to discharge its cargo at a belligerent port is engaging in war is not an assumption. It is a simple statement of fact.

The argument has also been advanced that repeal of sections 2 and 3 does not necessarily mean that we will send our merchantmen into combat zones, but that it simply means that we may do so if we desire. It is contended also that the real question involved here is simply the matter of getting rid of the remaining provisions of the Neutrality Act, and that we ought to get rid of them because the whole act is inconsistent with our agreed national policy.

In reply to the second of these contentions, let me say that I fully agree that any pretention of neutrality is inconsistent with our policy and if it in any way hampers that policy it ought to be abandoned. The Neutrality Act, so-called, however, is not a neutrality act. It is not now and it never was intended to be. The act was misnamed in the first place and it has continued to carry that misnomer. The purpose of the Neutrality Act was to avoid, if possible, the occurrence of those incidents which experience had shown in the past were war-provoking in character; that is to say, incidents which were calculated to lead us into war against our wishes. In that respect we have no further use for the Neutrality Act; first, because the incidents we feared, many of them at least, have taken place and they have not brought us into the war; and second, because, for the sake of carrying out our national policy, which we believe to be right, we are willing, and properly so, to risk the occurrence of many incidents, which, in the past, we have considered to be war-provoking. Therefore, so far as the complete abandonment of neutrality in itself is concerned, I would be perfectly willing to accept the Senate amendments if that were all that these amendments imply.

The mere abandonment of neutrality, however, is not at all the purpose or the reason for the Senate amendments. Their whole purpose, and, I think, upon reflection this must be agreed to by everyone, is to permit us to convoy merchant vessels into belligerent ports and to deliver war material there. This brings me, then, to the other contention advanced by some of those who are supporting the amendments, that their adoption will not be a positive mandate to send our ships into belligerent ports but that it would be merely a permission to do so in event we should decide to do it.

This contention, I regret to say, cannot be substantiated by any fact or by any word of testimony given by the official sponsors of this proposal before either the House or Senate committees. Their testimony, and it is all of record, is most definitely to the effect that they do intend immediately to send our merchant ships convoyed by our Navy through the zones of actual combat and into belligerent ports. They have said that in their opinion this is necessary. Their plans to do this have been carefully and fully perfected. Their testimony is that they are prepared to, and that they intend to, put this new policy and new strategy into operation as soon as the repeal of sections 2 and 3 will allow them leeway to do so. They were quite frank on this point before the House committee. They frankly stated as their reason for proposing to the House at first only the repeal of section 6 was that, while the Congress might be willing at that time to authorize the arming of merchant ships, it would likely not want to go as far as sending these armed merchantmen into belligerent ports under convoy, and that, therefore, they did not intend to ask the Congress at that time for any additional authority. That is the record, very plainly and very definitely.

I concurred wholeheartedly in the views of the Secretary of the Navy, of the Chief of Naval Operations, and of the Chairman of the Maritime Commission as to the necessity of immediately arming the merchantmen. A substantial majority of the House also concurred. It was on account of this substantial majority, and only on that account, that the official sponsors of House Joint Resolution 237 decided in the Senate to ask for the additional amendments to put the convoy policy into effect. In view of this, there can be no doubt, at least in my mind, that the adoption of the Senate amendments will actually inaugurate the convoy by the American Navy of American merchant ships through actual zones of combat into the ports of belligerents. It will not, as some have said, merely permit it.

In spite of my conviction that this new policy, which is prohibited not only under the Neutrality Act but under the Lend Lease Act as well, would bring us into actual fighting at a time when, admittedly and, as I have said, for good reason, we are not prepared for an all-out war, either on land or sea. I would, nevertheless, give the most profound consideration to this proposed new venture if I thought it were necessary in or-



der to get the output of our war production to Britain, Russia, and China. The entire evidence, however, shows that this is not necessary and that practically all of our shipments of war materials to these countries are reaching their destinations in belligerent merchantmen conveyed by belligerent warships, as contemplated and provided in the Lend Lease Act itself. The statement of Mr. Churchill to the British House of Parliament yesterday is revealing in this regard. He stated that the sinkings of British merchantmen carrying war material to Britain has decreased over the past 4 months to one-fifth of what it was during the preceding 4 months. Britain's merchant fleet is increasing and not decreasing. The situation has improved to such an extent that recently a universal reduction of 25 percent has been made in insurance rates on cargoes of war material going to Britain in British ships.

In the meantime the volume of American war material going overseas is increasing by leaps and bounds. We are rapidly giving Britain superiority in the air. We are furnishing to Russia not only the immediate material which she needs for defense but also the material which she expects to use in her offensive against Hitler next spring. China also is having no great difficulty in receiving the things which we are sending her. The whole situation is growing better, not worse, every day, and this is largely due to the policy which we are now following and which, I am convinced, we ought to continue to follow.

As I have said, all of this contribution by the United States to the nations fighting Hitler has been made possible because to date, by the exercise of our sober judgment, we have been able to keep out of the war. If we become involved in the war, this contribution must, for the most part, cease. Because I am convinced the adoption of the Senate amendments will involve us in the war ourselves, and thereby put a stop to this contribution, is one of the principal reasons why I oppose them.

There is another reason why I oppose this course of action, which I believe will bring involvement in this war through what I have called the back-door method offered by the Senate amendments. I oppose the method because it is a back-door method and because, by adopting it, we evade the direct responsibility of saying whether we shall go into the war or not through a declaration of the Congress. I hope, in the interests of our own Nation and of those nations which are fighting Hitler with the guns and tanks and planes we are furnishing them, that we may be able to avoid participation in this war as a fighting belligerent. To avoid that kind of participation, I know, may not be possible. Before long it may develop that our national defense and welfare may be best served in the role of a belligerent ally. That time, I am convinced, has not yet come. I pray that it may never come. But if it should come, then I would favor going in not by a back-door method such as is here proposed, and not through a series of steps which lead inevitably to

an undeclared war. I would favor going in, rather, in the only honorable, upright, responsible, and honest way—by a declaration of the Congress, after full and free consideration of that issue and of that issue alone, and in accordance with the democratic process prescribed for that purpose by the Constitution of the United States.

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

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, since I expressed my views on the ship-arming bill when it was before the House about 3 weeks ago, there is no reason to cover the same ground again.

As was pointed out in the minority report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which I helped prepare, we felt it was the plan when this bill reached the Senate to strike from the Neutrality Act not only section 6, which prevents the arming of merchant ships, but also sections 2 and 3, so that those merchant vessels, when armed, could carry contraband directly to the ports of belligerent nations.

In my opinion, there were many sound reasons to vote against the bill arming merchant ships as originally passed by the House, but certainly now there are many additional reasons why one should vote against this bill as amended in the Senate.

I only need to call your attention to statements of three of the highest authorities to support my position on this bill.

On May 27, 1939, in an open letter, Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, said in part as follows:

I furthermore believe that the most effective legislative contribution at this time toward keeping this country out of war, if war occurs, would be made by enacting or re-enacting provisions on lines as follows:

To prohibit American ships, irrespective of what they may be carrying, from entering combat areas;

To restrict travel by American citizens in combat areas; and

To provide that the export of goods destined for belligerents shall be preceded by transfer of title to the foreign purchaser.

Those words are to me just as true today as when they were first written. But you may say conditions have changed since then; the war had not even started at that time. Let me cite an authority as late as October 24, 1940, just about a year ago, after France had fallen, during the Battle of Britain and while Russia was a potential ally of Hitler. Our President, Mr. Roosevelt, said:

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps, we made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels 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?

I think, Mr. President, you were right at that time, and I feel that statement is just as right now. If conditions have changed since a year ago, they have

changed for the better so far as England and the United States are concerned. Then Germany and Russia were not engaged in a life-and-death struggle, and we have had an additional year to build up our own defense as well as that of England.

Let me quote from the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, when he appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee less than a month ago:

There were two compelling reasons in the minds of those who voted for the adoption of the act: First, those who voted for the act did not want to have the United States involved in incidents which might lead to war; and, second, they did not want the United States involved in war as a result of the action of private individuals who were keen to make profits out of trading with the belligerents. In this particular and in this sense, it may be said with justification that the act has been successful. The United States has not gone to war over incidents, and it has not been dragged nearer to war by any act of private interests or private individuals.

In his statement Secretary Knox also said the act only worked "until the spring of 1940." I believe that the act is still working and is one of the principal reasons why we are not at the present time in the war. It is working too well, and that is the reason the interventionists wish to repeal it.

There have been sinkings of American merchant ships by Germany. I do not attempt in any way to justify such sinkings, but I do venture to predict if we arm our merchant vessels and attempt to deliver contraband directly into belligerent ports these sinkings will multiply very rapidly until the public is so aroused by the loss of American lives that there will be a public clamor to enter the war.

If we enter this war we must follow that road to the bitter end. As was so well stated by Senator Brooks on October 31, 1941, in the United States Senate:

You cannot shoot your way a little bit into the war any more than you can go a little bit over Niagara Falls.

Will that end be another A. E. F. in Europe?

If you follow that road to war to the bitter end will it mean the bankruptcy of our Nation, loss of millions of lives, or a dictatorship as bad as the one we are trying to destroy? What is to be the cost in blood, treasure, and liberty?

History has a way of repeating itself. When the arming of merchant ships was before the House Foreign Affairs Committee before World War No. 1, Dorsey W. Shackelford, a member of that committee at that time, expressed his views in a minority report. Remember, this was before the United States entered World War No. 1, and we did not have the history of that experience to base our opinion on. He said, in part, as follows:

The other question is whether our interest counsels that we should choose war rather than peace. To determine this, let us count the cost. We could not wage a war without the expenditure of billions of dollars. Our people for many years to come would be burdened with excessive taxation. Our country would be saddled with bonded debts oppressive to us and our posterity for generations. Our already large pension list would be greatly swollen. Our public revenues would

be withheld from the useful purposes of the people in order to supply arms and ammunition to our Army and Navy. Our labor and capital would be diverted from the creation of those things our people need to the production of war supplies. Thousands of our young men would be taken from our fields and factories to fill up the ranks of war. Thousands of the flower of our young manhood would be cut down and thousands more sent home, maimed for life, to be charges upon the public. Thousands of our young women would be deprived of husbands. Sorrow and melancholy and gloom would overspread our land.

All of this for what? To enforce our right to sail the North Sea, which the British have mined and declared to be a war zone. To enforce our right to carry food, clothing, arms, and ammunition to the ports of Great Britain and her Allies. I cannot believe that it would be to our interest to wage such a war.

Humanity. The soul that does not live for humanity is lost; but the question for us to determine is, How can our country best serve humanity? Shall it be by sacrificing our young men to the diabolical god of war? No other country has done as much for humanity as has this Republic. We have planted other republics on every continent and in the islands of the sea. We have sent liberty and civilization into all of the world. We have done this not by the roll of the drum and roar of artillery but by the teachings and example of a peace-loving, just, and enlightened people. We can best serve humanity by following the course laid out for us by Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe. Keep ourselves out of the broils of Europe and out of entangling alliances with other nations. Preserve our own liberties and institutions and continue to be a light to the world.

Under the Constitution the President has no authority to determine when, or upon what provocation, our country shall go to war. Congress alone has power to declare war. In the exercise of that power every Member should put aside all individual fears, all personal considerations, and rise to the level of his dreadful responsibility.

In my judgment, our interest counsels that we should remain at peace, that we should forego our rights to navigate the high seas embraced in the war zones declared by Great Britain and by Germany rather than to wage war to enforce such rights.

However, if a majority shall hold a different view and our country shall be plunged into that insane war, then I shall, of course, stand by my country to the last dollar and the last man.

"Our country! In her dealing with other nations may she always be right. But right or wrong, our country!"

How prophetic were his statements. Almost every word that he uttered came literally true. Should we not stop and think, as Mr. Shackleford thought, before we entered World War No. 1, just where we are heading and what will be the result? Now is the time for Congress to refuse to sanction our entry into this war.

However, if this Congress should by a majority vote determine to enter this war, I could not do better than adopt the words of Mr. Shackleford as my own when he said:

However, if a majority shall hold a different view and our country shall be plunged into that insane war, then I shall, of course, stand by my country to the last dollar and the last man.

"Our country! In her dealing with other nations may she always be right. But right or wrong, our country!"

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

WE, THE PEOPLE—HANDLE WITH CARE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] when he pointed out that the war makers would be sad if these Senate amendments were defeated by the House. The gentleman from Virginia, in his remarks, failed to give any consideration to We, the people of the United States of America.

Were it possible to gather together all inalienable human rights, all the elements of social justice, all the freedoms that are dear to mankind, all the rules and regulations of a well-ordered society, and all the safeguards that man, from experience, has been able to erect around these priceless treasures; were it possible to gather all of these items in one single compact package, securely wrapped, tied and labeled "We, the people—handle with care," you would have an accurate description of our Constitution in this tragic hour.

Mr. Speaker, once this package, belonging to We, the People of the United States of America, and no one else, becomes the subject of careless handling—is tossed around to satisfy the whims and the caprices of those who care very little, if anything, for We, the people, but think rather in terms of Union Now or some other scheme to open up this package and destroy its contents—then there will be trouble.

I repeat, this priceless treasure belongs to We, the people of the United States—handle with care.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THILL] as much time as he may desire.

WILL CONGRESS APPROVE ROOSEVELT'S WAR?

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has sent to the House the bill to arm merchant ships, but it has added to this bill an amendment repealing that provision of the Neutrality Act which relates to keeping our ships out of combat areas. This is just what many of us feared was the plan when the ship-arming bill was considered in the House. Now it appears that the Democratic leadership did not want to present their entire proposal to the House in the first instance, and all they gave to the House of Representatives was one phase of their intended repeal of the Neutrality Act. But the sham and subterfuge has been removed. We are now face to face with war if our ships are sent into belligerent ports and combat areas. No longer do we hear the honeyed words "a peace measure" or "short of war" for the realities of the situation are too clear for anyone to propose such fanciful language and spurious argument. We know that this measure as it now stands means war—total war—with its ghastly implications, suffering, misery, and death for thousands of Americans. What I have asserted right along, that these proposals to repeal the neutrality laws were steps toward war, has now been proved as true.

The House faces a terrible decision today—peace or war. May God grant us the light to walk in the path of peace

and thus preserve this the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

I detest Hitlerism and all it stands for, just as I detest all foreign "isms" which are opposed to true Americanism. The stifling of those freedoms which we cherish—freedom of religion, of speech, and the press—by those foreign dictators who believe they can do no wrong, is abhorrent to all of us liberty-loving Americans. But my hatred of foreign dictators does not transcend my love of country. Because I love my land more than any other, I think of what is best for my country. And I do not think it best for my country to go to war now, with soldiers ill equipped, with the American people opposed to entry into war. I believe it is far better and more heroic for this Nation to preserve democracy here than to go totalitarian and lose our liberties by entering a foreign war.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] as much time as he may desire.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, old men make war which young men have to fight. That has been true since the beginning of time. It was the old men in primitive days, as it is today, who sat in the councils and determined the policy of the tribe, the clan, the race, the country. Of all the votes that will be cast in favor of this measure that we are now considering an infinitesimal number will actually go to the front to do the fighting. But lives will be lost by the hundreds of thousands, yes, possibly even several millions, before this ghastly horror is over. Yet the men who have brought it about will sit safely at home and take no part in the slaughter. Far from the front line they will enjoy their usual comforts.

This is a tremendously solemn occasion. Every one of us undoubtedly realizes its full significance, and we must face the consequences of our act, if not here, then in the hereafter. I cannot help but feel that I am sitting in judgment on the lives of untold numbers of our young men; and with that feeling deep in my heart I must try at the last moment to make some little effort to avert an impending calamity. Oh, yes; I know the slogans and catch phrases which have been used in the past, are being used in the present, and no doubt will be used again long after you and I are gone. These slogans—"A war to end all wars," "Make the world safe for democracy," "Preserve our way of living," "The four freedoms"—are worth-while sounding phrases that appeal to one's idealism, but they are screens that cloak the blood and horror behind them. I take it that there is not a single Member of either House of the Congress who has any sympathy for Stalinism, Hitlerism, or the hated philosophies which they represent, or who is unmindful of the hideous cruelties and barbarities of which they have both been guilty, but I cannot bring myself to condemn my neighbor's boy to death because Hitler or Stalin killed somebody in Europe.

I am not unmindful of the reasons given why we should enter this conflict: First, it was that we must join the fight before it was too late, because after Hitler



conquered Britain he would then conquer us. That theory has been utterly exploded. Second, it was that after Hitler had mastered the rest of the world he would make economic slaves of every farmer and laborer in the United States. That theory, too, has been ridiculed to death by men who ought to know. Now we are confronted with the time-honored slogan, "The freedom of the seas." Because the first two theories have been so thoroughly discussed and so thoroughly disproven I shall confine these remarks to the freedom of the seas.

This question was thoroughly discussed by the very able Senator from Massachusetts, DAVID I. WALSH, in the Senate of the United States on November 5. Senator WALSH pointed out that freedom of the seas meant the right of every nation to sail the seven seas and trade in whatever port and with whatever people any merchant saw fit. This freedom of the seas, however, could be exercised only in peacetimes. He pointed out that when two powerful nations were at war freedom of the seas no longer existed, because neither of the belligerents would recognize it. That was true in the first World War. Neither Britain nor Germany recognized the rights of any neutral nation to do business with its enemies. In a life-and-death struggle no nation will recognize the doctrine of freedom of the seas if such recognition means its defeat or even the possibility of its defeat. This was well recognized by the leading men of every nation at the time of the first World War. Mr. Bernard Baruch, the adviser of two Presidents, Wilson and Roosevelt, and a man of vast experience in the financial and business world, wrote about this subject of freedom of the seas in *Current History* for June 1936. Said Mr. Baruch:

Those principles (referring to freedom of the seas) were knocked into a cocked hat by both belligerents. So far as technical legality is concerned, Great Britain violated them much more flagrantly, continuously, and impudently than Germany ever did. She violated our mails. She called whatever she desired, and to whomsoever consigned, contraband of war, and—insolence of insolences—she blockaded the port of New York. No American ship could safely sail and no American cargo be safely shipped without first obtaining a clearance from the British consul general in New York.

And later on in the same article Mr. Baruch adds:

If you want to go in (war), the surest and quickest way to get in is to insist upon the freedom of the seas.

Then Mr. Baruch, further on in the article, gives the following advice:

What, then, remains for us to do? As far as goods are concerned, the solution seems simple: We will sell to any belligerent anything except lethal weapons, but the terms are cash on the barrel head and come and get it. Any American who sells goods on any other terms to a belligerent, whether directly consigned to him or consigned to a neutral and destined to him, does so at his peril. The flag will not protect such transactions.

This is the advice of a realist who went through the first World War as one of President Wilson's advisers and who was responsible for our production at that time and did an excellent job of it, too.

And bear in mind that Mr. Baruch was discussing these problems as a method to keep out of war, for he was discussing the Neutrality Act and knew whereof he spoke.

#### Ship sinkings

Many newspapers, anxious for American intervention in this war, have blazoned headlines across the front pages, "American ship sunk." But some of these ships were not entitled to our protection, because they sailed under the flag of Panama in an effort to avoid the restrictions of the Neutrality Act. Following is a list of the ships that have been sunk as a result of the present war:

*City of Rayville*: Flying the American flag, this ship struck a mine, identity unknown, while sailing in Australian waters in 1940.

*Charles Pratt*: A tanker sailing under the Panama flag and owned by a foreign company, the Panama Transport Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); sunk off West Africa on December 21, 1940.

*Robin Moor*: American-owned, sailing under American flag; sunk on May 21, 1941, in South Atlantic while carrying contraband to British South Africa, a country at war.

*Steel Seafarer*: American-owned, under American flag; sunk September 7, 1941, in Red Sea (12,000 miles from the United States), in what was formerly Neutrality Act combat zone before President Roosevelt revoked his combat-zone proclamation, while carrying contraband war supplies for Britain.

*Sessa and Montana*: Danish ships seized by United States and chartered to a private American firm; registered under Panama flag; sunk near Iceland while carrying cargoes to Iceland. The *Sessa* was sunk on August 17, 1941. The *Montana* was sunk on September 11, 1941.

*Pink Star*: Danish ship seized by United States and chartered to private American firm. Registered under Panama flag; armed by United States; traveling in Canadian convoy, convoyed by Canadian warships; sunk September 19, 1941, between Greenland and Iceland; ultimate destination, Great Britain.

*I. C. White*: American-owned, registered under Panama flag; transferred to British service under lease-lend; sunk on September 27, 1941, in South Atlantic while carrying oil (contraband) from Venezuela to South Africa.

*Bold Venture*: American-owned but flying the Panama flag; sunk October 17, 1941, 500 miles south of Iceland while traveling in a convoy. She was carrying contraband to England.

*Lehigh*: American-owned and flying the American flag. Sunk on October 20, 1941, while on a trading voyage from Bilbao, Spain, to the African Gold Coast.

NOTE.—No American life has been lost because of belligerent action to date on any merchant ship flying the American flag.

When one carefully reviews these ships he finds that only one of them, the *Lehigh*, can be classified as having been sunk without justification or excuse and in violation of our rights on the seas. All the other ships mentioned have either been violating the neutrality law or have been sailing under a foreign flag.

#### Destroyers

Next, let us consider the destroyers of our own Navy which have been fired upon, and in one case, the *Reuben James*, sunk by a submarine. On this point I again invite your attention to the speech of Senator WALSH on November 5, and I shall take the liberty of quoting from an article in the New York Times, an interventionist newspaper, by Mr. Arthur Krock. Mr. Krock is recognized as the

ace newspaper man of the United States of America. He certainly is quoted by Members of the Congress more than any other newspaper writer in this country. He is regarded as representing the highest type of journalism, namely, a fair, unbiased, accurate account of events as they transpire. Mr. Krock gave a talk on war policies to Columbia College alumnae. His speech was run in the New York Times, and I wish to quote from it:

An attack means an onset, an aggressive initiation of combat, a move which is the antithesis of defense. Let's face it, Mr. President. Americans are grown up now. In that definition, all three of our destroyers attacked the German submarines. \* \* \*

The U. S. S. *Greer* was informed by British naval plane that a submarine lay 10 miles ahead in her path. The British plane then went back and attacked the submarine. The *Greer* gave chase to the submarine, broadcasting its location on the way. The submarine, when the *Greer* came in range, then tried its best to sink the *Greer*.

The U. S. S. *Kearny* was on convoy duty in the same waters. She responded to a distress signal from a convoy which a pack of submarines had attacked. Her errand was to find the pack and destroy it. While so engaged, a submarine fought back; one torpedo hit the mark and 11 American Navy men were killed.

The steamship *Reuben James* was with a convoy and went on call to the aid of another which German submarines had engaged. A submarine sank our destroyer, with what loss of American life is yet unknown. I believe the full log will demonstrate that as soon as the *Reuben James* came into the area infested by the submarines she tried to finish them. She, too, attacked.

One of the members of the crew of the *Reuben James* wrote a letter to his father, from which I quote:

Yes, we saw and contacted several subs on this 37-day cruise. Our job is only to drop ashcans (depth charges) to keep them scared away from the convoy—but we are asking for it and, as you predict, it will probably happen any time now.

By what right did this boy lose his life in the performance of an unlawful act expressly prohibited by the law of our land? And by whose order was he engaged in this illegal and unlawful enterprise? Surely not by any act of Congress; on the contrary, the Congress had declared its opposition to any such conduct.

I feel that I should also direct attention to the *Salinas*, a United States Navy tanker which was torpedoed on the night of October 29-30 southwest of Iceland. The *Salinas* was traveling in a convoy when attacked. There was no loss of life or serious injury, and she reached port safely. This tanker mounted two 5-inch guns and a battery of antiaircraft guns.

Apparently we are to wage a naval war not by an act of Congress but by an order of the Executive. And so the argument will be made that we are not sending our boys overseas in a second expeditionary force. But are not the lives of our boys at sea just as precious to them as the lives of our boys on land? Of course, they are. So how can we differentiate between the loss of life of our sailors overseas and the loss of life of our soldiers overseas? They are entitled to equal protection at our hands. Then if you are not ready to vote to send a land force across the Atlantic, why should you be ready to send a sea

force across the Atlantic? In either case they are our boys, their lives are very dear to them, and in equal measure their safety and security are dependent upon their representatives in Congress, which means you and me. They have a right to rely upon our election promises which most of us made in the last campaign. They have a right to rely on the planks on war to be found in the platforms of the Democratic, Republican, and Progressive platforms. They have a right to rely on the declarations of the two leading candidates for the Presidency in the last election. We must now keep our promise or go down in history as faithless to our trust. We shall be held to strict accountability for our actions, if not here by our fellow men, then in the hereafter by our Maker.

The significance of the vote on this question cannot be in doubt. Every Member here knows what it means. The President of the United States himself stated what it means:

Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war.

At first a naval war with sinkings of ships on both sides and many of our boys going down with the ships. Then more and more aircraft will enter into the fray and the fight will get hotter. More lives will be lost. Newspapers will have flaming headlines and bloody editorials. Speeches will be made by fiery orators. Motion pictures will depict gruesome details of untold horrors. Meetings will be held and resolutions will be passed. The people will be aroused to a frenzy of war hysteria. Then war will be declared and our boys will be on the march. Millions of them going to Europe, to Africa, to Asia. There will be bands playing, flags waving, and much excitement and enthusiasm. By and by the casualty lists will begin to come in; loved ones will be reported killed or missing; the heavy hand of sorrow will be laid on many homes. There will be less and less of the glories of war. Tears will take the place of cheers. And, by and by, our boys will come back, some without arms or legs, some sightless, many helpless in mind and in body, and some wrapped in endless sleep, lying so peacefully in row upon row of wooden cells. These will be our bundles from Britain.

#### Preparedness

And how well will these young men between the ages of 18 and 35, for no doubt the draft limits will be changed, be prepared for this deadly modern mechanized warfare?

In the November issue of the Reader's Digest, there is an article entitled "The Failure of Our Defense Program" by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. This article deals with actual completed production, not with material on order. You cannot arm soldiers with guns on order. Let us hope that when the declaration of war is made, that our preparedness will be in much better shape than it is at present. I have simplified Senator BYRD's article as follows:

We have spent so far, \$10,000,000,000. And this is what we have produced in vital equipment: About \$75,000,000 worth of completed heavy bombers; about \$250,000,000

worth of completed merchant ships; about \$90,000,000 worth of completed tanks, and virtually no completed effective antiaircraft guns.

This is our total production for both the United States and Great Britain: Less than \$425,000,000.

Flying fortresses: As of September 1, 1940, our fighting forces had only 56 four-engined, modern heavy bombers suitable for first-line combat. In the year that has elapsed since then we have produced less than 200 others, although the President announced 500 a month as the goal.

Our total annual production of combat planes of all types is less than the number reported destroyed in the Russian-German war in a single month.

Merchant marine: Since Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, only 95 new Government merchant ships and tankers have actually been commissioned. They total 733,177 gross tons. In 2 whole years our Government has produced no more ocean tonnage than the British have admitted losing in 2 months.

Tanks: On hand September 1, 1940, 1 year after the war started, were 275 first-line light tanks, 18 medium tanks, and no heavy tanks at all.

In the second year of the war only about 1,500 light (12-ton) tanks of new design were produced.

The output of medium tanks (much more effective than light) was about 250.

We are still without a single heavy tank of the type most effectively used by Germany, though we do have one hand-made model.

Our Army's five armored divisions require, for training and combat, 590 medium tanks and 1,365 light tanks. We now have in use in these divisions 91 mediums and 602 lights, including some that are obsolete. Thus, after 2 years, the defense program has brought our completed tank strength up to a little over 2,000. The Russians and Germans say they have destroyed over twice that many in a matter of weeks.

Antiaircraft guns: A year after the war began we had only 431 3-inch antiaircraft guns (a type which since has been discarded as ineffective). Of the 90-mm. guns—the only ones effective against high-flying planes—1 was produced up to May of this year, 8 came through in May, and 12 in June. It would take 300 to protect New York City alone.

Senator BYRD's office advises me that these figures are of approximately September 1-15.

And so we are going to war with the most powerful military machine the world has ever seen, unarmed and unprepared.

There are those who believe that this war can be confined to a fight on the seas, and that the fleet of the United States, together with the fleet of Great Britain, can clear the seas of German ships. No doubt that is true under present conditions, but what if Japan opens up in the Pacific and our fleet must fight Japan in the Far East? Then we shall be engaged in a sea war on both oceans, and our two-ocean Navy will not be ready for several years to come.

I take the liberty of quoting from Senator WALSH, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and a Democrat:

Let us not deceive ourselves and let us not be a party to the deception of our people with the specious claim that the course which it is proposed that we now take is designed to enhance the safety of America and to diminish the prospects of our engagement in war. The truth is: the exact contrary.

This is not now a question of material resources. It is not now a question of lease-

lend. It is the stark and naked reality of war—total war—the giving of American blood.

Some men can view this as a party issue. Some men can view it as an opportunity to punish Hitler for his crimes. Some men can view it as all-out aid to Britain. Some men can view it as standing by the President. I cannot view it as any of these things. I can view it only as a ghastly mistake, the wanton entrance into a quarrel that is not ours, the hideous plunge into a bath of blood.

General Sherman said:

I am sick and tired of war. Its glory is all moonshine. It is only those who have never fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded who cry aloud for blood, more vengeance, more desolation. War is hell.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this Congress faces its most critical hour. Today, we shall decide America's destiny. Let no one be deceived, the adoption by this house of the Senate amendment to permit the President to send our ships into the war zones, will be sanctioning an undeclared war. Those who vote for the adoption of this amendment are voting to give the President a free hand to plunge this Nation into war.

Every member here knows that this means a shooting war. Everyone knows that it is impossible to send American ships into war zones with implements of war and not lose ships and men. These incidents must eventually mean another A. E. F.

If a declaration of war is desired by a majority of our members, let us be honest and forthright and demand an opportunity to vote on such a measure. Have we or have we not the courage and honesty to meet this issue squarely? So long as I am a member of this body I shall fight for the constitutional right of the American people that gives to their elected representatives in Congress the sole right to declare war.

The people back home who elected us, the boys in the camps who will do the bleeding and the dying, are waiting for our answer.

I pray God, at this critical hour, to grant understanding and courage to the elected Representatives of the people, that they may not today by their votes plunge this, our beloved Nation, into the holocaust of war.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I was for 18 years a purchasing agent for a large industry. Occasionally when we found somebody had not looked ahead or possibly because of inefficiency or because he had disobeyed orders to maintain reserve or spare parts, or perhaps in the midst of a real emergency when it was impossible to see ahead, we found production stopped through a break-down; in order to keep that production going, it was necessary for me to call up a manufacturer and give him a verbal order over the telephone and then later send him a confirmation order.



This happens in all industry and it just seems that in this business world occasionally one finds foremen or engineers who just simply do not have the ability to look ahead or to properly prepare for emergencies in time. Such men never become the president. It should be so in this Government; and, yet for 8 long years this Congress has been issuing confirmation order after confirmation order to make good on the program of an administration that has been woefully incompetent and inefficient from its very inception. Time after time, year after year, our President has asked for confirmation orders through the creation of emergency after emergency. It is because the administration has willfully refused to assume its constitutional function as the executive branch of the Government, putting into effect the legislation adopted and the appropriations granted by the constitutionally created legislative branch of the Government—this Congress, the board of directors of the Government. Instead it has acted first to create an emergency and then sought legislative authority and appropriations with which to cope with the Presidential created crisis. It has become a chronic disease, and with this warfare now upon us, we find the Chief Executive is continuing to come to this Congress and demand confirmation orders after he has already been sold a bill of goods by Winston Churchill. For my part, I shall not vote for this confirmation order or for any more in the future. It is time for the President—and the American people demand of the President now and in the future—that he come to the Congress with a definite program, that he take the Congress and the people of the United States into his confidence and that he tell us what he wants and find out from us whether or not he can have it. Mr. Speaker, the American people are getting tired of being sold into this war by a President who dares not carry the issue straight to the representatives of the people before he acts.

Mr. Speaker, if this House approves of these Senate amendments today, it will be placing its stamp of approval and giving a confirmation order, if you please, to the god of war to cause the sinkings of more American merchant ships. We will be giving a confirmation order for the death of American seamen. We will be placing our stamp of approval on the President's personal act in ordering our Navy into an undeclared offensive—not defensive—offensive naval warfare on July 31; and we will be giving him the green light to place a verbal order for a second American expeditionary force, for which he may not even take the trouble to come back to us, the Congress, and ask us for a confirmation order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard some Members of this House today, and in the past, tell us that this is our war. Those same Members are disciples of Lord Halifax; they are disciples of Winston Churchill; they are disciples of this man Streit—all of whom preach one or another version of Union Now. They will tell you there is no future security for the world. They will tell you that freedom will die in the world unless henceforth England and the United States join

hands to police the world. That is the background for their cry that this is our war. Now, let us examine that doctrine for just a minute; let us see just how many wars would have been our wars in the past had we had Union Now.

In 1800 we moved our Capitol to this spot in Washington in the District of Columbia. Since that time, in the 141 years intervening, we have had 54 invitations to join somebody else's war, which we will henceforth be called upon to do if the Union Now advocates have their way. In that 141 years we have fought six wars, only two of which were outside the Western Hemisphere—namely:

The War of 1812, fought against Britain for the freedom of the seas, at which time she invaded the United States and burned our Capitol on this very site.

The Mexican War of 1846.

The Civil War in 1861, at which time British blockade runners supplied the South, which may account for some of the southern support for the present aid-to-Britain program, and I say that in all charity.

The Spanish-American War in 1898.

The Boxer War in China in 1900.

The World War, 1914-18.

At this point in the Record I want to attach the following list of these invitations to death, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald yesterday morning in an article written by Frank C. Waldrop:

A list of the wars since Washington, D. C., became the Capital of the United States will demonstrate how many invitations to death our early Presidents were offered and how many they turned down.

Here it is following, worked out by a very competent historian, but if you know of any wars omitted, please write in and say so.

Meanwhile, this list is surely impressive enough to remind you that all these foreign quarrels have been on for a long, long time.

We ought some day to learn to live despite them. Just read:

1801: The old German Empire breaks up, and all territory on the left bank of the Rhine is ceded to France.

1802: French aggressions in Holland, Italy, and Switzerland.

1805: England declares war on Spain; France fights Austria.

1806: Napoleon enters Berlin.

1807: Napoleon defeats Russia.

1808: Napoleon invades Spain.

1810: France annexed Holland; Turks driven out of Balkans.

1812: War starts between United States and England.

1814: France invaded from all sides: Napoleon to Elba; British seize and burn Washington.

1815: Napoleon leaves Elba, is defeated by British and Germans at Waterloo, then sent to St. Helena for life.

1816: Holland annexes Belgium.

1817: British wars in India.

1822: Greeks and Turks at war; civil war in Spain.

1823: French Army enters Spain.

1824: British battle for Burma.

1825: Russia wars on Turkey.

1826: Russia invades Persia.

1827: Turks driven from Greece.

1828: Russia overruns Rumania.

1829: England and Austria intervene against Russia.

1830: Revolution in Poland and France; Belgium revolts from Holland.

1831: Prussia and Austria aid Russia against Poland.

1832: Egypt revolts against Turkey.

1833: French bombard Mexican ports. Debt collection, old style.

1839: Britain wars on China.

1846: War between the United States and Mexico.

1848: Schleswig-Holstein fights Danish annexation.

1849: Danish-Russian War.

1850: Britain blockades Greece. Prussia and Austria war.

1854: France and England war against Russia.

1856: British war on China and Persia.

1861: Civil War in United States. British blockade runners supply South.

1864: Germans defeat Danes.

1866: War between several German states. Austria wars on Italy.

1868: Britain invades Abyssinia. Spanish revolution.

1870: Franco-German War.

1871: Alsace-Lorraine goes to Germany. Back to France in 1918, and back to Germany in 1940.

1874: Spanish civil war.

1876: Balkan wars.

1877: Civil war in Japan. Russia wars on Turks.

1879: British war on Zulus.

1880: Boers and British battle.

1881: France wars on Tunis.

1882: Britain wars on Egypt.

1884: Japan wars on Korea.

1885: Russia wars on Afghanistan.

1887: Balkan wars. Italy wars on Abyssinia.

1894: Japan wars on China.

1895: Belgium seizes Congo State.

1898: Spanish-American War.

1899: Britain wars on Boers.

1900: Boxer War in China. United States returns Boxer indemnities.

1904: Russian-Japanese War.

1910: Japan takes Korea.

1912: Balkan wars.

1914-18: Russia, France, Britain, Italy, United States, Japan, Rumania, Serbia, Belgium, Greece, Portugal, and Montenegro (12 nations) battle Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria.

1917-18: The United States of America participated in the World War.

1920-30: A breathing spell and period of disarmament conferences, which obviously disarmed no nation except the United States. European and Asiatic powers destroy League of Nations' ideal.

1931: Japan seizes Manchukuo.

1932-33: Europe repudiates all World War debts to the United States (\$12,000,000,000).

1934: Italy takes Abyssinia; Spanish Civil War.

1937: Japan develops an incident in China.

1938-39: Germany takes Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. France and England declare war on Germany.

1940: Russia takes part of Finland. Germany seizes Denmark and defeats Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. Italy joins war against England.

1941-?: Germany and England at war. Italy, Rumania, and Japan, against Germany in 1914, like the figures of the year, have reversed their positions and are with her in 1941. Bulgaria, Greece, and Yugoslavia involved in conflagration. Starvation general throughout all Europe. Finally Russia and Germany fight.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious vote, and I hope every Member of this House will search the realms of his conscience and in casting his vote ask himself what is best for America.

Last week on the radio I heard Mr. Gerald L. K. Smith, chairman of the Committee of One Million, charge that the thing that disturbed him most and made many other people in this country lose faith in the Congress was that, according to him, there are three distinct

types of Congressmen who would be casting their vote today. The one class who believe sincerely that the President is acting in the best interests of America and therefore feel that it is up to Congress to give him this confirmation order—to arm American merchant ships and send them wherever he chooses. There is a second class—to which I belong—who believe sincerely that the President's course is not in the best interests of America and that the time to call a halt to his war-making program is right now. We were sincere when we told the American people last fall back in our districts, when we sought the honor of representing them again in this Congress in these trying times, that we would not participate in this war; that we would not by our vote send their boys to die on foreign soil. We gave them this solemn pledge, as did practically every Member of this House, and I for one—and I will be joined in my vote by many others who sincerely, patriotically, and in complete agreement with our own conscience—believe that the time has come now to stop this trend toward war.

And then Mr. Smith referred to a third class. He referred to that class of Congressmen who permit their vote to be guided by the god of political expediency. He referred to those Members—and I hope there are not many—whose vote will be influenced by the advice or possibly instructions of some political leaders back home or here in Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is a tragically serious vote, and I sincerely hope that every Member of this House, having listened to this debate, having thought this matter over seriously, will not dare go home tonight and say to himself, "I know my vote was wrong, and if it was up to me alone I would not have cast it that way, but, after all, I have to do what my constituents want me to do or I will not be reelected next fall." Mr. Speaker, this is no time for any Member of this House to cast his vote with any other thought in mind except what is best for his country. For myself, I cannot and I will not give the President a confirmation order in support of his Presidential decree ordering our Navy into an undeclared offensive warfare. I do not acknowledge that this war is our war. I despise Hitler. I want Britain to win, but this war is not our war and I do not intend by my vote to make it our war.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, this is not our war unless we say that this administration has adopted it, along with the profiteers who fatten on war industries. We paid our debt to Lafayette and we do not owe England a cent, much as we sympathize with her. Once we spent our treasure and blood like water for Europe, and when we were through we did not have a friend in Europe. No one fights our battles for us there.

It is the old struggle of the Celt, the Teuton, and the Slav that began back on the plains of Asia in the cradle of the human race. It has raged with varying intensity since these races stumbled down out of western Asia into Europe.

In Europe they found no peace, so millions of their descendants came to this country to avoid military slavery, and became fused into our citizenry where they are no longer Celt, Teuton, or Slav, but Americans. Are we going to engage in war every time a dog fight breaks out in Europe and thus disappoint these good citizens?

These nations of Europe are very much like Palmerston said of England:

England has no eternal enemies and no eternal friendships; she has only eternal interests.

I honor her for fighting for those "eternal interests"; at Waterloo, fighting by the side of Germany against France and Napoleon; just a century later, by the side of France against Germany. If her interests were in conflict with the United States, she would fight us as she has fought Germany and France.

Hitler armed right under the nose of France and under the eye of England. When Hitler came into the Ruhr Valley, General Gamelin wanted to march 10 divisions of the finest army on earth against him and forever end this foolish dream of the paperhanger, but England objected. It is said that English banks, not the Bank of England, had loaned Hitler some of the money with which he rearmed Germany. There are always profiteers who, like vultures, feed upon the hate or ambition of men and nations. It was so in the case of the orator of the beer hall of Munich. It will be so as long as there are wars to consume the wealth and waste the blood of nations. It is so in the eternal wars of tempestuous Europe. It is our good destiny to keep out of those wars, and here today, my countrymen, we have the golden opportunity to tell the world.

The tragic mistake was made at Versailles of making a bad treaty and then in not enforcing it. If you make a treaty that depends upon force, then that force should be used to implement and enforce its terms. England and France warmed a viper in their breasts, and now it is, as vipers will, biting them. At Versailles the Allies refused to follow the advice of the great altruist and idealist, Woodrow Wilson, to make a just peace which would last, and now they are paying for it, and they now entreat us to come again and do over again what we did in 1917; and the tragedy of it is that after this war is won they will, as usual, make another treaty based on hate and greed.

It will be the same old story: Napoleon trampling Germany under his feet at Jena in 1806 and marching on to Berlin; Germany preparing for many years and humbling France at Sedan and proclaiming the German Empire at the palace of Versailles in 1871; then France, in turn, arming and training her armies for her victory in 1918. Now, in turn, Germany turns on England and France, with France back where she was in 1871, and England fighting for her tight little isle and her empire that stretches around the earth. Now we are asked to finance another world war, with the origin and progress of which we had nothing to do. We have gone a long way already in voting out of the pockets of the people, already impoverished by the former war

and the depression that followed, \$13,000,000,000 to aid the Allies in their war against the aggression of Hitler and Germany.

We did this too while at home we need every dollar we can spare to patch up our domestic difficulties and to bolster our own defense on the Western Hemisphere. We have plenty of hungry people and farmers burdened with debt and little business struggling for its life. The money we voted for aid to foreign nations would have paid off every mortgage, real and personal, in the United States. We have many disabled soldiers of that other war to save democracy who are denied compensation and pensions. This money we have given away to European nations to help in their war would have taken care of these all but helpless veterans. It would also have taken care of pensions for the aged, upon whom the results of that war bear down with sickening poverty. It is a good old tradition that charity begins at home.

But now we are asked to pass this amendment in this bill which we know is a declaration of war in disguise, a very thin disguise, but which will mean in the end an agreement to spend our blood as well as our treasure in a second World War. For that war we have already authorized the expenditure of \$62,000,000,000, alleged to be for the defense of this hemisphere, but which, if this bill is passed, will plunge us into a war that may cover all the hemispheres. That is what you are voting for in this so-called amendment to our neutrality law. And all this in the face of the most solemn pledges of both our two major candidates for the Presidency that they would never lead this country into any foreign wars. And we too, pledged the same thing in the platforms upon which we were elected.

Are political pledges to count only as scraps of paper, to be flung in the face of the people who elected us? Is there to be no integrity in political contracts with the people? How are we going to explain this vote to those who trusted us last November? This vote means war and war in this case means to us in the end an army of from six to eight million men and no doubt another expeditionary force to send to the battlefields of Europe.

Now we are asked to join Mr. Willkie and the President in wholesale repudiation of all our pious pledges about keeping out of war. We will not be able, however, to shift our responsibility onto their shoulders. It is not either in the power of Mr. Willkie or President Roosevelt to make war. In our hands alone is that power. We are not fooled about what this amendment means. We know it means war. That places the responsibility upon our shoulders under the Constitution which we swore to protect and defend. We pledged to the fathers and mothers of our districts to do nothing that would lead this country into a foreign war, and I, for one, am going to keep that pledge, for I consider it a solemn obligation to the people who trusted to my hands the awful responsibility to decide upon the question of war and peace.



Only 13 Members are now serving in this House who ever had such a momentous decision to make, such a fateful vote to cast. To the exercise of that sacred duty let us listen to the voice of the people who do not want us to embroil them in any foreign war. Let us bring to bear the best thought of our minds and the noblest feelings of our hearts. Upon that decision of yours may depend the lives of hundreds of thousands of our boys. This is not a political nor a partisan question, it is a personal responsibility of transcendent gravity. May the Almighty aid us in the discharge of this awful duty and responsibility.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

#### AMERICA FIRST—FREE AMERICA

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday we celebrated in this country Armistice Day. That was the day the World War ended on November 11, 1918. At that time all the world rejoiced. Hostilities ceased; men came to their senses and decided to stop shooting one another. For a year or more we celebrated the event, feeling that we had, through our influence and by our entering the World War, made the world safe for democracy; and war, from that time on, would cease and men would live together as brothers and we would have the good-neighbor policy and that we would try to settle all differences in the future by arbitration. But a little more than 20 years have elapsed since that time, and now we find the world in a greater turmoil, in more bloodshed, more sorrow, trouble, and starvation than this old world has ever known in its history. Most of North and South America remain at peace, and I am now and expect to do everything I can to see that it remains at peace, not only with the countries in the Western Hemisphere but with the nations of the world. Two years ago, when we were at peace with everyone and had time to think deliberately, the President and the Congress were all practically in one accord that we should put into effect the Neutrality Act. Very, very few Members of Congress were against it. It was almost a unanimous wish and proposal of the American people and the legislators to do that which would keep America from future wars. And if it was good then, why all the propaganda and desire of what we might term the warmongers to do away with this Neutrality Act? The majority voted for it. Now, it seems as if the majority party wants to vote against it. I am for it today because I believe it is more liable to keep us out of war than the intentions were at the time it was passed.

It does not make so much difference to this Nation whether I, as an individual, want to vote one way or another. But it does make a great deal of difference to me, as a Member of Congress in trying to keep this country out of war. I believe that a vote to repeal the Neutrality Act now will grant such powers to the President that he will deliberately throw us into war by sending our ships and our Navy into the danger zones, which he forbade our ships to enter up until the

time he decided, with the Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, that they would enter these zones, regardless of the Neutrality Act. That was when they took over Iceland, sent our troops there, and now are trying to defend with the troops he promised the American people he would not send to Europe—and we call it national defense. I am of the opinion strongly and more strongly every day that our national defense begins on our shores bordering Canada, the Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, Mexico, and the Pacific Ocean. In my judgment, Hitler is not coming to America. He could not, if he wanted to; and it is going to be just as difficult for us to fight Hitler 3,000 miles away, or Japan 4,000 miles away, if that has to be. Had we used our good offices to try to settle the affairs in Europe by arbitration, certainly in time they would have been accepted and we could have been a Nation very powerful in trying to bring peace by arbitration rather than do what the warmongers want to do now—bring a forced peace at the point of the cannon. That is the kind of peace we had in 1918. Certainly, it ought to be a lesson to us that it did not work, and I am convinced that no lasting peace will ever be made in Europe at the end of the cannon and with bullets. It must be done with kindness and with sincerity of purpose in trying to iron out the differences of nations and settle them around the conference table.

Another reason I am against this legislation today is because of the fact that President Roosevelt promised the American people—and he stated:

I promise you again and again and again that I will not send our boys to fight in Europe unless attacked.

Now we are only inviting ourselves to be attacked so that we will have a good excuse to fight in Europe. But I am not willing to send 100,000 or 1,000,000 of our boys to Europe to be slaughtered. The price is too great in humankind. The misery and the sorrow cost too much for the American people to submit to anything of that kind. And what are we doing it for? Certainly, in my judgment, it cannot be termed national defense. Ninety-nine percent of all the mail I receive is to keep America out of war, and I am going to use this means of trying to do that, because I believe it will do more to keep America out of war than to send our ships into these danger zones to be blown up and cause the American seamen and the American men who might be on these ships to go down to a watery grave.

Let me quote the following excerpt on the cynical promise breaking of the President:

From the President himself the country has been informed of the true intent of the Lend-Lease Act. Those who opposed the measure when it was before Congress contended that it would lead the United States into a shooting war. This was denied by the proponents of the bill, including, of course, President Roosevelt.

In his message to Congress seeking revision of the neutrality law, President Roosevelt said: "I earnestly trust that the Congress will carry out the true intent of the Lend-Lease Act by making it possible to help deliver the articles to those who are in a position effectively to use them."

During the time Congress was being urged to pass the lend-lease legislation it was repeatedly told by the administration that the purpose was only to manufacture the supplies for war. Any talk of United States delivery was smothered.

Later the President declared that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

The true intent of the Lend-Lease Act is now revealed as being just what its opponents declared when it was before Congress.

As has been often said, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time.

Now the advice heretofore of men such as Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, McKinley and others, was to the effect that we should stay out of the affairs of Europe, that we should look after our own country and not try to rule the affairs of the Eastern Hemisphere. It seems to me we have enough to do if we stay at home and attend to our own business. I am for America just 100 percent, but I am not willing to wreck America to save any foreign nation, regardless of how big it is or how strong it is. No one can conquer all of Europe and control it for any long period of time. With the 24 or more different languages spoken in the Eastern Hemisphere, no single individual will ever control it. Insurrections and revolutions will be too prevalent. Only a peaceful settlement can prevail. Then again, we might side in with Great Britain, take Russia as a bedfellow—Russia, one of the most godless and cruel nations, that has killed more people than any other nation in the world in the last 20 years in order to bring them to subjugation. They have murdered the priests and ministers and closed the churches, and yet we want to join with them in fighting against little Finland, who up until the last 30 days we have praised above all the nations of Europe. Now Uncle Sam is trying to compel Finland to stop fighting Russia, and if there was ever a just war it is the fight that Finland is waging at the present time against Russia to have her territory returned to her.

I say to you men it is a terrible mess and it will never be settled with bullets. It must be settled by arbitration and nothing short of that will be of any consequence. I charge this administration with fooling the American people. From the time they passed the Conscription Act they knew that they were getting ready for an aggressive warfare. Instead of demanding the money from those countries who owed us from the previous war, which countries we were barred from lending money to by the Johnson Act, we went around the bush and passed the lease-lend law. Anyone but the President of the United States suggesting any such legislation, we would have thought crazy. But the lease-lend law gave the President great powers. He asked for \$7,000,000,000. The Congress appropriated it. He then asked for \$6,985,000,000 more. The Congress appropriated it. That means about \$100 for every man, woman, and child in America. The President can give it away to those countries principally who owe us \$13,000,000,000 from the other war. Not one

dollar will ever be repaid. It is not intended in the mind of the President and Congress that it will be repaid. So you can forget that part of the lease-lend law. Last week the President gave Russia \$1,000,000,000. No man in history ever was privileged to do such a thing. The American taxpayer will have to pay the bill. The President always has been a free spender of other people's money. Are you going to permit him to go ahead and continue to bring this country to its knees through bankruptcy? You are doing it, with a national debt now of \$60,000,000,000 and at the rate we are going we will be fifteen to twenty billion dollars in the red this year. It will soon be a hundred billion. Where are you going to get the money? You will not only have to pay this next year the greatest tax burden we have ever had, but you will have more taxes heaped upon you. I would not be surprised if you get a property assessment. Then it will not be long until the burden becomes so great that we will be bankrupt, and the fault will be the New Deal administration. We have forgotten all the sound fundamental principles of our forefathers and we are dissipating all the earnings that we have accumulated in 154 years since the Constitution was adopted. Nine long years of dissipation. Nine long years of spend, spend, spend. Nine long years of going in the red, red, red. Nine long years of the most ruthless and extravagant spending that was ever known. Nine long years of a joy ride for a lot of New Dealers who never knew what it was to work, who never operated a business nor met a pay roll, and who never made a success in business life.

Now with an administration of that kind are you, by passing this legislation, going to permit the President and the New Dealers to take this Nation into war? God forbid that that day has arrived. It will be the wrecking of our American form of government, our liberty, our independence, and setting up in this country a dictator, which all the American people do not want. I feel confident that the best interest of America can be attained at this particular time by refusing to give the President the power that he wants by passing this legislation. Mr. Speaker, I am against the legislation because I want to do what is best for America. I want to keep it out of European war, and I will cast my vote "no."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I am not standing here in support of any preconceived opinion or position. I have no prepared speech. I do not intend to fill the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a lot of flamboyant oratory.

The main purpose of my undertaking to address you at this time is that I may be able to secure either from the Committee on Foreign Affairs or from some other Member of the House who may be in a position to give it, or from some other source, information which I have not yet been able to obtain from listening to the

discussion which has occurred on the floor.

My position with regard to the approval or disapproval of the Senate amendment will not be controlled by my opinion as to whether or not its approval or disapproval may possibly put us in the war. I hate war. All of us hate war. We should be willing to take any honorable and sensible course to avoid war. But if its approval is necessary for the protection of the rights of the American people and the discharge of the obligations of the American Government in this time of world crisis to protect its people against the danger of aggression, then I shall vote to agree to the Senate amendment, and if it means war, let it mean war. When any nation fails to protect adequately the rights of its people and to safeguard them against threatened aggression, it will not be long until that nation will cease to exist.

I have voted for all defense measures. I have been in accord and am in accord with the foreign policy of the President. I expect to continue to support that policy. That, however, does not mean that I consider it my duty if at any time it is against my best judgment and such evidence as I am able to obtain from the arguments advanced upon the floor of the House of Representatives and elsewhere to support any position which may be assumed by the advisers of the President.

I have voted to help England. I am in favor of helping not only England but anybody else who is fighting or wants to fight Hitler. I consider nazi-ism the greatest danger to Christian civilization which has developed in a thousand years. But I want to know, and this argument has failed to advise me as thoroughly as I should like to be advised, whether the adoption of the Senate amendment is something which it is necessary for us to do in order to help England, and whether it is calculated to accord her a type of assistance in a vital particular that she cannot accomplish for herself without our aid.

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

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry, I cannot yield to the gentleman just now, but hope to be able to do so later.

I have sought information from the debate which has so far occurred as to the necessity for our sending our ships laden with supplies for the British people to England; as to the lack or not of British shipping available for that purpose.

I have not found in the debate sufficient information on that subject, but upon conferring with the Secretary of State and being referred by him to the Maritime Commission, I have ascertained that, according to the Maritime Commission, England today has merchant shipping composed of ships of 2,000 tons or more aggregating 16,806,378 tons, whereas the United States, of the same type of shipping, has 6,794,000 tons, England therefore having approximately two and a half times the amount of merchant-marine shipping possessed by the United States.

I have heard, as you doubtless have heard, rumors that the British are using their merchant marine in their ordinary world trade, that they are carrying on competitive activities in world trade which are injurious to the business interests of the United States and to its foreign trade, and that the purpose of this repeal of sections 2 and 3 of the Neutrality Act is to have us send our ships, although we have only 40 percent of the amount of merchant tonnage possessed by England, into the dangerous waters of the zone around England and carry supplies to the English, and permit their ships to carry on their ordinary world trade outside of the most acute danger zone. I want to know what evidence has been developed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs or may be furnished here now to show that this is not true.

I would like to know what necessity exists for sending our ships laden with supplies to the British Isles; whether or not this almost 17,000,000 tons of shipping which they possess is adequate for that purpose; and if not, why not; and why it is necessary that from our very much smaller tonnage we undertake to furnish the vessels that shall be sunk while British ships are carrying on the ordinary world trade of the British Empire.

Now, another thing: We sent a committee of Congressmen down to South America about 2 months ago to investigate conditions in South America, particularly as they are related to these international questions. This committee was composed of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAU], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BEAM], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER]. Since they have returned, rumors have been rife in the cloakrooms concerning their discoveries in the course of that investigation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. It is said that these gentlemen have discovered, for example, that business mail from South America to the United States is censored by the British at Trinidad, that orders for American goods are opened by the British and delayed 2 or 3 weeks, whereas information is given in the meantime to agents of British firms, who then approach the prospective buyers of the South American countries and undertake to quote lower prices than have been quoted by our concerns and get the trade which otherwise would go to the United States.

It is said that in at least one instance a South American prospective buyer wanted a Diesel engine, which he could not procure from the United States because the Priorities Commission would not approve the purchase, but he had no difficulty in securing it from England.

It is said these gentlemen on their trip to South America discovered that South America is full of British goods of types similar to types which are being furnished



by the United States to England under the Lease-Lend Act.

If these things are true, they would influence my vote, but I do not intend to vote upon the basis of cloakroom rumors. These gentlemen were sent to South America at the expense of the American Government. I understand some \$9,000 was spent in defraying their expenses there. Now, whether these things are true or not, I think these gentlemen should get up on this floor today and tell us all they know, because if there ever was a time when we needed this information that time is now. We should not wait for some 2 or 3 weeks after we have passed upon this momentous question. They ought to get up on this floor today and give us any information they may have been able to secure in the course of their trip of 22,000 miles to practically all of the important countries of South America.

I want to know before I cast my vote on these amendments whether this is something we are asked to do to relieve England of a responsibility which she would otherwise be able to discharge or whether it is something that we ought to do for her which she cannot do for herself in her efforts to defend herself against the modern Hun.

Considerations of this kind will determine what my vote on this proposition shall eventually be, and I sincerely hope that the membership of the House, including the Foreign Affairs Committee and the members of this delegation to South America, will be able to give us some information on these subjects.

Under permission granted by the House subsequently to the delivery of these remarks, I have extended them by the addition of a communication received by me from the State Department and also one from the United States Maritime Commission, both of which were submitted in response to a request I had previously made of Secretary Hull. The information contained in these communications sufficiently clarifies the subject matters concerning which I made inquiry as to justify me in giving the benefit of any doubt which may exist to the position maintained by our Secretary of State and by our Commander in Chief. I shall therefore support the Senate amendment. Nevertheless, it is my earnest hope that in exercising the powers it will possess to send United States ships to England after the passage of this act, our Government will carefully avoid endangering American lives and vessels in the discharge of any service the British may be able to accomplish for themselves. The communications follow:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, November 13, 1941.  
The Honorable MALCOLM C. TARVER,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TARVER: Secretary Hull has asked me to rush this to you. It is being carried by Mr. Robert B. Stewart

Very sincerely,

BRECKINRIDGE LONG,  
Assistant Secretary.

STATEMENT ENCLOSED IN STATE DEPARTMENT LETTER

Charges are frequently made that some of the governments opposing aggression, and

LXXXVII—558

particularly Great Britain, are taking advantage of our American aid in order to promote their own commercial interests. The repetition of these charges is naturally very helpful to the aggressor countries. Since the charges are without foundation the facts should be known.

Consequently at this critical time the following statements are made in connection with (1) the use of the Lend-Lease Act to push British exports; (2) the use of British shipping to further their own private commercial interests at the expense of the United States and other friendly countries; and (3) the use of wartime censorship of the mails to the detriment of American commercial and other interests.

# I

One of the most insistent charges against the British has been that they have taken advantage of our generosity, particularly in connection with the Lend-Lease Act, to push their export business into all corners of the globe at our expense. They have been accused both of reexporting lend-lease goods on a large scale and feathering their own nests with the proceeds therefrom, and of using lend-lease goods at home to displace domestic products, which they have in turn been enabled to export.

From the very beginning of these charges, running back to last spring, there was the most gross exaggeration with respect to this whole matter. So far as concerns the reexportation of lend-lease goods, any such reexportation would have been in clear violation of section 4 of the Lend-Lease Act, which provides that "all contracts or agreements made for the disposition of any defense article or defense information pursuant to section 3 shall contain a clause by which the foreign government undertakes that it will not, without the consent of the President, transfer title to or possession of such defense article or defense information by gift, sale, or otherwise, or permit its use by anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of such foreign government."

No transfer of any such article acquired under the Lend-Lease Act could legally take place without the consent of the President.

For some weeks after the Lend-Lease Act was passed, there continued to be some exports from Britain of domestic products more or less similar in character to types of products which we were lend-leasing to Great Britain. There was, for example, some exportation to South America of iron and steel products, but only under exceptional circumstances where this was clearly necessary for the prosecution of the British war effort and where the materials in question could not be obtained from the United States. Even so, there was a very rapid decline in shipments of such products to South America. By the middle of last summer, British allocations of steel for export were set at less than a quarter of what they were even as late as 1940 and constituted only an extremely minor fraction of their monthly production of approximately 1,000,000 ingot tons.

Meanwhile, however, our Government took up with the British Government the various types of charges which had been made with respect to abuse of the letter or spirit of the Lend-Lease Act in this regard, and as a result of those discussions the British Government issued on September 10, 1941, a white paper, in which it undertook to define in some detail the principles and practices to which it was adhering and would continue to adhere in the future as regards exports and distribution of lend-lease goods. The British Government affirmed that all lend-lease materials sent to it had not been used for export, and every effort would be made in the future to insure that they should not be used for export. With respect to the export of British goods similar in character to goods received under lend-lease, it promised not to apply any materials similar to those supplied under

lend-lease in such a way as to enable British exporters to enter new markets or to extend their export trade at the expense of United States exporters. It stated further that, owing to the need to devote all available capacity and manpower to war production, the United Kingdom export trade would be "restricted to the irreducible minimum necessary to supply or obtain materials essential to the war effort." It promised further that "no materials of a type the use of which is being restricted in the United States on the grounds of short supply and of which we [the British] obtain supplies from the United States either by payment or on lend-lease terms will be used in exports," with the exception of certain special cases which were enumerated and which our Government recognized were within the category of legitimate exceptions.

Even before the white paper was issued, our own Government was, in consultation with the British authorities, closely following up every charge of abuse and taking every possible precaution to safeguard American interests. Since the issuance of the white paper, machinery has been set up both in Washington and in London for following up in detail all of the administrative and policy problems arising in connection with the white paper. The fact of the matter is that the British have been leaning over backward in their desire to avoid doing anything to justify a charge that they are not complying with the obligations which they have assumed. Not a single instance has been encountered in which they have violated their pledge. They are going out of their way, in case of doubt with regard to any particular export shipment, to ascertain whether this Government would regard such shipment as in violation of the letter or spirit of British pledges. In fact, an orderly process has been set up for clearing all such doubtful cases in advance.

The plain truth of this whole matter is that: (1) From the very beginning of this agitation the air has been filled with charges of this sort or another which careful investigation has shown, in nearly every case, were largely or wholly without foundation; and (2) that the Lend-Lease Act is not being used by Great Britain today as a vehicle for encouraging British exports irrespective of defense and to the detriment of this country. The fact is that our two Governments are in close understanding with respect to this matter, and the Lend-Lease Act is being utilized by both countries for the purpose for which it was intended, namely, to defeat the terrible menace of Hitlerism which threatens to engulf us all.

# II

Allegations are made that the British are using a large part of their shipping tonnage to engage in normal commercial intercourse regardless of the prime need for such tonnage for war purposes. It is charged that 9,000,000 tons of British shipping are today being put to that sort of use.

The facts, however, are these: First, a very considerable proportion of this tonnage is today being used as supply shipping in the fighting services; second, half of the remaining tonnage is engaged in carrying war supplies and other absolutely essential goods to Great Britain; and, third, a substantial but minor portion of the total tonnage is engaged in furnishing indispensable shipping services between the different parts of the Empire, all of it vital to the effective prosecution of the war effort.

Naturally the tonnage which is engaged in carrying to Great Britain war essentials and civilian necessities from the United States and other sources of supply is available for carrying back to these countries on the return trip any goods which Great Britain is in a position, under war conditions, to export at this time. Many of these goods are of types

badly needed in the United States and other countries to which they may be sent. Notwithstanding charges that some of these are similar to types of goods which we are lending to Great Britain, the fact is that Great Britain has obligated herself not to engage in that sort of export trade at our expense and is not doing so today.

### III. CENSORSHIP

At the outbreak of the war the belligerent governments on both sides established censorship of mail and other communications. The United States has readily admitted the right of a belligerent government, including the British Government and the German Government, under international law, to censor private mails originating in or destined to their respective territories or which pass through their territories for transmission to final destinations.

While not denying the British right to censor mail passing through British territory, the Department has, however, taken up with the British Government or with the British Embassy in Washington any complaints regarding delays in the transmission of mails. The British assure us that they are taking all possible steps to expedite the transmission of mails detained for censorship and that any mails detained are forwarded by the next boat in the case of ordinary mails or by the next plane in the case of air mails. With regard to the question of trade information contained in letters detained by the censorship authorities, the British Government has given specific assurances that such information is not in any way improperly used or made available to British firms or even to other departments of the British Government.

The State Department keeps in close touch with the Post Office Department in all matters relating to our own mails and mails in this hemisphere.

It may be mentioned that the British censorship provides us, from time to time, with useful information which by courtesy the British Government passes on to us in the form of information believed to be of interest to this Government. Information is received from far-away points, Hong Kong and Singapore, for example, which is helpful in the administration of foreign funds control of the United States. This is merely one illustration of the type of information which may be received and which may cover a very wide range of subjects of interest and value to this Government.

This statement is submitted in the interest of accuracy.

#### STATEMENT FROM UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

1. Merchant tonnage under United States flag: Oceangoing steam and motor merchant vessels of 2,000 gross tons and over, as of September 30, 1941 (not including Great Lakes tonnage nor vessels loaned or chartered to Army and Navy), 1,114 vessels of 6,794,931 gross tons.

2. Merchant tonnage under the British flag: Exact figures are not published. It is estimated that as of the end of 1940 there were around 2,600 oceangoing steam and motor merchant vessels, 2,000 gross tons and over, of a total gross tonnage between 16 and 17 million tons, including tankers. This includes tonnage in the fighting services not available for trade; tonnage in coasting service, not available for foreign trade; and some millions of tons which have been sunk since the end of 1940, as well as a large quantity of tonnage laid up for ordinary repairs and war damages, which tonnage is, of course, not available for any trade.

3. According to the British Shipping Mission in Washington, there is not one oceangoing ship under British control that is not being employed either for the fighting services, or for the vital imports of the United Kingdom, or for certain services which are absolutely essential to maintain the life of the Empire communities for the war effort;

they have gone through the ships employed in these last-mentioned services with a fine-tooth comb to find any ships which can possibly be taken out, and have pulled out every ship that can be pulled out; wherever practicable, essential services have been and are being taken over by ships under American control. They have furnished the Maritime Commission with full information as to the employment of all British shipping and have declared the British Government's willingness to transfer any ship whose employment might at any time be found inconsistent with the foregoing. Changes of allocations have for over 6 months been made in daily consultation with the Maritime Commission.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOSER].

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record and include certain letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSER. What Price Glory? On Monday night, broadcasts assured America that Winston Churchill announced that if the United States declares war on Japan England will follow suit within the hour.

#### "WHAT PRICE GLORY?"

In the face of experience of each nation involved in the present European war, what more have we to expect from England than the empty privilege of helping that same England, whose same Churchill declared that if the United States had kept out of the World War England would have had a negotiated peace, and Russia's Government would not have fallen with its consequent bolshevism; that the Government of Italy would not have fallen with its consequent fascism; and that the Government of Germany would not have fallen with its consequent nazi-ism.

#### "WHAT PRICE GLORY?"

After the World War debts of our Allies had been scaled down from 15 to 11 billion dollars, and England had welched on payment of principal or interest, the same Churchill figured out a calculation whereby the United States, by his calculation of obligation, would owe England one-half the cost of every shot fired by that nation at Germany between the time of America's declaration of war and our actual effective participation aggregating by that calculation nearly \$5,000,000,000, and which, if the United States would honor as a debt and pay the interest thereon, would exceed \$5,000,000,000, making the United States the debtor Nation.

#### "WHAT PRICE GLORY?"

The same British Propaganda Minister Gilbert, who boasted it cost England \$200,000,000 to get us in the World War and it was worth it, is the same Gilbert who bemoaned German reparations, saying, "Uncle Shylock" took it on the debts as fast as Germany paid it to England and France. He is the same Gilbert who effected the cessation of reparations payments and consequent defaulting to the United States, saying that Americans would squawk but do nothing about it, for "after all, next to the Chinese, the

Americans are the most gullible people on earth."

#### "WHAT PRICE GLORY?"

Call the roll—Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, Greece, and Yugoslavia. England's allies—"What price glory?" If the United States of America declares war on Japan, England will follow suit within the hour. "What price glory?"

Edward Livingston, in a speech in the House of Representatives on Jay's Treaty, used this term: "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." "I dread these Britons and the gifts they bring."

When France was offering to sell Louisiana to the United States on the possibility of that nation's losing it, Jefferson has been quoted this year as having said, "If that should happen, we would have to marry the British Fleet and Nation, not because we wanted to but because we had to." This quotation was first used by William C. Chanler, corporation counsel of the city of New York, in the American Forum of the Air broadcast on June 1, 1941. I discussed the quotation with Congressman Bloom, who disavowed it as a fake; next with Congressman Shannon, who disclaimed knowledge of it, as never in all his research coming under his notice.

In her final broadcast on September 22, 1941, Eleanor Wilson McAdoo used the same quotation. Neither Mrs. McAdoo nor Mr. Chanler has answered my letters of inquiry as to the authority from which they had drawn this alleged quotation from Jefferson. Everyone familiar with Jefferson should know the remorse with which he was seized on Livingston's action concluding the purchase of Louisiana, which placed him in the position, as he believed and expressed, in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States. On the contrary, Jefferson did point out that, whenever the Constitution conveyed power believed to be questionable or in doubt, he would rather go to the people for affirmation, and reluctantly consummated the purchase of Louisiana.

Who declared this war involving our Nation? Was it Dorothy Thompson in Constitution Hall last winter? The Constitution of the United States still vests that commitment solely to the Congress. The President of the United States still recognized that fact as recently as June 1940, in response to the urgent appeal of the then Premier of France, when he—the President—responded that such commitment rested solely with the Congress. Was it Secretary Ickes? Was it Secretary Stimson? Was it Secretary Knox? Each of these Cabinet officers have given vent to such blandishments. Was it Willkie?

The Washington Star of June 19, 1940, published an account of an address at Hartford, Conn., the preceding evening by Henry L. Stimson, wherein he was the first of all to advocate all-out aid, delivery and conveying to Britain. On June 20 the President appointed him Secretary of War. It was Secretary Stimson who a year later asked for an American expeditionary force, and has only been joined since by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO],



the extension of time of selective service, and the lifting of the act's ban on service outside the Western Hemisphere. The buck was passed to General Marshall, and by a margin of a single vote in this House succeeded only in imposing an additional 18 months' training under the Selective Service Act. Mr. Stimson has always been a Republican. Secretary Knox, a Republican candidate for Vice President only 5 years ago, and at that time extremely vitriolic in his attacks on the President, my party, and its candidates, and to defeat whom I exerted all energies at my command, has ordered conveying in violation of the restrictive provisions of the Lease-Lend Act, declared war, and advocated England and the United States policing the world for 100 years after the end of the present World War.

Secretary Ickes has been in and out of so many political parties they might begin to balance the wars he has declared on 60 families, other domestic groups, and businesses, culminating in a broader sense into the international field to include war on Germany. His war on the oil companies, the users of gasoline, and the retailers selling it has effected the inflation of its retail price to the consumer and lessened the cost of distribution by closing the retail places at night, enhancing profit.

Was it Wendell Willkie who declared this war, calling on Republicans in Congress to follow his lead as titular head of his party to seize leadership in international affairs from the administration, while assuring those following him he will wage a personal campaign and speak for them in the next election?

As a Democrat I have supported the President completely on national defense. I differ with him on following the policies of my party expounded by these Republican appointees, who, defeated in succeeding elections, would now frame our country's course and international policy.

"I dread these (Republicans) and the gifts they bring."

Mr. Speaker, this is the second time in my career as a Member of the House of Representatives that I have felt constrained as a patriotic American, and as a Democrat adhering to the principles of my party laid down by Thomas Jefferson, to take issue with the present administration. I was born between Valley Forge and the Hessian camp, and there were no Tories in my ancestry. I am constrained to speak at this time because I well remember the night of the 30th of June 1939, when I yielded to a colleague and cast my vote against the recommitment of the neutrality bill. The vote stood 194 to 195, and Mr. Speaker Bankhead then asked to have his name called, when the vote stood 196 to 194. Having lifted the arms embargo and substituted the cash and carry, I subsequently supported the measure to keep our ships out of belligerent ports. I owe a great responsibility to the constituency which I have the honor to represent. From my district, up to the moment of the quorum call today, not a single constituent has requested me to vote for these amendments. Everybody that has written to

me or telegraphed has urged me to oppose the amendments.

Aside from that fact, I am constrained to remind the gentlemen on my right, my friends from North Carolina, that the first declaration of American independence against the English Crown originated in Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, N. C., and to my friends from the State of Virginia, I remind them that Mr. Richard Henry Lee held that the United Colonies are and of a right ought to be free and independent States, and that resolution brought to Philadelphia to Thomas Jefferson was the touchstone embodied by him as he penned the Declaration of Independence, when and where the birth of a nation was effected.

In the brief time allotted to me I have no opportunity to unfold what is in my soul. I grew up in that environment, and I would be disloyal to myself and to the people who sent me here if I felt it possible to violate my public pledge to them and betray their confidence by voting for the very thing today that we voted for 2 years ago, to keep us out of the then as now England's war as declared by that nation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to include certain letters, I desire to draw a contrast between those submitted to me by two ministers in my district. The first was received dated October 26, from Rev. Elias M. Barna, classifying himself as chairman of the group of organizations he alleged met to suggest a chart for my course as the Representative in Congress from the Fourteenth District of Pennsylvania. It is as follows:

READING, PA., October 26, 1941.

HON. GUY MOSER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Delegates of church, farm, labor, and veteran organizations met today at St. Nicholas Orthodox Church, Reading, in conference to discuss ways and means of defeating Hitler. The following resolutions were adopted:

1. This conference to defeat Hitler and Hitlerism goes on record in favor of expanding the lend-lease program to make the full resources of America available to all the anti-Nazi forces. We want America to become a true arsenal of democracy and declare ourselves willing to make the arms and sacrifice for this great cause.

2. Be it resolved that this conference declares itself in favor of the immediate repeal of the neutrality act, inasmuch as no neutrality is possible in the face of the piracy and utter barbarism which the Nazis symbolize.

3. Be it further resolved that inasmuch as Hitler has nine-tenths of his forces engaged in the invasion of the Soviet Union that this conference, interested only in the defeat of Hitlerism, favors the opening of a western front against the Nazis and urges the American Government to assume its full responsibility in the opening and maintaining of that front.

Respectfully yours,  
Rev. ELIAS M. BARNA,  
Chairman.

To this I responded as follows:

Rev. ELIAS M. BARNA,  
Reading, Pa.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of October 26 has been received and contents noted. Since you say the delegates who met with you are from farm, church, labor, and veterans' organizations, you could find no valid excuse for failing to give me the names of these

delegates, together with their post-office addresses, and this is what I ask.

You say in part, "We want America to become a true arsenal of democracy and declare ourselves willing to make arms and sacrifice for this great cause." This phrase gives rise to several questions:

When did you and each of you embrace this policy?

Since you are willing to make the arms, who do you expect to pay you for your labor?

You also are willing to make sacrifices for this great cause, so just how much are you willing to sacrifice?

I am not addressing this letter to you facetiously, but in all sincerity. You advocate a course you would have me take. I, therefore, have a right to know who would have me take this course and just how far to count on and depend upon you.

Very truly yours,  
GUY L. MOSER,  
Member of Congress.

It will be observed that Reverend Barna did not ask me to vote for these resolutions or against them. He has not seen fit to answer my letter. I am very certain that I know who, representing farm, labor, and veterans' organizations, made up his group, while he felt free to supply the church support.

In marked contrast stands the letter received this morning from Rev. Herman F. Miller, of Reading, Pa., who stands as the successor to a scion of the Muhlenbergs, well known for their records in the Congress of the United States. This scion, Rev. Henry A. Muhlenberg, was elected to the Congress of the United States and served at a time when it fell to his lot to move the previous question on the bill that revoked the charter of the United States Bank, dominated by Nicholas Biddle, more than a hundred years ago and during the administration of President Andrew Jackson. Reverend Miller's letter reads as follows:

READING, PA., November 12, 1941.

The Honorable GUY L. MOSER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MOSER: Permit me to write again to you concerning pending legislation.

It is my confirmed conviction that a majority of your constituency does not want any participation in the war in Europe and consequently no further steps toward such participation. In my contacts, the public rather generally thinks that our country has been brought to the verge of war by belligerent steps, which were disguised as peace moves. They feel that they were tricked. Nothing would be more popular now, not even proposed legislation to curb strikes, than the defeat of the present amendment to the Neutrality Act. It is high time that the administration be curbed in its fanatic and cunning plan for war. Millions of lives are dependent upon the vote in the House on this amendment. I trust that you will vote against it and be able to influence others.

God grant to you and your associates the power wisely and justly to bear your tremendous responsibility in this hour.

Very sincerely yours,  
HERMAN F. MILLER.

I am reminded of the President's Navy Day speech as it was reported in the headlines of the Philadelphia Record the next morning in these words:

Roosevelt warns Hitler—shooting has started; United States at battle stations.

The President is quoted as saying that the shooting has started, but it does not matter who fired the first shot—history

will record that—but it does matter who fires the last shot. It is the President who proclaims the shooting has started. It was the President who previously announced his "shoot on sight" order long after I had learned it had been issued.

In this newspaper on the same first page, column 3, also is reported the third appeal of the President of the United States to John Lewis.

He is the same Lewis who proclaimed, "The President of the United States supped at 'labor's table' and betrayed the host." He is the same Lewis who declared the Vice President of the United States "a whisky-drinking, poker-playing, evil old man." He is the same Lewis who, when disappointed at not receiving the nod to be the Vice Presidential candidate with the President who had befriended him and in an exhortation of abusive invective assailed the President of your country and mine in a most unseemly manner. In my campaign speeches I classed him the apostate and iconoclast he had proved himself to be. It is to this Lewis the President appealed three times instead of once to the Congress as the representatives of the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, on January 6, last, the President of the United States from the Clerk's desk behind me, said in part:

But we learn much from the lessons of the past years in Europe—particularly the lesson of Norway, whose essential seaports were captured by treachery and surprise built up over a period of years.

The first phase of the invasion of this hemisphere would not be the landing of regular troops. The necessary strategic points would be occupied by secret agents and their dupes—and great numbers of them are already here, and in Latin America.

That is why the future of all American republics is today in serious danger.

That is why every member of the executive branch of the Government and every Member of the Congress face great responsibility—and great accountability.

The need of the moment is that our actions and our policy should be devoted primarily—almost exclusively—to meeting this foreign peril, for all our domestic problems are now a part of the great emergency.

The best way of dealing with the few slackers or troublemakers in our midst is, first, to shame them by patriotic example, and, if that fails, to use the sovereignty of government to save government.

Convinced that this same Mr. Lewis cannot be shamed by any example, patriotic or otherwise, we can only wonder if the Executive will employ "the sovereignty of government to save government."

That is the condition existing in the United States. Let me say to my colleagues that everybody in my district discussing our national affairs has asked me, "What are you going to do about these defense strikes?" I have no contact to the opposite.

In his proclamation of unlimited national emergency the President, to support his appeal for complete national unity, elected to conclude it by lifting the concluding sentence, "And, for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred

honor," from that immortal document, the Declaration of American Independence, that flowed from the pen of Jefferson and as edited by Benjamin Franklin. National unity in England's cause can never be attained. It can be attempted in our domestic difficulties. We were sold as Americans on a debt to France, none to England in the last World War. That debt to France was written off when General Pershing, laying a wreath on Lafayette's tomb, 23 years ago, proclaimed, "Lafayette, we are here."

We left all European debt behind on leaving the field of battle with victory won to our assumed Allies, having won a war but lost the peace. "What price glory?"

Mr. Speaker, the President seeks national unity. The first step he could take and should take would be to settle the domestic differences we have at home that are bearing so heavily on the hearts and principles of our citizens. Last night there was a broadcast that today our distinguished Speaker would come before this body and give us assurance that if these amendments are adopted the matter of strikes in defense production will be settled. This recalls to mind a radio broadcast of recent date wherein the eloquent speaker, a man of great charm and fascinating radio voice, illustrated his point with the recounting of a story of one who delayed and procrastinated, saying, "Later, later, later," but the scene changed and did not wait for him, and the answer was, "Too late, too late, too late." Strong as my misgivings are, I trust the President is still in time.

I have the greatest respect and reverence for the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I regard him as my friend. I sympathize with him. I recall my Democratic colleagues to the pledge that we received at the beginning of this Congress, that there was to be a new deal for the Democrats. That pledge, you know, came from our Speaker. It was affirmed by our distinguished majority leader, whose worries are attested by the graying of his locks. I can attest it is no fault of theirs the pledge is not being kept by the third contracting party. Though the Speaker directed in the presence of the majority leader and whip that I contact the President concerning a matter of proposed legislation, on due representation of the direction and sponsorship, such audience was denied, while royalty instead of Representatives in the American Congress has the ingress to the White House. "I dread this royalty and the gifts they bring."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has made reference to some statements that he says he has heard in the cloak rooms, pertaining to our trip to South America, I feel it my duty as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of State, to make reply to some of the questions that have been

advanced. In the first place, the committee should be informed that I did not know this subject was coming up until today. We have at the present time a report being made for the House. The report is not completed, so I am talking to you from memory.

In the first place, we went down there to inspect our own foreign service and not to infringe in any manner on the prerogatives of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which has this bill before the House today. However, in the course of such an extensive trip, it was only natural that we should gather a great deal of miscellaneous information through our contacts in so many countries. One of the practices that was brought to our attention was the censorship at Trinidad of all mail passing between the United States and the east coast of South America. All mail going through Trinidad is inspected. Some of our own mail was not delivered in Rio on time. In fact, it was greatly delayed, and we had reports that some of the official mail of the United States had been opened.

In the course of opening this mail there are always some who prove themselves exceptions to the general rule of inspectors and take advantage of the information acquired by such an investigation. The vice president of the National City Bank of New York, in charge of their South American business in Rio, informed us in Rio de Janeiro of a complaint of one of his clients, who stated that he had ordered firebrick from an American firm and that at a later date someone representing an English firm approached him and told him that he understood he was in the market for firebrick. The client was provoked to learn that a third party had this knowledge, and asked, "How in hell did you find out?" The salesman replied, "I just found out. That is all. Somebody told me." The client said there was not a soul who knew that he wrote that letter requesting firebrick excepting himself and the firm to whom he had addressed it. That is one complaint we had.

We had other general complaints from American businessmen that they were at times discriminated against in favor of the English. It must be borne in mind that these infractions occurred just previous to the time that our Government established an understanding with Great Britain as to the volume of their trade in view of our lend-lease policy. Personally, I do not think these exceptions are caused by the actions of the English Government. I want to be fair about that, but I did impress upon all members of the State Department that they had to be on the lookout for the defense of American business all over South and Central America.

Of course, they are delivering some merchandise, such as bicycles, woolen goods, shovels, and picks. To our surprise we learned in one country they had delivered a Diesel engine, in another an automobile. In one particular nation they delivered an engine of considerable size that had clearly stamped upon it, "Made in the U. S. A." That, Mr. Speaker, is my reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].



Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] 2 minutes.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the addresses of a number of my fellow members who are in favor of repealing sections 2 and 3 of the so-called Neutrality Act and in none of these addresses has the question which has been constantly in my mind been answered, and I now propound it to the House for its consideration.

Through personal investigation and articles appearing in the public press I have been informed that our Army of 1,700,000 American boys is but only partially equipped with airplanes of various types, with antiaircraft guns, with field artillery, with light and medium tanks, and there is even a lack of automatic rifles, machine guns, and ammunition.

Under the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act we have been shipping the greatest proportion of these mechanical war devices to England. That, as I understand it, was the reason the Lend-Lease Act, a measure short of war, was passed by this House. It is my further understanding that, prior to delivery, any part of this equipment constructed with lend-lease appropriations can be retained in the United States and diverted to the use of our armed forces.

The question that puzzles me, which so far has not been answered, is this: If this country is drawn into active participation in the war, due to the sinking of an American merchant ship entering the war zones, does any Member of this House believe that the mothers and fathers of the soldiers of our country would permit, without serious protest to their Representatives in Congress, the continued shipping to England of another gun, another airplane, or another tank until their own boys had been fully equipped?

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this unnecessary and dangerous legislation.

I believe the future of America will be much happier if Hitler is defeated. Therefore, since the war began, in 1939, I have favored the policy of furnishing material aid to those countries resisting him. This policy was adopted in both the Republican and Democratic platforms in 1940, wherein we pledged aid short of war to those countries resisting aggression.

I also favor the building of a 2-ocean Navy, with an air force sufficient to keep an invader from our shores. Such a program also requires the acquisition and fortification of naval and air bases on the islands in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans which guard the sea approaches to our country.

I do not, however, favor the proposed amendment to the Neutrality Act which would allow our merchant ships to go into combat zones. Such a course, it seems to me, is a step into actual warfare. It is so considered by most people who give it careful thought.

This amendment is not necessary to carry out our program of aid short of war. Our production of war equipment has thus far been pitifully small. This has been due to three things. First, we have failed to organize our effort on a sound, business basis. Second, we have not taken the necessary steps to prevent strikes, which are impeding defense production. Third, we are not dealing firmly with certain great financial interests which are actuated more by profit than by patriotism. If we would spend more energy doing the necessary work of actually producing equipment, and less on the act of delivering it, both America and our friends abroad would be better served.

The principal argument made for amending the Neutrality Act is that we are already in the war and should proceed at once to get in further. Of course, we are not in the war. Under the Constitution, only Congress can commit our fortunes, our blood, and our future to total war. Congress has not so voted, and would not do so right today.

Most of the shooting in the Atlantic has been due to the unauthorized and unnecessary acts of the President. The question now is, "Shall we give congressional approval to these acts?" My answer is, "No."

If it is thought that the interests of America demand full participation in the war, let a resolution for war be offered in Congress. It could then be debated fully and honestly. The American people should remember that such a course is not necessary for our protection. Furthermore, it will cost billions of dollars and probably millions of lives. I am opposed to a declaration of war. I am just as opposed to getting into war by deceit and subterfuge.

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

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COOPER]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### NEUTRALITY REPEAL AND WAR

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, when this joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237), to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 was before the House about a month ago, I voted for the resolution to permit the arming of American merchant ships. As I stated then, I did so in order to provide every safety and security possible for American seamen operating these ships. I heard the testimony in the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Admiral Land, head of the Maritime Commission, and Admiral Stark, Chief of Staff of Naval Operations, both of whom strongly recommended the permitting of the arming of these merchant ships and stating that it would add to the safety and protection of these seamen. It is a domestic policy, one sanctioned by international law, and furthermore, under the Neutrality Act these ships are prohibited

from going into combat zones or belligerent ports. I have not changed my opinion with respect to this matter and will vote again for the arming of these ships if opportunity is given.

When this resolution which passed the House, which was strictly in accord with the recommendation of the President sent to the House, reached the other body it was amended to lift the restrictions against sending these armed ships into combat zones and belligerent ports. In other words, as now amended, the resolution will authorize the delivering of war material and other contraband on armed American flag ships to belligerents directly into the war zones and belligerent ports. This is not only a participation by us in the shooting war, but it is also in effect an approval by the Congress of an undeclared war.

I am opposed to the Senate amendments, thus precipitating us into the war by camouflage and subterfuge through the back door. The Congress alone, under the Constitution, has the right to declare war and if such amendments as these are to be approved by the Congress, we should face the issue squarely and vote upon a direct resolution in keeping with the Constitution as to whether or not this Nation shall declare war. Honest and fair dealing and keeping faith with the American public requires that we take this course.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, if the Congress approves the Senate amendments and we send our armed flag ships with war contraband to belligerents in the war zones, we are in a shooting war and in all likelihood this will be the last opportunity for the Congress to vote on the question of getting in or keeping out of the European war. Certainly, if we send our armed merchant ships with contraband into the battle areas where now, as we debate this question, such ships without arms are being sent to the bottom with great loss of life, we would be recreant in our duty if we did not also send our naval ships to convoy and protect American lives upon these ships. Without such protection we would, indeed, be sounding the death knell to many of these brave Americans who would be sent on such a hazardous journey without any protection. By giving this protection to these ships we would be joining in full force in a shooting war. We would be doing so, however, in violation of the constitutional provision which lodges the power to declare war in the Congress alone and we would be flying in the face of the pledge of our President and the Secretary of the Navy, both of whom opposed convoys because, as was said by the President, "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war."

Mr. Speaker, this position was in keeping with the promises made not only by the President in the campaign but the promises set forth in the platforms of both of the political parties and the pledge of the Republican candidate for the Presidency. It is needless to repeat here these pledges so solemnly made which are in the minds of each of you. For the sake of the record, however, let me recall two pledges of our President in seeking reelection to the high office he

now holds. In September of last year the President said:

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

In October, in Boston, the President said:

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

Mr. Speaker, I doubt not that the great majority of my colleagues here in this House made similar pledges. I know I did. I promised the people of my district that I would do all within my power to keep this country of ours from involvement in European wars unless we were attacked. I know it will be said, as it has been said, that we have been attacked, that our ships have been sunk on the high seas, and that our own men have been sent to a watery grave. Is not the answer that if such acts justify this country in entering upon this World War, that the just, honorable, and manly thing to do is for those who propose such a course to submit to the Congress a resolution declaring war, pursuant to the terms of the Constitution? We all hate subterfuge and hypocrisy. The American people are entitled in this, the most momentous crisis which has ever confronted us, to honesty and fair dealing. We, the representatives of the people, elected to carry out their wishes in passing upon this great issue which influences the lives and may sacrifice the lives of thousands of our citizens, should be frank and honest. We should not dodge the issues; we should vote our convictions; and we should keep our pledges and our promises, unless the underlying facts upon which the pledges were made have so radically changed as to justify the rejection of such pledges. Even then we should face the issue and answer it directly and not by subterfuge. If we are to throw overboard the solemn pledges made by the President and by the candidate on the Republican ticket for the Presidency, and the solemn pledges of the two great political parties, as well as our own pledges to our people and to our Nation in this European conflict, let us do it openly and above board in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and declare war. For one, I am opposed to such a course. I made my pledge to my people and I intend to keep it. No condition has arisen which, in my judgment, justifies the violation of my pledge. The safety and well-being of our Nation is the first consideration; all others are secondary. The safety of our Nation does not depend at this time on plunging this country into the holocaust of war and the sacrifice of the millions of American youth on foreign battlefields, in violation of the pledge of almost everyone holding a responsible position who has a voice in this important decision. We drafted our American youth to the service of their country. They were not consulted but were told it was for 1 year service. They were further told they would not be sent beyond the Americas to fight in foreign wars. If we pursue this course in violation of those promises to its logical end, we will be

sending the youth of our country to fight in a foreign war undeclared and carried on by subterfuge and deceit.

Mr. Speaker, no one here has greater contempt for the Axis dictators who have been ruthlessly destroying the countries of Europe. I despise their theories, their programs, and their objectives. On the other hand, I want to see our country do everything within its power, short of precipitating our own country into the war, in aiding Britain and her allies in the fight against the Axis regime. As a Member of Congress, I voted for all the appropriations under the lend-lease bill and all of the legislation proposed for the perfecting of our own national defense so that we may become impregnable against the attacks of any and all nations, and that we may uphold the Monroe Doctrine and protect the Western Hemisphere, and I will continue, as long as I am a Member of the Congress, to carry out such a program.

Mr. Speaker, if the purpose of these Senate amendments providing for the sending of our armed merchant marine into combat zones and belligerent ports is for the purpose of aiding Great Britain and her allies, it follows that it will be an actual participation by the United States in the present war as a belligerent. It is therefore tantamount to a declaration of war, as I have said. On the other hand, if our sole desire is to aid Britain to the fullest extent with war materials, including merchant ships, under the lend-lease law, all of these American merchant ships which we will arm and send into war zones under this resolution, if passed, could be loaned to Great Britain, and would give immediate and effective service in helping to defeat the Axis Powers and would not involve us as a belligerent. Such a program would have almost unanimous support of the Congress. It would bring the unity which we all so very much desire in this critical time, when the very life of our own Nation may be at stake. It would also remove the stigma from the Congress in giving sanction to America to sneak into the war by this subterfuge through the back door.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, my hopes and desires are with Britain and those fighting with her to defeat the evil powers of the Nazi and Fascist regime seeking to overcome her. I have nothing but contempt for those who are seeking by ruthless conquest to dominate the world and destroy democracy wherever it may exist. The blood that courses in my veins, so far as I know, all comes from England, Scotland, and Ireland. In fact, my paternal forebears came to America with Roger Williams some 300 years ago. My whole background is based upon the freedoms which the English-speaking nations, including our own, have brought to the world. Furthermore, if and when it is necessary for the defense of America and the upholding of our own rights in the Western Hemisphere and the Monroe Doctrine, or in the event that we or any of our sister nations in this hemisphere are attacked, I will be among the first to support the use of every means at our command to beat off the invaders, including a declaration of war by the Congress;

and I am sure that the American people, with complete unity, will join in a program to protect our rights under such conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the charge that those of us who refuse to violate our pledges and who vote against this program to put us into the war without a war declaration by the Congress will be purged, if possible, even by the President, and our seats in the Congress taken by others who vote as they are told. The precious thing we are seeking to preserve in these critical times that face us is our American way of life, our own democracy, and our own Constitution. If we have fallen to such depths that the elected representatives of the people are no longer free to carry out their pledges and to vote as their consciences dictate, and to vote for what in their judgments is best designed to conserve and preserve our Republic—if such is a fact—we are fighting a vain battle; our democracy is already destroyed; we already have a totalitarian Government. If that time has arrived we are already under a dictator.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to meet this challenge, to keep my pledges, to vote for the safety of our country, and to refuse to be swayed from the course I perceive for the best interests of our country, and I refuse to vote to put our country into this war by subterfuge, let the consequences be what they may. There is no partisanship, no personal consideration to be considered in deciding this grave question involving the very life of our country. I will cast my vote against the Senate amendments which, if adopted, will plunge America into the war now raging overseas and in foreign lands. It will mean sending our American boys beyond the Americas to fight on foreign soil and on and under the seas of Europe, Asia, and Africa. This I cannot do and retain my self-respect.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] 5 minutes.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, "While I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I say to you, and I say it again and again and again, that your boys will not be sent to fight on foreign soil. Not one man, not one ship, not one plane, not one gun."

The President of the United States made that statement a year ago. I hold no brief that the circumstances have not changed sufficiently to alter that expressed viewpoint. I realize fully that what may be a steadfast conviction on any man's part today may tomorrow, by the unfolding of events, be completely altered. One cannot know what is foregathered in the God-kept store of years, and few men in America have maintained completely unchanged attitudes about the world circumstance. The President has indicated his great wisdom and farsighted search into the future probabilities by anticipating our needs for a greatly expanded Navy and national-defense structure far in advance of any possible conception on the part of the average citizen or the Congress itself. He has been in advance of public thought on international problems all through these troubled years, and I do not say



that he is wrong in suggesting the sending of our ships into combat zones. Only the unwritten pages of history can hold the evidence which will make possible a just and certain verdict.

In this problem as to what to do on this particular issue rests many factors more far reaching than the simple alteration of this law. To contend, however, as some do, that this issue determines America's right to the freedom of the seas is a grossly false assumption. That right exists as certain as international law exists. It is as definite as my right to half of the highway as I, in my car, approach an oncoming car which, under common consent, is entitled to the other half of the highway where we meet and pass. Whether or not I insist on my half of the highway would depend upon circumstance. It would be generally conceded to be foolhardy if I drove my automobile straight into a drunken speed demon who was across the line of demarcation and coming head-on toward me on my side of the road. It is the simplest of common sense to recognize that circumstances can arise where self-preservation and self-interest would depend upon a self-limitation against the temporary exercise of what may be a permanent and an inalienable right. The right to freedom of the seas is not involved in any restraint we ourselves place on our exercise of it. In the calm of reason and considered judgment, at the suggestion of the President, this Congress voted to restrict our ships from entry into combat zones. To that extent we isolated ourselves from Europe's conflict. We did not give up any right. We did not deny the exercise of the freedom of the seas. We simply said, "These temporary circumstances are such that common sense indicates that self-interest should restrain us from an insistence on the immediate exercise of our unquestionable and inalienable right to complete freedom on all the open seas. In my considered judgment, isolation is a dream, but intervention, even as we have known it thus far, is a nightmare."

I do not say that, as one citizen of the world community of nations, Uncle Sam should not engage in an individual or collective effort with other nations to police the world. It might well be that fundamental right and common good for the world depends upon each nation's determination, individually or with the collective aid of other nations of similar character and conviction, to prevent injustice, to stamp out international crime, and to arrest and destroy international criminals. I do say that, if such a policy is to be adopted, it should be faced squarely and met with a full recognition of what its attendant responsibilities are.

I have been particularly unhappy about our backing into war. If we are going to war, let us sit down, honestly admit the issue, determine its advisability, and act accordingly. Let us not deceive ourselves. Sending American ships into the combat zones is tantamount to a declaration of war. We are already at war in the sense that we have become the military supply depot for the armies of Great Britain and her allies, but there is one step that we have not taken, and,

in my opinion, the vote today decides whether or not that step will be taken. Of course, the step that I refer to is putting American men into combat.

When it was established as a policy of this Government that we would send American materials to war, I considered that established policy no longer debatable and have given full and wholehearted support toward the success of that program. But sending American materials to war was said to be the full and total program and it was accepted as a program to prevent sending American men to war. I do not say that we should not declare war. I do not say that my vote today against what I conceive to be a declaration of war is the right vote. I simply say that I think it so and I believe it is my solemn responsibility to vote my convictions, to do exactly right as God gives me the power to see the right. I am casting my vote today irrespective of the clamor that has been aroused to press and persuade me from that vote. I may not be right, but I think that I am right and, in reaching that decision, I have listened only to the quiet voice of my own conscience and studied thought. If we were to declare war on the basis of right and justice for the world, we should have declared war against the gangster Government of Japan when she invaded China. We should have reached the long sword of destruction to pierce the heart of Italy and behead the murdering Mussolini when he butchered Ethiopia. We should have pledged our lives and sacred honor in the cause of heroic Finland. We should have declared war on the insane fiend Hitler and the cruel, heartless enemy of justice and liberty, Stalin, when they put Poland on the rack to draw and quarter. If war is a matter of honor, if war is a matter of fighting to maintain justice and right throughout the realm and reaches of the earth, then let America turn away in burning shame from her criminal neglect of Czechoslovakia.

It might be that we have made a mistake, but we decided that we would become guardian and protector only for the Western Hemisphere. We said to the world that we are prepared and determined to protect our family against injustice and crime, but we said to Czechoslovakia, to Finland, to China, to Ethiopia, and to brave and honored Greece that we are going to attend to our own affairs. We sympathize with you; we think you are right. We are sorry to see you beaten, murdered, and buried, but our self-interest demands that we attend to our own affairs. I do not say that that position is correct, but I do say that we have less reason today to enter this war than we have had at any time since its beginning so far as honor and justice are concerned. We refused to reach out in the dark of desperation and lend an assuring hand and a strong arm to the aid of good and fine and courageous Finland. We failed to answer when weary, tired, and sore besought, the desperate, determined little nation of Greece cried, "Uncle Sam, are you there?" But Great Britain, who, I am beginning to believe, is willing to

fight to the last life offered by their allies or dominions, has said to us, "It is profitable for us to stick together. You come in and furnish the money, the material, and, later on, the men, and we will be partners. You do the work, the fighting, and paying of the bills and I will do the thinking. Of course, it should be understood that I cannot be bothered even with the thinking if it becomes an unpleasant interference with my tea time."

No; we did not answer the heart-breaking plea of Czechoslovakia, but when Stalin, like a ghoul from the grave of murdered liberty, like a warden from the penitentiary of chained freedom, said, "Help me," we send him a billion dollars and probably pledge to send him everything, even our sons.

All of this and more constitutes the nightmare that we have come to recognize as intervention.

Now we come down to the issue. Shall we send American seamen into combat zones? I am not trying to speak for anybody else. I simply say for myself that I do not believe that it should be done. Oh, I have a heart full of hate for the polyglot of threats, deceit, and low cunning that has been molded into the damnable character of a man called Hitler, and my mind is not closed against the thought of wresting from his gory hands the treasures looted from the desecrated temples and the homes of murdered souls wherever the Myrmidons of this fiend or the pups of this dog, Fido, Mussolini, have contaminated the soil of the world. But I do say that if we come now to a decision that war in the active sense is in our self-interest, or that it should be out of a belated sense of justice, then let us be sensible enough to realize that before we set forth to destroy the Hitler of the Huns we should first put our own house in order. We should free American labor from the Hitlers at home. We should release our defense efforts from the "fifth columns" of waste, interference, and obstruction to be found in our great caboodle of dollar-a-year men. The Congress should take a good sharp knife and remove that verminiform appendix. We should free the American taxpayer from the back-breaking burden of bureaucratic waste and corruption and selfish, nonessential spending before we place on his shoulders the additional staggering load of actual combat in war.

I will not take time to express a full opinion of the cleaning up we need at home, nor to fully express my contempt of British inactivity, but I do say—and I want to say it again and again and again—that I find it absolutely impossible even to entertain the thought of commanding American men to enter the combat zones when their lifeline of supplies rests on American labor, which is itself subject to the domination of dictators at home. It may be that we will be compelled to stop, to destroy, or to imprison the Hitler of the Huns, but let us first stop, destroy, or imprison the Hitlers in our family.

Let us set our house in order before trying to set Europe's house in order. Free American labor from Hitlers at

home before setting out to destroy Europe's Hitler.

I understand that the Speaker or the Democratic leader will admonish us to follow leadership by way of concluding this debate. I am not satisfied with my Speaker. I am not satisfied with my leader. I am not satisfied with my colleague who does not agree with me that now, not tomorrow, is the time to stop strikes in defense industries and free American labor from ruthless dictatorships of selfish so-called leaders. Now, not tomorrow.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BOREN. For those who say we cannot pass such legislation now, that we cannot pass it before this pending bill is passed, I want to say it can be done. We are going to give you that chance by defeating this bill today. We will not permit our armies to advance on Europe with that sort of situation behind them at home. If we must set Europe's house in order, let us set our own in order first.

I am intensely opposed to this declaration of war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

#### NEUTRALITY

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, when the Neutrality Act of 1939 was under consideration I maintained that it was impractical and would be ineffective. I asserted that it would be a delusion. I maintained then, and I contend now, that neutrality under the law of nations will best promote the peace and security of the United States. The act was proposed by the administration to promote peace. I wanted to aid the President of the United States in handling foreign affairs to promote peace. Notwithstanding my views and misgivings, I voted for the act. I therefore not only favor the pending resolution to repeal section 6 of the act, permitting American vessels to arm, but I also favor the repeal of section 2, relating to commerce with belligerent countries, and section 3, with respect to combat areas. I favor the resolution as passed by the House and as amended by the Senate.

Before proceeding with my remarks I should like to refer to the observations of my friend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and my friend the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] with respect to English competition with the United States in Latin-American trade, with regard to England using vessels for overseas trade, and with relation to rumors and complaints with respect to the sale in South America of bicycles, Diesel engines, and other American products by the English. While there is no accusation, the inference might well be drawn that such goods were sold the English under the Lease-Lend Acts. Both of these gentlemen are members of the Committee on Appropriations. That committee reported not one but two lease-lend bills. If the intent and purpose of the Lease-Lend Act were not being complied with by England, the Committee on Appropriations should

have proposed proper restrictions and limitations. There were comprehensive hearings. I relied upon the committee of which the gentlemen are members.

England and the British Isles are entirely surrounded by water. Vessels for overseas trade are as essential to England as highways and railways are to the States of the Union. Overseas trade is imperative to the existence of the British Isles. There is no contention that the British are indulging in foreign trade as usual. Their commerce is abnormal. They must use some vessels and they must sell some goods to survive. Personally, I wish them well. I am not alarmed about competition. If the United States cannot compete with Great Britain in foreign trade in South America or elsewhere when British trade can only be conducted through mine-infested waters with submarine and air attacks on every hand, the United States might as well forget foreign trade. If we cannot compete in war we certainly cannot compete in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that some Members of the House who voted for the repeal of section 6 and who have supported the foreign policy of the administration now oppose the pending resolution. With deference I believe their position is untenable. First, there are those who oppose because they maintain that the labor policy of the President promotes labor dictatorships and that while opposing dictatorships abroad the President is aiding dictators at home who put selfish labor unions above the defense of the country. No one has opposed the labor policy of the President more than I; no one has denounced selfish labor leaders more than I; no one has urged by vote and speech more than I that strikes in defense be curbed, prevented, and eliminated. I have disagreed with the President's labor policy. I have maintained that if legislation could help labor, legislation can curb labor. I have insisted that labor racketeers be eliminated. I want to be fair with the President. I have not agreed with him respecting labor, but the President has recently spoken. He has emphatically, not once but many times recently, rebuked John L. Lewis. I commend the President for so doing. I congratulate him. The Mediation Board, an executive agency, has repudiated the position asserted by John L. Lewis. It is most unfortunate that at the time the President is asserting his opposition to labor dictatorship, those who have supported his foreign policy announce their opposition. I do them the credit to say that they supported his foreign policy because they believed it to be sound and not because he proposed it. If his policy is sound notwithstanding his labor mistakes, that policy should be supported, and especially at a time when the President is undertaking to put labor in its place. There is a responsibility upon the President but there is also a responsibility upon the Congress. It might as well be argued that a Member would oppose all legislation in Congress because Congress had not followed that Member's labor views.

The public press reports that the President of the United States in rebuking John L. Lewis was influenced by a call from his own son in far-off Iceland. The President's son is right. He but said to his father what every soldier is saying to Members of Congress. The men in the armed service resent strikes; they resent the delay in arming those who have been drafted. The resentment of the President's son is characteristic of the resentment of all who have been drafted. Labor strikes are undermining the morale of enlisted men. Congress is now in a temper to pass restrictive legislation. Labor must be dealt with. It is time not only for a crackdown on John L. Lewis but for a showdown between selfish labor unions and the Government. We are now, however, dealing with neutrality.

The intention in passing the Neutrality Act was good but its operation has hindered; its repeal will strengthen resistance to Hitler; it will free the United States for aid to the democracies; it will enable the United States to defend itself and it will encourage oppressed peoples in all lands. It was a domestic policy, intended to promote peace, but it has been weighed in the balances and found wanting. It should be wiped clean. We must be not only honest but we must be real. Freedom of the seas is essential to the security of the United States. We have thought of the oceans as fortresses; they will not be Maginot lines unless they are held by America or by friendly powers. The question is whether the democracies will control the seas or whether Hitler will rule the oceans.

Neutrality has not kept us out of war; it will not keep us out of war. Under the Constitution of the United States the President represents the Government in foreign relations. He should be free to deal with emergencies as they arise; his hands should not be tied. The passage of the pending resolution will give to the President the same right in the execution of his constitutional powers in foreign relations that has been accorded to every President from the days of Washington; it will untie his hands.

There are different causes for every war. No two wars are alike. The Neutrality Act has placed in the hands of Hitler the control of the traditional policy of the United States on the seas. Hitler is free to sail the seas. Under the Neutrality Act that freedom is denied to the United States.

Secondly. It is asserted that the repeal of neutrality means war. There is nothing new about the argument; it is the same argument that was advanced against the repeal of the embargo; it is the same argument that was made against the passage of the first Lease-Lend Act; it is the same argument that was made against the passage of the second Lease-Lend Act. It is not supported by the facts of history. It might as well be argued that the neutrality policy under international law that obtained for 150 years involved the United States in all foreign wars. If the resolution is adopted, the policy that has obtained will be restored. That policy did not result in



the United States taking sides in all foreign wars, and that policy of itself, when restored, will not result in the United States engaging in the present World War. War may come, but it will not come as a result of the repeal of neutrality legislation that has proved to be worse than futile. With respect to war, if the resolution is adopted, our position will be the same that has obtained since the days of Washington, and the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our Army and of our Navy under the Constitution, will have the same discretion and the same power that was vested in Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson when they insisted upon the freedom of the seas.

Thirdly. It is stated that repeal means an American expeditionary force. Such statements were made in opposition to the Selective Service Act, the defense program and aid to England. There is nothing new about the contention. Incidents involving the sinking of ships whether by Japan or by Hitler do not result in expeditionary forces; they do not result in war. They may result in hunting down and destroying the pirates of the seas but only Congress can declare war. There will be no American expeditionary force until Congress does declare war. A moment's reflection will convince the most careless that there can be no American expeditionary force unless it is authorized by Congress. The Army will have to be increased, millions will have to be drafted before there is an expeditionary force; billions will have to be appropriated. Unless Congress so decrees there will never be an American expeditionary force.

Fourthly. There are those who maintain that repeal is an indirect declaration of war, that it is entering war through the back door. Some even go so far as to say they would prefer to vote for a declaration of war to voting for repeal. I doubt if they have thought the matter through. They portray the horrors of war, they emphasize unpreparedness. It is unthinkable to me that those who oppose the pending resolution would vote for a declaration of war when they assert that there is no need of war and that we are not prepared for war. I do not recall a single Member who has stated that he would vote for a declaration of war if such a declaration were permissible as a substitute for the pending resolution. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

#### HATE OF ROOSEVELT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There are those who criticize the President of the United States. They hate Roosevelt. There are those who say that they love their own sons and the sons of their constituents too much to vote for repeal of neutrality. What about Franklin D. Roosevelt? His sons are in the service. One of his sons in Iceland is closer to Hitler today than probably the son of any Member of either the Senate or the House. Who is there who would say that the President would expose his own son to danger sooner than we would expose our sons or the sons of others?

I repeat that there are those who hate Roosevelt, but they should not permit their hatred to interfere with the security of their country. Wilson was hated; Lincoln was hated. There are those who criticize the President of the United States. What substitute do they offer for his foreign policy? They criticize the destroyer transaction; they admit the results of that transaction are desirable; they find fault with the method because it was Roosevelt's method.

Who is there that would not want American boys to shoot back when they are attacked without warning? Yet there are those who criticize the President of the United States for ordering our Navy to shoot to defend itself. The opponents agree with the aim, they agree with the ends, but they criticize the means adopted to promote the ends.

I oppose war; it is always destructive. I hail from the Southland. The generation of my father knew the horrors of war from actual experience. There has been a good deal of loose thinking and of loose speaking respecting the sending of our armed forces to foreign shores. For my part, if war must come to the United States, I would prefer that it be fought on other soils and in enemy countries. I live in Mississippi, in which Vicksburg is located. Successful warfare has always been waged in enemy territory. We can best defend America by keeping war out of the United States and by fighting our wars and battles in other lands.

#### HITLER BENT ON WORLD DOMINATION

The international situation has materially changed since the passage of the Neutrality Act of 1939. In the first World War Germany's submarines attacked in war zones. Hitler has spread his attacks to the seven seas. Not one ship but more than a dozen have been sunk without warning. Armed and unarmed ships have been torpedoed. Ships in the war zones and ships far away from the war zones have been sunk to the bottom of the sea. Americans on ships without contraband and outside of the war zones have been wantonly murdered. The right of the United States to sail any sea has been challenged.

I extend by saying the *Robin Moor* was unarmed; it was in an area where it had a right to be. It was not even in the area that Hitler had marked as a prohibited zone; it was ruthlessly sunk by Nazi terrorism. Some may say she was carrying contraband. The ship was near the equator in the mid-Atlantic. Even if she carried contraband the right to sink her did not exist under international law under the doctrine of the freedom of the seas unless there was no way by which the cargo could have been either captured or destroyed. There was nothing to prevent the submarine's officers from dumping the cargo into the sea. Unless we accept Hitler's challenge we might as well abandon the doctrine of the freedom of the seas.

The *Lehigh*, flying the flag of the United States, was sunk off the African coast on October 19, 1941. This was after the resolution to arm passed the House. This was before the Senate voted for repeal. The *Lehigh* was unarmed; it car-

ried no cargo; it was not in a prohibited zone; it was not in a war zone. The only cargo it carried was American citizens. Unarmed and empty, it was sent to the bottom of the sea. It was sailing in ballast down the African coast hundreds of miles away from any actual combat zone. The ship was sunk by a German submarine. The situation is changed since 1939. Hitler has challenged the freedom of all the seas.

Hitler asserted, following Munich, that his continental program was complete. Since Munich 14 nations have been destroyed; their citizens are murdered; one purge follows another; civilian hostages are executed. If there was ever any doubt about Hitler's plan for world conquest, that doubt was dispelled when he proclaimed the "new order" not only for Europe but for the world. In that order there were to be two races, and the German race was to be the master race. If Hitler is not bent on world domination, why is Japan in the Axis? All doubt was removed by the unprovoked invasion of Russia. The United States, with its wealth and with its resources, constitutes the richest prize in Hitler's world conquest.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY

Is the United States threatened? Is there danger of war? The brave face dangers. A mighty nation must not be shackled. We admit the danger, else why would we have supported a two-ocean navy; else why have we embarked upon the greatest program of national defense in our history; else why did we vote for aid to England; else why do we sympathize with Russia?

If it be in the interest of American security to aid England, we will be untrue to the taxpayers of the United States unless we make effective that aid. Are we manufacturing tanks and ships and war materials to be wasted and sunk to the bottom of the ocean? If we favor aid to England, we must make that aid effective.

#### GOVERNMENT BY LAW AND NOT BY MEN

The preamble to the constitution of Massachusetts contains a quotation from Samuel Adams. It lays down a great fundamental: "A constitution is ordained that government may be of law and not of man." We should defend our country by law. Under the Constitution the President is the Commander in Chief. The constitutional power is tied by legislative enactment. That legislation should be repealed.

Is there an American patriot who would say that the United States should not enjoy by law the privileges of the sea, as asserted by Hitler? Neutrality prevents such enjoyment. If Japan becomes involved, if there is war in the Far East, it may be essential to our very existence for our ships to enter belligerent ports; otherwise we would be cut off from vital materials essential to our military defense—tin, rubber, chromium, and some 30 other materials that are not produced in the United States, or only insufficiently, and in proper quality or quantity can only be obtained in the Dutch East Indies. The materials are vital not only to our trade and commerce in peace but to our defense in war.

## NONE WOULD ABANDON OUR PROGRAM OF DEFENSE

If Russia falls it is less than 23 miles to Alaska. Who is there who would abandon our program of defense? Who is there that does not acknowledge that we face the gravest period in our history? Germany may conquer Russia, Moscow may fall to Hitler. There are tears and blood and sacrifice ahead for the democracies. Napoleon was defeated at Moscow in 1812, but it was 3 years from Moscow to Waterloo in 1815. The road may be long, it may be difficult, it may be hard, it may require sacrifice. It does require unity. It is time for careful analysis and for patriotic service. There are some things worse than war. It was Patrick Henry of Virginia who said, "Is peace so dear or life so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" The repeal of neutrality is essential to the security of the United States.

## NEUTRALITY AND IMPARTIALITY

Neutrality under the law of nations and as propounded by Hugo Grotius, the great jurist of Holland in the sixteenth century, contemplated that nations not taking sides in war would undertake to seek the right cause and support it. In international law the neutrality theory does not involve the concept of impartiality. There is no thought that nations could be impartial.

The United States, while neutral and while proclaiming its neutrality when Hitler invaded Poland on September 3, 1939, has never been impartial. We have stood for freedom in our own and in other lands. We have opposed terrorism, we have opposed invasion, we have opposed the murder of innocent civilian hostages, as we have opposed purges, we have opposed aggression and oppression. We have stood for freedom on the land and on the sea. As the march of Hitlerism advanced to world conquest we have not only been partial but we have really abandoned our neutrality. We might as well be frank. Hitler must be destroyed. We are determined to aid those who are opposing Hitler. That aid in honesty and in good conscience must be made effective.

The United States has never been impartial when oppression was involved. We have opposed war, we have stood for peace. We have adopted our domestic policies. The Neutrality Act involved a domestic policy that some believed would aid peace. It is now evident that it is hindering peace. Hitler may not invade the United States, but if he conquers Europe he may conquer Asia. He may conquer Dakar. The chance of war is ever present. Hitler's invasion may not be physical; it may be economic, but we are determined to stop him where he is. The Neutrality Act is a delusion; it is aiding the aggressor. We should plant our feet on solid ground again. We should assert and preserve the rights that we have proclaimed for 150 years. It may be necessary to fight for our freedom; it may be necessary to engage in war to preserve our liberty, but the greatest nation in all the world will not shrink from doing its duty because danger is involved. We will unshackle the chains

that bind and face all dangers at home and abroad with courage.

## ENGLAND

It is charged that England is lying down. Have we forgotten that until Russia was invaded England was alone with her back to the wall? Have we forgotten Dunkirk? Have we forgotten Greece? Have we forgotten Crete? Have we forgotten the bombings of London and of Liverpool by day and by night? Have we forgotten the destruction of innocent civilian populations night after night, day after day, month after month? Have we forgotten that England is preparing and fighting not alone in the English Isles but on all the seas and in all the continents of the world? Those who criticize England and have supported the lease-lend bills are worse than inconsistent. We have aided England to aid ourselves, and we shall continue to aid England and other democracies to preserve our security.

## ARMISTICE AND PEACE

It is the paradox of the ages that peace can only come as a result of war. We celebrated the armistice on November 11. There is a difference between peace and the armistice. We now know that the armistice was not enough. This troubled world must have peace. The peoples of all lands and the sons of freedom in all the world are looking to the United States to aid in the restoration and preservation of peace. We cannot save ourselves without saving others. We cannot protect our homeland without aiding foreign lands.

If liberty is lost by conquest it may be regained. If liberty is abandoned by indifference it can never be regained. There are too many Americans who believe that democracy is for fair weather. There are too many Americans who believe that our way of life and our form of government are not threatened. Democracy and freedom are synonymous. Slavery and not freedom obtains under totalitarian rule.

Vice Premier Darlan, of France, recently announced that General Petain, the hero of Verdun, agreed to full collaboration with Germany, and that in making the agreement he had to choose between life and death, and that General Petain chose life. I do not believe him. I assert that it would have been better and it would have been more accurate for Admiral Darlan to have said that General Petain had to choose between slavery and resistance and that General Petain chose slavery.

What a contrast between Darlan's statement and the bold statement of England's Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, who recently said, "The English people would rather die on their feet than live on their knees."

We stand for peace, but we do not believe in peace at any price. There are those in France today who would rather be in London suffering the horrors of war among free men and women than in Paris enjoying so-called freedom among the slaves of Hitler. Paris is an open city; its buildings were spared; it was not bombarded. In the future, as in the past, Americans will go to Europe. In Paris they will visit the Louvre; they will marvel at the architectural beauty

and symmetry of the magnificent cathedrals; they will admire the splendid architecture. I believe, however, that those who visit London will receive a greater inspiration from the ruins of St. Paul's Cathedral and from the damaged walls of Westminster Abbey than they will receive from the unscarred monuments, public buildings, and cathedrals of Paris.

Freedom is not something to be handed down from generation to generation. Freedom has to be achieved. Freedom is not in retreat; it is on the march. Justice and righteousness will prevail.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this House has, in compliance with the message of the President, already voted to arm our merchant ships. When his message was read, however, it contained an additional request that we should remove another inhibition of the Neutrality Act which prevents our ships from entering the ports of those countries that are in a state of war. If we agree to the present resolution, we shall comply in all respects with the expressed wishes of the President. I am certain that he has not made this request hastily nor without due consultation with his advisers. In times like these, which bring before Congress considerations of military and foreign policy which are unfamiliar to our daily lives, it is necessary that we repose confidence somewhere and complement our own experience with the trained knowledge of those who have made a life study of these problems. I have high confidence in the patriotism and foresight of our President, and confidence in those who head our Departments of State, War, and naval affairs. It is in partial reliance upon their wisdom that I have arrived at my own decision.

There has been a highly organized effort throughout the country to stamper Congress and to defeat this legislation, but in spite of letters and telegrams—in some cases several wires from the same family—I am convinced that the people at large support our foreign policy. These obstructionists refer to this measure as a war measure. I do not agree with them.

A defeat of this bill will not protect our ships from Nazi piracy. They are being attacked off our own shores. In protection we are ferreting out their craft and destroying them in those waters which we deem necessary for our national defense. This resolution will increase the area which we must patrol, but our task remains the same. We cannot falter or weaken in the face of this aggression. It is our national will that we supply war matériel to our friends, and we must affirm our determination to see that it is delivered.

Opponents wish to frighten us with the bloody spectacle of a new A. E. F. and talk of war hysteria that will be created by the continued sinking of our ships. It is they who are hysterical. If we as a nation decide that we must fight Hitler abroad in order to keep him from



America, it will not be because of the passage of this bill. We have learned one lesson from Hitler—if we embark in a complete war we shall do it deliberately with victory in sight, just as we now deliberately refrain from war. We will not be stampeded by anyone.

If I did not think that the Nazis were our mortal enemies, I would not vote for the Senate amendment. I thought the same when I voted for the lend-lease bill. If I had changed my mind, I would vote to repeal it—for how foolish we would be to disrupt our economy and pile up a staggering debt for a war which is not our own.

I fear a Hitler victorious over Russia and England. I dread to think of this country reduced to impotence beyond its borders, surrounded by its enemies, its fleets skulking in its harbors afraid to venture forth, its prestige sunk to the level of China of the last generation. But my fear of Hitler is not a paralyzing one. That is the fear that he tries to implant with his mass murders and his debasement of humankind. My fear impels me to action lest we ourselves become another Poland or France.

Millions of Russians are locked in an embrace of death with the Nazi hordes. British cities have been leveled and thousands of their people killed. All we are asked to do as our share in the war against a common enemy is to produce materials of war and see that they are delivered. Let us not shirk our task, let us not be branded in history as a generation of cowards who might have saved civilization but dared not take the necessary steps to do so.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, this is not a war resolution, and I am, therefore, not going to make a war speech but, as Bill Arp would say, I would like to "ruminate" a little about war. Or, as others would say, I would like to make a few observations.

My first observation is that this country has never entered or become involved in a war until a majority of the people favored it and were willing to support it, and we might observe further that this is as it should be in a democracy. At present there seem to be well-crystallized sentiments in this country. One is we would be willing to go to war to prevent actual invasion, and the other is we are opposed to entering a war which would necessitate the sending of armed forces to a foreign country. The former sentiment is as old as our country; the latter is young.

In the first place, the people are still definitely and positively democratic in their ideals and are willing to make any sacrifice to sustain them. In the second place, the sentiment against what is referred to as a foreign war probably dates back to 2 years ago when Hitler began his campaign for world domination and the establishment therein of a new order of life. Of course, he began his operations in Europe, and he let it be known that his program was first to cover Europe and then incorporate the other countries having democratic systems of

government. He is reported to have said that in carrying out his program of aggression force would not be necessary in many countries, for he would be able to effect his program by teaching and propaganda. He prophesied the United States would be one of the easiest to conquer.

I do not know what his plans were for propaganda in this country, but he certainly knew there was already a pronounced feeling on the part of many in the United States against England and France because of their failure to repay loans obtained from us during the World War and their failure to show what we considered proper appreciation or gratitude for the services rendered by our armed forces in that war. A sentiment against any further assistance to these countries in the way of supplying them with armed forces soon crystallized, although there was a feeling that the United States should furnish Britain, France, and other countries with democratic systems of government with all the material and military equipment we could spare short of troops. The idea was subscribed to by many of us. Even the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy subscribed to it. I do not know whether Hitler and his associates promoted the idea or not but in view of what has taken place since then it must have been great comfort to him to know he would not be met by American expeditionary forces in Europe.

Of course, we are all still indulging in the hope that he may be stopped and that we may not become involved, but suppose Hitler succeeds in Europe and we should have to become involved, the question then will be whether some of us will not have to change our minds about meeting the aggressor outside our own territory. It will then be our war and not Britain's.

It has just occurred to me that most of the wars in which we have heretofore become involved were foreign wars and we fought outside of our own country. We have had but one great war in this country, and we are all hoping we are never to have another. We have had three other great wars, the War of 1812, the Spanish-American War, and the World War, all of which were foreign wars and were fought in foreign territory except in the War of 1812 when England was able to land an army and wage a war on our own Continent.

The circumstances at the time and following the World War are still fresh in the minds of many of us, but it may be interesting to make an observation or two relative to the Spanish-American War. I do not know whether it has ever been definitely known why we got into that war. We know a war was going on at the time in Cuba with Spain and it is also known that the United States did not like the way Spain was treating the Cubans, for President Cleveland interceded with Spain in behalf of these people but no further action was taken.

When Mr. McKinley became President he did the same thing but no action was taken until after the battleship *Maine* was anchored in Cuban waters one night

and was blown up and 266 Americans lost their lives. President McKinley then sent a message to Congress which included the following: "In the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, and in the interest of endangered American interests—the war in Cuba must stop." Acting upon this message Congress declared war against Spain April 25, 1898. We did not have any particular interest in Cuba and we did not have any quarrel with Spain except we felt she was imposing on the Cubans. Spain, apparently, did not have anything against the United States; she had made no threats about invading our territory nor had she openly attacked any of our merchant vessels on the high seas. Spain had made no threats about the destruction of our system of government. She had made no threats about destroying the institutions established under our Government, and she had not threatened our rights on the high seas, nor was there any evidence that she was planning to take over this country and set up a new government, a new type of religion, a new marriage system, and establish a new order of life or a new philosophy of living. Spain did not say anything like that yet this country declared war on Spain. It was a foreign war to be waged in a foreign country, but the people generally were in favor of it and the men who went into the war were volunteers and from all accounts they wanted to fight in foreign territory. They preferred to brave the dangers of war on foreign soil rather than subject their homes and families to the dangers of war at home. They not only wanted to go a distance of 3,000 miles to Europe and fight but they volunteered to go 10,000 miles or half way around the world to fight in the Philippine Islands where they met the enemy and won the war against Spain.

Someone has said, "Change has not only fixed its seal upon the habits, customs, and manners of people but upon the human mind itself." The present situation well illustrates the thought expressed, because we are all saying, from the President of the United States down to the average civilian, that we are willing and ready to make any sacrifice to protect our own country, but we are not willing to meet the enemy in foreign waters or on foreign soil.

But, as I said at the outset, this is not a war resolution. It simply means that we are not making any war zones nor are we planning to have one made for us. It provides, in effect, that we will continue to exercise rights common to all nations to the use of the high seas upon established principles of international law. It has been said here today that there is no international law any longer. It is true Hitler, along with aggressor nations, have violated practically every principle of the law, but that does not prevent us from adhering to it and exercising our rights under it. The Ten Commandments are violated by someone in the brotherhood of man every day, but that does not relieve me or you of our responsibility of trying to adhere to them. The last observation I have to make now is that nations, like men, get into trouble more often by violating a

law than by obeying it, and my thought in this connection is that if this country follows the spirit and the letter of the long-established principles of law between nations, we are more likely to stay out of trouble than by adopting a policy of trying to justify our violations of the law simply because someone else violates it. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

#### NEUTRALITY ACT REVISION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I was opposed to the neutrality bill when it was first presented because I realized that tying our own hands and telling the world we were afraid of them was the sure way to get into war. I opposed the first change in the Neutrality Act in 1939 because I felt that it was an act of war contrary to our proclamation of neutrality. I opposed the Lease-Lend Act as it passed the House because I felt that it was another act of war.

But, having committed the country, and the shooting having begun, and we having participated in the war, I can see nothing to do except to support the carrying on of that war. There are two ways to get out of war once you get in, and that is the thing that most of the members of the House do not seem to realize. One, is to surrender and pay tribute and submit to alien domination. The other is to go out and win. I have not the slightest doubt that when the people understand the situation we are in and that there is no way out except one of the two alternatives, they will choose to go out and win.

I have no sympathy with the President and his misrepresentation of this situation to the American people. I have no sympathy with the President and the manner in which he has for 2 years since the war began, and since we took the first step in the war, encouraged the sabotage of our defense program by catering to labor racketeers. I have no sympathy with the efforts that those who surround him have made to get rid of our form of government and to destroy the private employment of our people and regiment labor.

Unless the President quickly gets to the point where he is prepared to support the defense program that he has established and to support the war effort and to end racketeering and the effort to change our form of government, the effectiveness of our defense effort will not be more than 50 percent of what it could be.

But, for my own part, as long as we are in the war I can only vote for such measures as are designed to end it by victory.

For these reasons, I shall vote yea on the motion to agree to the Senate amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it needs no words of mine to indicate the seriousness of the occasion.

I have not approached this question with a clear decision made up from the beginning. I have been inclined one way at times and another way at other times. I confess I approached the whole question with an attitude of doubt and an attitude of misgiving. I know many Members of the House who have had and who now have that attitude of doubt. I say there is more faith and love of country in honest doubt and in seeking for the truth than there is in blind partisanship or in taking a position quickly because of some selfish reason, than trying to maintain and bolster it up with arguments.

Many men in this House, appreciating the seriousness of this situation, not overly religious men, have felt that this was such a serious moment that they prayed with all the earnestness at their command that God might give them the light to see their duty, and having given them the light to see their duty, give them the strength to do it. All of us I believe are interested in one thing above all others and that is the happiness and welfare of the American people now and in the future.

Our course in foreign affairs has been pretty well indicated. We passed the repeal of the arms embargo and we passed it because we felt that our first attitude of withdrawing into our shell and saying this is a back-room brawl over there, something that does not concern us, was in error. We passed that repeal and the record shows we passed it in order to help those who were resisting aggression. Having voted for that bill, having voted for the lease-lend bill, having voted for the rest of this foreign policy upon the premise of self-defense for America, America meeting its destiny manfully and courageously. I believe those votes were right.

I think the passage of the arms embargo, for instance, has given us time to arm and defend ourselves. In my opinion, if we had not passed the repeal of the arms embargo, England would have been down today. There would have been no one to resist aggression if we had not given aid. No one but this country alone and unaided in a totalitarian world.

I say to you that the attitude that I have adopted with reference to what is best for the welfare and happiness of the American people is that we want to maintain and improve our democracy at home. We also wish to indicate to the world that we, the American people, want to do something to preserve peace and the manner in which we want to do that is as follows: When an aggressor nation arises, we want to indicate our desire to maintain peace in the world by cutting off communications with that aggressor and by sending to the victim aid and succor in the form of materials. That I believe is what we should do today and that, I believe, is the destiny of America in the years to come.

Why have I resolved my doubts in favor of supporting repeal of this neutrality law? What is the necessity for it? The necessity for it is this: We have

come to a time when the giving of aid to those nations resisting aggression must be made effective. All over the world are men and women shackled and living in bondage and in slavery. Their voices are mute, but their hearts still beat for the love of liberty and freedom. We have raised the star of hope before them. We can keep it glowing brightly today or we can dim it, and forever crush their hopes.

We cannot shackle ourselves with this Neutrality Act. As the act now reads, the President establishes combat and danger zones. Where? Where the most danger exists. Under the present law he would have to change the combat zones every 2 days. For example, most of the sinkings have taken place off the coast of Africa. This means that he should declare a combat zone off the coast of Africa, even though it is not near the belligerent nations. Tomorrow another danger zone is created by Hitler. Aside from the propriety of Hitler establishing where we can go and when we cannot, there would be so much confusion that we could not effectively ship goods not knowing where danger or combat zones were from day to day.

At the present time I believe the American people are in favor of conveying goods. It was the implications of this thing rather than the thing itself that gave me doubts. Would it be used as a springboard to war? Having once voted here, would we have left the springboard? If so, all that will be heard hereafter will be the resultant splash into war. However, I do not believe that is so. I have faith and confidence now that it is not so. Why, even if this Congress were to command the President tomorrow to send troops into Europe, he could not do so. Why? Because we have passed a law which forbids the sending of draftees or selectees outside the Western Hemisphere.

I believe the desire and the wish on the part of the President is the same as the desire and the wish on the part of the American people, to give material aid, to see that the goods get there, but not to send an expeditionary force, not to send an A. E. F., not to have again a "the Yanks are coming" policy.

The present aid we are giving is ineffective. Perhaps I should not say it is ineffective, but it is inefficient. At the present time we convoy as far as Iceland. Then the British take over from Iceland. We convoy 2,600 miles, from Boston or New York to Iceland. There is a scant 600 miles beyond that to the British Isles.

Ships cannot meet there at sea on any time-table basis. You cannot use radio facilities, due to the fact that there are lurking submarines in the vicinity. They cannot meet like two men keeping an appointment. There are resultant delays, amounting to days at times, between the British convoys and the American convoys. The merchant vessels and our destroyers waiting there are a prey to German submarines. But what lies beyond? You could convoy to the British Isles. One operation would, of course, be vastly more effective, and the elimination of the delay now caused in Iceland



would mean that the danger of sinkings and of increased loss of life would not be materially greater.

I believe we have made up our minds to give the victims of the aggressor nations material aid and support. I believe the Russians are putting up a good fight. Further, I have no truck with the argument that the British are not doing a good job. After all, they want to win the war. We may find fault with this maneuver or that maneuver, or the lack of one, but the British want to win the war. Theirs is the decision that must be made, and made not as coolly and calmly as we can make it ourselves. They are fighting in self-defense, their homes are being bombed, their children are being killed, and they want to win the war. Carping criticism as to what method they adopt or do not adopt is still only carping criticism, 3,000 miles away.

I believe we can stop aggression by helping Great Britain, by helping Russia, and by helping China. We ought to do this to prevent a Hitler-dominated world for you and me and for our children and our children's children. I want to avert that, Mr. Speaker.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] as much time as she may desire.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I am the mother of five sons and the widow of an aviator who served in the last World War. I am also the daughter of a general who served in the same war, and my father-in-law was a graduate of West Point—a classmate of General Pershing. My brother is now a lieutenant in the United States Army. From my background you can understand my deep interest in the military affairs of this country.

My oldest son is near military age and, being aware of the importance of the repeal of the Neutrality Act, I talked with him and asked what he would have me do. He immediately replied, "Mother, there is only one thing to do and that is to vote for the repeal of the act, and I will be very proud of you."

I feel it is my duty to my sons, to my late husband, and to those I represent to vote for this measure so that our country will remain the democracy it is today and not be dominated by Hitler. I have asked divine guidance in casting my vote today and my conscience would not let me do other than I am doing.

As a mother, as a Representative in Congress, and as the widow of a World War veteran, who would not have me do otherwise, I beg of you to vote to concur in the Senate amendment.

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

DOES THIS MEAN WAR?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, if it is to be the policy of this country to meddle in wars born out of the hates and quarrels of Europe and other foreign countries, then it is very probable that we are now writing the final chapter in the history of the United States. This warning is as old as the Government itself. It was given by the Father of our country,

Washington, who saw with the vision of the mystic and warned his fellow countrymen to avoid foreign entanglements.

His warning was disobeyed less than a quarter of a century ago and the burden that we placed upon ourselves, for that mistake will remain for generations yet to come.

In a calm and cool hour when the judgments of men were not swayed by the hysteria of war, this great legislative body, the Congress of the United States, placed upon the statute books of this land, as the result of their considered judgment a law, the Neutrality Act, which gave notice to the world that if other countries went to war, the position of the United States toward them would be known in advance.

We said to the belligerents of the future, if you go to war, here we stand and intend to remain neutral. We made a solemn declaration that we would have no part in the quarrels of other lands; that we would not permit our nationals, our ships, or our money to go to countries locked in the death grapple of war.

Like many other Members of this body today, that policy had my whole-hearted support. I admit it was a departure perhaps of the tenets of international law but it was a solemn and a firm declaration by a great Nation, the United States of America, that in case of war our position had been made certain and our conduct known in advance to any and all nations of the world who might become so engaged in strife.

Step by step that great document or law has been emasculated, modified, amended, and stripped of its noble purpose and objective until we again stand on the very brink of another foreign war, destined undoubtedly to drag us further down in the scale of nations and plunge our people further into debt and economic collapse. Now we are asked to take another fatal step and all of these have come within 2 or 3 tragic years; a step to send our ships, our men, and material into the battlefields of the sea, there to become the target of the belligerent nations in Europe. We are to take a step which will invite tragedy, invite the death and destruction of precious American youth. Blood is to be spilled and death is to become the portion of the young manhood of America in order, as we are told, that the democracies of the Old World may not die.

I despise Hitler, his methods, his cruelty, his ruthlessness, and his world ambition to establish a new order in the countries of the Old World. But like every other Member of this House, I owe a solemn duty to the people of this Nation and those of my district for whom I speak, and who had my pledge in the last campaign that I would exert every effort at my command to avoid our entry into another foreign conflict. I propose to keep that pledge and promise to my people.

The American people according to every popular test thus far made have shown by overwhelming majority that they are opposed to involvement in this war. We are not a united people. We are a divided nation.

Let us beware in this land that while we are striving to save democracy in the Old World that we do not lose it here at home. When the highest officials of this Government and the leaders of great political parties say one thing and make promises to the American people before election, and then do the very opposite after election, such conduct strikes at the very heart of our republican form of government. It causes the people to lose faith and confidence in the chosen leaders of their Government and in the stability of the framework of government constructed under the Constitution of the United States to govern and protect them and their way of life under it. To say before election that the fathers and mothers of this land need have no fear; that their sons would not be sent to engage in another foreign conflict, and then after election tell the people that this is a war to the finish and our armed forces are to shoot or sight is a condition to destroy the trust of a great people in those who lead the Nation under present circumstances.

The urge for speed and haste in the production of the implements of war has too often, up to this very day, been entirely ignored and disregarded on the part of certain groups within this country who have thus far demonstrated that they have very little sympathy or interest in the welfare of the United States. The present administration, charged with the responsibility of leading and defending the Nation, up to this hour has either been unwilling or grossly negligent in taking any action to rectify the deplorable condition existing in our own land. It has destroyed that unanimity of purpose for which the American people have always been noted when the welfare of the Nation was at stake, by selecting and appointing to positions of high place men and women whose records and utterances display opinions counter to the fundamental principles upon which this Government was founded. Before we attempt to establish or preserve democracy in Europe let us begin at home and put our own house in order and demonstrate to the other nations of the earth that here in America a republican form of government, founded on freedom and justice, shall be administered, conducted, and preserved through the enforcement of laws guaranteeing such principles to every citizen who lives beneath our banner.

To provide for our common defense and the means to make this country impraguable is a program which every Member of this body has been willing, is now willing, and always will be willing to discharge without hesitation.

This will be the last vote before we enter the second World War. Its very nature and purpose is war itself. I challenge any Member of this House to show that what we are doing here today is to preserve the peace of the United States. It means war, and every Member knows it.

I am opposed to House Joint Resolution 237, to repeal sections 2, 3, and 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and shall vote against it in the interest of peace and to prevent my country from going to war.

Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!  
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!  
Humanity with all its fears,  
With all the hopes of future years,  
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, up to the present time I have generally supported the administration's aid-to-the-democracies policy, and all efforts to build an impregnable defense for this country and for the Americas.

I voted for the lend-lease bill, and my support was given to all of the appropriations for the implementation of its purposes.

The original conscription bill had my support, and also the measure for its extension. I have gone down the line for all general national-defense measures.

These measures were also all in the self-interest of America. They received my support not simply because they came to us under this administration, but because I was satisfied and had firm personal convictions on two points: First, that our people were all-out in their demand for the strongest national-defense program we can build; and second, that a great majority of our citizens wanted the democracies to win this war and were willing to give every aid short of war to bring about that result.

But how or where under the joint resolution before us is America served?

If we accomplish the objective of the pending resolution, we accomplish war. Informal or undeclared, to be sanctioned or not, characterize it as you may, it will still be war.

That is the brutal fact. No amount of twisting and turning and deception can obscure it.

There are some who would coddle us with the idea that this is a measure to keep war away from America; that by repealing the Neutrality Act, we would simply be going back to time-honored and proven international law; that we would simply be reasserting the doctrine of the freedom of the seas.

Perhaps the next thing, as the greatest absurdity, is that we are going into war in order to stay out of war!

Who in his sane senses has such a grotesque concept of international law that would assert for the neutral a right to perform unneutral acts; that would assert the right of a neutral to claim freedom from every peril when that neutral moves munitions to the very receiving platforms of the belligerent's docks, through combat areas? It is simply too ridiculous to dwell on.

We know, and all of our people know, that the immediate and direct cause of our participation in the World War was the destruction of American lives on our armed merchant ships.

And let us not forget. Three weeks from the time that we first began arming our ships, President Wilson requested Congress for a declaration, recognizing the existence of a state of war.

Well, if we pass this resolution, let us remember that we are helping to set the stage for history to repeat itself.

In supporting the administration's measures on defense and aid to the de-

mocracies, I did so but from one thought, one conviction, that our best interests would be served.

But in the resolution before us we come to a new phase in the administration's program. Frankly, I dislike subterfuge, but it is abhorrent to me when it is used to gain the passage of a measure which if every sign does not lie will involve us in a shooting war, at least so far as our Navy is concerned.

Why only a few weeks ago we acted upon this ship-arming bill. There are many people who feel that such a course of action is directly in our best interests. I do not believe this. I have searched everywhere with the greatest care I could bring to the effort to find determining evidence that such a policy is sound or expedient. The preponderance of the evidence impelled me to be against the proposal. But I shall not argue that now.

I say we acted on the ship-arming bill then, not the present proposal to scuttle the Neutrality Act. Neither in the Foreign Affairs Committee nor in this House did we argue the merits of anything but the ship-arming proposal.

There were many of us in the House who had complete faith that the action of Congress would be limited to the ship-arming proposal. But now we know the naked subterfuge that was practiced. And those of us here who were imposed upon have every right, for themselves and for their people, to feel strong resentment.

The ship-arming bill, laid alongside the momentous issues raised in the pending resolution, is admittedly subordinate.

Stripped of all its legalistic phrases, the measure before us would give the sanction of Congress to active naval warfare, existing or intended. Furthermore, it would give the green light to the President—and he would have sole control of the light switch—to take us into an all-out war. The Congress would be in an abject and sorry situation. The people would lose their only forum for the control and expression of the national will.

For years and years the prohibition against American vessels entering the combat zones, and, of course, belligerent ports, has been characterized by the President as the keystone of the Neutrality Act, his first objective in any amendments which would curb those influences, those causes, most likely to involve us in outright, total war.

Out of political season, as well as in, the President urged the wisdom of keeping this keystone in the neutrality law, and the people throughout the land agreed. Secretary of State Hull had this to say of this first objective of the President:

In the recommendations formulated by the Executive as a substitute for the present legislation (arms embargo) it was especially urged that provisions be adopted which would exclude American nationals and American ships from zones where real danger to their safety might exist.

It is not worth bothering today, in this crisis, as to whether the Congress should get any of the credit for the prohibition against American ships en-

tering the combat zones. Let us give it to the President.

But it is a bitter commentary on his agility to make "switches," as his purposes are to be served, when we are faced with the President's statement in Collier's magazine, the issue of October 4, 1941. Mind you, not October 1940, but October 1941. And this was exactly 5 days before Congress received his ship-arming proposal. This is what he said in that article:

This time, after protracted debate (referring to the congressional debate on repeal of the arms embargo and substitution of the present Neutrality Act provisions), 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 it had done in the last World War.

Even then he was thinking of his first objective, the prohibition against American ships entering the combat areas.

The plea is made by some that we should pass this resolution in the interest of our reassertion of the time-honored doctrine of the freedom of the seas. Let us get down to the facts and see just how the repeal of the Neutrality Act applies.

Essentially, as every schoolboy knows, this principle is invoked by and for the benefit of neutrals. Neutrals, and not belligerents. It has been an American watchword for a long time, and a good one. Perhaps in the years to come the prestige of America will so make itself felt that we can attain freedom of the seas in the way that President Wilson championed.

But the doctrine today is the doctrine it has always been—that the seas are common highways free to all nations to send their ships for engagement in commerce and trade provided—and here comes the rub—they do not interfere with belligerent operations. The practices under this principle are complex, as we all know, but the principle itself is centuries old.

But under this doctrine, as under all international law, when we would assert rights we have to accept duties. This reciprocal arrangement cannot be disregarded. Freedom here, too, is under law, and not license. The doctrine of freedom of the seas is, of course, part of international law itself. It is elementary, therefore, if you cannot do under international law as you please you cannot do it under the principle of the freedom of the seas.

In truth—and we might as well be candid about it—belligerent powers having access to the seas will seek to narrow or expand this freedom in ratio to their control or need.

"War would not be war if there was freedom of the seas" declared old Clemenceau, of France. And in backing up the Old Tiger, Lloyd George put the case bluntly—deadly so. He said—and I take this from his own words:

We could not accept an interpretation of the freedom of the seas (the Woodrow Wilson proposal), which would deprive Britain, who had no great army, of the only effective



weapon in her armory when challenged to the arbitrament of war.

I certainly do not fear that we need worry over the rantings of Hitler or that we shall have at any time to bow to his decrees respecting our rights under the doctrine. We know our rights. And I expect we shall maintain them. But if we exceed our rights, we must accept the risks, and if we sail ships loaded with munitions from American ports into allied ports let us in common honesty not cry out that our lawful commerce is being pirated.

We are now told by the President that the Neutrality Act is bankrupt, that it is defunct; indeed, that it is a menace. If we want to get into this war lock, stock, and barrel, he will find plenty of agreement. When did the Neutrality Act become bankrupt? When? Let him answer specifically. There have been many, many tragic days and periods during every one of which the President himself hailed the Neutrality Act, and especially the keystone of it—the prohibition against American ships entering the combat zones; and when he was the crusader for its might and its strength to keep us out of war. We all remember, because it is hard to dim the memories of Holland, Belgium, Denmark, France.

What would the President give us, what can he give us in the place of the safeguards accruing to every man, woman, and child throughout the land under the Neutrality Act? I am afraid that the only thing he can substitute is war.

For us to make war today, Mr. Speaker, would strike the most vicious blow against our interests I can conceive.

We all know the policies that have the unified backing of America, but the people do not want those policies to be made the instrument for degeneration into war.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the question before us has been thoroughly discussed in the course of the debate in the Senate. It has been further discussed in the debate in the House. I have studied the hearings and debate in both bodies closely and have given the matter my deepest consideration.

I shall not contribute further to the debate than to state my position in the matter as briefly as possible.

I am in favor of the bill as passed by the House in accordance with the request of the President amending the so-called Neutrality Act so as to permit our merchant vessels engaged in legitimate trade outside of combat zones, as defined by the President, to arm for their self-defense. I supported the bill in this form in the House.

I cannot conscientiously support the Senate amendments to the bill further amending the act so as to authorize the sending of our merchant ships with American crews under the American flag, with arms and ammunition to belligerent nations, into combat zones and belligerent ports.

I am opposed to the Senate proposal because, in my judgment, it is both unnecessary and unwise.

It is unnecessary because any available shipping which we can spare can be transferred to Great Britain immediately under the lend-lease law without further legislation.

It is unwise because it means, in all human probability, increased sinkings under the American flag, increased headlines, decreased freedom of action in dealing with the two-ocean problem which now confronts us and the probability, if not the certainty, of a situation compelling us to plunge woefully unprepared into an all-out war with Germany, Italy, and Japan.

I am in favor of all steps conducive to an impregnable national defense at the earliest possible moment. I am in favor of the maximum production of material aid for Great Britain which can be spared in the judgment of our military and naval experts. I am opposed to any step tending to plunge us all out, unprepared as we are, into the most terrible war in history, unless that step becomes a clear and imperative necessity.

The day may come when we are compelled to join in an all-out battle. It has not yet come and, in my judgment, it is foolhardy to precipitate it.

We are lamentably unprepared at the moment. We are lacking, among other things, in fighting planes, tanks, anti-aircraft guns, ammunition, shipping, and trained manpower. The country would be shocked if the facts were fully known.

A declaration of war would deprive England of much that we are now able to give her. It would compel Japan, under her treaty with Germany and Italy, to enter the war against us. It would assure for this Nation a terrific sacrifice, accentuated by our lack of preparedness.

If it becomes necessary to consider our entry into all-out battle, the decision should be made squarely and realistically in the light of expert military and naval testimony. It should not be made on a collateral measure savoring of deception and camouflage.

I appreciate fully the importance of national unity. Once a decision as to policy has been made, it is incumbent on us all to cooperate wholeheartedly in that decision. In the formulation of the policy, however, as a Member of Congress, I must be guided by what, in my judgment, appears best for the security and welfare of America.

I speak neither as an isolationist nor as an interventionist. I propose to pass on each question on its merits. I realize fully that many disagree with my conclusion in this instance. To them I can only say that my decision is based on the most careful and prayerful study that I am capable of.

The Senate proposal, in my judgment, goes too far too fast.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I am not interested today in preserving either bolshevism or nazi-ism in Europe. We have entirely too much of both in the United States today. I am only interested today in Americanism, and I am satisfied that it cannot be preserved by going to Europe to do so,

I am against the pending resolution because it means war. It means an endorsement of a shooting war which the President of the United States has already declared, and for that reason I am against it.

If America is to survive, we must take care of our own form of government. It is the opposite of all forms of government in Europe. We have only to analyze the situation we find ourselves in today to be convinced of the fact that if we enter this war it may leave us, as it will leave all of Europe, with a large part of Europe devastated and most of the youth as well as other citizens killed, starved, or dead of disease. The last World War left most of the nations in Europe bankrupt, and all that the war finally brought to Europe was nazi-ism and communism, neither of which believes in our form of government. It brought bankruptcy to most of the nations of Europe, and with our present financial condition in this country, if we participate in this war, it will mean bankruptcy for us and eventually communism or nazi-ism, or perhaps both, in this country.

Our country has grown to its present position among the nations of the earth by attending strictly to our own business. At least once or twice a year I always visit the grave of George Washington at Mount Vernon, and as I do I think of some of the things that he said to our forefathers in his Farewell Address. Certainly no one was better prepared to give advice than General Washington after we had won our independence in America. It is too bad that more people in America have not been privileged to visit his grave and reflect on the words of wisdom given to the American people before his death. I quote excerpts from his Farewell Address:

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all.

• • • Nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave.

So likewise a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification.

Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships

or enmities. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

Our financial structure today is such that we could not possibly survive a long war. Just before the first World War was declared in 1914 it cost approximately \$740,000,000 to run our Government for 1 year. Our national debt was \$1,225,000,000. Today the interest on our obligations is twice as much as it took to run the Government for the fiscal year ending in 1914. The interest on our obligations today is more than the national debt in 1914. Since the beginning of this fiscal year—July 1—up to and including November 8, 1941, a period of 131 days, we have spent \$7,637,419,075.55, and this does not include a debt retirement of \$52,356,050. This was on an average of \$58,500,908.56 for each day of 24 hours. It meant that we spent \$7,417.29 for each minute of the day. The deficit for this period of time was \$5,018,301,764.78, or an average deficit of \$38,307,647.05 for each day of 24 hours. We ran in the red each minute at the rate of \$4,848.30. On November 8 the Treasury report shows that we paid out in interest on our public debt on that date \$518,944.79. In other words, thirteen and a half days of our spending since July 1 would have run this Government for a whole year in 1914. Our public debt on November 8 was \$54,273,540,593.18.

Every Member of this House, and the public generally, are familiar with the billions that we have appropriated since this session of Congress met on January 3. Every Member of this House knows that this spending cannot possibly continue without, sooner or later, causing inflation, repudiation of our debts, or bankruptcy. Any one of these would cause the American people to lose their freedom, as it has in Europe. What we want to do in America is to preserve the freedom that we already enjoy instead of trying to fight someone else's battle that they may enjoy the same form of government that we enjoy when they know nothing about it and care less.

If this resolution is defeated, the President will not be in such a hurry again to give orders to shoot people on sight if they do not agree with us. If we are to have war, it should be one declared by the Congress of the United States, and the membership knows, the President knows, and the people of the United States know that the Congress is in no mood to declare war against anyone at the present time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to the committee that traveled to South America a short time ago. In connection with that, I very briefly call the attention of the Members of the House to some advertisements appearing in the Buenos Aires Herald under date of September 23, 1941. Here is one advertising, "Peacock Knitting

Wools, just unpacked," imported from England.

This is another small ad, headed "Buy British. Smith's English Clocks."

These are all from the same paper. This is another one: "Electric Arc Welding Equipments, in stock for immediate delivery; British Manufacture."

Another one, at the top, reads "British Made," and then follows, "Semi-Porcelain Salad Bowl," and so forth.

Another one reads, "Longstaff Raincoat; English Material."

Here is a larger ad with the picture of a battleship in the foreground and a merchant fleet in the background. The ad reads:

British ships steam in convoy guarded by the guns of the Royal Navy.

They are British.

Shipments of Britain's finest woollens—the best of them—still continue to come to us in spite of war, dive bombers, and submarines.

At the port of Valparaiso, Chile, I found that the imports from Great Britain, valued in gold pesos, were as follows for the months of January to June, inclusive: 1939 value, 20,778,399; 1940 value, 24,209,685; 1941 value, 34,577,891.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the question before us is a grave one. We will soon vote on the repeal of sections 2, 3, and 6 of the Neutrality Act. This means that our merchant ships will be armed, and they will sail to the ports of belligerent nations and through combat zones. This is the virtual repeal of the Neutrality Act.

The self-imposed restrictions of the neutrality law have been a denial to our merchant marine of the freedom of the seas, a doctrine that the American people have long insisted was their right. The restrictions of this law were such that it was impossible to enforce effectively the Lend-Lease Act, for the policy underlying lend-lease committed the Nation to furnish all possible aid to those nations resisting Nazi aggression. When the Lend-Lease Act was passed America ceased to be neutral, and it was evident to all discerning people that its passage would ultimately bring about the repeal of the Neutrality Act. We decided when we adopted the lend-lease policy that we would use the productive capacity of our Nation to prevent the rest of the Old World from being destroyed. We determined that we would give help to those nations who were compelled to meet the Nazi onslaughts. With this course our national policy, it must be pursued with all of the vigor and determination we possess.

It will not weaken our own defenses to pursue it for the capacity to produce quickly the very latest planes, tanks, guns, ships, and other implements and munitions of war is more important than the mere possession of numbers of outmoded ones. We know too well from the experiences of other nations that the reliance on outmoded weapons is a suicidal military policy. Through the lend-lease, we will in large measure expand our production of all kinds of war weapons. The modification of the Neutrality

Act will mean that the goods produced will be delivered to the peoples we seek to help and will be used by them. That is the primary purpose of the policy behind the modification of the Neutrality Act, for with our ships armed they will in larger measure be able to deliver the goods to the nations we seek to aid.

I do not believe it can be rightly contended that the lend-lease policy means a full participation by the United States in this war. I take it that the amendment to the Neutrality Act means that we are determined to deliver arms, food, and supplies to the nations that are our friends. I take it that aid to the democracies means effective aid, and effective aid cannot be given unless the needed munitions are placed in the hands of those that need them. Many of us do not want to see an American expeditionary force sent to Europe. We believe that the people that are now fighting Germany will be victorious if they are given the needed weapons. It seems to me that it is part of foresight to provide our friends with these weapons and that in so doing our own chances of entering this war will be lessened, and that is the reason that I supported the lend-lease bill and all of the appropriations that have been passed to carry it into effect; and that is the reason I am supporting the Senate amendments to the Neutrality Act.

The situation facing the people of the United States is plain. Hitler is going to be either stopped or his successes will continue. The most important advantage of the Nazi forces has been their possession of superior mechanical equipment. The hope of stopping him lies mainly by exceeding him in the production of modern and effective mechanical equipment and war weapons. There is only one nation in the world that can hope to do this, and that nation is the United States, so the main job we have is to increase our production of modern implements of war just as fast as we can. This is a much saner policy for us to pursue than to send our sons to European soil implemented with weapons that are obsolete or outmoded. Our primary role is the production of weapons superior to those of the dictator nations and in such quantities that England, Russia, China, and our other friends among the nations will have the advantage over the mechanized legions of the Nazis.

The real question before the people of this country today is all-out production of modern weapons and the delivery of them to the nations who are fighting our battles. Both production and delivery are of the utmost importance. With hundreds of thousands of our sons leaving their homes, their schools, their civilian professions, and their various vocations to enter the armed forces of the country, with a large part of our population making great personal sacrifices, with the large part of the world afire with war, and with our past military preparations along lines that are now outdated, it becomes our duty to bring into being weapons that are mobile and modern, weapons superior to those of any possible enemy, and at the earliest possible time. This is a colossal task, and to accomplish it we must use our leading inventors,



scientists, and industrialists to create the new types of war machines and weapons that are essential and all of our patriotic workers to fabricate them in overwhelming quantities.

Numerous strikes such as are seen now all over the country are hindering the production of planes, ships, tanks, guns, munitions, and all of the other articles that are imperative for our protection and for the salvation of friendly nations. The days these men are on strike represent only a partial loss of their productive capacity; the days preceding strikes, days when the workers are preparing to strike count perhaps more in the failure to produce than the days the workers are idle.

Patriotic Americans are determined that the productive capacity of this country shall be used to the utmost in this emergency and this cannot be if strikes continue. Legislation must be enacted at the earliest possible moment that will prevent these ill-advised strikes. The best interests of labor demand such action. The welfare of the country makes it imperative that Congress enact legislation that will guarantee all-out production.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, California, Oregon, and Washington face the Pacific and look out across that ocean to Japan. There is not one Representative in this body from those three States who is not familiar with the local Japanese problem that these States have had, and they are familiar with Japanese politics locally and as they involve world conditions. Every one of these Representatives, as I am myself, should support these Senate amendments.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, with me this is a very serious moment because of the responsibility that rests upon my shoulders as a Representative in this great body.

I have weighed the debate as I have heard it indulged in here, I have studied the question that is involved, and I have reached the conclusion that it is my duty as a Representative of my district and of my people to take a firm stand in this matter, as I have endeavored to do in all matters, and to cast my vote for these amendments as they have been brought to us from the Senate. I know what we are facing. I know there are those—and they are in earnest—who would like to see us shirk the great responsibility that rests upon our shoulders at this time, that we might, if possible, turn our faces from the grave danger that stares our country in the face at this moment. I say to them that I have a son who must march in this conflict if marching must be done by our citizens, and I very much prefer sending our allies war materials with which to fight than to be compelled to send our sons overseas. If, in order to deliver this war material to our friends who are fighting our battles, it becomes necessary to use our own ships, I am ready to see those ships engage in that

necessary line of defense. I believe we all prefer keeping this war as far from our shores as possible. I think you will agree with me that war materials furnished involve a far less sacrifice than furnishing an expeditionary force composed of our sons. Let us pass this bill and, as far as possible, keep this war from our shores and keep our sons at home.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] 2 minutes.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was promised 15 minutes for today, but I gladly yield to those Democrats and others in this House to have my time to state their positions where they have changed their minds. You know it is not bad luck to turn back when you are on the wrong road. So we welcome you back. As for myself, I have consistently voted against all of these steps leading toward war, which this is. I have high regard for those of you who are voting otherwise, but believe me when I say in all humility I will be proud to my dying day that I have voted against every step that has been leading on to this war.

I was elected as a Roosevelt Democrat. I supported Roosevelt for three terms, and all that I have been doing in these votes I have cast on the floor of the House has been to help him keep his promises to the American people. In his inaugural address in 1933 he said the greatest fear we have is fear itself, and so today the leaders of this Nation, both on the Republican and Democratic side, are being filled with fear and are trying to instill in the American people the fear of Hitler. I myself have the same fear of Stalin and communism as I have of Hitler and nazi-ism. They will all pass away.

I am reminded of a little poem I learned when I was a boy, by Ella Wheeler Wilcox. She said:

However the battle is ended,  
Though proudly the victor comes  
With fluttering flags and prancing nags  
And echoing roll of drums;  
Still truth proclaims this motto  
In letters of living light,  
No question is ever settled  
Until it is settled right.

Though the heel of the strong oppressor  
May grind the weak in the dust,  
And the voices of fame with one acclaim  
May call him great and just;  
Let those who applaud take warning  
And keep this motto in sight,  
No question is ever settled  
Until it is settled right.

Let those who have failed take courage,  
Though the enemy seems to have won;  
Though his ranks are strong, if he be in the wrong,  
The battle is not yet done:  
For sure as the morning follows  
The darkest hour of the night,  
No question is ever settled  
Until it is settled right.

So Hitler will pass away, and so Stalin will pass away, as Caesar and Napoleon and the Kaiser passed away, because the people of the world will do away with these dictators.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the day of Thanksgiving. For my part I am thankful that a large majority of the

people are opposed to participation in this war. We are also approaching that wonderful season called Christmastide, when we celebrate the anniversary of the Prince of Peace. I thank God that there was a Prince of Peace, and I believe with all my soul that His way of conquering will be the real way of conquering—not by force of arms, but by the love of heart which He showed throughout the whole world. So I believe again with all my heart that the peoples of the world will see the right way of winning for democracy as well as we do here in America.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] commented on the danger threatening on the Pacific coast from Japan. Let me say frankly that the Japanese on the coast like a majority of the Japanese people are peace-loving and peace-abiding people. They have in their little island of Japan a small group of warmongers who are misleading them in their efforts to conquer China. Why should we in America be led by a minority group to wage war against the Japanese in far eastern waters?

Mr. Speaker, today we have reached the Rubicon. Shall we cross it as did Caesar of old and enter upon a conquest of the world—to force all the people of the world to adopt our way of life—to guarantee by means of war the four freedoms throughout the world? Or shall we build up an adequate defense of the Western Hemisphere so strong as to be impregnable against all the dictators and their hordes of misguided followers in Europe and Asia? That, Mr. Speaker, is the vital issue confronting us this 13th day of November 1941. Notwithstanding the deceptions and subterfuges of the past year, since the last election, we have been led step by step toward participation in this World War No. 2. This is the final step. Make no mistake. This is in reality a declaration of war by the Congress. It is still camouflaged as a peace measure but it is the last fatal plunge into the vortex of the world conflict. To many of you, my colleagues, blinded by your persistent admiration and affection for your party leader, it seems like the hand of Esau, but in your hearts you know it is the voice of Jacob. I repeat it, sir, the passage of this measure is a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States.

Who sponsor and urge the enactment of this legislation? First of all, the two leaders of the major political parties, in direct violation of the specific pledges of their 1940 platforms and in definite breach of their solemn pre-election promises to the American people. It is needless and useless at this time to repeat those party pledges and repeated promises. They are household words throughout our Nation. Then there are the special interests throughout the country which always profit during wartimes—the great monopolies which even now have been and are crowding out of business the small, independent concerns that are the real backbone of our economic structure. The Army and Navy are naturally for it. These days are red-letter days for those two arms of our Government. Not content with the billions appropriated for the actual defense of our America, the palms of the leaders of these agencies

itch for a control incomparable in the whole history of the world. What a glory to be His Excellency Super-Admiral Knox of the British-American Navy, mistress of the seven seas. Then there is Prime Minister Churchill and his type of leadership in the British Empire. Certainly they count on another A. E. F. The Russian Bear will soon hibernate, not for the winter but for a decade or more, and then the British Empire will expect every American to do his duty—to pick her chestnuts out of the fire. She has never fought her wars. She hired the Hessians to fight Washington and his patriots at Trenton. She had her Masons and Slidells in the War between the States. She had her Allies in World War No. 1, and this is the cold statistical record in World War No. 2 up to September 1, 1941:

*Casualties of World War No. 2*

Poland .....	1,675,000
France .....	2,365,000
Belgium .....	230,000
Holland .....	160,000
Greece .....	95,000
Norway .....	5,000
Yugoslavia .....	225,000
Russia (3 months) .....	2,585,000
Great Britain (2 years) .....	134,000

A Canadian made the observation to me Sunday that most of the so-called British casualties were Canadians and Australians.

Lastly, many sincere but misguided Americans favor this measure. Thank God they are a small minority thus far in World War No. 2. They are sincere in their simple belief in the old maxim: "The King can do no wrong." They look with admiration at their infallible leader when he practically quotes Louis the Fourteenth who said, "I am the state. I trade 50 destroyers for British bases (which we are paying a second price for) that in many cases are worthless swamps—and the Congress ratifies it. I and my man Friday (Secretary of Navy Knox) give orders to shoot to kill in foreign waters and my Navy pursues German submarines for hours in the Eastern Hemispheric waters and today, I am asking the Congress to ratify this in the name of freedom of the seas. As a logical result of all this I am going to ask for another A. E. F., eight or ten million strong, to land in Africa, Europe, and Asia to force democracy on these peoples and guarantee the Four Freedoms throughout the world (except possibly not freedom of religion in Russia—that would not be right to force freedom of religion on so great a man as Stalin)." My God, Mr. Speaker, what a tragic step to take! Here and now I challenge any Member to refute the sequence of foregoing events and the inevitable consequences.

Who are opposed to the passage of this bill? All of those who remember World War No. 1—the last futile attempt to make the "world safe for democracy" with its tragic aftermath—the stalking Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, the wreckage and ruin, the depression, the near collapse of civilization. This includes the rank and file of the veterans. The leaders of Christian churches, both Catholic and Protestant, are clearly and

definitely opposed to our participation in this war. They not only see the folly of war but they are sincerely following the injunctions and life of the Great Master, the Prince of Peace. Against participation are the peacetime conscripts who are now urged to enlist for 3 years at the expiration of their compulsory service. They would be the second "flower of our young manhood to lie in a second Flanders fields." Then there are their mothers—the millions all over this fair land of ours who do not want to shed bitter tears, carry heavy aching hearts and wear gold stars as mothers of 1917-18 did.

Lastly, there are the one-third of a Nation ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished and their many friends who have begged and are now pleading with the President and with the Congress to use our best efforts and our funds, first for the actual defense of our Western Hemisphere, and secondly, for the solution of our serious domestic problems which overshadow all foreign problems and foreign entanglements. It is our duty as elected Representatives of these millions of people to gird up our loins for the battle against poverty and crime and injustice within our own borders. When this is done there will be unity of action and not before.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the distinguished Member from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, entertained us with one of his witty speeches. Unfortunately, it was neither wise nor convincing. He pictured the terrible Hitler as we all know and despise him. But the same can truthfully be said of the unspeakable Stalin whom Jesse Jones has just befriended with a billion dollars—all in the name of democracy and religion. The gentleman from New Jersey also was proud of our great country as we all are—its wealth, its power, its courage. We could conquer any aggressor. Most certainly true, Dr. EATON, most certainly true! But you want to do it in Asia and Europe. You want to drench foreign soil with the blood of our brave sons and the after-war tears of our gold-star mothers—we who oppose this step want to preserve our wealth, our power, and our courage to defend democracy here in the Western Hemisphere. We sincerely and honestly believe that our plan will make it unnecessary to shed either blood or tears because we will be invincible to any and all foes on our own soil. You want to fight foes on two fronts where we will most assuredly lose out. We want to be prepared to fight on one front on the good old frontiers of the Americas. There we will and can win—we can make the Americas safe for democracy and so by persuasion and conviction and not by force, lead and not drive other nations to her wonderful way of life and form of government. This, Mr. Speaker and fellow colleagues, is our job. Let us start the program right today by defeating this measure. Then let us take this whole matter into our own hands where it belongs and carry it on to a successful finish. The American people (and no doubt the whole world—but that is really immaterial) are look-

ing on today. They are vitally interested in what we do here today. They have had no opportunity to voice their wishes in this matter. It has been denied them in authority. We are their duly elected Representatives to act for them. Congress must not let the people down!

Is undue pressure brought to bear on you, my fellow colleagues, in this matter? Are you thinking about the pork-barrel measure introduced today to make your mouth water and lull you to sleep? I, too, have some pork in that barrel; but so help me God, I will vote my convictions today as always. I may not always be right, but I can at least follow my own conscience and the expressed will of my constituents. I must live with my own conscience forever, and I feel obligated to represent my constituents even though I may not again be permitted to represent them in this body.

This day will go down in history as the most momentous since that April day in 1917. What we say will soon be forgotten; what we do will affect the future welfare of every man, woman, and child in the United States. Our action is pregnant with the most far-reaching results for good or for evil. It is a sacred trust with which our splendid form of government has endowed us. Let us acquit ourselves as men worthy of that trust and thus be worthy of the everlasting gratitude of those who have granted us the honor to serve them.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN].

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset of my remarks transgress upon your attention to make a plain and simple announcement. I make it for the reason that the gentlemen and ladies of the press have been calling my office for the last 48 hours, inquiring whether or not the New York delegation in this body will seek to punish the President of the United States for his unwarranted interference in our local municipal campaign. My answer to the gentlemen of the press and to you and to my country is this, that the members of the New York delegation are Americans, before they are Democrats or Republicans, and that they will decide this issue by their individual votes as their conscience and their patriotism may dictate.

We are faced today with a tremendous decision. Like all of you, I have searched my mind and my conscience, and have come to a decision as my conscience dictates. My distinguished colleague from Washington [Mr. HILL] who just preceded me, quoted a poem he learned in his boyhood days. When I was a boy, and, as you know, I was born and reared in my beloved city of New York, as a student in our schools, for a number of years at assembly I carried our starry banner over my shoulder to the rostrum. The entire student body stood in salute in a pledge of allegiance to that flag.



The flag that is the only hope of mankind. I was taught by my teachers that our flag represents a sovereignty, the sovereignty of the United States of America. If that be true, and it is true, one of the attributes of sovereignty for any nation is freedom. That, among other things, includes the right to send ships to the seven seas without anyone's let or permission or hindrance. That is the sole question we are faced with today. The simple question is, Shall we as Americans, as Members of the American Congress, assert our rights of sovereignty and send out ships under our flag where we choose? I have been amazed by the suggestions of some of you in this debate that we covertly transfer our ships to foreign registry and then by subterfuge accomplish what we dare not do as free-born Americans. Are we Americans, or are we something less than Americans? Are we, who inherited our freedom, meekly and cowardly to seek to transfer our ships to foreign powers? Any real American should be able to answer.

Again it has been suggested that those of us who think as I do love England. I do not love England, but I do love my country, and if the rights of my country are transgressed by any power, I am willing to meet the challenge.

Some have boasted that they have aided and assisted in our lend-lease program to Britain. Well, if they have, then, for Heaven's sake, be consistent and follow through and deliver the goods. It is easy to boast that you are for all aid to England, but how is England going to get our aid? Are we scribes and pharisees, or are we Christian men and women devoted to the straight way of life, and not the way of subterfuge? Dictatorship and force is challenging everything we hold dear and sacred. Are we worthy inheritors of the liberty and freedom that has been handed down to us, or are we in truth what Hitler describes us in his infamous *Mein Kampf*? He proclaimed to the world that we were soft and decadent and would not, if need be, fight, suffer, and sacrifice for the liberties that were given us.

We seek by this bill to assert the rights of a sovereign people; the right to commercial intercourse and contact with the other nations of the world. The principle "the freedom of the seas" is solely an American principle; zealously maintained, protected, and fought for by every American statesman since the inception of our Government under the guidance and leadership of George Washington. Frankly, we are faced with a challenge whose only choice is surrender or retreat. To us as Americans worthy of our inheritance, there can be but one answer. For myself, I choose not to surrender but to maintain the principles of our Nation laid down by its founders and zealously maintained throughout our entire history.

The present world conditions, if they portend at all, must bring to our minds a total challenge to every principle of liberty and freedom we as Americans hold dear—yea, dearer than life itself. Europe is overrun by a Nazi pagan nihilism.

So far as I am concerned, I choose Christianity against Nazi-ism; Americanism against a dictated system of government; sovereignty in place of surrender; civilization instead of chaos, and Christianity as against paganism. In truth, I prefer the Cross of Christ to the Swastika of Hitler.

By our vote today let us send forth a clarion call of freedom to the oppressed men and women of the world, recalling to them that the United States of America stands as her founders intended, the citadel of liberty of justice, and of peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks made earlier in the afternoon by including therein a statement from the Maritime Commission and also a statement by the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, relating to the subject matter discussed by me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. And I wish further to say, Mr. Speaker, in that connection, that the information that I have received touching the subject matters I undertook to discuss is of a character which in my judgment requires that I shall support the Senate amendments.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I voted to arm our ships. I voted for the resolution as it came before this body originally. That was self-defense. The Senate amendment, it seems to me, however, asks the Congress to sanction the sending of our ships carrying contraband under convoy with shooting orders into ports which we ourselves have described as danger zones. That, in my judgment, is a contemptible way to take on a foreign war.

I have no use for Hitler. I think he is a criminal paranoiac, as Secretary Welles said the other day. I believe he will destroy himself. He cannot force his conquered people to love him. He dare not lift his iron heel. Some day his deeds will destroy him if his enemies do not. But if it is our duty to stop him, let the issue be fought out on that basis with an open, outright call for a declaration of war. But let us not get into a foreign war by kidding the people that this is a peace measure.

I listened closely to the arguments yesterday. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom], the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said that the passage of these amendments was essential or needed to carry out our program, but in what respect is it needed?

Is it needed because Britain lacks ships? No. If it were, we could lend-lease the ships needed.

Is it needed to deliver goods to Britain? No. Every dock in Central and South

America is piled high with boxes labeled "Britain delivers the goods."

Is it needed because British shipping is in a bad way? No. Only yesterday Churchill told the House of Commons that improved shipping conditions had beaten Hitler's plan of starvation, that net shipping losses in the last 4 months had been reduced to one-fifth of the previous 4 months.

Is it needed to deliver goods to China? No; because the President has never found a state of war to exist in China and has never invoked belligerent zones under the Neutrality Act.

Is it needed to deliver goods to Russia? No; because the President has not found a state of war to exist there and Murmansk in the Atlantic and Vladivostok in the Pacific are both open to arms traffic now.

Is it needed to get goods to Suez? No; because the President revoked the ban on the Red Sea as he could for other ports if it were not for one stubborn fact—the stubborn fact of the public opinion of America. The people of the United States do not want to get into a foreign war.

Is it needed to permit our naval ships to go into belligerent zones? No. The restrictions of the act apply to private vessels and not to Government-owned ships.

Is it needed to give the President freedom of action as argued by the gentleman from New York? No. He can now modify or revoke proclamations of belligerent zones as he did in the Red Sea; he has the power; but what is lacking is evidence of national support for such action. That is why this legislation amendment is before us. It is a proposal to give congressional sanction to the sending of armed merchant ships carrying contraband under convoy into ports which the President has declared to be danger zones.

It is not a proposal to send hospital ships and food ships on errands of mercy to starving people. That could be done now except for the fact that freedom of the seas is denied in another direction.

This proposal has nothing to do with freedom of the seas. Neither international law nor the custom of nations has ever claimed that freedom of the seas included the right to ship contraband into belligerent ports.

Freedom of the seas was involved, is involved in sinkings such as that of the *Lehigh*, a ship without cargo on her way to bring manganese to this country, sunk on the high seas. I am in favor of stopping things like that.

I refuse, however, and the American people refuse, to get excited over the sinking of ships that were seized from countries at war, transferred by us to Panamanian registry, armed without Panama's consent at a time when we ourselves did not permit arming, and sent into waters which we denied to our own vessels. Of all things done in the name of courage and freedom, that I think has been the most shameful and cowardly.

And, if there was any reason why such a thing had to be done and this legisla-

tion were the only way to correct the situation, I would vote for it. But I have yet to hear anyone say why it was necessary for the United States to run ships under the flag of Panama and violate her hospitality while we did so.

Thus, with no one offering a valid argument on the necessity for this action, we come back to the proposition that the Senate amendments seek to get the Congress to give somebody sanction to say that Congress has approved delivery of contraband into belligerent ports with convoys ordered to shoot German ships at sight.

Now, personally, I do not think Hitler is invincible and I do not think we are puny. We can beat Hitler here or there—when we get set for the job. But as a distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said, "There is such a thing as going too far and going too fast." There is such a thing as getting the men ahead of the tanks. Those of you who have visited maneuvers as I have within the past month and have seen logs used for guns and red flags waving for guns firing will know what I mean.

There is one other argument that has been made for this bill. The gentleman from Texas, [Mr. JOHNSON] made it yesterday. I presume it will be sounded hard today. It is that a failure to pass this resolution instead of sending the Senate amendment to conference will be wrongly interpreted by Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress of the United States to act on the basis of its own welfare instead of consulting the feelings of Mr. Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that this question comes to a vote in this way at this time. But if it be unfortunate that this vote comes at this time, lay not the responsibility on those who oppose it. They sought to avoid having such a vote taken.

Before the bill first came up in the House, before the bill was introduced I went to the majority leader on my own responsibility and said to him that I felt there was a clear distinction between the two subjects of arming ships and the lifting of belligerent zones. I called attention to the fact that the President had separated the issues in his message to the Congress. I handed him an article by Raymond Clapper to the same effect, the article to which I called attention on the floor of the House and which I placed in the RECORD. I said that I thought it would be for the best interests of the country to have one vote come up on which a decisive majority could be recorded.

I presume many others spoke to the leader or to the Speaker or to others on the Foreign Affairs Committee. In any event, the bill came to the House originally on the single issue, that of arming our ships, and on that basis many of us voted for it. But on this proposal to send our ships with contraband into belligerent zones which we ourselves proclaimed, to send them under orders to shoot on sight, many of us will be obliged to vote no.

For, Mr. Speaker, some of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, are under

the compulsion that Woodrow Wilson, most distinguished disabled veteran of the World War, felt when he threw aside critics by saying:

They do not know what promises and bonds I undertook when I ordered the armies of the United States to the soil of France, but I know and I intend to redeem my pledges to the children; they shall not be sent upon a similar errand.

And, Mr. Speaker, in a more inspired day than the present, the President, at a birthday dinner in honor of Woodrow Wilson's memory, December 28, 1933, the President, Mr. Roosevelt, said:

We could get a world accord on world peace immediately if the people spoke for themselves. \* \* \* Through all the centuries and down to the conflict of 1914-18, wars were made by governments. Woodrow Wilson challenged that necessity. That challenge made the people who create and who change governments think. They wondered with Woodrow Wilson whether the people themselves could not some day prevent governments from making war.

As I have listened to the debate on this question in the House of Representatives—the House where the people speak—I have wondered if that day had not come. For I have heard, yesterday and today, men daring to speak for the people regardless of pressure, regardless of precedent, regardless of political whips. Let no man doubt the courage of Americans after hearing the gentleman from South Carolina, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTHERN] speak yesterday. We who heard them and who have heard others speak as men can speak only when moved by deep conscience will forever prize more greatly our membership in a body that brings such men together and our country which produces such men.

For, as Woodrow Wilson said over the graves of American boys in France:

There is something better, if possible, that a man can give than his life, and that is his living spirit to a service that is not easy, to resist counsels that are hard to resist, to stand against purposes that are difficult to stand against, and to say, "Here stand I, consecrated in spirit to the men who were once my comrades and who are now gone, and who have left me under eternal bonds of fidelity."

Mr. Speaker, bring here a proposal to lead this country, to lead the world to peace, and this Congress, the House of Representatives, the people of the United States will back you to a man. Tell the President, Mr. Speaker, that he can have unity if he will be a voice for the people of the world. No one today can speak as he can. Let him lead the world to peace—not war. Some day it will come. Will a bankrupt United States, will a bankrupt, blood-drained world be better able to solve the problems that divide nations than we could today if we set our hands and our minds to that task?

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against the amendments, not to voice or create disunity, but to express the hope of the people expressed by Mr. Roosevelt that some day the people themselves could prevent governments from making wars.

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

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress must determine the value of legislative proposals having to do with the present World War with particular regard for the interests of the United States.

I, personally, would vote to permit the arming of American merchant ships having been assured by our naval leaders that such protection should be accorded American sailors and ships under present conditions. I am not satisfied on the hearings or on the arguments that any particular advantage will accrue at this time to the United States or to Great Britain, Russia, or China from the passage of the provision which would permit American ships to enter war zones. It would make possible further loss of American lives under war conditions which can be avoided without reducing by a single ship the number which can enter the war zones carrying supplies to Great Britain, Russia, and China.

Under the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act, American ships can be transferred to and manned by these governments. Recently, England returned to the United States 20 American tankers which had been transferred to Great Britain and which were no longer needed by that country. Similarly, other American ships can be transferred into this service.

I am in agreement with the policy of President Roosevelt whereby the American Navy and air forces are patrolling the North Atlantic and other shipping lanes, thereby reducing the sinking of ships by German submarines and airplanes to a noteworthy extent.

This week, speeches in the British Parliament by Prime Minister Churchill and others have shown that the British shipping losses have been reduced to less than 200,000 tons per month during the past 4 months while the amount of foodstuffs now stored in Great Britain is twice that of 1939.

Obviously, at this moment, the transfer of war materials to England is being made under the most favorable conditions since the war started. The present policy is largely successful. The use of American merchant ships, flying American flags and manned by citizens of the United States, would not, on the testimony, make the present policy more successful. It would create further hazards which can be avoided without injury to this policy.

If, at some future time, conditions change which show that the interests of the United States will be better served by a revision of our present Neutrality Act, Congress will undoubtedly consider what changes are then shown to be necessary to further the interests of our country.

Under the conditions of today, I am of the opinion that this conference report should not be adopted with relation to the repeal of the provision of the



Neutrality Act which prevents American ships from entering war zones.

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

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including three newspaper articles at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, her name is not Docia Karell, but this is the only thing phoney about the article she writes under The Watchtower. Let me say that I have known Miss Karell—though this is merely her pen name—for several years. She is one of the finest persons, with one of the most brilliant minds and with one of the best hearts, that I have ever known. The following article is so true, so timely, and so illuminating that I think many people will be interested in it. Under leave to extend my remarks I include it:

[From the Springfield (Mo.) News and Leader of November 9, 1941]

#### THE WATCHTOWER

(By Docia Karell)

It looks as if we have bought ourselves a war, at a cost of many billions of dollars next year, and uncounted billions for at least 10 or 20 or 50 years to come. It will take all our lives and all our children's lives to pay for it.

I doubt if it's worth it.

We shall celebrate Armistice Day this week, and with great ballyhoo—but I don't know why. It wasn't much of an armistice that couldn't last 20 years. We cannot celebrate a victory and we cannot celebrate a peace—so it must be we are celebrating the fact that the World War has started up all over again. And the way we are planning to celebrate it, it looks as if we are also celebrating—or selling—the fact that we are about to plunge into it again.

That's not my idea of any celebration, or anything to celebrate.

I don't like war, but probably I could come to accept the idea if I could see an atom of sense in it.

I cannot.

I cannot see that war accomplishes one single worth-while thing that couldn't better be accomplished without it, and prevent all the insane destruction, the mass murder, the mass hate, the brutalizing of whole generations of people, the tragic, incalculable losses of everything worth while in this world—loss of life itself, of cleanliness and order, of decency and beauty, homes and schools and churches and libraries and all the pleasant, civilized things that men have created, of the confidence that men have in each other, of their integrity and honor and kindness and brotherhood—prevent the fear and the terror and the hunger and all the multiplying miseries and horrors that degrade human life so inconceivably.

It is a madness, and there is no sense nor reason to it.

And certainly it is not necessary. When the whole frightfulness is over, the ones who are left are going to have to get together and write a peace—or another armistice.

They might just as well do it now.

They might far better have done it before they started.

I do not for 1 minute believe that if the men of this world had wanted peace, they could not have had peace; and I do not believe that if the leaders of this Nation, beginning in the White House, had genu-

inely wanted peace here more than anything else, they could not have kept it.

The kind of peace Roosevelt wants is the kind of peace Hitler wants—peace on his own terms.

Hitler wants the whole world to accept the Nazi philosophy.

Roosevelt wants the whole world to accept the American philosophy—and intends to see that it does so. Just last week he said it in so many flat words, "The American people have made an unlimited commitment that there shall be a free world."

The American people have made no such commitment. Only Roosevelt has made it.

The American people know what they want for themselves. They want freedom and they want security. Most of them—or at least a great many of them—want peace. But the American people aren't hell-bent, like their President, on imposing freedom on all the rest of the world.

So far as most of the American people are concerned, Germany can have Hitler if it wants him—though, of course, hardly anybody can see how it would. But if they like being told what to do, and how and when to do it, and having every action of their lives and every thought of their minds controlled—and they seem to love it—that's up to them. It's not up to us. If liberty makes them unhappy, let them have their dictator.

So far as most of the American people are concerned, any country on this globe can have the kind of dictatorship it wants—the iron-fisted dictatorship of Germany and Italy, or the wise and benevolent dictatorship of Brazil—so long as they leave us alone.

Most of us do not feel obliged to guarantee all the freedoms to everybody in the world, whether they want them or not—and to compel them to accept them anyhow, if they don't. Only the President feels such a call.

But the rest of us, it appears, are going to have to fight for it and pay for it.

I believe that the only reason this world has wars, is because some people like wars and some people want wars. Some think they are glorious. Some want them for ambition and power. Some find them profitable.

I believe that if one tiny fraction of the money spent for war, were spent toward peace, we could have had peace—or could have peace now—or could have it whenever we want it.

But the truth seems to be that only a few sentimentalists honestly want peace today. Millions of Americans would be aghast if the war were to end tomorrow. Our newfound prosperity would collapse. They would lose their so-called defense jobs.

There was a great deal more truth than humor in the story Martha Moore was telling here the night of the Frisco banquet, about the Irish woman who hadn't been to church lately. The priest called to remonstrate with her, but found her strangely unresponsive. Finally she said to him frankly: "Look at my Danny—he's got a job in the shipyards now making \$80 a week. Look at my little Pat—not out of school yet, and he's got a job in an airplane factory making \$60 a week. Look at my old man. He hasn't worked for 12 years, and now he's got a job making \$30 a week. And you and the pope praying for peace! Why should I come to church, indeed?"

There is that side of war, too—the boom in business, the work and the activity, the building, the excitement, the importance of it all. We all share in it, one way or another—and it blinds us to the cost in blood and tears.

Yet in the long run, in spite of all the prosperity and the excitement, war is not

even good economy. The destruction is too great—the productive returns too small.

But power-lust and greed and momentum keep the war going—and there is not one in a position to do so, who has the will to stop it.

This week we shall have a drive on behalf of the Red Cross—to provide nurses and doctors, ambulances and hospitals, for the men who will be wounded. A few millions for that. Billions for the machinery that will blow off their arms and legs and make the nurses and the doctors necessary. (Of course when we blow off their heads, even the Red Cross can't help.)

And how much do we spend to prevent it all? How much to stop it?

Could anything be more insane than shooting men to pieces—and then calling ourselves civilized and humane, because we try to provide the means to put them together again, or anyhow to patch them up?

Armistice Day and the Red Cross roll call! What a colossal farce!

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States today faces its greatest crisis since the beginning of the Civil War. On our foreign policy, we are a house divided against itself. The manner in which we have pursued our foreign policy has developed the most bitter name calling we have ever experienced. Racial prejudice and religious bigotry once again rear their ugly heads. Such warped judgment is distinctly un-American and should have no place in our national life. In my judgment it is wrong that anyone should incite such prejudice by labeling the Jewish and those of British ancestry as warmongers and equally reprehensible to point the finger of suspicion at those of our citizens whose ancestry is Italian or Germanic.

While there may be a small minority in every group entitled to criticism, you will find that in the main they want this country to do that which in their judgment is best for America. To me, it is tragic, therefore, that such prejudices have arisen to disturb our national unity, especially at a time when most of all we need unity. Just what is the reason for such discord?

It is because those who are formulating our foreign policy have constantly promised one thing and have done another. Step after step has been taken in the name of peace and yet after each step was taken, we have found ourselves closer to the brink of war. In order to preserve our traditional foreign policy of friendship for all nations, the Congress unanimously passed the neutrality law at a time when the Congress and the President, and the American people were thinking in terms of what was best for the United States rather than the interests of some foreign nation. Our one thought was to preserve peace here by guarding against the influence, the propaganda and the pressure of any other nation. When the war broke out abroad, those who wanted to take sides

immediately started a hue and cry for the repeal of the arms embargo provision in the neutrality law. Those of us who wanted to preserve our neutrality predicted that this would be the first step toward war. The proponents of repeal of the arms embargo argued loud and long that this repeal would preserve our neutrality and assure peace for our country. Let me read you some quotes in support of that statement:

September 21, 1939, the President sent a message to Congress including the following quotes:

At the outset, I proceed on the assumption that every Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and every member of the executive branch of the Government including the President and his associates, both personally and officially, are equally and without reservation in favor of such measures as will protect the neutrality, the safety, and the integrity of our country and at the same time keep us out of war.

Further on in this message, the President said:

I seek greater consistency through the repeal of the embargo provisions and return to international law. It has been erroneously said that return to that policy might bring us nearer to war. I give to you my deep and unalterable conviction based on years of experience as worker in the field of international peace, that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today. 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.

How inconsistent is that statement with our present policy and the proposal now before us to arm our merchantmen and send them into combat zones. Further on in the same message the President said:

The step I recommend is to put this country back on a solid footing of real and traditional neutrality.

Similar quotations and assurance for the preservation of our neutrality and peace at home on the part of proponents of the repeal of the arms embargo in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, as well as the Cabinet, could be read ad infinitum, but time will not permit.

Later on, however, the pretending of neutrality was dropped and the policy of aid to Britain proposed in the lend-lease bill. Once again, however, the step was taken in the name of peace. Every proponent of the measure assured the Nation that by giving Britain the tools with which to fight we would preserve peace at home. This assurance is summed up by the statements of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman McCORMACK, majority leader of the House, and Senator TOM CONNALLY, the present chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative McCORMACK, said:

The purpose of the pending bill is to keep our country out of war and to keep war from coming to our shores later on.

Senator CONNALLY said, speaking of the lend-lease bill:

This bill, I submit, is not intended to get the Nation into the war, but it is intended to keep it out of war. It is the purpose of the bill, by aiding Great Britain, \* \* \* to keep the war in Europe.

It is interesting to note that none of the proponents of the measure suggested convoys. And so, with such assurances that the bill would preserve peace at home, the measure was passed. In doing so, we scrapped the Johnson Act, which forbids loans to defaulter nations; we scrapped our neutrality; and then appropriated \$7,000,000,000 of our taxpayers' money to carry out the provisions of the act.

Then came the question of convoys, to which the President declared:

Convoys mean shooting and shooting means war.

Once again the impression was created that all efforts were being continued to keep us out of war. However, the same roundabout manner which had been used in previous steps was once again adopted and the word "patrols" substituted for convoys. And, to give an excuse to convoy three-quarters of the way across the Atlantic Ocean, we occupied Iceland, although troops of one of the belligerents were there and are still there.

The Congress is now being asked to destroy the Neutrality Act by arming merchantmen and sending them into combat zones. This, along with our patrols in the name of freedom of the seas. Well, I am for the freedom of the seas and always have been and would be willing to have this Nation fight for its preservation, but I do not like to see the term used as an excuse to perform some other task. Those who now shout "freedom of the seas" were strangely silent when we were prevented from feeding starving millions in the lands of our former so-called Allies in France and Finland. The time has come for those in authority to stop kidding the public. It is high time that frankness and truth take the place of deceptive campaign oratory. It certainly must be obvious to everyone that we cannot continue along the road we are traveling without definitely heading into war, in all probability an undeclared war. As long as we continue on this path, our war effort, and that is what it is at the moment, will be impaired by internal strife and discord. The facts, costs, and implications of our involvement in war should be made plain to all. Our people should be fearlessly told that the billions thus far allotted for lend-lease aid are but a drop in the bucket.

They should understand that the new taxes are but a fraction of those that will have to be levied to sustain a war effort. It should also be made plain that if we enter this war that our boys' fighting will not be confined to the Western Hemisphere. Contrary to other assurances, they will be forced to do battle all over the world. The decision of peace or war should not be left to one man; and in the interests of national unity the decision should be made without further delay before steps have been taken that will so involve us that we cannot retrace them. If we have a war to fight, let us fight it, and not merely pay the bills. Let us go into it with our eyes open. Let

us do it in the truly American way by a vote of the Congress of the United States. As one Member of the House, I am willing to assume my duty by voting on the question today. The Congress should assume this responsibility and the others which have been delegated away should be restored to it. Such a vote should be taken by the Congress without further delay, in the interest of national unity and in the interest of national safety. Once such a vote is taken our position will be clearly defined, not alone at home, but abroad as well. Instead of being divided into bitterly opposing groups, as we are today, we will be united under the will of the majority. Once the Congress has spoken there is but one course that any true American can take, and that is to accept the decision and give it wholehearted and all-out support. Stephen Decatur once said:

My country in her intercourse with other nations of the world, may she always be in the right, but right or wrong, my country.

It is more important that we prevent a one-man government at home than to defeat it abroad. If we are to preserve democracy and unity, let us start at home and make our decision in the truly American way by a vote of the Congress of the United States. As Daniel Webster said:

Let our object be our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country; and, by the blessings of God, may that country itself become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberty upon which the world may gaze with admiration forever.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I am not the least excited about this situation, because I am satisfied from the last few months that all we have been called upon to do is to ratify what the President has already done. The President has enough votes in this body to carry an expedition to the moon. So I will not get excited about it.

Now that the President sees fit to classify every citizen who does not agree with him on his foreign policy as a Nazi sympathizer, it is well to review the facts. I do not propose to draw conclusions but state the facts as I understand them to be and as a careful check indicates.

The House passed a Neutrality Act on June 30, 1939; the Senate agreed, and the President signed the bill, making the act the law of the land. When the President took his oath of office he swore that he would uphold the laws of the United States, and that included the Neutrality Act.

Under this act our ships were to stay out of combat areas. There was absolutely no authority for any ship of the United States to carry munitions to England or to her allies; there was no authority given in the act to convoy ships; there was no authority to arm merchant ships; and there was no authority in the act to begin shooting at the sight of a German vessel.

The record shows that up to date only seven ships flying the flag of the United



States have been torpedoed or bombed by German ships. They are:

(1) The *Robin Moor* was torpedoed, shelled, and sunk by a German submarine in the South Atlantic, May 21, 1941. No loss of life.

(2) The *Steel Seafarer* was bombed from the air and sunk in the Gulf of Suez, September 5, 1941. No loss of life.

(3) The *Lehigh* was sunk off Africa, October 19, 1941. No loss of life.

(4) The *Greer*, United States destroyer, was attacked on September 4, 1941, at a point southeast of Greenland, but was not hit.

(5) The *Kearny*, United States destroyer, was torpedoed off Iceland October 17, 1941. She was injured, but made port with 11 of the crew missing.

(6) The *Reuben James*, United States destroyer, torpedoed and blown in two in the North Atlantic on October 30 with the loss of 100 lives. This destroyer was engaged in convoying British ships.

(7) The *Salinas*, Navy's armed tanker, attacked on October 31, but made port safely with no casualties.

The *Greer*, United States destroyer, on September 4, while chasing a German submarine about 500 miles southwest of Iceland, was hit by the submarine. The *Greer* was under orders from the President to hunt German submarines—and remember this was before the unauthorized Presidential order of September 11 to "shoot on sight" any German craft.

In reporting this matter to the American people, the President said:

My fellow Americans, the Navy Department of the United States has reported to me that on the morning of September 4 the U. S. destroyer *Greer*, proceeding in full daylight toward Iceland, had reached a point southeast of Greenland. She was carrying mail to Iceland. She was flying the American flag. Her identity as an American ship was unmistakable.

She was then and there attacked by a submarine. Germany admits that it was a German submarine. The submarine deliberately fired a torpedo at the *Greer*, followed later by another torpedo attack. In spite of what Hitler's propaganda bureau has invented, and in spite of what any American obstructionist organization may prefer to believe, I tell you the blunt fact that the German submarine fired first upon this American destroyer without warning, and with deliberate design to sink her.

The President either knew the facts or he did not. What he said was not a fact. He, better than anyone else, knows whether he told the correct story. If he did not know that the *Greer* was chasing a German submarine, to state that the destroyer was on a peaceful mission when he did not know the facts was just as much of a fraud on the American people as if he were in possession of the actual facts. If he had the actual facts and then stated the contrary, it was an overt act of deception. In either case it was a grossly misleading statement and apparently intended to fan the flames of war sentiment in America. Just what does the President think the commander of the German submarine should have done when chased for several hours by a destroyer? That commander probably had the usual instincts of humanity to live. At least that commander had good reason to believe the destroyer was not try-

ing to catch the submarine as a gesture of friendship. The chasing was done in violation of our present law, and it hardly seems proper for the President to find fault with what he calls the "obstructionists" just because he himself invited the shooting.

The United States destroyer *Kearny*, on October 16 and 17 was engaged in convoying British ships through Icelandic waters. Receiving distress signals from another convoy, the *Kearny* raced to its assistance and dropped depth bombs. Shortly after that she was hit by a torpedo. The ship was put out of action and 11 men killed.

Convoying of British or American ships loaded with munitions for England was not authorized. The neutrality law still stands; the President, contrary to law, authorized the *Kearny* to convoy and authorized it to "shoot on sight" any German craft. The people of the United States never authorized this convoying or "shooting on sight." If 11 citizens were killed in the action, the responsibility for their deaths is obvious. For the President to now fan the war hysteria in America by citing the killing of these men, as he did in his broadcast on October 27, shows a willfulness on his part to shove the people of this country into a war which a great majority do not want. As a smoke screen to his own unwarranted action, he charges that those who oppose him are Nazi followers. To make this smoke screen good and black he hopes that his name will not be found among the Nazi followers. The President is so obsessed with his own patriotism that he cannot conceive that any true American could possibly disagree with his unauthorized action.

It is stated that seven more ships owned by Americans have been torpedoed, but these ships were flying the flag of Panama, and not the Stars and Stripes. It was a subterfuge to put these ships under Panamanian registry, and when they were so registered this country cannot, or at least should not, lash itself into a frenzy of war because ships flying flags other than ours, were sunk. These ships were registered in Panama to avoid the Neutrality Act.

The President, in his last broadcast, classified a great many American citizens as Nazi followers merely because they do not agree with him in all that he does. From his high position he has a great advantage in this method of debate because there is not much a small citizen can do after the President gets through his tirade of classification.

As one Member of Congress I am not a Nazi follower, nor am I a Nazi sympathizer. I feel that the mass executions of innocent people in France for the shooting of a German officer, and with which these victims had nothing whatever to do, was a most atrocious and barbarous act.

But even this act does not justify us, through the blind leadership of the President, in going to war. I am thinking of the United States just now. The President seems determined to enter this war against a thousand promises to the people of the United States that we would not.

In his last broadcast the President said we were already in the war. The question is, How did we get into it in view of the neutrality law which has not yet been changed? Does the President admit that he has not obeyed the laws of the land?

Arming of this country so far has not yet equipped us to do much damage to any country. England has now in the British Isles over four times as many armed and trained men, doing nothing, as we have in our training camps, yet we have appropriated \$59,000,000,000 for war purposes. This means a tax of over half of the assessed value of my own State, and still we are not half ready for war. We have spent too much of this money on other nations. We should now spend our money in our own self-defense, and not get boastful until we do get ready. Merely stating over the radio that Hitler will be crushed is merely letting a wish dictate our thoughts. Get ready to back up what we say and do less bragging and broadcasting will be the best service we can render to our country.

If the President thinks he is ready for war now, it would at least be a good gesture to submit the matter to Congress. There is no chance to be taken by the President, because he has enough Democrats in both Houses of Congress to carry anything he wants, but it will be the constitutional way of doing business. There are, however, a great many Democrats in the Congress who know the President is just boiling over for war, and who know also that we are not ready for war. It is not certain that all Democrats in Congress will permit the President to tirade them into war.

The President will find that when we get into this war in the constitutional way that the citizens who now criticize him for his unwarranted demand for war will be as loyal to the Government as are those who are whispering daily in his ear to bring about war. The President's treatment of those who oppose his willfulness is entirely unfair, unjustified, and beneath the dignity of the Executive.

When the President has entered a shooting war on his own account and without the authority of the people, he should take the consequences and not come limping back to the people shouting, "They shot our destroyers and killed our citizens." The President himself is responsible for this, and no power of his on the radio can place the blame on the citizens who have objected to his unauthorized course. His abuse of loyal citizens will hardly do as a substitute for his own high-handed methods.

I suggest to the President, as his friend, to keep cool, build our defenses here and not in Europe and Asia, and when he can no longer restrain his mania to enter the European war, communicate that fact to Congress and ask for a declaration of war.

This Senate amendment goes further than that of arming merchant ships. It permits these ships to enter harbors in war zones and everyone knows this cannot be done without shooting and bloodshed. The President, himself, says shooting means war, therefore, this bill as amended by the Senate is nothing more or less than an underhanded declaration of war. It was predicted when this bill

was debated in the House that the Neutrality Act would be undermined step by step, but no one thought this action would come so quickly.

If we vote "yes" on this amended bill it means war, but if we vote "no" we still have a chance to keep out of a war that is not ours. We are not prepared for war, and for Congress to open the floodgates of war on a peaceful people is nothing less than shameful. The great majority of the people of the United States do not want this action. Shall we let the war crowd push us into a war the people do not want and a war in which we are not prepared? We have not been attacked by any power and there is no present danger of attack. We want to force the "four freedoms" on the peoples of the world, yet at the same time we deny these freedoms to our own people. We cannot settle our own domestic problems—those troubles are raging in every corner of this country—and at such a time shall we march away to settle troubles in foreign lands and forget our own?

If we do get into this war in this underhanded way, can we expect a united people to back this war? Our first line of defense is to have a united people here at home, seeking no territory, seeking no right to force our way of life upon other nations, but a people striving for their own ideals but ready to defend our country against attack to the last able-bodied man. That should be the background of the United States in entering any war.

When this debate shall have been concluded, the people of the United States will still be at peace or obliged to engage in a war which they do not want.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, from my study of history I am convinced that the Congress of these United States of America has never faced a more important decision than that which we are about to make here.

Tuesday we observed Armistice Day. In doing so, we paid our small mark of tribute to the dead of the World War, those who died because of our entry into the European war, which we believed, then, was fought to make the world safe for democracy. After that war was over we were completely disillusioned. We saw the supposedly high idealism of the allied cause and the war aims of Woodrow Wilson betrayed by the cynical peacemakers. That war produced more tyranny and bred dictators everywhere. That war upset the economic system of the world, intensified nationalism, and let loose a violence that has not been checked. Nothing but sorrow and tragedy the war brought. Nobody gained; everybody lost. I plead with you men to keep clear the conviction, "Never again."

Today we men determine whether or not this great Nation, which has survived all the world's wars and has pur-

sued a steady path of progress, shall once again quit our own to stand on foreign soil; shall once again attempt to cure Europe of its hatreds and greeds; shall once again give up to the slaughter of war the cream of the youth of our country, in order to maintain the status quo of European power politics.

This is no time for hypocritical lip service to freedom and peace. We have passed the stage when we can be told, "This measure will keep us out of war." This measure is a determination of whether or not we shall involve ourselves in a shooting war. This is the last time we men here will have an opportunity to express our choice of war or peace. The future of America and the future of millions of Americans is to be determined by the decision we are about to make. Those men who vote for the enactment of this legislation vote for war. You break faith with those men who bled and died in the war to end all wars, the war to make the world safe for democracy, and the blood of the new crusade will be on your hands and on your consciences.

To say that this legislation is not the equivalent of a declaration of war is downright hypocrisy, and very closely approaches a contemptible lie. You know as well as I do that the enactment of this legislation will be immediately followed by the actual dispatch of American merchant vessels into the ports of a nation at war. You know as well as I do that such action will put completely beyond our control any choice between remaining at peace, even technically, and abandoning all hope of living our own lives in our own way.

We are told that this legislation should be enacted in order to express our resentment against Hitler's submarine warfare. The step we are urged to take is to throw more American lives at his submarines. You know as well as I do, as well as every newspaper urging this legislation knows, that when those men have died we will not stand here and talk; we will have set our course; there then can be no turning back. We will be the avengers, and we will be called upon—a call we will not refuse to heed—to redeem the lives of the dead with the blood of more and more dead, in order to make the world safe for democracy again.

The arguments against the enactment of this legislation are not dictated by fear of anyone. They are prompted by cold-blooded, selfish common sense. America alone can take care of herself, but only if she is prepared and has behind her a united people, definitely committed to an honest program of defending America for Americans.

We need have no fear of enemies from Europe, Asia, or Africa—what we do need fear is enemies from America; enemies who a few short months ago shouted against our participation in the war, but who now, thanks to the position of Gory Joe, scream for an American expeditionary force, and who, when the shooting is all over, may well be in the position they have dreamed of—that of having witnessed the scuttling of freedom and liberty here in America, while we

were so busy trying to impose that freedom and liberty on the peoples of the world.

Those who are most outspoken in supporting this legislation, by their own explanations, acknowledge the fact that this Nation is destined to assume the role of an international police force, and maintain armies and navies ready at a moment's notice to take one side or another in future wars the world over and impose our ideas upon the nation, or group of nations, we shall choose to call enemy.

By voting to enact this legislation, you acknowledge your support of this policy, and you pledge the future youth of the Nation to be sacrifices in Europe's periodic blood letting.

Gentlemen, this step by step to war procedure is neither honest nor honorable. I have opposed those steps—I will continue to oppose them. I objected to the Draft Extension Act because I was convinced it would lead to further measures aimed at drawing us into the war. I opposed the original measure to arm merchant vessels because, as I stated at that time, I was convinced it would be followed by the measure we have before us today. I am more convinced than ever that now is the time to call a halt in these part-way measures or give up the hope that we can spare the Nation the grief and misery and disillusionment that will surely follow our participation in the present war.

I have sought help and guidance in prayer for the decision I make on this grave question. If this were to be the last thing I did on this earth before I faced my Maker, I could not be more sincere than I am now. I plead with you—in Heaven's name—do not take America into this war.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] such time as he may desire.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is whether we concur in the Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 237, a joint resolution to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

Several days ago the House passed the resolution to repeal section 6, which would permit the arming of merchant vessels flying the American flag. The Senate, however, has gone further and proposes to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act, to permit our merchant ships to enter combat areas which were defined by Presidential proclamation under the Neutrality Act.

I believe it is a mistake to lift those restrictions now, and for that reason I shall vote against the Senate amendments.

I voted for the bill extending the time of service for soldiers because I believe that we should have men adequately trained to defend our country in case of direct attack, and so that our Army



would not be reduced to a mere skeleton, as would have been the case if the men in service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act had been released at the end of 12 months of service.

I voted for the two lend-lease bills which came before us because I believe that the American people want to help the democracies in defeating Hitler. We want to do all we can in that direction short of entering the war as belligerents.

I voted to arm merchant vessels because I feel the men manning our merchant ships are entitled to have weapons with which to defend themselves in case of attack, but I am not disposed, at least for the present, to say to these men that they will have to go into the war zones to carry supplies to Great Britain.

Let us continue to furnish to the democracies all the materials of war that they need, but let them furnish the men to use them. If they need additional ships, and we can supply them without jeopardizing our own defense, let us give them some more, but let them furnish the crews.

I am not satisfied that the British manpower is being used to the extent that it should. The British colonies are furnishing most of the fighting men used by Great Britain, according to reports we have received. Unless and until I am furnished proof to the contrary I must base my decisions on these reports.

To accept the Senate amendments is, to my mind, tantamount to authorizing an undeclared war and the people of America are not ready nor willing to go to war, although they are willing and anxious to furnish all the war material necessary for the democracies to defeat Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported the program of the administration, but on this matter of sending our ships into the war zones I have to draw the line and shall vote against the amendments.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE] 4 minutes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently opposed all the steps which I felt would inevitably lead this Nation into the European war. I am convinced that if we become further involved in this war we will lose our democracy at home while trying to protect it abroad.

We are all conscious of the forces from within that now threaten our own democracy. If we cannot cope with John L. Lewis and his labor racketeers who are now sabotaging our national-defense production, how can we be so optimistic about destroying Hitlerism in Europe?

The leading British military authorities have already stated that it would take an American expeditionary force to conquer Germany. The commitments of the executive branch of our Government are at variance with the laws which Congress has enacted. The measure before us would permit our ships not only to transport war materials to belligerent ports but also to take another American expeditionary force to the battlefields of Europe. If we repeal these remaining prohibitions in our Neutrality Act, our

American sailors and soldiers will be sent to watery graves in the submarine-infested combat areas. Will not such incidents arouse and inflame the people of this country to demand a declaration of war? Are you sure that is not the purpose of some of the organizations that are advocating the passage of this measure?

The interventionists want to defeat Hitler regardless of the sacrifices that we may have to make. I want to see Hitler defeated, but I am not willing to vote to gamble the lives of millions of American boys and the future security of this Nation.

Instead of plunging into this war, let us strengthen our own national defenses so that we can defeat Hitler or any combination of foreign powers that might threaten the Western Hemisphere.

We have already authorized or appropriated under our national-defense and lend-lease programs a stupendous sum of money, equal to twice the value of all the farm lands and buildings in the United States. We cannot finance all the wars of Europe and Asia and finance all the countries in the world that are in distress without jeopardizing our own national security.

We know that the social, economic, and political repercussions that followed in the wake of the last war brought communism, fascism, or nazi-ism to those countries which suffered the greatest impoverishment of wealth and manpower. Can we be blind to the repercussions that are sure to follow in the wake of this war? I do not want our country to succumb to any of these foreign ideologies. If we make the sacrifices that will be necessary in an all-out foreign war, we will have prepared a fertile seedbed in this country for a totalitarian power, and we, too, will wake up under a dictatorship.

Our people are looking to the Congress to check the warmongers and to protect our internal economy and future security. They are beginning to realize that they have been deceived by the subsidized propaganda that has so adroitly been moving this country into the war.

Dictators may engage in either a declared or an undeclared war, but under our Constitution it is the sole responsibility of Congress to declare war. If this measure passes, Congress will have approved an undeclared war against Germany and possibly Italy and Japan. The Congress of the United States will have surrendered its constitutional prerogative to declare war.

Kill this measure and save the lives of millions of our American boys, and preserve the future security of this country.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that a republic, a representative democracy such as ours, can long endure unless we maintain political honesty and integrity and keep faith with the people who entrust us with the power of office, and I make no distinction between domestic policies and foreign policies.

Based upon that premise, I approach the debate on this all-important ques-

tion of war or peace and borrow a phrase so often used by a great Democrat and a great statesman, "Let's look at the record."

In 1936 at the Democratic convention at Philadelphia under a subdivision, foreign policy, it was stated:

In our relationship with other nations, this Government will continue to extend the policy of the good neighbor. We reaffirm our opposition to war as an instrument of national policy, and declare that disputes between nations should be settled by peaceful means. We shall continue to observe a true neutrality in the disputes of others; to be prepared, resolutely to resist aggression against ourselves; to work for peace and to take the profits out of war; to guard against being drawn, by political commitments, international banking, or private trading, into any war which may develop anywhere.

At Cleveland, Ohio, the Republican Party in June 1936 in similar language, by party declaration, said and I quote:

We pledge ourselves to promote and maintain peace by all honorable means not leading to foreign alliances or political commitments.

Obedient to the traditional foreign policy of America and to the repeatedly expressed will of the American people, we pledge that America shall not become a member of the League of Nations nor of the World Court, nor shall America take on any entangling alliances in foreign affairs.

We shall promote, as the best means of security and maintaining peace by the pacific settlement of disputes, the great cause of international arbitration through the establishment of free, independent tribunals, which shall determine such disputes in accordance with law, equity and justice.

After much of the world was at war and after Hitler's plans were well known to our Government, in fact, just as well known as they are today, the Democratic Party assembled in convention at Chicago in 1940, by party declaration, said:

The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia and Africa, shall not come to America.

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.

In self-defense and in good conscience, the world's greatest democracy cannot afford heartlessly or in a spirit of appeasement to ignore the peace-loving and liberty-loving peoples wantonly attacked by ruthless aggressors. We pledge to extend to these people all the material aid at our command, consistent with law and not inconsistent with the interests of our own national self-defense.

The Republican Party in its commitment to the American people in stronger language at its convention in Philadelphia in June of 1940 said and I quote:

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

We are still suffering from the ill effects of the last World War—a war which cost us a \$24,000,000,000 increase in our national debt, billions of uncollectible foreign debts, and the complete upset of our economic system, in addition to the loss of human life and irreparable damage to the health of thousands of our boys.

The Republican Party stands for Americanism, preparedness, and peace. We declare for the prompt, orderly, and realistic building of our national defense to the point at which we shall be able not only to defend the United States, its possessions, and essential outposts

from foreign attack, but also efficiently to uphold in war the Monroe Doctrine. To this task the Republican Party pledges itself when entrusted with national authority. In the meantime we shall support all necessary and proper defense measures proposed by the administration in its belated effort to make up for lost time, but we deplore explosive utterances by the President directed at other governments which serve to imperil our peace, and we condemn all Executive acts and proceedings which might lead to war without the authorization of the Congress of the United States.

Our sympathies have been profoundly stirred by invasion of unoffending countries and by disaster to nations whose ideals most closely resemble our own. We favor the extension to all peoples fighting for liberty, or whose liberty is threatened, of such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense.

Mr. Speaker, these party commitments were made; the nominees of the respective parties were chosen. Let us therefore look at the record and see what interpretation the candidates themselves placed on these party commitments as to what our foreign policy should be.

The following are a few of the statements and promises made by the successful candidate, Mr. Roosevelt, during the campaign of 1936, subsequent thereto, and in the campaign of 1940.

May 20, 1936—letter to W. H. Oppenheimer:

And I am glad to reiterate here a declaration I have previously made that the people of America and the Government of those people intend and expect to remain at peace with all the world.

June 12, 1936—address at Texas centennial:

We seek to banish war in this hemisphere; we seek to extend those practices of good will and closer friendship upon which peace itself is based. (Washington Star, June 12, 1936.)

August 14, 1936—address at Chautauqua, N. Y.:

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "No" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

I have seen war; I have seen war on land and sea; I have seen blood running from the wounded; I have seen men coughing out their gassed lungs; I have seen the dead in the mud; I have seen cities destroyed; I have seen 200 limping exhausted men coming out of line, the survivors of a regiment of 1,000 that went forward 48 hours before; I have seen children starving; I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war.

I have passed unnumbered hours—I shall pass unnumbered hours—thinking and planning how war may be kept from this Nation.

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. I can at least make clear that the conscience of America revolts against war and that any nation which provokes war forfeits the sympathy of the people of the United States.

November 27, 1936—address to Brazilian Congress:

Your first concern, like ours, is peace—for we know that war destroys not only human lives and human happiness but destroys as well the ideals of individual liberty and of

the democratic form of representative government, which is the goal of all the American republics.

January 3, 1938, before joint session of Congress:

The people of the United States and the Government of the United States have shown capacity for restraint and a civilized approach to the purposes of peace while, at the same time, we maintain the integrity inherent in the sovereignty of 130,000,000 people, lest we weaken or destroy our influence for peace and jeopardize the sovereignty itself.

October 26, 1938, radio address from White House:

I speak for a United States which has no interest in war. We covet nothing save good relations with our neighbors, and we recognize that the world today has become our neighbor.

November 4, 1938, radio address from Hyde Park:

And, while we are developing that coolness of judgment, we need in public office, above all things, men wise enough to avoid passing incidents where passion and force try to substitute themselves for judgment and negotiations.

February 18, 1939, radio address, Key West, Fla.:

We desire by every legitimate means to promote freedom in trade and travel and in the exchange of cultural ideas among nations. We seek no territorial expansion; we are not covetous of our neighbor's goods; we shall cooperate in every proposal honestly put forward to limit armaments; we abhor the appeal to physical force except to repulse aggression; but we say to all the world that in the Western Hemisphere—in the three Americas—the institutions of democracy—government with the consent of the governed—must and shall be maintained.

October 26, 1939, address, New York Herald Tribune Forum:

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogeyman. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any State government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner, or form the remotest possibility of sending boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake.

April 20, 1940, to Young Democratic Clubs of America:

I am not speaking tonight of world affairs. Your Government is keeping a cool head and a steady hand. We are keeping out of the wars that are going on in Europe and in Asia, but I do not subscribe to the preaching of a Republican aspirant for the Presidency who tells you, in effect, that the United States and the people of the United States should do nothing to try to bring about a better order, a more secure order, of world peace when the time comes.

July 10, 1940, message to Congress:

That we are opposed to war is known not only to every American, but to every government in the world. We will not use our arms in a war of aggression; we will not send our men to take part in European wars.

September 11, 1940, excerpt from address before teamsters' union—press release:

I hate war, now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all that I can to keep war away from these shores for all time. I stand, with my party and outside of my party as President of all the people, on the platform, the wording that was adopted in Chicago less than 2 months ago. It said:

"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."

October 23, 1940, address at Philadelphia—New York Times, October 31, 1940:

We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "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."

October 23, 1940, speech at Philadelphia:

I give to the people of this country this most solemn assurance. There is no secret treaty, no secret obligation, no secret commitment, no secret understanding in any shape or form, direct or indirect, with any other government, or any other nation in any part of the world—no such secrecy that might or could, in any shape, involve this Nation in any war or for any other purpose.

October 30, 1940, address at Boston Garden—New York Herald Tribune, October 31, 1940:

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.

The purpose of our defense is defense.

December 29, 1940, fireside chat—press release:

There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

Mr. Willkie, prior to his nomination and while a candidate, in forceful language stated his position in a speech made on June 18, 1940, to the Brooklyn Republican Club, and I quote:

I want to repeat what I have said on several previous occasions, that despite our whole-hearted sympathy for the Allied cause, we must stay out of war. In the stress of these times, when our hearts are confused with emotion, we must keep our heads clear. We do not intend to send men from the shores of this continent to fight in any war. That is not mere selfishness on our part; we shall not serve the cause of democracy and human freedom by becoming involved in the present war; we shall serve that cause only by keeping out of the war. I believe in national defense, not as a step toward war, but as a protection against it. It is the duty of the President of the United States to recognize the determination of the people to stay out of war and to do nothing by word or deed that will undermine that determination. No man has the right to use the great powers of the Presidency to lead the people, indirectly, into war; only the people through



their elected Representatives can make that awful decision, and there is no question as to that decision.

After his nomination, and after accepting and approving the platform of the party, in interpreting the same, he told the American people that we would not have another A. E. F. I quote from numerous speeches made by him during the campaign. October 4, 1940, over the radio, he said:

If I am elected President of the United States I shall never lead this country into any European war. As a matter of fact, I shall never lead the country into any kind of a war unless the people, through their Representatives in Congress, insist upon it, and I shall also refrain from indulging in extravagant attacks upon other nations. The best way for us to keep out of this war is by rebuilding our domestic economy, and by the building of a great national defense, and by bringing our people into one united common purpose to develop our own country and to keep out of other people's troubles.

Speaking in Boston on October 12, 1940, Mr. Willkie said:

We can have peace, but we must know how to preserve it. To begin with, we shall not undertake to fight anybody else's war. Our boys shall stay out of European wars. This is only one way. We must become strong. We must build ourselves an air force, a Navy, and an Army so strong that no dictator will dare to tamper with our commerce, our interests, or our rights. That is the defense program we must have.

Speaking from Baltimore, on October 30, 1940, Mr. Willkie said:

I have given you my pledge many times over. I will work for peace. We are against sending our boys into any war other than the defense of our own country.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone, in view of the commitments of the two great parties seriously contend—does anyone sincerely expect anyone to believe, in view of our pledges as political parties, and in view of the interpretation and statements made by our respective candidates, if they were in good faith—that our foreign policy was more than aid short of war? Do you think for a moment that any candidate for the Presidency or any candidate running for Congress, on any ticket, could have been selected in November 1940 if they had stated "we are in favor of, and will vote to repeal the Neutrality Act"?

But some gentlemen argue that by the enactment of the lease-lend bill we abandoned the policy of aid short of war to those fighting Hitler and the aggressors.

This I deny. Did anyone arguing for the administration during the debates on the lend-lease bill say that it repealed the provisions of the Neutrality Act? Did they dare say that we expected to arm merchantmen and send them into the war zones and belligerent ports? Of course, they did not. I admit that the Lend-Lease Act went far beyond neutrality and that we did forsake and abandon real neutrality when we passed the lend-lease bill, but we avoided, or at least we told the people that we were avoiding, any physical contact with the Hitler forces. This bill that we are asked to support does more than scrap the Neutrality Act. It invites shooting. When merchantmen sail with contra-

band goods, with war material into combat zones and belligerent ports, we become legitimate target for the enemy and, as has been so ably stated by distinguished Members of the Congress of both parties and in both Houses, it is extremely doubtful if such a policy would contribute to the defeat of Hitler and Mussolini.

Why? Because, when we are drawn all the way into a shooting war, no doubt involving us in two oceans, the American people will demand, and rightfully so, that we conserve more of our own defense material and resources for our own defense and there will be less, rather than more, lend-lease aid for others.

Mr. Speaker, when we pass this bill we have virtually declared war. Some gentlemen argue that we are already at war, that when the President gave the order to shoot on sight that war was declared, notwithstanding the provisions of our Constitution that only the Congress shall have the right to declare war. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that the shooting has begun and that we are close to the precipice. The enactment of this bill will put us all the way in. It will completely shove us over the precipice.

On the other hand, gentlemen high in the ranks of this administration, members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, both in the House and in the Senate, sponsoring this resolution, deny that we are at war. If they are correct, then as a humble Member I do not want to do anything that will further cause my country to take that awful and final step.

The enactment of this legislation will do that. I do not want the blood of American boys on my hands and on my conscience, in an undeclared war. One of the strange things about this whole affair to me, looking at it from the standpoint of a common ordinary citizen, is that gentlemen in both bodies of this Congress who claim they do not want to go to war, contend that the taking of this fatal step by the enactment of this legislation will not get us all the way in, and that they do not expect to go to war, yet they argue and with every sentimental phrase that they can command, say, "We must fight for freedom of the seas." That we must fight because of the unfortunate incidents that have already occurred under our policy to shoot on sight. That because some of our destroyers and tankers were convoying and engaged in battle and as a result American lives were lost, that we would attempt to right those wrongs by going to war. No one regrets more than I the spilling of American blood and the loss of the lives of our American sailors in these unfortunate incidents, brought about, as I believe, illegally by convoying and by actual combat with German submarines without a war declaration by the people's Representatives.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us remember that almost 150 years ago when Europe went mad with war, as it has gone mad today, a great President Thomas Jefferson said, "In the present maniac state of Europe we should not estimate the point of honor by the ordinary scale."

The reasoning which made this a sound rule in the maniac state of Europe in Jefferson's day makes it equally strong in the maniac state of Europe today. Let us never forget, Mr. Speaker, that this Nation has always deemed it to be a good policy and has always been wise enough to proceed with calmness and patience where our feelings have been outraged by incidents.

When Washington was President and neutrality was first declared, war convulsed Europe, our ships dared not put out to sea, commerce was paralyzed, and business depressed. American passengers and American crews were thrown into prison and deprived of legal right. Genet, the minister from France, fitted out privateers in our harbors, flouted our officials, and tried to rally this country to the support of France in return for the help France gave us in the Revolutionary War. England and France seized 400 of our ships and confiscated millions of dollars' worth of our property, and up in Quebec Lord Dorchester promised Canadian Indians the pleasure of burning American homes and scalping American citizens. But we didn't go to war. Washington settled our troubles short of war.

When Adams was President, France preyed upon our commerce. She extended her seizure, searches, and confiscations to the very waters of the United States themselves until she had piled up in our State Department charges of over 2,300 violations of the neutrality law. American ambassadors who sought to adjust these wrongs were refused recognition and openly insulted at the French court. But we didn't go to war.

When Jefferson was President England seized hundreds of our ships and Napoleon hundreds more. From 1793 and 1807 historians say England and France together captured 1,600 American vessels and \$60,000,000 worth of American property. England compelled over 2,000 American seamen to serve against their will in the English Navy and Napoleon ordered the seizure and confiscation of American ships wherever they were found. Our shipping rotted at every French and British harbor, our crews were cast into prison, and left to die of abuse and neglect. The British ship *Leopard* fired upon the American cruiser *Chesapeake* in American waters, killed and wounded several of our sailors, took three native-born American citizens off the *Chesapeake*, and hanged one of them in Halifax.

But we did not go to war.

When Pierce was President the British minister in this country and three of his consuls violated our neutrality during the Crimean War. We gave these representatives of Great Britain their passports and sent them home. But we did not go to war.

When Lincoln was President this country's rights were violated on every side. England, Russia, France, and Spain were guilty of such flagrant violations that Secretary of State Seward advanced a plan to go to war with all of them at one and the same time.

France used every possible influence short of open war to injure us. She not

only permitted the building of Confederate vessels in private shipyards but she allowed at least two to be built in the national navy yard of France, and she supplied them with supplies from her Government arsenal. And England did more.

Through his Secretary of State, Lincoln called England to account for the seizure of the U. S. S. *Chesapeake* on the high seas bound from New York to Portland, for the burning of the U. S. S. *Roanoke* off Bermuda, for the seizure on Lake Erie of the ship *Phil Parsons* and the scuttling of the *Island Queen*, the shooting of its engineer, and the wounding of its passengers; and he protested to England against the invasion of the territory of the United States by a band of southern sympathizers from Canada, who rode across the border into Vermont, burned a portion of St. Albans, looted its homes, robbed its bank of \$211,000, killed one of its citizens, and wounded several more. England let loose the *Alabama* to prey upon our commerce, to destroy \$100,000,000 worth of property, to capture 84 of our vessels, and drove our flag off the seas. No nation ever inflicted upon another nation a more damnable or more maddening wrong than England inflicted upon the United States in the *Alabama* outrage. But we did not go to war.

When Harrison was President the people of Chile conceived a violent dislike to the United States for our insistence upon neutrality during the Chilean revolution. When this feeling was at its height one junior officer from the United States warship *Baltimore* was killed outright in the streets of Valparaiso and 16 of our sailors wounded, 1 of whom afterward died. But we did not go to war.

When Grant was President, during the war between Spain and the Spanish West Indies, a Spanish gunboat seized the vessel *Virginus*, flying the American flag, and a Spanish commandant in cold blood shot the captain of the *Virginus*, 36 of the crew, and 16 of the passengers. But we did not go to war.

Oh, yes; Mr. Speaker; we hear a lot about freedom of the seas—freedom of the seas—yes, it is an old doctrine and a good one. I believe in it. I stand for it steadfastly and loyally as a fundamental proposition. I would defend our right to rove the seas unhindered and strike with all of the Nation's resentment against any nation interfering with us with the purpose and intent of arbitrarily and insolently limiting our right to the use of the seas. There can be no division of sentiment in this country as to that, but at this time in this country we are facing an extraordinary situation. A great war is raging all over Europe and in Asia and Africa. Forbidden zones have been declared by those engaged in that war. They have not only been declared by Hitler and by Mussolini, but by England. Blockades have been established and thousands upon thousands of people are starving in the Lowlands—conquered people everywhere who had nothing to do with this war, who are in no way responsible for it are denied food and clothing. England says they must not be sent food because she says to send such might aid Hitler. Their policy is twofold about

this matter. They say that they will not permit us to send food and supplies to them. First, because Hitler and his soldiers might get the supplies, and secondly, for the reason that they can be starved into a rebellion and uprising against him.

Yes; we prate and shout about freedom of the seas, but you and I know that when a world war is raging we must be realistic about these things. Yes; if we permit sentiment to usurp the place of judgment, we can dive headlong into the turbulence seething in these narrow areas of the sea. Gentlemen in bursts of oratory may ask who shall deprive an American citizen of his unrestricted right to go upon the seas when and where he pleases. But I say, in the language of a distinguished statesman who served his country faithfully and well for many years in the United States Senate, "Possibly no one should dare to do that terrible thing. Nevertheless, I venture to say that the American citizen who would with glaring foolhardiness deliberately go into the very mouth of this maritime hell where war is raging in its most ruthless form, wrapping the American flag about him and shouting defiance to the war would be rendering a very poor service to his country."

Yes; Mr. Speaker, let us be reasonable. Let us be realistic. Let us be sensible about this thing. Are we ready to go to war?

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that we have just cause, assuming, for the sake of argument, that Hitler has designs upon the United States—are we ready at this time to go to war? Is it un-American to ask that question? Again I say we had better be realistic about this thing. If I know anything about reason, if I know anything about common sense, if I know anything about logic, it would seem to me that immediately that we arm our ships and send them into belligerent waters with orders to shoot on sight that we encourage Hitler to shoot. That we encourage him to draw us into this war for all purposes. Are we ready?

With strikes going on daily in our defense plants, with the administration still following the doctrine of appeasement with certain elements in this country, with incompetency rampant in the boards and bureaus and alphabets that have been created and set up to deal with those who manufacture defense needs and material, and with labor, with the policy of the administration to permit no one capable and responsible of organizing and coordinating the defense program, I ask, "Are we ready to go to war?"

Mr. Speaker, time will not permit me further discussion of this matter, but I cannot let go unanswered the insinuations and innuendos of the Dorothy Thompsons and others that the great people of the Middle West are so backward in their thinking and have so little understanding of international affairs that they do not know or understand what it is all about, and that they should blindly follow a leadership which pro-

claims one thing today and another thing tomorrow.

One of the tragedies of this thing so it seems to me is the utter confusion now in the minds of a vast majority of American people and it could hardly be otherwise with this off-and-on policy that we have pursued. And another tragedy of the whole thing seems to me to be this—that those who attempt to direct the thinking of this country and more particularly the press and a vast majority of the commentators, leave no room for a middle ground. They make their own divisions of the country and classify the people as either isolationists or interventionists. I believe that there is a middle ground that can rightfully be occupied, and I firmly believe that the vast majority of the people in this country belong to that middle-ground class. They are neither interventionists nor isolationists. They want to build and to make our own defenses so impregnable on ground, at sea, under the sea, and in the air, that no aggressor nation or group of aggressor nations will ever dare attack us.

They sympathize with every nation in Europe that has been crushed by the aggressor and are willing to lend, or give, if necessary, all aid short of war to those who are fighting to regain their freedom.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are willing to go in for an all-out sacrifice, if need be, to make our country safe and strong. They may wonder just a little bit sometimes just how much some of those who are talking loudest about all these sacrifices we are to make, intend to make themselves.

On the other hand they do not want to send our sons to Europe, Asia, or Africa to engage in foreign wars for the purpose of attempting to try to solve and settle the problems of the warring nations. They do not want another American expeditionary force. This I am sure is the way that 80 percent of the American people feel about this war picture.

I realize that human affairs, national and international, viewed from a standpoint of a nation, are complex and that there are dominant factors that often are neither ascertainable nor predictable. I come from the great Middle West, and I realize that our people in Oklahoma are not as directly affected by the European war and the Asiatic war, either economically or emotionally, as the people who live in some other parts of the country. Very few of us have near kinfolk in foreign countries, investments abroad, or interests in international organizations. Probably we feel safer because of our inland situation. It seems to me that in the great Middle West area that the people are inclined to a relatively dispassionate view of the international situation, possibly chiefly because of the reasons that I have heretofore mentioned. Be that as it may, I sincerely believe that more than 80 percent of the people throughout the entire Middle West, sizing up the whole picture, are pretty much in accord with the following policies.

First, they believe the United States should continue with our preparedness program, continuing to increase our



naval, land, and air forces to such a degree of efficiency that we can successfully defend the whole of the Western Hemisphere, if needs be, against any aggressor or combination of aggressors.

Second. That aid to the so-called democracies should be continued in order to enable them to obtain their needed supplies from us, but that we should not enter into methods of warfare in order to deliver goods to them, and that we should not underwrite their success in their present struggle.

Third. That our frontiers are not on the English Channel, the Rhine, the Mediterranean, the Yangtze, or the East Indies, unless we enter the war and make such a choice of frontiers. That the choice of these frontiers when we are at peace implies an intention to dominate the world through our naval, air, and military might.

Fourth. That entry into this war by us will result in impoverishment of the American people, and when complete victory is gained, the economic power flowing from the victory will not be sufficient to pay us for the costs of the war in dollars and cents, to say nothing of the suffering, sorrow, and tears that war would bring.

Fifth. That after having entered the war and after having won the war, we would have to assume the role of an international policeman for an indefinite time and would have to support this position by maintaining indefinitely great naval, air, and military forces throughout the world. That we would have to remain so prepared so as to maintain in all of the countries of the world such a huge army so as to be in a position at all times to support our judgment against the judgment of the people whose order we had undertaken to preserve and whose territorial integrity we had agreed to maintain.

Sixth. That if we do not enter the war we will, after the war is ended, be able to meet our economic competitors in the international field successfully.

This, I believe, fairly sums up the thoughts, the wishes, and the hopes of the great majority of our people. They hate Hitlerism and everything it advocates. They hate communism, with all of its undermining influences and characteristics. Both are contrary to every conception of American ideals and our free institutions. They resent being called Nazi sympathizers simply because they oppose sending our sons to again fight and die and rot on European and Asiatic battlefields. They do not want another American Expeditionary Force.

Mr. Speaker, during the late campaign repeatedly I promised the people of my State that if elected as a Member of the Congress I would do everything in my power compatible with the honor of our country to keep our people out of this savage, brutal, and bloody conflict. I have humbly asked for supreme guidance. My conscience will not permit me to cast my vote for this resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I have opposed every step toward our involve-

ment in foreign wars, and I shall continue to oppose every step until this Congress, speaking for the great majority of the American people, say we ought to go into a foreign war. I shall lean upon the spirit and the words of William Lloyd Garrison, who said:

I will not equivocate, I will not excuse, I will not retreat one single inch, and I will be heard.

Mr. Speaker, we are asked today to take the last step toward foreign war involvement, to put our approval upon an undeclared war, if you will. I call to this Chamber the spirit of the 110 or more American sailors recently dead who are sleeping in watery graves tonight to speak to you Members of Congress and say whether they would approve of an undeclared war in which other American boys would lose their lives. I challenge you to read the statement made by a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the other body, who in debate on these amendments last week in that body said:

I have confidential information, and I say on my professional word that these ships, the *Greer*, the *Kearny*, and the *Reuben James*, were engaged in aggressive war acts when they went down in combat zones.

Gentlemen of the Congress, you are taking the responsibility for war into your own hands today. You can bring back to the people the power to say whether we are to be involved in a foreign war, declared or undeclared. The responsibility is a serious one. Witness across the seas: Today we see deadlocked two diabolical dictators, Hitler and Stalin, reminding me of a picture I saw in one of the magazines recently of two deer whose horns were locked in mortal combat out in one of our national parks. It was necessary for a game warden to saw off their antlers as a humane act to save their lives. Today it looks like we have the responsibility to save communism for the world instead of democracy. God help us in this hour of national peril.

Across the seas we see raging a controversy between two diabolical dictators who know not Christ but who follow only the mandate of the international bankers and who are powerful today because they are the offspring of British imperialism. We hear very little said about Mr. Stalin today in this debate and his diabolical system of government which is equally if not more dangerous than Hitler's system of government. They say, "How about the Russians holding the line? The poor Russians, the poor people of Germany, the poor people of England, none of whom started the war, must suffer for the sins of leaders who are strangers to Christ." The poor people have not a thing to say about this war. The international banking ring made this war possible. This is not a labor war. It is directed by the anti-Christian bankers who were responsible for the last World War. The time will come very shortly, I think, when you may see a separate peace between Herr Hitler, the demon of today, and Mr. Churchill, the great hero of today—England always takes care of England—and then when this takes place poor old Uncle Sam will again be holding the bag. Poor old Uncle Sam they will call him, as they

did before. He now walks down the road taking the last step toward war, punch-drunk and dizzy from the doses of British propaganda administered to him the past few years.

Save Uncle Sam today by your vote against these neutrality amendments. Do not go through life with the blood of American boys on your hands. Let the swastika and the hammer and sickle crumble to dust, but hold fast to the cross of Christ, the only symbol of real peace left in an insane and war-torn world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, spread across the entrance to the University of Pennsylvania law school are these words:

The reason for a law is the soul of the law.

Never in the history of a legislative body has any action been taken that more typifies those words than did the enactment of the neutrality bill just a few months ago. We had before us at that time the experience of a world war. Perhaps because I happened to have been one of the many men who fought in the war to end all wars, I am just a little bit skeptical about taking any steps that will involve us in another war. Members of the House, if you have any doubt in your minds, or if anyone has any doubt in his mind as to what got us into World War No. 1, I refer you and them to the files of the newspapers in the Congressional Library. Spread across the front pages in bold headlines in all the best newspapers of America and in the editorial comment of those newspapers day after day was just one thing, namely, the loss of the lives of our nationals. Not a word mentioned about the size of the vessels; not a word mentioned about the value of the cargoes—but one thing, and that was the loss of the lives of the men on those ships. With what result? With the result that in America there was created that hysteria that manifested itself in a demand for war; and I respectfully submit that the adoption of these amendments means war again. If we learned anything at all from our past experience, let us profit from it to the extent that the amendments will be rejected.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON].

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the question is not whether we shall arm merchant ships. Neither is it a question of repealing the sections of the act which prohibit our ships from entering combat zones—no; it is not even a question of the repeal of the act in its entirety. The fundamental question which we legislators must attempt to answer is, What is best for America? My own conviction is and has been that what is best for America is certainly not intervention in the ever-recurring wars of Europe. If we again become involved as we did in 1917 the American people must be prepared from now on to accept full responsibility for the conduct of nations and governments all over the world. We become policeman, father, judge, and

banker to all peoples and nations everywhere. The cost is tremendous, and not in money alone. Moral and spiritual values are at stake and vitally so. We Americans are not all sprung from a common ancestry. We are a fusion people who have determined upon a way of life and a philosophy of government which is one thing only—it is American. It is not English or German or Swedish or Russian. It is not Protestant or Catholic or Jewish or Buddhist. It is not north or south or east or west—it is American.

I believe with all my heart that we Americans are prepared to give up everything to defend that way of life and philosophy of government. We are willing to tax ourselves poor to buy war materials—planes and battleships and tanks and guns—to defend it. We are willing that every able-bodied man from 17 to 60 be trained for 1, 2, 5, or 10 years to defend it. But we are not willing to jeopardize it, as surely we are, by asking for trouble. Asking?—by seeking it out.

Because I feel this way, because I have thought the question through to this conclusion is not to say that those who differ are wrong. It could very easily be that I am mistaken and have not given full weight to all factors which enter the question, nevertheless I have tried, and traveled to Europe and South America, and read and listened to both sides; but I am still convinced that we are following the road to war by the repeal and revision of the Neutrality Act. I do not believe the people I represent want war. I believe they resent it as deeply as I do and are thinking only of what is best for America. I shall, therefore, vote against repeal and revision of the Neutrality Act and by so doing reaffirm the position I have taken on behalf of the people of the Ninth Iowa District: Against war and against any steps which lead to it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that I am competent to add much to this discussion; as a matter of fact, it is with a great deal of hesitancy that I inflict myself upon the membership of the House, for I am conscious of the fact, especially, that I have spoken on this subject several times in the past. If I am guilty of repetition to a certain extent, I hope you will forgive me. I would not speak at all upon this question were it not from a very, very profound conviction that the Neutrality Act, or what remains of it now upon the statute books, is injurious to the safety of the United States. At the risk of repetition, for a moment or two let us look back and examine our motives and our hopes when in 1935 we embarked upon this program of enacting neutrality laws.

I think no one will deny that by their enactment the United States voluntarily and deliberately surrendered some of its most precious rights, rights for which our forefathers fought upon more than one occasion. Apparently the majority of the Congress at that time, perhaps a majority of the people, were convinced that by the surrender of rights we would

be safer. At that time I could not bring myself to believe that such a thing was true or could be true, for as I judge human nature and as I try to read history, never once have I found an individual or a nation made stronger or safer by surrender of his or its rights.

I think we injured to a considerable extent—not fatally—the strength of our defense when we said to the world that whenever war broke out anywhere on the face of the earth, no matter how far it might spread, we would in a sense retire into a shell and keep our ships off the ocean and our citizens from traveling. Of course, we went further than that and declared we would not sell anything to anybody who was a belligerent. I think to an extent we injured our own strength when we did that. More than that, I believe we did a disservice to civilization, for no matter how frequently we hear international law made fun of, no matter how frequently we hear the assertion that it is scrapped, to every thoughtful person it must occur that if international law is not to be sustained by the decent peoples of this earth, civilization is on the downward grade.

What have the nations for decades been attempting to do in the field of international law? They have been attempting to reach agreements amongst themselves to limit the fury and the horror of war, to reduce to the minimum the suffering of civilians—men, women, and children, the sick and the wounded—and, as a part of international law, to preserve to the decent neutral, who is in no way responsible for war, the right to live his life free from these horrors, free from the destructive intervention of the forces of war. I am perfectly willing to admit that as the result of recent events international law has been severely strained, if not smashed, but I am not willing to admit that the American people should give up their devotion to it; for if we, the greatest nation in the world, as we say we are, and perhaps the most peaceably inclined, desert the ideal which our forebears attempted to insert in international law, what is the effect upon other and lesser nations? There can be no hope for them, there can be no hope for posterity. Force and more force, cruelty and ruthless cruelty, will sweep and control the world if America abandons the ideals of international law. So I am convinced that this matter is profoundly important to us today, to our children, and to the world in years to come. The human race today is faced with a world-wide revolution, not merely a war of conquest but a war seeking revolution, a revolution having as its objective things so offensive to our spirit that one hesitates in an attempt to define them.

This law says, in effect, that no American vessel may carry supplies to a belligerent. Let me explore the practical field, and this is the field that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] said most correctly shifts and changes from day to day and hour to hour. Let us explore, if we can, the practical field.

I think we expend too large a proportion of our attention upon the Atlantic and too little upon the Pacific. In the

Pacific there is a great power, an openly although not a belligerent ally, of the so-called Nazi-Fascist powers. That power—Japan—is intent upon establishing a totalitarian system in Asia to govern hundreds of millions of people with enormous resources. She has taken long steps in that direction and, judging by the utterances of her leaders, she intends to take more steps unless perhaps the United States says "No." Just how the crisis may develop I do not know.

But let us assume that Japan attacks Russia. Then, if this present law of ours is an honest law, those far Pacific waters may become combat zones. It does not do to say, as my friend from South Dakota suggests, that they need not become combat zones if the President of the United States decides not to recognize a state of war between Japan and Russia. I hope we shall not count upon such evasion. This is either an honest law or it is a dishonest law; and to state that in the event of a war between Japan and Russia there will be no combat zones in the Far East is to state an untruth. So I assume that an untruth will not be stated; that instantly upon the breaking out of such a contest American vessels would not be permitted, under our law, to go to the East Indies.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Briefly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman is referring to the remark I made, I merely pointed out that in the Chinese-Japanese War the President said he did not find a state of war to exist, and so responded to a resolution of inquiry here in the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I recognize the historical accuracy of what the gentleman from South Dakota states, but I do not think any man in this House will say there is no state of war between China and Japan today.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Neither did I say that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And I agree with the gentleman.

In such an event none of those vessels could go to the Dutch East Indies or to Indo-China. They might be permitted under sufferance to visit Manila. None of them could go to Vladivostok. I am assuming, of course, those waters will be combat zones. With this law upon the statute books, our vessels are barred from visiting any belligerent port in Europe, combat zones still persist in the Atlantic, and in the Pacific we shall be confronted with a closed door. No American merchant vessel will be permitted to visit any belligerent port and must be kept out of combat zones.

This will cut off a vital supply line of the United States, cut off because we have surrendered our rights. There is no other explanation for it.

I agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that the Japanese Government is watching the proceedings in the House of Representatives today with much curiosity. If by our vote we decide to continue with the surrender of our rights, they will at least derive considerable encouragement in the following out of their plans to establish their con-



trol over a vast area of the earth directly antagonistic to our vital interests.

Now, just a word about ships. By an overwhelming majority this House has appropriated money or authorized the appropriation of sums to build millions of tons of merchant shipping. Why? To strengthen the United States, primarily, I assume. They are beginning to slip down the ways with ever-increasing rapidity. In a few months we shall have launched hundreds of them.

Where are they going to be used? Mind you, Mr. Hitler does not recognize the limitations of our combat zones as the limitations of his combat zones. He sinks ships wherever they may be found. That there shall be conflict if we are to stand up against such a policy is inevitable. Of course there will be shooting, as there has already been shooting, for we cannot tolerate the doctrine that a belligerent has the right to sink any ship anywhere and without giving the passengers and crew a chance for their lives.

It has been suggested that these new ships of ours may be loaned to Great Britain and manned by British sailors. Mr. Speaker, have we come to that? Do we not have courage enough to man our own vessels? I emphasize that side of the question more than I do the practical side because it hurts me to my very soul to hear that we are going to launch millions of tons of ships and American sailors will not sail them.

The other, practical, consideration is that the British seafaring population is not large enough to man their own merchant marine plus our rapidly increasing merchant marine. If that be true, and it becomes necessary for those ships to be used in support of our policy, then I suppose we would revert to that sweet little device of putting a Panamanian flag over them. Think of it, Members of the House of Representatives; the great Government of the United States either forced or induced by the existence of this statute to resort to such a device as that. I confess I cannot stomach it.

Men ask me and men ask you, "Are we going into a full-fledged war?" Frankly, I do not know the answer. I wish I did.

Men ask me, "Are we going to send an expeditionary force outside the Western hemisphere?" I do not know. I cannot answer. I cannot judge the future with sufficient accuracy to make me confident in an answer.

Men ask me, "How long is this war going to last? Will somebody break down in a year? Will somebody give up in 2 years? Will someone win in 3 years, or 4? Will there be a stalemate?" I do not know; I cannot answer.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is just one thing of which I am absolutely confident. We must not—and we might as well be realistic about this; it is a grim situation, and we must look it straight in the face—we must not, we cannot permit this world revolution to prevail, for if it should succeed, there will be no freedom. Here in our country we shall have to desert our form of government in order to marshal and regiment our people in a desperate attempt to prevent the spread of the revolution here. Freedom will be the safer in

America if the attacks on freedom elsewhere are defeated.

When I speak of freedom, I mean those things of the spirit so much more precious than material things, things for which human beings have striven for centuries and centuries. At times the race seemed to have achieved its great objective only to suffer a set-back. Indeed a terrible set-back has occurred in recent years. Fearful disillusionments have overtaken people. Once again freedom is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this pending bill because I am convinced that our freedom will be the safer if we pass it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I said in my first speech on the neutrality bill:

An exhibition of national weakness is always an invitation to conquerors.

Mr. Speaker, I left this Chamber last night almost brokenhearted, feeling that we had exhibited national weakness which was an invitation to aggressors, and which would cause rejoicing among Hitler's followers. Disunity is weakness of the most dangerous sort.

I would not curb freedom of speech, but I would try to reach down to the roots of the bitterness which has been so apparent in this debate. I desire to comment on three of those roots which are deeply embedded and carefully nurtured by the Hitlerites.

First. The anxiety about the labor situation: This is well-founded, but it is no reason for calling in Hitler. Neutrality and labor are two definitely different issues, and they must be settled by different legislative proposals. It appears to me that those who expose our national weakness to the world may be doing the very thing they so resent in the labor leaders.

Second. Hatred of England: This has been so apparent that no one can be indifferent to it. This is no time to hark back to the mistakes of England. What other ally can we now call to our side?

Third. Bitterness toward the administration: This was the root cause of many adverse comments yesterday. This administration was chosen in a free election, open to our whole citizenship. It has more than three years yet to run. Those who would pull it down in the midst of a great danger cannot be counted among the bulwarks of our democracy. I beg my colleagues, in this dark hour, to act without being impelled by bitterness and resentment.

I cannot conceive that any Member of this House would vote contrary to his deepest convictions, because influenced by the thought of votes in the next election. It does not matter who sits in these seats. The avalanche of propaganda has not been actuated by the highest motives. It, too, has its roots in bitterness, and it is largely paid propaganda. Let us cast aside every thought of self and every

resentment and vote our deepest convictions for the defense of our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no further time desired the question is on the motion.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDS. What is the rule as to disposition of time in the event one of the parties who divided the time yielded back his time and left the party dividing the time with him up against the other side entirely? What about that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has a right to yield back his time if he desires. The gentleman from New York, chairman of the committee, has a right under the rules of the House to close the debate.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'Connor] 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am not so unsophisticated as not to realize that this is the last time that we are going to have a chance to vote on peace or war. If we pass this resolution we are in war. We are going on with our undeclared war. More and more and more of our ships will be sunk and more and more of our boys will be killed. I have here a sheaf of telegrams which came this morning from Montana, from the fathers and mothers of Montana, requesting us to defeat this resolution.

I have said again and again and I repeat now that this legislation is entirely unnecessary, even though the manner in which the Neutrality Act is enforced is, as the President said, restricting his moves. Whenever a lawyer agrees with me I always say he is a great one. I find, on consulting the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I am not the only Member of Congress who has taken the position that our neutrality law in inhibiting our citizens, and so forth, is discretionary with the President. I find, as disclosed by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated October 2, 1941, page 7597, that Senator PEPPER, the chief blitzkrieger for war in the Senate, took the same position, and I quote:

I think, however, that even those who want to clear the pathways of the seas for our ships have been too ready to assume that our only relief from these restrictions lies in the repeal of the Neutrality Act. I believe there is another and more appropriate avenue of relief. That is provided in the Neutrality Act itself.

The President's proclamation was issued under authority conferred by section 1 (a) of the Neutrality Act of 1939. This section provides that—

"Whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States, or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and shall from time to time, by proclamation, name other states if and when they may become involved in the war."

Thus, the provisions of the Neutrality Act apply only if the President finds two things: First, that a state of war exists; second, that the restrictions of the Neutrality Act will promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or protect the lives of its citizens.

The provisions of the Neutrality Act are discretionary rather than mandatory. The old Neutrality Act of 1937 compelled the President to issue a proclamation whenever a state of war existed. Upon the issuance of this mandatory proclamation the prohibition of the old statute against the movement of American vessels and against the arming of American vessels came immediately into operation.

But the Neutrality Act of 1939 is vitally different. The President need not issue a proclamation, even if he finds that a state of war exists, unless he finds, in addition, that the imposition of those restrictions is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States.

Thus the President must, in exercising this broad discretion, look foremost to the security and peace of the United States and the lives of its citizens; and only when he determines that it is necessary for the protection of those great interests is he required to issue a proclamation under the Neutrality Act.

When Germany declared war on Russia the administration deliberately refrained from issuing a proclamation under the Neutrality Act. It was explained that the issuance of such a proclamation would not be in the interest of the peace and security of the United States. The people and the Congress accepted that explanation. If that explanation holds true in the case of Russia, it holds equally true in the case of Britain.

If the proclamations heretofore issued under the Neutrality Act do not protect the peace and security of the United States, why should not those proclamations be revoked? What possible reason can there be for permitting restrictions, believed at the time they were imposed to be helpful to the defense of the United States, to continue after it has become clear that those restrictions are inimical to the defense of the United States?

It would be absurd to conclude that though the President must find that "it is necessary to promote the security, to preserve the peace, or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States" before he can issue such a proclamation, he is compelled to continue it in effect once it is issued, even though he may conclude that its continuance is dangerous to those very interests which it was designed to protect.

Indeed, section 1 (b) of the Neutrality Act provides:

"Whenever the state of war which has caused the President to issue a proclamation under the authority of this section has ceased to exist, he shall revoke same."

It is clear that the purpose of this provision was to give the President the power to revoke a proclamation when the conditions which caused its proclamation ceased to exist. It is plain that "the state of war which has caused the President to issue a proclamation under the authority of this section" refers not to the cessation of hostilities but to the cessation of the kind of state of war defined in the statute which caused the President to exercise his statutory powers.

If the President possesses this power to revoke, as I most emphatically believe he does, then the question becomes one of fact.

Senator PEPPER has stated what I have told the House on two different occasions in stronger and clearer language than I used. Now, if the President feels that his hands are tied, he has the power to untie them. If, as a result of passing this bill, more ships are sunk and more of our boys are killed, the tragedy will be put into the lap of Congress; whereas if the President feels that his own proclamations should be revoked he may revoke them and permit our ships to go wherever he sees fit, but he must as-

sume the responsibility therefor. He need not have issued the proclamations which he did, but he did so and they have worked mighty well thus far. I was in hopes that the President would be satisfied to leave things as they are, at least until we are better prepared. I am going to vote against these amendments. I voted against arming the ships for the reasons I then stated. I do not want the blood of our boys on my hands in this foreign war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

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

Mr. CLUETT. Mr. Speaker, this debate will result in one of the most momentous decisions this House has ever been called upon to make, and not one of us can be unmindful of that fact. We have listened to or read much of the exhaustive debate in the Senate, and I believe hardly a point, pro or con, remained unsaid. Now it remains for us to render our verdict, which may well spell war or peace for this Nation. On October 16 last I made my position clear on section 6, and now I am prepared, after prayerful consideration, to cast my vote for sections 2 and 3, in favor of the repeal of those sections. This decision is no sudden or impulsive one. As far back as May 5 last, I made my decision clear on the floor of this House by urging the delivery of all our shipments to Great Britain by any means within our power. Not a word of protest for this utterance have I received from any Member of either side of the House, although then it seemed a novel and rather dangerous position to take and not politically expedient. I have not regretted that stand.

That there exists wide differences of opinion on a matter of such vital national importance is not unnatural and is quite in accord with our democratic processes, if at all times the reasons advanced are for the ultimate good of America.

At this time it would seem that a unity of expression was impossible. On both sides of the question are ranged the best minds of the country, men and women who are honest in their convictions, all I believe interested in bringing honor and happiness and safety to this Nation in a great crisis. We all yearn for the defeat of the damnable and dangerous Hitler, and aid to those who detest him and all his works, but our methods are far apart, and here is the great pity of it all.

I doubt that any good can come from calling names; that method never won a battle or gained a decision. To insult a gangster or criminal when he is in the act of lending aid when one's very life is in danger is stupid and reprehensible. Again I repeat what I said almost 1 month ago: What are the alternatives?

Is not the danger to us greater by hesitating or turning back from the acts and resolutions we have made? The answer to that is what faces us today, and no one I am aware of has yet given us that answer. To delay now, or cease for one instant, our preparations for national defense, whether such defense is direct or indirect, will not only interfere with

but cripple all that we have done and bring consternation, hopelessness, and despair to those awaiting our promised aid. Not for one moment will I vote to let them down. Their heroism and fortitude under the most frightful circumstances men and women have ever endured will endear them forever in the hearts of all civilized peoples. A few have criticized every twist and turn in the desperate efforts of our administration to render that aid they have been promised and have every reason to expect.

Has the time come when political utterances and party platforms will supersede the dangers of the moment, when our national safety is at stake? When those pledges and those platforms were made we did not know what we know now. Shall an error in judgment then prevent us from carrying out to the full the responsibilities which crowd upon us with ever-increasing force and danger? My answer is emphatically "No!" That because both political parties have been guilty of unwise statements, shall we condemn them both, and be content to allow our Nation to suffer in consequence? The problem we are now asked to solve must be taken utterly and for all time from any political consideration. We have only one pledge now and always, and that is to obey and defend the Constitution of the United States. War or peace will be decided here when the time comes. Today, unless all polls are incorrect, a majority of our people want this Neutrality Act repealed and are in favor of the President's foreign policies. If those expressions are correct, I have no fear of what our decisions will be. More and more our citizens are becoming aware of our danger; they see preparations being made in hundreds of our cities for possible air raids and other like dangers. What is the meaning of all this preparation? The isolationists will tell you there is no danger. Hitler is 3,000 miles away, and a vast ocean between. They cannot reach England, 20 miles away. The whole thing is a vast hoax, hysteria, and propaganda engineered by the Commander in Chief of the Army and his obedient associates. Mothers and fathers are cautioned that their sons are being made ready for another American expeditionary force, for cannon fodder, and they must resist this planned trend toward war. If leading us down the road to war is giving aid to the democracies who are fighting and dying for us, then gladly shall I join the procession. The longer Hitler delays announcing a state of war with the United States the stronger and more secure we become, and by 1942 we will be able to render effective, if not decisive, assistance in the overthrow of our common enemy. If we refuse this legislation now, we undo—if we do not destroy—every act of ours which had for its object the crushing of a murderous scoundrel who seeks to destroy the freedom and happiness of the entire world.

Yes, my colleagues, we are taking a grave risk, and it may mean war, but I prefer this to a cowardly escape. We are gambling on a chance 14 other nations took and lost. I refuse to join that unhappy company. The history of their suffering and enslavement must never



become the lot of America. It is true our Navy is the finest fighting force in the world and ready for action. They were prepared for just such an emergency, and when the time comes every man aboard will acquit himself with honor to his country. What we do here today may call upon the best and bravest in them. They will tell us that the freedom of the seas has not been lost to America, and with the help of the British be free to enter any port in the world. I believe this is our right, and because it is so, that right will prevail. While our immediate problem concerns the Neutrality Act, it is only one of many facing each one of us in Congress, and each one must be solved if we are to render effective aid in this world emergency. First of all, matériel and food, and every war necessity must be produced with all speed, a speed greater than we have ever known, else our aid will arrive too late. Labor appreciates this task and will accomplish it if they are allowed to do it in the American way, and without interference from irresponsible leaders. No man or group of men any time, anywhere, during this emergency shall be allowed to prevent directly, or indirectly, our defense production. Here again the will of the people will prevail. Again our power to produce must be protected from extravagance in government, billions must be saved from waste and extravagant projects under the guise of national defense. Inflation must be curbed and regulated. Communists in high places in defense work must be removed. Only by such restrictions can we carry forward effectively the work in hand. What then is our objective now? It is to take back a right we should never have released, the right to sail the seven seas and enter any port in the world. Did anyone worry or complain bitterly when we sent our destroyers away, or flew hundreds of fighter and bomber planes to land on foreign soil? Oh, no, that was quite all right and we were delighted that so many of them, manned, too, by American pilots, reached Great Britain safely. These men must endanger their lives, but our sailors must remain locked in safe harbors. What a travesty. We may be certain that if this resolution is adopted it will have the support of a considerable majority of the American people, and can we hope for or expect any better reason for our decision?

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

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, less than 30 days ago a resolution was brought into the House at the request of the administration to repeal that part of the Neutrality Act that forbids the arming of American merchant ships. The House passed the resolution, and it went to the Senate. The Senate adopted an amendment which also repealed that part of the Neutrality Act which forbids the American merchant ships to go into the ports of the warring

nations or into the war zones. The matter before us for consideration today is, Shall the House concur in the Senate's amendments? I am opposed to the Senate's amendments because it is in effect a declaration of war. It will permit the President to prosecute on a larger scale undeclared wars. I opposed the resolution before the House to authorize the President to arm merchant ships because of our experience in World War No. 1. The records show that within 30 days after we armed our merchant ships in 1917 we were in a shooting war. Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, made a statement in writing that the arming of our merchant ships in the first World War would not protect the ships or the sailors and would not result in the destruction or serious injury of any enemy war vessel or craft or airplanes. On the contrary he stated that 35 of our merchant ships were sunk and 58 sailors lost their lives.

The law of the seas is that if a merchant ship is unarmed no one can fire upon it or sink it even though it carries contraband of war to an enemy nation. The warships of the enemy nation must first ascertain if it is carrying contraband of war, if it is carrying contraband of war those in charge of the ship must be provided with safe means of escape and then the attacking war vessel may tow it into port or sink it. If a merchant ship is armed it at once becomes a war vessel and can be fired upon and sunk without notice or warning and without any regard to the safety of the sailors on the ship. Therefore, our experience in the last World War was that the arming of merchant ships with small guns, as they must be, afforded no protection, but on the other hand invited attack and destruction.

The House was assured by the administration and its leaders that the arming of our merchant ships would promote peace and help to prevent war. I knew that this was not true. I also knew that this apparently harmless bill was another effort to deceive the Congress. I knew that the administration would take the next step in the Senate by providing that these armed merchant ships would be sent into the dangerous war zones and ports of the warring nations. I stated on the floor of the House that that very thing would happen and now we have the Senate bill before us, not only authorizing the arming of merchant ships, but permitting the administration to send them into the very hell-holes of war itself. The bill before us comes up under a special rule and it cannot be amended in any respect. Not a single word can be stricken out. Neither will it permit the change of the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." When the roll is called we must vote either "yes" or "no" as the measure came to us from the Senate.

I agree with our Democratic colleagues, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. RICHARDS of South Carolina, Mr. SOUTH of Texas, Mr. HUNTER of Ohio, Mr. BEAM of Illinois, Mr. KEOGH of New York, Mr. LYNCH of New York, Mr. SOMERS of New York, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and nearly a score of other distinguished

Democrats, practically all of whom have supported the President on all of his foreign policies. They insist that this bill attempts to deceive the American people. They insist that it is in effect a declaration of war and the administration is trying to enter the war by the way of the back door. Several of them have asserted that this action is cowardly and that if the administration thinks that Congress should consider the question of peace or war a resolution to that effect should come before the Congress, and if we go to war at all it should be in the way and manner provided by the Constitution. More than a score of Democrats have expressed opposition to this bill in their speeches and remarks on the floor of the House, perhaps 50 more will vote against it. A number of them also pointed out that American ships, in violation of the acts of Congress, have been taken into the war zones and our Navy, in violation of the acts of Congress, has been convoying these American merchant ships and British merchant ships and an undeclared war has been carried on in the belligerent waters of Europe, and our naval vessels have been engaged in aggressive warfare against other countries, and our merchant ships and some of our naval vessels have been sunk and many American sailors have lost their lives. Mr. Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, stated in Parliament the other day that the American Navy and the British Navy were joining together in a naval war. This is in violation of the express acts of Congress and in violation of the Constitution. Congress alone can declare war and it has not declared any war.

#### ISSUE IS PEACE OR WAR

Our colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], who is supporting this bill, frankly stated that it is equivalent to a declaration of war. He also frankly stated that the lend-lease bills and other measures put through Congress by the President were war measures and not peace measures as contended by the President and others of his administration. I agree with Mr. Cox and other distinguished Democrats that this bill before us is equivalent to a declaration of war. If we arm these merchant ships and send them into the dangerous war zones where the waters are mined and are filled with submarines and other enemy warcraft, many of them will be sunk and great numbers of our sailors will be killed or drowned.

While the Lend-Lease Act expressly provides that no authority is given to convoy, the American Navy will convoy these vessels and go into these mined, submarine-infested waters, and this will result in a shooting war. When the lend-lease bills were up, the Congress and the country were assured by the President that American ships would not be required to take these war materials to the belligerent nations or go into the dangerous waters of belligerent ports, and that there would be no convoy of merchant ships by our Navy, and the President assured the Congress and country that these were measures to keep us out of the European, Asiatic, African wars, and to

emphasize his pledge that there would be no convoys he said, "Convoys means shooting and shooting means war." But the President and our Army and Navy have been sending our ships into these war zones and have been convoying, not only American merchant ships but British merchant ships, with the result that some of our merchant ships and our warships have been sunk and many, many American sailors have lost their lives, and these lives have been lost because the President and the Navy have violated express acts of Congress and the Constitution of the United States and their express promises to the Congress and to the American people.

Today is the most momentous day of all of my service as a Member of Congress. Through misrepresentation and deceit, the American people have been led step by step into the second bloody World War, and the President is urging Congress today to take the longest and most momentous step of all. I tremble to think of the ruin and disaster that the future has in store for our country.

Both parties, in their platforms, and both candidates for the Presidency, and practically every candidate for the House and Senate last year, including myself, made most solemn pledges to the American people that we would not do this thing.

Our colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] urged us today to adopt this measure. If we did not we would cause a lot of sorrow to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Navy and Army officers, and other high officials. The question before us today transcends all partisan considerations, and rises above all personalities. I certainly have no desire to hurt the feelings of the President or any other high official of this Government. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] says the President and these other officials will be very unhappy if we defeat this bill. More than 80 percent of the American people are opposed to our going into this second World War, or going into any war except and only when it shall become necessary for the defense of our own country. That means more than 100,000,000 Americans are opposed to our involvement in this war. I am only concerned in doing the very best thing for our country, and while the President, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and Chief of Staff may be sad if we defeat this bill, it will bring great joy to at least a hundred million loyal Americans, and what joy it must bring to the millions of young men of America and to their fathers and mothers.

To vote against this bill will meet the complete approval of my conscience, and I shall have kept my pledge.

#### WHY SHOULD WE BUTT INTO THAT WAR?

About 18 months ago, the President told the country that Hitler would soon invade the Western Hemisphere and the United States, but Hitler did not come, and he is not going to. No unfriendly German or Italian will ever set his foot on American soil. I have believed all along that it was the purpose of the President ever since the King and Queen of England visited the United States to

involve us in another World War, if it should come.

Neither Hitler, Mussolini, or their armies or navies would come to the Western Hemisphere or the United States to attack us. They did not lay the weight of their hands on the rights of any American citizen or put a foot on American soil or the Western Hemisphere. The war has been confined to the countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia.

The war did not come to us. Our administration had to take our country to the war. British statesmen outsmarted our statesmen. They suggested that we take possession of Greenland, but that did not get us into the war. Iceland did not belong to Great Britain. Britain took possession of Iceland. Britain suggested that they move out of Iceland and that the American soldiers, sailors, and marines move in. Iceland is nearer to Europe and on the great highway in the war zone. We did move in, but England did not move out. Our soldiers, sailors, and marines in Iceland are serving under British officers and under the British flag as well as the American flag. Iceland is 2,500 miles from the United States. It is in the danger zone of the warring nations of Europe.

Our ships began to operate in and around Iceland, in the very middle of the dangerous waters of these warring nations. Our merchant ships and our naval vessels were looking for trouble and, of course, they found it. When our merchant and naval vessels were sunk and many American sailors lost their lives the newspapermen, at the President's press conference, asked the President if the sinking of our merchant and naval ships and the loss of these American lives was grounds to sever diplomatic relations with Germany and was a cause for war, the President answered that it was not ground for severing our diplomatic relations or cause for war. We have always been told that when one nation fires upon another nation, sinks its ships, and kills its citizens that is ground for severing diplomatic relations and is cause for war. The President answered as he did because we butted into the war over there. We were the aggressors, we were looking for trouble, and we found it. This measure before us enables the President and our naval and military officials to look for trouble in every part of the world, and, of course, we shall find it.

We are called upon to vote today for a measure that will certainly plunge us into total war and, more than likely, involve us in every part of the globe. How long it will last no one can tell. How many lives it will take no one can say. We can be assured of one thing—it will be the longest, costliest, bloodiest war in which this Nation ever engaged. I am determined that whatever destruction and ruin comes to this country in butting into this European-Asiatic-African war shall not be laid at my door.

The President has been unable to whip the 80 percent or more of the American people into line for this war. Is it the hope of ambitious men, selfish groups, munition makers, and others seeking war

profits that by sending our ships and sailors and our Army to the danger zones of the seven seas and to various outposts they will build up enough sentiment in Congress and in the Nation to wring from an unwilling Congress a constitutional declaration of war? That, in my opinion, is what they want. That is what they are striving to accomplish. We are sending our young men to Iceland, to Singapore in Asia, to Iran in central Asia, and to other parts of the globe. One of these days there will be a demand for another great A. E. F. to save those that we have sent on before. I am amazed at the cunning by which the American people have been lead into this unnecessary, ghastly, bloody war.

We were first urged in 1939 to repeal so much of the neutrality law as would permit us to make and send munitions of war to Great Britain and other countries. Congress, though, expressly provided that it was based strictly upon a cash-and-carry basis and they must come to this country and buy the war materials, pay the cash, and take title to the property before it left our shores. Prime Minister Churchill stated that all they needed was the tools—that they had the men and would win the war. The next thing we heard was that Great Britain and her allies were broke, and Congress passed the lend-lease bill giving to England and her allies approximately \$13,000,000,000 in war materials and food. They assured us that they would come and get this war material and we would not be involved in the war—that our ships would not have to go into the war zones. Although we have given and provided for Great Britain about 2,000,000 tons of merchant ships, they now insist that our ships must deliver these free war materials into their dangerous waters that are mined and infested with submarines and other enemy warcraft, and they insist that our Navy must convoy not only American merchant ships but British merchant ships into these dangerous war zones throughout the world.

What Great Britain is really driving at, she wants our Navy in this war, and she has already involved our Navy. This bill would give it some semblance of legality, and Churchill and other Englishmen are now saying that they cannot whip Hitler without the American Army, and the clamor has started for another A. E. F. to Europe, Asia, and Africa. We can see at once that this war, as we predicted 2 years ago, was following step by step the same steps taken by this Nation in the first World War. We are furnishing now the war materials, the ships, and already furnishing men, and there will be more men. Strange to say, they are using the same slogans that they used to involve us in the other World War. They are urging us again to save democracy, insure the freedom of the seas, and to fight this war to end all wars. Those are the slogans that we fought for in the last war. Not a one of them was carried out after the war. We found out to our sorrow after the war that the nations over there were fighting as they had fought through the centuries for territory, trade, and power, and that is what they are fighting for this time, and we will be deceived again. Our sacrifice of treasure and



blood no doubt will be greater in this war than in that war. Our debts will be greater. The country will be more disrupted, and we shall come out of the war with little or no freedom ourselves. I should like to see all people free, but I am more concerned about the freedom and the welfare of the people of the United States than I am of any other nation on the earth. Our first duty is to protect our own country and our own people.

#### THIS BILL DANGEROUS AND UNNECESSARY

Let me say to those sincere persons who are anxious to preserve the British Empire and maintain the bloody tyrant and dictator Stalin with his Communist regime, that this measure is unfair to the American people and is dangerous and unnecessary. It is not necessary for the President and his administration to break faith with the Congress and the American people. If he made his pledges honestly last year there is no reason why he should not keep them this year. Prime Minister Churchill said on the opening of the British Parliament this week that Hitler would be disappointed in undertaking to starve the English people, as England now had double the amount of food stored away that she had in 1939. This war started in 1939. Now England has twice as much food, according to Prime Minister Churchill, as she had about the time the war started. Prime Minister Churchill said that the sinking of British ships and her allies the last 4 months had been cut down to two-thirds over the previous 4 months. He declared that Britain and her allies had lost 700,000 tons of shipping in the last 4 months and that Germany and her allies had lost a million tons. In other words, Germany and her allies had lost about 50 percent more tonnage of shipping in the last 4 months than Great Britain and her allies had lost. The sinkings of Great Britain and her allies are on the decrease while the sinkings of Germany and her allies are on the increase. Mr. Churchill also said that Great Britain now equals Germany in the number of planes and bombers and is superior in the skill of her aviators.

Lloyd's & Co., of London, the great marine insurance company, who insure practically all, if not all, of English ships, reported some time ago that when the war started that Great Britain had over 21,000,000 tons of merchant ships of 100 tons or over, and when Germany conquered Norway, Denmark, Holland, and France, Great Britain with her powerful navy took over 12,000,000 tons more from these conquered countries. Great Britain has built a great many ships since the war started, and we have turned over and built for her 2,000,000 tons or more since the war started. She undoubtedly now has several million more tons of shipping than she had when the war started. When the war broke out we had about five and a half million tons of shipping. We have sold or given so much of our tonnage to Great Britain that we now have only approximately 4,000,000 tons. Great Britain now has five or six times as much merchant-ship tonnage as we have, and millions of tons of her shipping are en-

gaged in strictly commercial enterprise in competition with the United States and other countries. Her ships are now sailing the seven seas of the world, and we are building millions of tons of shipping for her. Yet there are those who insist that we must use our ships and our sailors to carry these free war materials to Europe, Asia, and Africa and other possessions of Great Britain. Great Britain does not need our merchant ships. She wants the American Navy and American boys. She wants us to get into this war, and it has been decided, in my opinion, the best way to get us into a total war is to arm American merchant ships and send them into war zones convoyed by the American Navy. Great Britain started in 1170 with 50,000 square miles of territory. When this war started she had 16,000,000 square miles of territory, and since the war started she has taken possession of more than a million more square miles. Over one-fourth of the earth's surface and 500,000,000 people are under the British flag. She has a million more square miles in North America than we have, but her statesmen are clever enough to have the United States and other countries to furnish her with war supplies and more ships. She has more than 4,000,000 men thoroughly trained and fully equipped. Only 22 miles of water separate Great Britain from the European Continent.

The war between Russia and Germany started on June 22, 1941, nearly 5 months ago. The bulk of the German Army and three-fourths of the German air force have been constantly engaged against Russia. So far as the records show, not a single Englishman or English plane or bomber or ship has been fighting in Russia. Some try to claim that England is fighting our war. It is not our war. We were not consulted, and we did not start it. No one has attacked our country or our citizens. England is not even fighting her own war. If the effort of any country is helpful to any other country, it is the fighting power of Russia against Germany. Why has not England used her 4,000,000 men and her mighty air power to aid Russia? Why has she not blown Germany to pieces? Why did she not send her bombers to the front lines and fight with Russia against Germany? Two or three thousand fighters and bombers likely would have decided long ago the battle between the Russians and the Germans, but England sits behind her ramparts on the British Isles with her 4,000,000 of trained and equipped men and her large air force. If England could not cross the English Channel with her great air force and millions of trained men and inflict severe blows on Germany, how in high heaven can they expect the United States, with its small force of mostly untrained and unequipped men, to travel 3,000 miles to fight Germany? If England cannot fly a few hundred miles to help Russia out, can it be said that Germany can fly thousands of miles across the Atlantic and attack the United States and the Western Hemisphere? British statesmen have managed in all of the wars of Europe, Asia, and Africa to align nations against each other and to aid her, and after the war is over she

has added to her immense possessions. She fights hard when her soil is attacked, but history does not record her fighting or financing other nations. I admire the zeal and loyalty of Englishmen to their country. They do not permit the propaganda of other nations to lead them into a destructive war that takes the lives of their young men and bankrupts their nation. I wish those in charge of the destiny of this country would show the same loyalty and devotion to our country.

#### THE COMMUNISTS CELEBRATE

How times have changed. In the World War we loaned Russia \$8,000,000. Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and other Communists overthrew the Russian Government, murdered the Czar, all the members of his family, and millions of other Russians, and made a separate peace with Germany. We loaned the Russians an additional sum of \$187,000,000. This communistic regime repudiated all of it. It was so cruel and wicked that Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover refused to recognize Russia. President Roosevelt did recognize Russia. They broke their promises to him.

In 1939 Stalin gave Hitler the green light to overrun Poland, destroy its citizens, and massacre its people. Hitler agreed to protect the eastern flank with the German Army. He was to receive one-half of the loot from Poland and have a free hand to destroy the four democracies of Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. He swallowed up three of these small democracies and destroyed much of Finland and killed hundreds of thousands of her citizens and destroyed many of her cities. Finland was forced to surrender much of her territory. Stalin protected Hitler while he was overrunning other countries of Europe. Hitler turned on Stalin. I feel sorry for the common people of Germany and Russia. I have no sympathy whatever for either of these cruel, bloody dictators, Hitler or Stalin. We were given to understand that Russia would get no part of the lend-lease money. This promise was broken by the administration.

The other night the Russian Embassy in Washington gave a great reception. Thousands of people were invited. Those who voted against lend-lease and other war measures were not invited, according to press reports. I was not invited, but I am not offended. I did not vote to give Russia a billion dollars. According to the newspaper reports, great quantities of vodka and champagne and caviar were consumed. On that day President Roosevelt gave Stalin a billion good American dollars taken from the taxpayers of this Nation. What were they celebrating?

The twenty-fourth anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party in Russia. For nearly 24 years now communism has been denounced time and again on the floor of the House and Senate, in every pulpit, and on every platform in this country. It was considered enemy No. 1 by all the nations of the earth. We looked upon it as such a cruel and hateful thing that Congress finally passed a law providing that no person who had ever been a Communist could find lodgment in this country, and could be de-

ported. The Government, the people, the schools, and the homes have been fighting communism as the greatest enemy to mankind, and now we grasp the bloody hand of Stalin and join with him in celebrating the twenty-fourth anniversary of the founding of this monstrous philosophy and ideology, the arch enemy of freedom, of liberty, of the church, of the school, and the home, and present him with a billion dollars, no interest is to be charged, and the first installment is to be paid 5 years hence. Of course, no part of it will ever be paid and President Roosevelt assures Comrade Stalin there is more to be had and plans are now being laid to take American soldiers to Archangel, in the Arctic Circle, and march over the frozen wastes and snows to join Stalin in his struggle with Germany. This reminds me of that little poem:

Vice is a monster of such frightful mien—  
To be hated needs but to be seen;  
But seen too oft to its face,  
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

I am wondering what effect this embrace of communism will have on this country and the world.

At the same time we are clubbing little Finland in our efforts to force her to cease fighting Russia. A little over a year ago our hearts bled for little Finland. We gave gifts of food and clothing. We presented her with \$25,000,000. If we embark upon this war, there is no man wise enough to tell us how far reaching the results may be upon our country and our people. No one is speaking up for the little democracies of Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania that American treasure and American blood helped to create in the other World War.

How wise our forefathers were in advising us to stay out of the wars and quarrels of Europe and Asia and Africa.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] 4 minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week we celebrated Armistice Day. On the eve of Armistice Day, in the Well of this House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] made a very effective speech, in which he said:

No greater injustice could be done our honored dead, whom we honor every day in the year, but particularly on November 11, than to imply that they died in vain.

And the gentleman was absolutely right. Up to the present time we can say that they did not die in vain. Tonight, after this vote, the reverse may be true.

It is true they did not accomplish their main objective. This objective was to make the world safe for democracy. Measured by this standard, they died in vain and their noble crusade was a dismal failure. For immediately upon the signing of the armistice 23 years ago their Commander in Chief, as he sat at the peace table, learned, to his bitter disillusionment, that while we had fought the war exclusively to make the world safe for democracy, our Allies had fought the war just as exclusively on the old formula, to wit, conquest of territory and greed for world trade, war indemnities, and loot.

And ever since the signing of the armistice the world, and especially Europe, has been far, far more unsafe for democracy than it had been for centuries.

And not only that, but, characteristic of the breed, after they pocketed their ill-gotten gains and thus sowed the seeds of the present war, these greedy power politicians had the temerity to blame our dead for the fascism, nazi-ism, and communism of Europe. I repeat, measured by the standard of that objective, the lives offered on the altar of making the world safe for democracy were sacrificed in vain.

But still I say the gentleman from Arizona was right when he said, "They did not die in vain." They did not die in vain, unless we by this vote so decree. For these 126,000 made the supreme sacrifice to end all wars that other millions of Americans, the millions it will take if we get into this war, might live.

Mr. Speaker, it took these 126,000 lives and a quarter of a million casualties to teach the American people by bitter experience that European wars are and will be fought only for conquest, world trade, indemnities, and loot. It took this bitter experience, this tremendous sacrifice, to teach them to say, "Never again." During the past 23 years I have heard hundreds of veterans say, "Never again." During these years we have heard the people of the United States from the President down saying "Never again." And over 80 percent of the people of the United States are still saying, "Never again."

And then, when in 1935 European war clouds again threatened our horizon, remembering how they had been tricked into the last war, remembering that over one hundred and fifty millions had been spent by Britain alone for propaganda to inveigle us into that war, remembering that such things as "incidents" were used by the small but powerful war group to trick them into war, the American people, wishing to provide some guaranty against its repetition, began the enactment of so-called neutrality legislation, amending and perfecting it from year to year, to the end that our 126,000 dead in the World War should not have died in vain.

Mr. Speaker, we enacted those laws not as an act of fear but in the consciousness of our strength and the futility of dissipating that strength in European power politics. We included sections 2 and 3 to restrain the war makers from creating the incidents that we knew might trick us into another World War more horrible than the first one. It has accomplished the desired noninvolvement up to the present time, even though it was not accorded a fair application. It was intended to operate and protect the American people in just such a situation as we now find ourselves, and it was not intended to be repealed whenever it became operative, as was suggested by Members on the floor in yesterday's debate.

Mr. Speaker, on the 3d of November last, one of the war makers, a leading and influential Member of Congress and a proponent of the repeal of sections 2 and 3, intimated on the floor that it would take a certain number of sinkings

together with a certain number of lives lost to arouse the American people to war. The required number, of course, was not indicated. Assuming that this is true, it follows, as the night follows day, that that number will be attained much more quickly with the repeal of sections 2 and 3, permitting our ships to go into combat zones, than without such repeal. It is therefore quite evident that the underlying purpose of this repeal is to precipitate us into war. Especially is this evident when we consider that if the purpose were to facilitate delivery of lend-lease war materials, this could be far more easily and effectively accomplished by putting our ships under British registry, under the lend-lease law.

In short, the passage of this legislation means war; it means that millions of our men will be sacrificed in Europe; it means that our 126,000 dead in the World War have died in vain.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, they shall not have died in vain, and for that reason I shall vote against repeal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my distinguished colleague from New York how many speakers he has left?

Mr. BLOOM. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I have two speakers who will take up the 22 minutes remaining. Then there are four Members on this side who would like to extend their remarks in the Record. I do not mind telling the distinguished gentleman from New York that the two speakers are the majority leader and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point in favor of the adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, with a profound sense of the responsibility placed upon the Congress in this grave hour, I have, after a most complete and exhaustive study of all facts and views available, and without regard to political partisanship, reached a decision to vote for the resolution before us today as the safest course to pursue in the sole interest of our own future security and well-being.

In the determination of my position in this measure, I have endeavored to be realistic and face the facts clearly and sincerely in the light of what a Hitler-dominated world would mean to the people of the United States and the Western Hemisphere. I have sought to make clear in my mind the effects upon our Nation if Hitler should be successful in his effort to crush Europe. In such an event, I can see nothing but the gravest of peril to our liberties, our principles, and all the things that we as Americans have cherished for centuries.

Hitler has already conquered 15 nations and is now seeking to drive Russia against the wall. Military experts see a



great threat in that situation, and should Russia fall, England will be next in the line of invasion. And should England fall, would the price of peace be its powerful fleet? This in itself would menace our safety, for the seas would then be dominated by the Axis fleet of 1,100 fighting ships to our 350 which now constitute the strength of the United States Navy. If such a thing should come to pass, America would then face the gravest threat of its history. With the Axis Powers controlling the sea lanes of the world, it is obvious our own shores and our commerce would be greatly endangered. The cost to us in money, effort, and sacrifice will be great but that cost will be far greater even in the immediate future, if we stand aside and allow England to fall, and face Germany alone at a later date.

I have consulted many times with our greatest defense experts, and it is their unanimous opinion that this bill should become law in the interest of our own safety.

The forces of Hitler are on the march in an attempt to dominate the destinies of the world, and the least we in America can do is to supply and, if necessary, carry the materials of war to those who are fighting for their very lives in their efforts to remain a free people. I for one cannot bring myself to vote against this measure and in so doing give comfort and satisfaction to Hitler's hordes in this terrible conflict that has already subjugated hundreds of millions of people and swept asunder so many nations of the world.

With all these thoughts in mind, I am convinced that I should support this measure as the best and safest course to pursue in the interest of the United States.

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

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein certain quotations from the last national Democratic platform, certain quotations from the President and two Members of the House, and a letter from a mother in my district, in opposition to this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, on October 17, 1941, this House passed House Joint Resolution 237, authorizing the President to arm American merchant vessels. There was no proposal in the House at that time to repeal section 3 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, which section of said act forbids American merchant ships to enter combat areas.

In my remarks in opposition to the passage of the resolution authorizing the arming of American merchant ships, I stated:

Upon the passage of this resolution by the House it will go to the Senate, and there it will be amended so as to authorize the President not only to arm American merchant ships but to load them with the munitions of war and send them under the American flag into combat zones. An armed ship in neutral waters, where there is no enemy to attack it by submarines, by other war craft,

or by bombing planes, would not serve the purpose of those back of this legislation; but an armed American ship flying our flag, manned by American sailors and by a naval gun crew, sent into waters where a furious shooting war is being waged, would sooner or later become the target of a German, Italian, or Japanese submarine, other war vessel, or warplane, and thereby lead to the shedding of American blood and to the furnishing of an incident which those desiring our entrance into this war long have sought.

My prediction has come true, and House Joint Resolution 237 has come back to us from the Senate rewritten and amended so as to authorize not only the arming of American merchant ships but the sending of these ships under our flag, loaded with the munitions of war, into combat areas and into the ports of Great Britain and other nations involved in war with the Axis Powers.

In my remarks in opposition to the arming of American merchant ships, I further stated:

It thus appears that the passage of this resolution is designed to put the camel's head under the tent, and then when it reaches the Senate we will be led in under the big top into a shooting war.

The distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] stated to this House in his address this morning that if this House fails to pass this resolution as rewritten by the Senate, and fails to authorize the arming of American merchant ships and the sending of those ships into the seas surrounding Great Britain and her possessions and surrounding Russia and her possessions, we will cause the President and the Secretary of State and the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to have heavy hearts.

I represent the Second District of Tennessee in this House. The fighting men of my district have shed their blood and given their lives in defense of this Nation in every war in which it has been engaged from the Revolution down to the present good hour. My people have never run away from a fight for the protection of our flag, our liberties, and our country. But they are not a fool-hardy people. They do not believe in running, unprepared, into somebody else's war. As the Representative of the more than 420,000 brave people of my district, I have no commitments save to them. I have had no rendezvous with the representatives of any foreign power. My duty is to my people, to the fathers and mothers and boys of my district and to the fathers and mothers and boys of this Republic. In keeping with the promises and pledges made to the people of this Nation by both the Republican and the Democratic Parties in their National Conventions in 1940, I promised my people that I would not vote to make a European policeman out of Uncle Sam or to send their boys to fight or die in the endless wars of Europe, Asia, or Africa. The President of the United States made, in effect, the same promise again and again and again. He sponsored and he favored the passage of the Neutrality Act which it is now proposed to scrap. And on the faith of his words and actions in advocating and approving the passage of the act which it is now proposed to scuttle, he won the confidence and the support

of the American people. And he obtained and held the confidence and support of the American people by making his race for reelection in 1940 upon the Democratic national platform, which declared:

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.

The President accepted the nomination for a third term on that platform, and in his speeches he reaffirmed, repeated, and expanded the promises of the platform on which he was nominated and elected.

On September 11, 1940, in his address to the teamsters' union in Washington, D. C., he said:

I hate war, now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all that I can to keep war away from these shores for all time. I stand, with my party, and outside of my party as President of all the people, on the platform, the wording that was adopted in Chicago less than 2 months ago. It said:

"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."

On October 23, 1940, in his address at Philadelphia, he used these words:

We are arming ourselves, not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "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."

On October 30, 1940, in his address at Boston Garden, he again promised the people:

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.

The purpose of our defense is defense.

And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again, Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

And in his fireside chat of December 29, 1940, the President used these words:

There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can therefore nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

But a change has come over the spirit of the dreams of many of those who promised to keep this country out of war. Today not only Winston Churchill and other leaders of the British Government are demanding an American expeditionary force to fight in Europe, Asia, and Africa, but the voice of Joseph Stalin, the Russian dictator, is demanding such a force at Murmansk and at Archangel, within the Arctic Circle on the frozen soil of Russia. Let us not kid ourselves. Let us not undertake to deceive the American people. The great prize for which Great Britain and Russia are now clamoring and striving is an American expeditionary force of millions in Europe,

Asia, and Africa. It may be that their hearts will be sad if we do not push American boys as pawns into the slaughter of this conflict for the maintenance of the British Empire and of the Russian Soviet Union. My sympathies are all with England, with Russia, and with the other peoples who are fighting the aggressor nations. There are only 132,000,000 people in this country. We are so situated between 2 great oceans, removed all the way from three to five thousand miles from this conflict, we are so strong in material resources, in industrial development and in manpower, with the ability to produce the munitions of war, and with such a splendid Navy, that no nation or combination of nations can successfully attack and overcome us. The British Empire has a population of 504,000,000 people. The Russian Nation has a population of more than 180,000,000 people. China has a population of 400,000,000 people. Thus a billion one hundred million people are arrayed in arms against the aggressor nations. If our 132,000,000 people open the pocketbook of this Nation to these great populous nations, and if we become the arsenal for them in this conflict, these hordes of millions of people should be able to win this war. If they are not, then I am opposed to the needless sacrifice of the lives of American boys in the defense of these vast far-flung nations. And I am led to doubt whether this Nation can afford to maintain the British Empire in the style to which she is accustomed. That an American expeditionary force is the goal for which England and Russia are striving is shown by the undisputed facts known to all well-informed men.

During the 1940 presidential campaign Prime Minister Churchill stated, in effect, that England would not need an American expeditionary force until 1942. The reaction of the American people was so hostile to this suggestion that in a few days Mr. Churchill modified his statement and said that England did not at any time expect or need an American expeditionary force. And he stated: "Give us the tools and we will do the job." But since the election of 1940, Mr. Churchill has spoken with increasing boldness in announcing the foreign policy of our Government. He recently stated that the wrath of the American people was rising to the very verge of war. He has told the world that the armed forces of this Nation, together with those of England, would win this war and thereafter police the world. In short, he has virtually taken Uncle Sam by the hand and led him down the road to the very brink of this war. The British generals, Wavell and Auchinleck, have both announced that if Hitler is conquered on the continent of Europe an American expeditionary force will be necessary. And only a few weeks ago the London Daily Sketch assumed to tell the American people "to dismiss as insane the idea that the war can be won without the shedding of American blood." And this British paper prophesied the approach of the day when American soldier boys will "mingle their blood, sweat, and tears in the common drain."

The giving of ships, of planes, of tanks, of cannon, or rifles, machine guns, munitions, foods, and money is the giving of material inanimate things. But the unnecessary forcing of American boys into this conflict is placing in the red-hot fingers of the moloch of war the bodies and the lives of the bravest, the strongest, and the best of our American young manhood. This involves the broken bodies, the shed blood, the suffering, the anguish, and the death upon the battlefield, of American boys and the anxiety, the breaking and the bleeding of the hearts of the fathers and mothers of this Nation.

Yes, there will be heavy hearts if this disguised, dishonest, and cowardly subterfuge is adopted as a means to involve us in this war. At this time I wish to read a letter from the mother of two boys, written me a few days ago. She is only one of hundreds of the mothers of my district who have written to me and talked to me against the proposal to put their boys into the welter and slaughter of the present war:

HEISKELL, TENN., November 3, 1941.

To the Congressmen of the United States of America:

MY DEAR FRIENDS: First I will tell you I am old and have no education much, but I hope you can understand what I mean.

In the Presidential election of 1940 my two boys, the only children I have, told me to go and vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt because he said he would not send our boys to fight in foreign wars. So both my boys went and volunteered to fight with their lives in the United States Army. One is now on maneuvers in the Carolinas, and the other was turned down because of bad health. Their father is 71 years of age. And I ask of you, I beg of you, please, oh please, don't let the President send our boys away. I do hope and pray that God will take the lead of your hearts and minds.

We are all true-blue Americans and are willing to do what is right, but I don't think it is right to send our boys away. So I am hoping and praying hourly that you won't let him send them away. Please don't. From one of the mothers with a bleeding heart. May God bless you.

Mrs. ALFRED H. OVERTON.

The facts are undisputed that by the help we have given Great Britain up to this time she has more food stored within the confines of the British Isles than she has ever had before. The facts are undisputed that the sinking of British merchantmen has very materially decreased and that Great Britain, with our help, is winning the Battle of the Atlantic. That ocean has been bridged with British and American ships. It is not necessary to send American merchantmen into British ports in order to deliver to Great Britain the billions of dollars in food and in munitions of war which the American people are giving to her without stint and without price. Let us turn American ships over to British crews and let British sailors carry these gifts of the American people into the British ports. Let us reject this proposal to make decoy ducks out of American ships in order to draw down upon them inevitable destruction at the hands of German submarines and German bombing planes. There can be no excuse for this House making it possible and inevitable for this Nation to be swept into this pres-

ent World War upon a red tide of the shed blood of American boys.

It was stated on the floor of this House today by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum], "We are sitting on a keg of dynamite." I challenge that statement. The proposal is that we cross the sea and sit down upon a keg of dynamite and strike a match in order that there may be an explosion.

When the President of the United States advocated the passage of this very Neutrality Act which it is now proposed that we scrap, he stated in his address to a joint session of the House and Senate, in this very Chamber, on September 21, 1939:

At the outset I proceed on the assumption that every Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives and every member of the executive branch of the Government, including the President and his associates, personally and officially, are equally and without reservation in favor of such measures as will protect the neutrality, the safety, and the integrity of our country and at the same time keep us out of war.

Because I am wholly willing to ascribe an honorable desire for peace to those who hold different views from my own as to what these measures should be, I trust that these gentlemen will be sufficiently generous to ascribe equally lofty purposes to those with whom they disagree. Let no man or group in any walk of life assume exclusive protectorate over the future well-being of America, because I conceive that regardless of party or section the mantle of peace and of patriotism is wide enough to cover us all. Let no group assume the exclusive label of the peace bloc. We all belong to it.

The President then reviewed the efforts of the American people to keep out of Europe's wars, and said:

For many years the primary purpose of our foreign policy has been that this Nation and this Government should strive to the utmost to aid in avoiding war among other nations. But if and when war unhappily comes, the Government and the Nation must exert every possible effort to avoid being drawn into the war.

The executive branch of the Government did its utmost, within our traditional policy of noninvolvement, to aid in averting the present appalling war. Having thus striven and failed, this Government must lose no time or effort to keep the Nation from being drawn into the war.

In my candid judgment, we shall succeed in these efforts.

This neutrality law which it is now proposed to throw into the wastebasket has kept this Nation out of this war.

The passage of this Neutrality Act was and is to keep this Nation out of Europe's wars. The act has succeeded in its purpose. It has kept this Nation out of this present World War by keeping our ships out of combat zones. It has kept us out of this war by staying away from the war except as we have been put into it by the operation of the Lease-Lend Act and by the orders of our President to our naval forces to shoot German warcraft on sight.

#### ARMING OF AMERICAN MERCHANT SHIPS INCREASES THEIR DANGER

Arming of American vessels will not contribute to their safety. It will increase their danger and imperil the lives of those aboard them. This was our experience in the first World War. On



March 1, 1917, at the request of President Wilson, Congress granted him authority to arm American ships. On April 6, 1917, President Wilson signed the war bill and proclaimed a state of war. And after our merchant ships were thus armed in the first World War, 35 armed American merchant ships were sunk by the enemy. Fifty-eight American lives were lost, and not 1 submarine or foreign warcraft was sunk by an armed American merchantman. The reason for this is not far to seek. Merchant ships are not designed, built, armed, or equipped for warfare. And in the present shooting war between our vessels of war and German submarines one of our destroyers has been seriously damaged and 11 American lives lost, and another of our destroyers, the *Reuben James*, has been sunk by a German submarine and 95 American lives lost.

When I listened to the able address of the distinguished Member from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] in favor of the scrapping of our neutrality law, and heard him tell this House that we are sitting on a keg of dynamite, I recalled that on September 21, 1939, he inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio address which he delivered to the people of Virginia, in which he used these wise words:

The question uppermost in the minds of every American citizen today is, Can America keep out of this war? As the matter stands at the moment, I think the question can be very definitely answered in the affirmative. If you mean by keeping out of the war can we avoid any aggressive action against other nations which will necessitate the sending of troops to foreign soil, then certainly the answer is, "Yes." We will keep out of that kind of war.

He then goes on to state:

For my own part, I have adopted a slogan for this crisis. There is nothing particularly new or novel about it, but I believe it represents the sentiments of my constituents, and feel confident that it expresses the thought of an overwhelming majority of the American citizens. It is this: "Keep America safe for Americans in America." I commend this sentiment to your careful consideration. In whatever may come before Congress, and in whatever official action I may be called upon to take as your Representative, this shall be my guiding star. . . .

We all agree that America must stay out of this conflict. There is no difference of opinion on that score.

And when I listened to the impassioned address of the distinguished Member from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] on yesterday, in which he advocated the scrapping of our neutrality law, I recalled that in 1935, when the American people had cool heads and when we had not been swept off our feet by a flood of foreign propaganda, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] said on the floor of this House, with respect to the enactment of our first Neutrality Act of 1935:

The peace of the world is in danger and the outlook is as dark as it was in 1914 just prior to the beginning of the World War. It behooves us to set our house in order and eliminate every hazard which may tend to drag us into the vortex of war. The purpose of this resolution is to do that very thing.

And again he said:

Let me say, in conclusion, that, regardless of the conflicting views that may be enter-

tained by the Members of this House as to the character of neutrality legislation that should be passed, I think we are all agreed that we have had enough of war and are resolved that our Nation must not again become involved in a war between foreign countries.

We are still paying the penalties of the last Great War, and our children and the generations yet to come will continue to do so. The signing of the armistice and the subsequent treaty of peace ended hostilities. It did not end the suffering and sacrifices of our people, nor of the other peoples of the world. I am glad, therefore, to vote for this resolution, which is designed to, and I think will, materially reduce the danger of our country's becoming involved in war, if other nations should decide to fight.

The prevention of war is one of the highest duties that government owes society, and any nation that will not take every precaution and use every legitimate means to avert the holocaust of war is unworthy to stand among civilized nations of the world.

Now, in spite of all we do to stay out of this war this country becomes involved, there will then be no division among the American people, and I, along with every other Member of this House, will leave no stone unturned to win any war in which we may become involved. It should make the heart of the President of the United States and every other official of this Government glad if we can help the President keep his promises, repeated so often in the last campaign, to keep this country and our boys out of this war.

It would seem that enough has been done by this Government to satisfy those who lust for the shedding of American blood. We have placed American armed forces in the bases we acquired from Great Britain. Our armed forces are on guard in the Caribbean, in Greenland, in Iceland, at Honolulu, and in the Philippines. Our naval vessels are scouring the seas; our war planes are crisscrossing the skies in search for German submarines, raiders, and aircraft, with orders from the President to shoot on sight. In the Far East we are face to face with a dangerous and desperate adversary in Japan. If those who cry so loudly for armed conflict will but possess their souls in patience, war may come to us all too soon. That we are not prepared for war is realized by all of us. In his message to this Congress, read to the House of Representatives on October 9 of this year, the President said:

We know that we could not defend ourselves in Long Island Sound or in San Francisco Bay.

Why all this haste? We all recognize the fact that we are not now prepared for war, and yet we are threatened with war in both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. In his testimony before the Senate committee investigating the national-defense program, on April 23, 1941, General Twaddle, of the General Staff, stated, upon the question of the Army's ability to fight now:

We couldn't make a very good showing, I don't believe, sir. We could fight defensively with some units, a few of our units.

Our first and supreme duty is to our own country and our own people. The security, the defense, the lives of our people, are in the keeping of the membership of this House. The eyes of the fathers and the mothers and of the boys

of this Nation are upon us today. Ours is a solemn duty, and in its performance I must be actuated and can only be moved by what I deem to be the best interest of my own country. We have been led step by step down the slippery road toward war, and I cannot afford, in the light of my duty to my people and my country, to rush headlong into a war in which, if we become involved, we are brought face to face with the threat of the loss of our liberty here at home, the transformation of our institutions and our way of life, the squandering and dissipation of the hard-earned wealth and means of livelihood of our people and the slaughter of uncounted millions of our greatest possession, the young manhood of this country.

For these reasons I shall vote against this resolution and devoutly hope that it may be defeated.

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

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of October 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, in the present condition of the world, it behooves those of us to whom life and liberty must from our natures be synonymous, to take all of the steps necessary to defend this country from a contrary philosophy.

In the present condition of this country, a great responsibility is ours to act with deliberation and courage—not on impulse and with foolhardiness. Any step that is clearly one of defense, whether advanced by the administration or the opposition I have favored—extension of the selective service and arming of our merchantmen. We are a peaceful people, but not a cowardly people. We do not go about looking for trouble, nor do we stumble about in quarters where we are likely to find it just because we are dared to do so. Discretion was once thought to be the better part of valor, ably by the brave Britons who have so and by some is still thought to be—not won our admiration in the defense of their shores, but who forebore taking offense when hopelessly unprepared to prevent the rape of the small nations of Europe.

I am for national defense—first, last, and always. When this Congress passed the lend-lease bill—which I did not then favor and about which I have seen no reason to change my mind—I bowed to the inevitable and voted to finance it.

I voted to extend the Selective Service Act, for if, try as I may to prevent, this country finds itself in a shooting war, my duty has been but half done if I have failed to give those boys who will, because of their age, have the fighting to do, sufficient training to defend themselves, to say nothing of their mothers and their children.

I voted to arm merchantmen. If a man's peaceful pursuits oblige him to go into places of danger, I am the last to

deprive him of the questionable safeguard of arming so far as our resources permit.

All these things I have done, as a loyal American and a member of a loyal opposition. On the face of them, these steps appeared what their proponents called them, "safeguards of defense."

But I have reached the point now where I feel I have a right to demand that henceforward my reason be appealed to, not my emotions. My reason tells me that until our national decks are cleared for action we should be deaf to all requests to blindly follow any leader in any action not plainly marked by our own reason as "defense." I cannot support a request merely because it is made.

Our country has war within its borders. Many of our defense industries are at a standstill and men are denied their constitutional right to work. Labor leaders defy the President of the United States, and our great transportation system faces immediate paralysis.

And in the face of these things, we are called upon to remove the only restraining hand to complete an all-out warfare. It is said that to remove the restrictions does not mean that a merchant ship will go to a belligerent port. But the method adopted to emasculate this Neutrality Act reveals the intention behind the request.

The adoption of these amendments is to shoot our way to the British Isles and back again, and to begin now.

It is said that failure to adopt these amendments is to wreck the President's foreign policy. Caution in a world of hysteria can but strengthen our position as we await developments in the Pacific.

To remove those restrictions means immediate and general warfare.

I shall not support these amendments.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I candidly confess to the House today that I am heartsick over the repercussions of today's action. After a 20,000-mile journey by plane to 14 South and Central American republics, in the course of which it was the privilege of our committee to discuss with ambassadors, ministers, and other officials problems of air safety and the collateral problem of defense, I know the feeling and impression of disunity which will be spelled out in the newspapers of the world tomorrow morning, no matter whether this measure is enacted or rejected.

Had I been present when the House voted on the proposal to arm merchant ships, I would have supported it and urged my colleagues to do likewise. Today a trans-Atlantic air line is operating from Europe to South America, spotting ship positions and transmitting the information by short wave to submarine commanders who ply the South Atlantic. In Central America as many as 14 short-wave receivers are being used in the legation of a European country in addition to short-wave transmitters which are now employed. Information on ship departures goes from this country to another nation in the south, and from there is transmitted by short wave

to Berlin. We have ample evidence that some short-wave transmitters have been confiscated and that many others are operating because inadequate monitor equipment makes it impossible to locate them. In these circumstances, the very least we can do is to arm our merchant ships, as the President suggested in his first message to Congress on the matter, and give such vessels some opportunity to defend themselves against raids from the sky or from beneath the surface of the sea. I would gladly support that proposal.

But today we are in a snarl by virtue of the additional amendment which was written into the bill by the Senate. How fortunate it would be for the Nation and for our foreign policy if the ship-arming proposal could be brought back to both Houses in the form of a conference report without the provision for the repeal of the prohibition against entry of our vessels into a combat zone, because it would enable us to salvage a bit of unity.

The damage to unity in the eyes of other nations has already been done. The close Senate vote, which I heard discussed on the streets of Mexico City no later than last Friday morning has indicated our lack of unified purpose in a critical hour. It has already been spelled out and reechoed in the newspapers of our sister countries in this hemisphere. No matter what the outcome here today, that impression has already been made.

Our whole problem at this crucial moment is one of unity. If there should flow out of the enactment of the measure before us certain eventualities, we can effectively meet them only as a united country. But we are not united and we are not ready for such eventualities.

I can advance but a single sound reason for voting against the pending measure and that is our unreadiness in this hour.

We are not ready on the labor front. There is no assurance that in the case of undeclared hostilities which may flow from the adoption of this proposal, strikes in defense industries will not continue and thus place us in a position of even greater jeopardy. There is scant evidence that those richly endowed with this world's goods are yet ready to make the sacrifices that will be required. There is a general apathy which is indeed not conducive to unity and until every element is welded into a unified whole, shall we take this chance now?

I am fully sensible of the grave responsibility which we exercise today. From a survey in 14 republics, I know something of the extra problems which we shall encounter. I know what the repercussions will be in other lands. I shall be the last to give aid or comfort to the Axis Powers. I have said before and say again, that, in my opinion, the people of this Nation desire the defeat of the Axis Powers and are ready and willing to support all aid against aggression. The step that we may take today, however, is fraught with grave peril and in all humility I submit as

persuasively as I know how that we must be ready. I submit also that we are not yet ready.

On September 18, I briefly addressed the House and urged a program of unity. I still stand foursquare behind that program. It called for an end of hate, for temperate criticism, for commendation of the cautious handling of the problem in the Orient, for full lease-lend aid to the nations whose defense is vital to our own, for encouragement of such efforts as the President may make to keep us out of war, and for support of the announced policy of patrolling the defense waters of this hemisphere. In the light of the amazing espionage system with which our merchant vessels must deal today, I shall be glad to support a proposal to arm our merchant ships.

To go further than this at a time when the Nation is disunited and unreadiness may be the invitation for trouble.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, we have two speakers on our side in opposition to this important measure. I am informed there are two speakers on the other side. I recognize, of course, that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has the right to close the debate, but I insist on the right of the minority that the opposition should be given the next to the last speech on this important measure.

My inquiry is, if I have not correctly stated the situation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The Chair will state in response to the parliamentary inquiry that under the rules of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, is entitled to close the debate. With reference to recognition of Members prior to close of debate, of course, that is under the control of the gentleman in charge of the time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. With all due respect to the Speaker pro tempore, may I call his attention to the fact that if his ruling is construed literally it will permit the chairman of the committee controlling the time—

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I shall yield to the gentleman from New York, and will put on a speaker, then he can put on a speaker.

Mr. MICHENER. May I finish my parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is entitled to complete his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MICHENER. Reverting to my question before I was interrupted by the gentleman from New York: If the chairman of the committee controlling the time is permitted to close the debate and is not limited to one speaker in closing the debate, would it not be possible for such a chairman to open the debate, for instance, and then compel the opposition



to use all of its time before the proponent used any more time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. That right to close debate means one speech. If it meant two, it might mean three, and if it meant three it might mean four. It might be within the power of the proponents of any bill to compel the other side to put on all their speakers, then wind up with only the speeches of the proponents. Such a precedent should not be set. Am I correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct in the statement that the proponents of the bill have the right to close debate. That has been the holding of the Chair and it is in line with an unbroken line of precedents of the House. The Chair has no way of knowing how many different Members the gentlemen in charge of the time on the two sides may desire to yield time to. The Chair holds that the proponents of the bill are entitled to close debate.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, we have the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], and if they will tell me what they would like to have I will try to accommodate them. I have just two speakers. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will go on, then they may put some one on, then I will put the Speaker on. Then I have five requests to extend my remarks. If the gentlemen will kindly give me the information so I can arrange my program accordingly, I shall be very pleased to oblige them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has 5 minutes and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLOOM. What do they want? I will be glad to oblige them.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will permit, it is my intention now to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] 4 minutes; then after he is recognized I assume the majority leader will speak, and after the gentleman puts on the five unanimous-consent requests the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] will follow; I assume to be followed by your final speaker, the Speaker of the House?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], the majority leader, five unanimous-consent requests and the Speaker. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the program now?

Mr. BLOOM. I am trying to find out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understood the gentleman from New York stated he wanted to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. That will leave the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] 1 minute. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in this grim and fateful hour the fact that Members from both parties are on both sides of this debate shows that the House of Representatives is apparently functioning as a deliberative body. I rejoice in the fact. We are not just opposing,

we are not just rubber stamping, we are deliberating.

I am one of those who feel that blind, unreasoning opposition to everything our President proposes is not only unpatriotic but stupid. I also feel that blind and unreasoning support of everything the President proposes is an unpatriotic and stupid way to legislate. If every bill must be supported because we must uphold the President, if Congress must approve everything the President suggests in order that our Government have prestige over the world, then there is no need for a Congress. Hitler used to go through the motions of receiving approval from the Reichstag, but it was a fake because they were not allowed to give their opinions—only their approval.

I hope in these closing moments that there will be no last-minute partisan appeals by anyone to this body. I hope we will not legislate to make people in foreign lands feel good or feel bad, as has been suggested but for the best interests of our own country.

The truth is that by constitutional means the President has asked the opinion of Congress on certain policies and we cannot duck our responsibility. We cannot duck it by doing what the people want, for they are confused on this law. They do not know as much about it as we do. They are relying on their Representatives. We cannot duck by just opposing or supporting the President, for he has asked the Congress for its opinion. The question before this House today is not What do the people want? or What does the President want? but What do you think, Mr. Congressman?

This is a deliberative body.

We have a very small question before us today, but it has great implications. All we are doing is passing on Senate amendments to a House bill. We usually refuse to concur, as a matter of course, and send the bill to conference. If this resolution is voted down, all that will happen is that the bill goes to conference. The Senate suggests that we authorize the sending of our armed ships into belligerent ports, where there is shooting going on, in order to deliver the goods under lend-lease. In my opinion, this is an unwise and ineffective way to deliver lend-lease materials. A much more effective way is under the lease-lend law itself.

But something more is involved in this bill. It is somehow an indirect way of securing approval of policies that are not mentioned in this bill. Its passage will mean, first, ratification of the last step, the shooting naval war; second, advance approval of the next step, whatever it is to be.

All of us would vote to protect our own peacetime shipping in neutral waters by shooting on sight. All of us would vote to protect the importation of strategic materials into our country by shooting on sight, but in order to approve such steps, we are forced to approve other steps we do not approve, conveying arms to belligerents, shooting, and war.

This present bill, to repeal three sections of the neutrality law, illustrates the furtive, tricky, back-handed way in which

our foreign policy has been presented to Congress. All the bill proposes to do is to permit arming our merchant ships and their entry into belligerent ports. In itself the bill is ineffective to carry out any policy at all. Arming merchantmen will not effectively protect them and does more harm than good. The sinkings and the loss of life on our armed warships, compared to our unarmed merchantmen, is significant. No armed merchantman has ever sunk a submarine. Thirty-five armed American merchantmen were sunk during the World War.

I know about this myself from personal experience in the last war. As a naval aviator I was on convoy duty and anti-submarine patrol over the North Sea and along the Atlantic. I crossed the ocean on an armed merchantman. We had a Spanish War gun that fired every third time the breech was closed. We knew that not our arms but our speed and the destroyer escort we picked up on the other side constituted our protection. Arming merchantmen will not protect them against mines or raiders or torpedoes; anti-aircraft guns will keep planes higher; but under international law and common sense arming a merchantman makes it a warship, subject to attack without warning. No American merchantman has yet been attacked without warning. All of them will be fair game the day this law passes.

We are told that arms make the crews feel safer, even though they are not, and thus helps their morale. I question the policy of building morale by deception.

We are told that sending our ships into belligerent ports is to carry out the lease-lend policy. As a matter of record, the lease-lend law specifically states that it does not authorize convoys, or entering combat zones, or the "transfer" of defense articles.

Britain could obtain all the war supplies she needs under the lease-lend policy as written and as stated last spring by the administration. We could lease-lend our ships, armed if Britain desires, and British crews could take them into any ports desired under the British convoys now protecting those ports.

Mr. Churchill's speech yesterday showing that sinkings in the last 4 months are only one-fifth of what they were in the preceding 4 months, the 25 percent reduction in insurance rates, all show that the goods are being delivered under our present laws. Thus it is clear that something more than delivering the goods is desired. Our deeper involvement, our naval manpower, is what is sought.

Up until now "freedom of the seas" has meant the right of neutral merchantmen with peacetime cargoes to sail the seas unmolested. Never before has a nation demanded the right for armed vessels to deliver arms to belligerent ports in the name of "freedom of the seas." Every one of us would agree that our Navy should protect our peaceful commerce in neutral waters by shooting on sight, if necessary. On the other hand, convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war, and no one but Congress has the right to put America into war.

The President has done it anyhow, without authority. And every one of us

knows that, in addition to its specific provisions, this present bill will be considered to mean:

Ratification and approval of the unauthorized naval war.

Approval of such unauthorized actions in the future, including expeditionary forces.

I am opposing this bill as an ineffective measure in itself, and a pusillanimous roundabout, left-handed way of deciding our foreign policy.

If this bill passes, an A. E. F. of 600,000 men can be ordered any place in the world without further authority from Congress. Five hundred and thirty thousand Regulars and sixty-six thousand marines have no territorial limitation on their service. The War Department disclosed last night that it was seeking volunteers for overseas duty. My guess is, we will not vote directly on an A. E. F. until the first A. E. F. has been in action in Africa, and the question then will be, not whether we should send a force to defeat Hitler, but whether we shall send the drafted men and guardsmen to avoid a possible "heroic evacuation" of American forces already there.

This vote cannot affect our relations and negotiations with Japan, for neither Japan nor China are belligerents under the neutrality law. Japan is not sinking our ships. Our increasingly effective embargo against Japan is not disturbed by this bill. Under existing law, 600,000 men and our whole Navy may now be sent to the Orient if Japan rejects our peaceful negotiations and risks war.

The very indirection by which all of these questions are involved and injected into this vote prevents any loss of Presidential prestige if the vote is adverse. On the other hand, an adverse vote, while not involving a vote of lack of confidence in any of the policies indirectly involved, will be a rebuke to the President for his lack of confidence in Congress in failing to place directly before Congress the policies for which he seeks approval.

Whether this bill passes or not, the great issue still faces us:

What should we do to combat the Nazi assault on world civilization?

There is no use looking back and arguing about how we got to where we are. The questions now are, "Where are we?" and "Where do we go from here?"

In answering these questions, let each one of us look deep inside himself.

I am not a pacifist nor an isolationist. I fought in the World War and I am willing to fight again if we are attacked. I was a League of Nations Republican in 1920. I served in the international conference at Washington in 1921-22. I believe America has an obligation and a destiny that involves the whole world. Some people have called me an internationalist. And with this background and because of this background I am against our involvement in the fighting overseas.

We must eliminate our own ancestral bias. My own ancestry is Dutch and Scotch, English, German, a little Irish and French. I am a walking melting pot, a one-man League of Nations, but with all of my ancestors born in America for 140 years, I am racially just an Ameri-

can. I respect the Americanism of those who came later. I appreciate their affection for their native lands and tongues and cultures, but when it comes to dual allegiances we cannot afford in this crisis to have German-Americans, Italian-Americans, or British-Americans. We must all be just plain Americans.

Certain politicians have advised Republicans to support the President's foreign policy and oppose his domestic policy. When you realize that our present domestic policies are the result of our foreign policies, the unsoundness of this advice is apparent. We should support the President when he is right on any policy and oppose him when he is wrong. I have helped this administration draft and put through my committee and the House its historic restatement of the Monroe Doctrine and other measures implementing the good-neighbor policy. I have supported every national-defense measure the President has proposed for our Army or Navy during this emergency. I approve the President's policy in the Pacific and have twice made constructive suggestions to him directly which have been acknowledged most courteously. In this crisis we must not think of "my party first" but of "America first."

Where are we now?

This is a terribly difficult question to answer in a world aflame. The fog of war and the lightning changes which take place in revolutionary periods make it hard enough to understand what is going on. In addition, we have the black-out of censorship and the deliberate distortion of propaganda from abroad and a studied policy of secrecy, deception, and double talk by our own Government in telling the people of our own situation.

Are we in the war?

Every day people say to me, "What's the use talking? Whether we wanted it or not, the President has gotten us into the war, and we might as well make the best of it." They point out that our warships have been attacked, men lost in naval battles. On the other hand, the President does not say we are in the war. His October 9 message said:

The revisions I suggest do not call for a declaration of war.

His adviser on Germany, Hugh Wilson, said in Columbus recently:

We are not at war.

Senator CONNALLY, administration chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, says this bill is to keep us out of war. We are continuing diplomatic relations with Germany.

All I can say is that we are where we are—not in a state of war, not in a state of peace, but in a state of confusion worse confounded, and that our leaders "planned it that way."

In this aggravating, humiliating situation for the greatest nation on earth, we must all keep our heads, and keep our heads up. Ostrich tactics will not do, either for isolationists or for fight-for-freedom people, who urge fighting when we have not the arms, or the place to fight. We must keep looking around. Russia is tottering but has not fallen. Japan is threatening, but has not started to shoot. Germany is losing men and

material daily. Our defense is growing stronger daily. Britain is steadfastly refusing to intervene except where her own interests are served.

How can we best do our part in resisting the world-wide Nazi threat?

I try to keep this one thought in mind: We owe it to ourselves and to the world to defend and preserve and maintain our democracy here in America, at all costs, and everything else is secondary.

Wendell Willkie, speaking for the interventionists, says in the Reader's Digest:

Hitler will never be able to subjugate the free peoples of the world until he has somehow crushed freedom in the United States.

I agree; and conversely, so long as freedom is not crushed in the United States, Hitler will never be able to subjugate the free peoples of the world.

Therefore to insure Hitler's ultimate defeat I suggest the following program for America:

First. We will resist totalitarian tendencies here at home, whether they come from without or within, from below or above.

Second. We will make our own military defense impregnable.

Third. We will furnish material aid to those resisting Hitler.

Fourth. We will confine our fighting to our own sector, and will not fight overseas.

Fifth. We will continue an American peace offensive to break the fighting will of the German people.

Let us consider each of these.

First. We have a real fight against dictatorship on our hands here and now, with conscription of soldiers and industry already in effect, with business being rationed by Executive decree, with price fixing just ahead, with public hearings in committees silenced, with military censorship, and now production censorship in effect. Only the ostrich-minded will deny that in the name of stopping the totalitarian threat we are going totalitarian ourselves. Limitations on free speech are closing in. Halls are closed to those opposing the administration. In Ohio one man has been sentenced for criticizing the President, another man was arrested and tried for comparing Frank Knox to Benedict Arnold. The Government tells us only what it wants us to know. The President announced his shoot-on-sight order in mid-September. That order was given July 31. We have an Office of Facts and Figures to prepare propaganda. Some of these measures may be necessary, but we are using so many leaves from Hitler's book, that the story is becoming clear. Recently the wife of a New Deal official told me calmly that Hitler's system of organizing his country was all right, it was only the nasty way he did it that was bad. She did not mean it the way it sounded. She did not realize that Hitler's system breeds a Hitler, and results in Hitler nastiness. We owe it to ourselves and to the world to devise a system that will secure efficient and unified action without sacrificing the ways of our Republic, and this is going to require Yankee ingenuity, and American pioneering.

Second. We must be impregnable in our hemisphere. I have supported every



appropriation for our Army and Navy, and have voted for all but one, when I was sick. We have appropriated far more than this administration has been able to contract to spend. The lag is in the Executive, not in Congress. The bottlenecks of defense must be eliminated, some American way must be found for eliminating strikes. Congress is ready to act, but hesitates to enact laws curbing strikes that must be enforced by an administration which fails to use the powers it now possesses. I voted for a two-ocean navy because we must rely on no navy but our own for our own protection. Our growing Navy will soon be powerful enough for all eventualities, unless we give it away or lose it piecemeal in struggles that do not vitally affect our interests.

Third. We are committed to the policy of furnishing aid for those resisting aggression. The lease-lend policy has been adopted by constitutional processes, after full debate. I opposed its adoption, but since we are committed, and nations have fought on and men have died in reliance upon that policy, we dare not abandon it. I have voted for thirteen billions for lease-lend. Here again, what is now needed is efficient, businesslike administration. Only 2 percent in defense materials of that thirteen billions has been turned over to those who are fighting. The arsenal of democracy must do better than that.

Fourth. We should confine our fighting to our own hemisphere. Britain is now calling for an American expeditionary force. Generals Wavell and Auchinleck have said they need it. We are going to be called upon to make the same stern, hard-boiled decision the British have made this year. Russia has called upon Britain for an expeditionary force, but they have refused because, all things considered, it is not worth it to Britain. We, too, should learn from Britain. We should avoid token expeditionary forces and heroic evacuations.

Here we get close to the heart of our problem. We all sympathize with the British in their trial and suffering. I honor their gallant fighting qualities, their tenacity, and stubbornness. Our country has prepared to sacrifice for years to come to give aid to the British. But is Britain's survival absolutely essential to our defense? I say no. Preferable, yes; highly desirable, yes; but essential, no. On the other hand, our survival is essential if there is to be any hope for the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Except for the ostrich-minded, here are the facts:

We cannot be successfully invaded, if we preserve our own defense. Lieutenant Colonel Phillips, of our general staff, writing in *Army Ordnance*, has made it perfectly clear that "land-based air power has made the United States impregnable to invasion."

Conversely, our invasion of Europe, against land-based air power, is almost equally impossible.

The size of an effective American expeditionary force has been estimated at from four to fifteen million men. The

General Staff figure is reported as 8,000,000. The cost is estimated by Hanson Baldwin, military expert of the *New York Times*, at a minimum of three hundred billions. To send over and maintain millions of men, and their equipment, will require shipping of 7 tons per man—more ships than there are in all the oceans. I have been criticized for "counting the cost" of our beating Hitler in Europe. I think we could do it—furnish the men and the ships and arms and supplies. To do it, however, we would have to become a military dictatorship. Before we become further involved and committed, I believe we ought to count the cost, to us and to the world, of transferring the last stronghold of democracy into a military dictatorship in order to overthrow a military dictatorship.

Fifth. I believe we should push an American peace offensive. I do not mean asking Mr. Hitler please to negotiate with us. As I have said repeatedly, I would never agree to proposing or accepting peace based on Hitler's word or promise. We would demand guaranties from the German Government that would make peace depend on more than a piece of paper. We would not approve a peace of aggression, or surrender, or appeasement. We would present the German people with a definite alternative to fighting which would be so fair that their government would have to accept, or face trouble at home. If we will never deal with Hitler then we should state the terms we will offer if he is overthrown. General De Gaulles' Armistice Day declaration for "victory and vengeance" may cheer the French and the British, but it helps keep the Germans going too. Some way or other we must get across to the people of Germany an alternative that is better than unconditional surrender, sights unseen, to the tender mercies of the authors of Versailles. The German people want peace, but not another Versailles of victory and vengeance. Neither do we. America alone is in a position to state fair and definite peace aims without loss of face for the world knows we are leading through strength and not from weakness. We have already started my kind of a peace offensive. We are carrying it on effectively in the Pacific. Secretary Hull's five points, Sumner Welles' speeches, and the historic eight-point Atlantic declaration have been opening skirmishes in the European situation. What we need is something less vague, and more authoritative. We must remember that the German people remember President Wilson, and Versailles, and therefore do not rely on the words of an American President. We should state our peace aims as we have recently restated the Monroe Doctrine, by congressional action, approved by the President. In this way we can show that we mean business, and establish a firm foundation for peace and freedom for all peoples in a world gone mad.

Waging peace requires as much shrewdness and daring as waging war, but we risk nothing in trying for peace as we prepare to risk everything in war.

If we now go beyond aid short-of-war, we may find ourselves in war short-of-aid. We aid no one but our enemies by going too far too fast.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in considering the policy of our Government in dealing with the nations involved in the European war now before us for consideration in the pending bill, I stand squarely upon the pledge made to the people of this country in the Democratic Party's national platform adopted at the last national convention in Chicago. As a member of the resolutions committee, I helped draft the Democratic platform and I now stand squarely on the pledge we made to the people of this country when we said:

The American people are determined that war raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa shall not come to America. 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. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine.

For over a hundred and twenty-five years we have safeguarded the integrity of our country and American ideals by maintaining the Monroe Doctrine to keep the avaricious hands of the political spoilers of Europe away from the countries of the Western Hemisphere. We have followed the advice of the immortal Washington to keep free from entangling foreign alliances, to become great and powerful among the nations of the earth until—our people were intrigued into forgetting the advice of the founder of this country and plunged into the World War lured on by the shibboleth "To make the world safe for democracy" and "Wage a war to end wars" from which we returned saddened and disillusioned to take up again the task of our daily lives in an attempt to repair the damage and restore our national economy.

Mr. Speaker, a hundred and thirty years ago when England was impressing our seamen and heaping every abuse on the American people short of war, the people of this country were clamoring for redress and the slogan was heard many times in this capital that "President Madison could not be kicked into a fight."

Today England is again making a war offensive in this country. She wants us to go out and fight her enemies. The American people are being intrigued into an unpopular war by every artifice that can be devised and brought to bear on the President and his advisers to put this country into the European conflict with all the consequence and disaster it will bring to our innocent and peaceful people.

Mr. Speaker, as our Government under the provisions of the lease-lend bill is committed to supplying England, which

we now propose to extend to Russia and the avowed purpose of this bill is to provide the means of delivering these supplies to these belligerents, that is the real purpose of the program proposed in this legislation, the enactment of this bill is unnecessary. We have the goods, we have the ships, and we have appropriated the money under the provisions of the lend-lease bill. All the administration has to do is turn over the needed ships to the belligerents under the provisions of the lend-lease bill and let them proceed to use them to do exactly what we proposed to do under this bill—deliver munitions and supplies to the belligerents we propose to assist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I were an emissary of Hitler or the "red" regime of Russia bent on the destruction of this Government by sowing the seeds of strife and dissension to disorganize and destroy its unity I would work for the passage of the bill—a bill to change us from a neutral to a belligerent, knowing full well that participation in this war now and by the means we seek to accomplish it by this legislation is unpopular with the American people and will bring about the very condition that Hitler desires—strife and dissension in this country.

If we must have war and take up England's fight, why all this camouflage; why all this pretense that we do not want to be a belligerent? If we propose to wage war, let us vote down this legislation to make this country half neutral, half belligerent, and do what the American people always have done—stand out, declare ourselves by declaring war or defining our neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, whenever we hear of peace we hear of peace offense. Since when has peace become offensive to the American people? Since when have our hearts failed to respond and our minds failed to be inspired by the blessed words we sing at Christmastide, "Peace on earth, good will to men"? Are Christian ideals and Christian maxims only to be accepted in times when wars are dormant? Where is the Christian spirit of America today; where are our great churchmen? Is the best interpretation of peace they can give us that it is offensive? Must death and destruction, anguish and misery, spread to all humanity? Will no one raise their voice to stop this terrible conflict? Will no one call to bleeding, dying humanity the blessed words of our Redeemer, "Peace on earth, good will to men"?

Mr. Speaker, I stand for peace and neutrality and urge and pray that the great influence of our Government and the noble men and women of this country do their best to lift humanity from this terrible ordeal to the higher, finer ideals of our Christian religion, peace, good will, plenty, and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from a pioneer citizen of Idaho expressing his views on this subject:

SANDPOINT, IDAHO, November 11, 1941.  
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Twenty-two years ago today we wrote the final chapter on a section of American history that netted us world condition of today. This week the House of Representa-

tives is going to determine whether or not we repeat the folly of trying to settle European politics. A large part of the House have been reelected several times by voting administration measures; but, unless I cannot foresee clearly, it's going to take more propaganda than is described in the enclosed letter of HENRY DWORSHAK to make the American people accept another A. E. F.

If it requires this much money—tax money—to convince us a war is what we need, they better approach some other way for newspaper and radio propaganda is having the opposite effect for which it is intended today. If you can agree with me defeat the Senate neutrality measure for allowing our ships to enter belligerent ports and use every bit of power you have with other Members.

Yours,

C. W. GRESHAM.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I take it that the main aim and purpose of the foreign policy of the United States Government at the present time is to maintain the independence and freedom of this country. In view of the declared purposes of the leader of the totalitarian group that it is his intention to force the entire world to a subjugation to his ideology, it is a necessary corollary to our main purpose that the forces led by that international butcher, Mr. Hitler, be not only defeated but entirely crushed.

The adoption of the pending resolution and the Senate amendments repealing sections 2 and 3 of the so-called Neutrality Act will very materially help toward attaining the objective so much desired by practically every American citizen. In my view, favorable action on the motion to concur will prevent the necessity in the very near future of the shedding of the lives of thousands of our American boys on our own soil in defense of our homes and our civilization.

I do not agree that adoption of the Senate amendment will, in any wise, bring us closer to war. I truly believe that it will have the opposite effect. No one can deny that the furnishing of material for the conduct of the defense of those nations opposing Hitler will tend to keep that dictator occupied in an area far removed from the United States. Insofar as neutrality is concerned, I am not concerned whether Mr. Hitler approves of my action or the policy of the United States in doing everything within reason to defeat his avowed purpose of domination of the economic, religious, and civic life of the entire world.

If the dictators wanted a reason or excuse for warring against America, it was amply supplied by the passage of the lend-lease bill and other measures approved by this House. As to repeal of a self-imposed surrender of our international rights, it is no more a cause for a war against us than is the arming of our merchant ships, which just a few short weeks ago had the overwhelming approval of the membership of this body.

Up until now aggressor nations have had the initiative. If I am any judge of conditions at the present time, it is apparent that the time has come for the embattled democracies of the world and their allies to take this initiative into our own hands, and the passage of the meas-

ure now before us for consideration will be a forcible step in that direction. By the passage of this resolution we are simply proclaiming to the world that we are recapturing the same rights which our ancestors and our forefathers have proclaimed since the foundation of this Republic, and for which many of them have died.

As far as I know, no other nation in the world has imposed upon itself the limitations which are contained in sections 2 and 3 of the so-called Neutrality Act, and I can see no reason why the United States of America, which I believe to be the greatest and most powerful nation on the face of the globe, should continue to shackle its operations and its free commerce by continuing these restrictions in force.

It is beneath the dignity and the prestige of this great country of ours, as well as a repudiation of those principles for which our forefathers founded this country, and for which principles many of them died, to abjectly say to the world that we are afraid to not only proclaim our rights but to fight for them if need be.

Having a firm conviction that approval of the motion to concur in the Senate amendment will react to the future security, independence, and freedom of this Nation and to the saving of the lives of many thousands of our citizens on our own shores in defense of that freedom and independence, I would be derelict in my duty as a patriotic American citizen and as a Representative in Congress if I failed to vote in its favor and urge others to take the same position.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have voted for every bill concerned with national defense, assuming that by so doing I was defending American liberties and perhaps civilization itself. I intend to vote for this resolution for the same reason.

As I see it my first responsibility is to my country. My vote is based on the premise that having voted billions of dollars of taxpayers' money to help those countries defending democracy it is logical to provide the means to get the materials to their destination.

The question we must decide here today is whether or not we shall bow to the domination of a murderous gangster, who has destroyed nations, separated millions of devoted families, created slave labor, and butchered men, women, and little children over the earth in his quest for power; or continue to support those countries defending democracy and even civilization itself.

We must decide how much our freedom and our liberties mean to us and how much sacrifice we are willing to make to maintain them.

This is no easy decision to make. I gave all the service I was capable of in the World War. I know the heartaches endured by the brave men and women who, at that time, gave their all that democracy might endure. I seem to see those brave men who laid down their lives to perpetuate freedom in the world



calling on us today to continue the fight for that freedom—sacred to every red-blooded American—to carry on the fight, to keep our flag flying in all its strength and purity.

This is my country—the greatest country in all the world. The country that received my parents when they came here seeking freedom and opportunity. The country that provided me with the opportunity to live in happiness and security. I cannot be a traitor to her. To permit the threats of a murderous gangster to frighten me at this crisis would be to confess myself unworthy of the great heritage of having been born an American.

God knows I do not want to see the life of a single American lost, but much less do I wish to live in a world in which everything we have been taught to revere is sacrificed on the altar of expediency and cowardly surrender. We cannot and we must not permit Hitler's threats to drive our ships from the seas and we must see to it that the billions of dollars' worth of defense weapons will reach their destination, and if they do it will be our greatest and best insurance to prevent our active participation in another World War. In this spirit and praying for Divine guidance in the great crisis confronting my country, I shall vote for this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT].

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the bill to revise the Neutrality Act presents a single issue. The question is, Is such revision necessary if we are to get more material aid to the enemies of Hitler as quickly as we can?

It is not really a question of eliminating pirates, nor is it a matter of preparing the way for another A. E. F.—a step which a large majority of Americans oppose. It is not even altogether a decision to enter war zones, for during the last two months, whether we like it or not, the whole Atlantic has virtually become a war zone.

It has been our American policy from the beginning to give all possible material aid to Hitler's enemies, because we know that our own interests, our own future, our own freedom would be jeopardized by a victory for the Nazi tyrant. Revision of the Neutrality Act is needed to implement that policy. The need for such action, now or in the very near future, is affirmed by our military, naval, and maritime experts.

The American people long ago recognized the dangers and counted the cost. Ships have been sunk and the people remain calm and sane. Sinkings—which will or will not happen regardless of how we vote today—are not going to raise any hot war fever here. We are going to carry on our policy of getting food and munitions across the sea—of being an effective arsenal of democracy.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the United States enjoys a larger measure of

liberty than any nation on earth. As Representatives of the people, our highest obligation is to perform our duty in the way best calculated, in our opinion, to bring about a continuation of that liberty. We are confronted with a great issue. Ours is the responsibility of considering solemnly the effect which this vote today will have on our country and on the liberty of our people.

One after another, the countries of the Old World have fallen under the domination of powerful aggressors who are continuing their aggressions. The leader of this drive for new territory has given assurance after assurance that he would take no further aggressive steps, only, in each instance, to take that step and move on to further conquest. This modern conqueror has said that totalitarianism—his system—and democracy—our system—cannot both exist at one time on this earth. There is ample evidence that he has designs on our Nation. This is a threat under which every citizen of the United States lives today. Many will say that Hitler cannot successfully invade this country and cite in support of that contention the fact that the British Isles have not yet fallen. It is well to remember that this contention is made while the British Fleet is under English operation. It is hard to put ourselves in the frame of mind in which we would be if that fleet should ever fall into the hands of its opponent. But physical invasion is by no means our only danger. It is obvious to all of us, as we view the European scene, that if ever the time should come when the United States or the North American Continent, or, indeed, the Western Hemisphere should be surrounded by totalitarian governments, the liberties of our people would be adversely affected, if not destroyed.

In our own defense we are committed to a policy of aid to those nations opposing aggression. We have spent and are continuing to spend billions of dollars to implement that policy. It is being carried out under the leadership of the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, in cooperation with the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Operations of the Navy and their staff of expert military and naval advisers.

The proposal before us today is on its face an amendment of the Neutrality Act, but it is in effect a part of our program of national defense through effective aid to the countries which we have undertaken to help. To refuse to adopt this proposal is to refuse to follow the policy we have already adopted.

It is charged that this proposal amounts to a declaration of war. In that connection, it should be pointed out that the effect of the adoption of the Senate amendments will be but to cause our Nation to announce that henceforth we shall be bound in the matter of our ship movements by the rules of international law—the rules by which we have been bound since our establishment as a nation and throughout our national life, with the exception of the past 6 years.

This is a time for a straight out-and-out meeting of the issue before us. The

issue is, Shall we support our present foreign policy? With utmost respect for my very distinguished colleagues who have raised domestic questions, particularly the question of strikes in defense industries, I submit that this is no time to seek to influence domestic issues by the threat to withhold support from this important measure. This is no time for recrimination, no time to confuse issues. Rather it is the time now to meet squarely the issue presented by the measure before us.

Our objective is to free ourselves from the danger which threatens our liberty. We have solemnly concluded that we can best attain that objective by aid to those opposing aggression. The measure before us is designed to enable the United States of America more effectively to give that aid. If those to whom our aid is given fail in their efforts we may look forward to the day when we shall face alone the dangers we are today so earnestly endeavoring to strike down. When that day ever comes the sons and the mothers of sons whose interests we are here to safeguard will in their distress point the finger of accusation at us and say, "The fault is yours." Let us not fail them now. Let us adopt the Senate amendments.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. KRAMER].

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein remarks contained in a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Los Angeles, together with certain telegrams.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from Mr. Harold B. Lull, department commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California, and also certain telegrams, which are as follows:

NOVEMBER 10, 1941.

The Honorable CHARLES KRAMER,  
Congressman from California,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLIE: Your letter of October 28 received.

At the United Veterans of the Republic State and national convention held October 25 and 26 at the Hayward Hotel, Los Angeles, five resolutions were unanimously passed, all concerning the Government program. All these resolutions were in favor of the administration's program, such as dispensing with the Neutrality Act, arming of vessels, and ships to go everywhere in the world.

Everything going along nicely here. Hope you are in good spirits and health, realizing that this session of Congress has been very difficult and no doubt tedious at times. With best regards to Grayce and to yourself, I am,

HAROLD B. LULL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
Representative KRAMER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

I am in favor of Senate's amendment of Neutrality Act.

VIRGINIA D. ROSE,  
1705 North Morton Avenue.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
Representative KRAMER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:  
I am in favor of Senate's amendment of  
Neutrality Act.

E. C. ROSE,  
1705 North Morton Avenue.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
HON. CHARLES E. KRAMER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:  
Our family urges your support of adminis-  
tration foreign policy and we particularly  
favor pending neutrality revision.  
JULES KOCH,  
836 North Hobart Boulevard.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
HON. CHARLES E. KRAMER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:  
Pending neutrality revision is vital to our  
safety and my family joins me in urging your  
support of bill.

HARRY W. ABELES,  
659 Penrith Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
HON. CHARLES B. KRAMER,  
House of Representatives, House  
Office Building, Washington, D. C.:  
Your constituents approve Senate Neutral-  
ity Act amendments. Please use your influ-  
ence for House passage.

Mr. and Mrs. OSCAR MOSS.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
The Honorable CHARLES KRAMER,  
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:  
Repeal the Neutrality Act.  
VIRGINIA VANHORN FOX.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 12, 1941.  
Congressman CHARLES KRAMER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:  
We urge you to support the President in his  
endeavor to change the neutrality law; also,  
do something before labor gets entirely out  
of hand.

OTIS C. AND BEVERLY E. DORSETT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
CHARLES KRAMER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:  
We urge you to vote for repeal of the Neu-  
trality Act.

B. AND B. SHERR.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
HON. CHARLES KRAMER,  
House Office Building:  
We are confident you will support necessary  
revision neutrality legislation.  
Judge and Mrs. HAROLD B. LANDRETH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 12, 1941.  
Congressman CHARLES KRAMER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:  
We Californians depend on you to cast your  
vote for the repeal of the Neutrality Act.  
The voters of your home State realize that  
never can our shores be safe until this un-  
fortunate act is wiped off the slate.  
Respectfully submitted.

Daryl F. Zanuck, William Goetz, Mark  
Hellinger, Henry King, William  
Perlberg, Anatole Litvak, Nun-  
nally Johnson, Bryan Foy, Phillip  
Dunn, Sam Hellmann, George  
Seaton, Julian Johnson, William  
Koenig, Col. Jason Joy, Capt. Gor-  
don Mitchell, Maj. John Aalberg,  
Ben Hecht, Irving Cummings, Tal-  
bot Jennings, William Lebaron,  
Ernst Lubitsch.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 12, 1941.  
Congressman CHARLES KRAMER,  
Washington, D. C.:  
Urge support for modification Neutrality  
Act permitting arming of ships.  
ROBERT A. ROWAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
HON. CHARLES KRAMER,  
Representative from California,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:  
In this vital fight for freedom we urge  
your vote in favor of the measure to repeal  
the Neutrality Act. This is one of the most  
important moves that we must make to  
speed up victory for the preservation of all  
those principles we hold most dear.  
P. G. WINNETT,  
President, Bullocks.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
Congressman KRAMER,  
From Thirteenth District,  
Los Angeles, House of Rep-  
resentatives, Washington, D. C.:  
CONGRESSMAN KRAMER: As voters of your  
district, urge yes vote to repeal sections Neu-  
trality Act which hinder armed ships bring-  
ing supplies to Allies, defeat Hitler.  
Mr. and Mrs. PERLIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 13, 1941.  
Congressman CHARLES KRAMER,  
Washington, D. C.:  
Constituents urge that you fight your hard-  
est to support President to avoid serious in-  
ternational repercussions.

HENRY MAYERS.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield  
such time as he may desire to the gen-  
tleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, in the words  
of the Greeks, it is better to die on our  
feet than live on our knees.

I have listened in vain now for 2 days  
for a single mention of the word "loy-  
alty." We have heard with great empha-  
sis the implications attendant on our  
vote for or against these Senate amend-  
ments. It means war or it means peace,  
my colleagues say; it is right or it is  
wrong according to the views of the in-  
dividual; but there is never a thought  
wasted on what is to me the loftiest  
motive of all—loyalty.

Loyalty to a man? Not merely that,  
although under our form of government  
the President is the Commander in Chief  
of us all and to repudiate him at the  
moment of crisis is not only disloyal but  
dangerous. Loyalty to the officers and  
men who form the first line of our de-  
fense? It would be only a short time  
before their resistance would crumble if  
they felt we were sacrificing them in the  
face of the enemy while we bickered and  
floundered and yielded to indecision, to  
disunity, or to craven fear.

Loyalty to the people of our country?  
They know as do you and I that we of  
the Congress have by affirmative vote  
embarked on a policy of aid to all those  
opposing Hitlerism with the express in-  
tention of destroying that pagan philoso-  
phy before it shall engulf us or at least  
of causing the defeat of the gigantic war  
machine which seeks to saddle this  
philosophy upon the world.

Loyalty to an ideal? America's ideal  
is the pure joy of living like Americans—  
where every home is the family castle,  
and where every right of a free people  
is enjoyed by all of us and is forever

guaranteed by a time-tested Constitu-  
tion.

Loyalty to our God? The very essence  
of Christianity is the protection of the  
weak and the underprivileged and the  
right of all men to worship God as they  
please, not as a dictator decrees.

For more than 20 years the American  
people have been searching for a formula  
which would guarantee peace. It was in  
response to this earnest hope that the  
Neutrality Act finally found its way to  
our statute books. Most of us applauded  
this move, feeling that at last we had  
clothed ourselves with an ironclad pro-  
tection against all future wars. We  
reckoned not with the advances of mod-  
ern science, the effective shrinking of the  
earth's surface, the actual annihilation  
of space, and almost of time. And, last  
but not least, we reckoned not on the de-  
signs of those who have not in 2,000 years  
renounced war as an instrument for set-  
tling international disputes, but who  
have, on the contrary, taken advantage  
of the peaceful aspirations of most na-  
tions to crush, to destroy, and to enslave  
all who were not prepared to resist. With  
our neutrality laws we have tied our own  
hands, but have done nothing to fetter  
the hands of the disrupters of world  
peace. Is it any wonder then that our  
people, disillusioned by the ineffective-  
ness of a one-way neutrality act, de-  
mand the stripping of the chains that  
bind us in order that we may rise to the  
defense of our country and the preserva-  
tion of our free way of life?

Neutrality for all the world would be  
ideal—neutrality for ourselves alone  
would spell disloyalty to all we hold most  
dear.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield  
such time as he may desire to the gen-  
tleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, we heard  
the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRK-  
SEN], who has just returned from a  
23,000-mile trip over South America, tell  
us what the Nazis are doing to consoli-  
date their position there. He has made a  
splendid argument in favor of this bill  
but says he is not ready to vote for it to-  
day because we have not unity. He calls  
upon us for unity. I say to him, give us  
unity and join with us in following our  
President in his foreign policy, which has  
the approval of the great majority of the  
American people.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this bill  
today not because I wish to aid England  
and Russia, except incidentally, but I  
shall do so because I want to preserve in  
our time and for those who come after  
us the democratic way of life which our  
fathers handed down to us.

The United States has shown by a long  
course of conduct that our Nation is for  
peace and that we are probably the most  
peaceful of all the nations of the earth.  
We passed the Neutrality Act, we  
thought, in the interest of peace, and  
that alone. We specifically stated in that  
act that we reserved the right to repeal  
or amend it if we later decided it was not  
accomplishing the objects for which it  
was passed. By statute we gave up the  
freedom of the seas which we had en-  
joyed for more than 150 years under in-  
ternational law. We took our ships off  
the seas, and by the Neutrality Act de-  
clared to all nations, good and bad alike,  
that in the event of hostilities at any



place in the world, for whatever cause, we would retire to our own shores, take our shipping off the seas, and bury our national head in the sand.

Mr. Speaker, the present war is not a European war. It is a World War—a world revolution. It is a war between two ideologies—that of force and that of democratic processes. We call ourselves the greatest and strongest nation in the world, and yet by the present neutrality legislation which we are today seeking to repeal, we are confessing that we should have no part or hand in controlling our own destiny or the destinies of the world, of which we form so large a part. In my opinion, we should pass this legislation and reassert our full privilege of the right of the freedom of the seas, and not only the freedom of the seas but the freedom of the air above the seas, because from now on, in my opinion, the freedom of the air will be just as important, even more important, than the freedom of the seas.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should have legislation to prevent the obstructions to our national-defense program that we are now experiencing. While we are taking our young men from their homes and from the factories to serve in the Army, we should exert every endeavor to see that they are properly equipped with guns and tanks and munitions, and no one should have the right to interfere with or obstruct the program to provide for them those things which are necessary in their and our defense. We have not arrived at the time in the history of our country when the United States Government can be dictated to by any minority group, whether labor or business, or any other group. But while I think that there has been too much delay in bringing in legislation to prevent the sabotage of our production program, I am not willing to attempt to block the passage of this bill because I may not approve of certain actions, or rather lack of action, on domestic policies. That certainly is not fair play or statesmanship.

By our vote on this measure today we should publish notice to the aggressor nations that all the citizens of the United States are in full agreement in our resolution to give all-out aid to those sorely pressed countries that are resisting destruction and the enslavement that is being forced upon them by the dictatorships of the world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to have my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] a few minutes ago do me the honor to quote a sentence or two from my remarks in the House on November 10, on the eve of Armistice Day. It pleases me that he agrees with me in the sentiment quoted, even if only in part. At least he and I agree that our honored dead should not have died in vain, and I affirm that they have not so died, though the gentleman from Michigan feels that, in some respects, their sacrifice was in vain.

All informed persons must admit that subsequent events have been very disappointing, and some of their objectives—that is, the objectives of our fighting

men—failed to materialize but, even so, I contend that their efforts were certainly not in vain, and their sacrifice was not in vain. My reasons for this conclusion are:

First, the Imperial German forces in their day were loose on a planned program of world conquest. For more than a generation the German Junkers had preached a doctrine of kultur, and had come to regard themselves as supermen whose mission was to rule. The ruling class of Germany then believed in autocracy and based their action upon the philosophy that might makes right, which Prussian ideals, if they had been successful, would have made the world unfit in which to live for all the lesser breeds.

Second, without America's timely intervention, that philosophy and that force would undoubtedly have been victorious in the Old World.

Third, America's timely and adequate effort in the first World War, although it cost the lives of those whose sacrifice we remember on Armistice Day, saved the world at that time from Prussian kultur, regardless of the mistakes made since. It was not in vain that our honored dead helped to stem the tide of Prussian autocracy—at least they saved the world from that one blight.

Mr. Speaker, I have not hastily made up my mind on this vote, but I have made it up. I think it unfortunate that we are called on to vote on the particular matter before us at this time. It would have been much better had the bill passed the Senate just as it passed the House, permitting the arming of our merchant ships.

So great is my dread and abhorrence of a Nazi-Fascist victory in the Old World that I would be willing to implement our arsenal program even to the extent of carrying arms to those fighting for freedom, when convinced that the supply from our arsenal could get to them in no other way, but I think our supplies are getting to their destinations now, and there is not, in my judgment, the imperative need at the moment for any change in our present plan. However, the matter is before us, and I feel much better about an affirmative vote now than a negative vote, when I think what an invitation a defeat of this measure today would mean to the aggressor nations. It certainly would mean a backing down on our part and a come-on sign right at a time when delicate negotiations regarding the future of lands surrounding the Pacific Ocean are in progress.

Yesterday I sent a letter to the President of the United States, and sent copies of the same to our Speaker and to the Democratic floor leader. In this letter I asked what implications, other than the obvious ones, might be carried in this measure if it passed. Of course, I did not expect a direct answer on such short notice from the Commander in Chief, but my mind was satisfied by a direct and personal statement a few minutes ago from Speaker RAYBURN in partial answer to my inquiry.

No doubt the Speaker will say to the House, and for the benefit of the Record, some of the very things he said to me as partial answer from the administration to my letter. I wish to have my

own stand definitely made clear, that an affirmative vote on the matter before us is not a declaration of war or equivalent to a declaration of war. I want my own stand known that an affirmative vote in the House today is not a vote for an American expeditionary force nor does it imply another A. E. F., nor will it inevitably lead, as some have contended, to another A. E. F.

America started out to convert our country into an arsenal for freedom, to produce weapons and more weapons, to be furnished to those who are fighting the foes of freedom. If we concur in these Senate amendments today, we are simply carrying out our avowed policy, more for our own safety, or as much, as for that of any other nation.

Let it be remembered that there remain two other moves for Congress to make before we enter into total war involving an expeditionary force. One of these would be a declaration of war by Congress, and the other a repeal of existing law which now prevents the sending of our selective service men outside the Western Hemisphere. If there are Members who are firmly opposed to a declaration of war, or who are firmly opposed to another A. E. F., their privilege lies in voting "no" when or if those two propositions are squarely put before this body.

I have had messages saying, "Do not send our sailors to watery graves." That, of course, could only apply to our men in the naval forces, as this measure, if passed, permits our merchant vessels to go into war zones, but does not send them there. As for sending our naval vessels into such zones, that would depend largely upon our Commander in Chief. I am sure he is as interested as we are in minimizing dangers and losses and in conserving human life, though I have heard it implied, time and again, that in everything put up to him he would take fiendish delight in sending our own guardians to destruction. What bitter absurdity.

Much of the argument I have heard against this and every other move we have taken to protect our country is, to my mind, no argument at all. It is this: We should build up such a defense that Hitler could never invade our country even if he established absolute domination over the Old World. That notion is so fallacious as to be ridiculous.

There is a horrible poem by Poe entitled "The Conquering Worm," conveying the terrible thought that each human body has within it a conquering worm, has it there all the time throughout its active life, and although a corpse might be enclosed in a hermetically sealed coffin in a hope of preserving the body, yet the conquering worm is there. I fear our beloved country has within it some such horrible thing ready to start destruction when conditions allow, and a Hitler victory in the Old World would make possible a conquest from within, regardless of our attempt at hermetically sealing this Nation with guns and rings of steel. Let that force from the depth of hell prevail abroad, and it will prevail here—make no mistake about it.

An affirmative vote today is just another effort to make effective what we have already done toward destroying the

barbarism which seems about to engulf the world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this bill. I do not like the way the legislation has been brought before the House one bit, but I cannot base my decision on that sort of consideration in this case. I have from the beginning wanted to keep our country out of war. I have been against an American expeditionary force. I still am. But I cannot dodge the fact that our Government is at this hour dealing with governments which have shown that they are more likely to precipitate trouble if we give evidence of hesitation or division than if we present a strong front to them. Little as I like in many ways to vote for this bill, I can see that it may well be that greater danger may confront our country if the House gives indication of rejecting the policy heretofore pursued—that will be the case if we do not do that.

I have had real concern lest, since I cannot vote for an American expeditionary force, I might be inconsistent in supporting this bill. But there is on the statute books a law that prevents any drafted men being sent outside the Western Hemisphere. I want to serve notice now that I will vote against an attempt to change that law.

Passage of the lend-lease bill placed this country in a definitely unneutral position and made the keeping of a Neutrality Act on the statute books inconsistent with our adopted policy, if not actually hypocritical.

We recognize that having once set out to give aid to the nations resisting Hitler, there is no sense pursuing that policy in a half-hearted fashion. Nor is it reasonable to put forth great effort at the production of munitions for the anti-Axis nations only to see the things we have produced end up at the bottom of the sea.

I am not in a position to question the statement of some of our best-informed people that additional shipping will be required if lend-lease aid is to be transported. Indeed, after a good deal of effort, I have finally gotten definite information on this point, and it proves to me at least that additional shipping is most important if the things we are producing are to be effective.

But I am voting for the bill with my eyes wide open and my emotions firmly under control. I know that the United States will be shipping as much material of war to anti-Axis powers as we can. I know that our Navy has been ordered to protect shipping in the Atlantic by whatever means may be necessary. I know that Germany knows these things. I know that incidents on the high seas are going to take place. I hope they will be few and I fervently hope American ships, their crews and cargoes can be effectively protected. I agree that we should do everything we can to protect them.

But I can hardly expect anything else but some such incidents as have already happened under the circumstances. And I propose to exert every influence I have

to prevent such events being used as occasions for attempts to whip up American emotions to the point where the country can be taken into war or where an expeditionary force of American soldiers may be called for.

I should have voted for the bill with greater conviction had such attempts not already been made. So far, I believe, they have not been successful. It is my belief they should not be successful and my purpose is to prevent them from being successful. In my opinion, America's great concern about this war is not piracy on the high seas or even primarily freedom of the seas. America's great and compelling interest has to do with protecting the opportunity of our people and other people to achieve in the future a better and far more democratic life than anything that has ever been in the country or any other in the past. If nazi-ism is a danger to America, it is because it threatens this hope for the people—not because it sinks ships.

My vote for this bill means I am voting for effective lend-lease aid. That is all it means.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when I cast my vote in favor of the pending neutrality amendments it will be with the understanding that I am voting to preserve peace and the American way of life. War will never reach our shores and its devastating effect will neither sear nor sever our democratic system if the madness of Hitlerism, of war-mad Germany, is destroyed. Toward this end we must not only produce, but we must deliver arms, ammunition, planes, tanks, and ships to all the nations fighting the invader and oppressor. If this bill should fail to pass, the morale of Britain might collapse, the courageous resistance of Russia might cease, and the valiant fight of the Chinese come to an abrupt halt, and along with this all democratic countries, like valiant Poland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, and Yugoslavia, and Greece, resign themselves to everlasting slavery beneath the damnable hoof of German nazi-ism.

Should this come to pass, I am certain war would be upon us; if not immediately, it would be eventually. With the collapse of Britain and Russia the production of steel available to Germany and Japan would be increased to a point where it would more than match our own maximum production. Steel is the basic product upon which Mars depends for the conduct and victory of war. The oil of Russia and of the Near East would give Hitler the power necessary to propel the implements of hell in the direction of America. This I am anxious to forestall, and this can only be done by sending bombs, barbed wire, planes, tanks, and baled hell to the people of Europe and of Asia who are resisting the Axis Powers. This is the only way to save the lives of our American boys. I shall not expatiate any further, Mr. Speaker. I

am ready to cast my vote for the pending measure.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I favor the resolution because I do not wish to withdraw the American flag from the Pacific, as well as the Atlantic. Our destiny does not ordain this action.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOORHIS]. He made one observation with which I take slight issue. He stated that the defeat of this motion will mean that all that will happen is that the bill will go to conference. That is not exactly so, because the defeat of this motion will constitute instructions by the House to the House conferees on the bill, and that presents an entirely different situation than that presented when a bill is sent to conference without instructions by the House to its conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the House on the high plane on which this debate has been conducted. It has been conducted in a manner consistent with the finest ideals of the House, and equals the conduct of any House of the past in debate on any important legislation.

I assume that at the present time there are 25 or 30 Members of the House on both sides of the aisle whose minds are still open on this question. I hope the observations I shall make may be of assistance to them in determining what their vote will be.

It seems to me to be a fair argument that if a Member's mind is still open, if he is still in doubt, that doubt ought to be resolved in favor of the recommendations of the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the responsible constituted officials of our Government.

I have in my possession a letter from Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, which letter reads in full, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, November 13, 1941.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER; MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: In response to your request for my views on House Joint Resolution 237, which provides for the repeal of sections 2, 3, and 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, I offer the following brief comment apart from the points covered in the President's letter to you of this date.

It is my judgment that in the light of existing conditions the passage of this bill is absolutely essential to our national defense. These conditions are completely different from those existing at the time the Neutrality Act was passed; they present an entirely new problem of danger and of methods for dealing with it.

The Neutrality Act represented an endeavor to avoid the limited danger which might arise from the entrance of American citizens and American ships into areas of hostilities far from our own shores. The provisions of that act did not and could not visualize the vast



danger which has since arisen from a world movement of invasion under Hitler's leadership, and which is now moving steadily in the direction of this hemisphere and this country.

As a part of this movement of conquest the greatest intermediate objective of Hitler's armed forces is to capture Great Britain and to gain control of the high seas. To this end Hitler has projected his forces far out into the Atlantic with a policy of submarine ruthlessness. By intimidation and terror he would drive our ships from the high seas and ships of all nations from most of the North Atlantic. Even in the waters of the Western Hemisphere he has attacked and destroyed our ships, as well as ships of other American republics, with resulting loss of American lives.

The breadth of our self-defense must at all times equal the breadth of the dangers which threaten us. In the circumstances of today we must be free to arm our merchant ships for their own protection; and we must be free, in the event of particular and extreme emergency, to use these ships for the carriage of supplies to nations which are resisting the world-wide movement of conquest headed in our direction. This Government would, of course, use caution in carrying out the power which it could exercise upon the passage of the bill.

To maintain our security we must pursue a resolute course in a world of danger and be prepared to meet that danger. We must take measures of defense whenever necessity arises. We cannot promote, much less preserve, our safety by a course of inactivity and complacency in the face of a peril which is coming toward us. Other countries, and especially countries unfriendly to us, will necessarily assume that this bill has been discussed and dealt with on its own merits. I hope this will be kept in mind.

The paramount duty of this Government is to preserve the safety and security of our country. I would be neglecting the responsibility of my office if I did not state the frank opinion that there is imperative need for the passage of this bill to enable our Government effectively to carry out this duty.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

I have talked by long-distance telephone, within the hour, with Admiral Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, he being in New York this afternoon. He told me that I can quote him as stating that this legislation is necessary to giving aid to the countries which are fighting the aggressors.

I have in my possession a letter from the Chief of Staff of the United States Army. The Chief of Staff of the Army is not a Democrat nor a Republican. His job is to defend this country in case of war, and it is his job to prepare this country in anticipation of events our leadership believes may reasonably happen in the near future. He sent me this letter in answer to certain rumors, and undoubtedly in answer to statements made during yesterday's debate.

His letter reads, in full, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, November 13, 1941.

This morning's papers carry reports that the War Department is conducting a recruiting campaign for 3-year enlistments for overseas service. Several of these articles are calculated to give the impression that we are engaged in building up an expeditionary force, and one paper I understand has already taken us to Africa.

During the past year the War Department has been working to increase the number of volunteers, or 3-year men to meet the in-

creased requirements for the present overseas garrisons, such as Panama, Hawaii, and the new Atlantic bases; also to supply the large numbers required for Air Corps units, together with a sufficient percentage of long-service men to give stability to the Regular organizations in the United States, particularly the technical armored corps.

In addition, the Army has been endeavoring to provide the necessary numbers of volunteers to carry out the President's announced policy of relieving the Marines in Iceland and the elements of the British Army stationed there. The recruiting campaign to secure men for the Iceland command was initiated last August at Camp Custer among the units of the Fifth Division. We still have to meet the necessity for 10,000 men for this purpose.

The War Department has also felt that it was highly desirable to have at least one division out of the 34 divisions of the Army, the First Division, 100 percent volunteers, in order that it could be placed on an equal footing with the Marine division with which it has been training for some months in a provisional corps.

To summarize, these requirements amount to 36,000 volunteers a month, of which 25,000 are required for the Air Corps alone. The recruiting necessary for these normal and well-known purposes evidently gave rise to the articles which appeared in the papers this morning. In this connection approximately 25,000 men volunteered in October, which is 9,000 short of the monthly number required.

There is no foundation whatsoever for the allegation or rumor that we are preparing troops for a possible expedition to Africa or other critical area outside this hemisphere.

G. C. MARSHALL,  
Chief of Staff.

On the one hand we have a rumor and on the other hand we have a letter from the Chief of Staff. Who are you going to believe? The Chief of Staff or those who circulate the rumor for the purpose of bringing about division and disunity?

I recall several weeks ago a distinguished Member of the House in the debate that took place at that time saying, "Why, freedom of the seas means nothing real today," and I heard that statement in amazement. I know of one of his forebears as a great Secretary of State of this Nation, and I felt, when I heard that statement, that his forebear would have risen from his grave, rebuking the statement that freedom of the seas means nothing real to America. Why, in the early days of our country, when we had no navy, when under our constitutional form of government we were weak, those of our generation fought for freedom of the seas. They fought for it in the days when we were weak as a government, and there are some in the days when we are strong who, because of fear or because of other influences—I do not attempt to penetrate their minds to find out—would give up the very foundation of our security and of our national defense.

Freedom of the seas is the very foundation upon which our security as a first-rate Nation is predicated and based. When we give up that great principle, when we forego freedom of the seas, when that day comes, America, sinking its head in shame, will become nothing but a second-rate nation.

This is a moment of grave importance to the people of our country. This generation, as I have said before in debate, is on trial. The good people who are in

this gallery, and every one of the 133,000,000 Americans, are on trial today. The country we are possessed of we inherited. The country we are possessed of by inheritance came into being through a revolt against conditions that existed preceding the Revolutionary War, and during those days men and women gave their lives and were willing to give their lives for those who survived, in order that they might have the freedoms that we possess in this country. From a weak Nation we have grown to be the most powerful Nation in the world; from 13 States to 48 States; from 13 States along the Atlantic coast to 48 sovereign States from the Gulf to Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the Nation we have inherited from past generations. We are on trial today, and what I say in this well or what anyone else says here or elsewhere is not going to determine the outcome. The outcome is going to be determined by what our country does in these trying days. However, the question that addresses itself to you and me, as thinking Americans, is whether or not we of this generation are going to go down in history as a generation of Americans that failed, the first generation of Americans that failed to perform their trust. This Government of ours is my Government, individually, and it is the individual Government of every American; and it is the duty and the responsibility of every American to determine in his own mind what course of action is for the best interest of our country. Following his conscience, whatever it is, I respect the views of those who may disagree with me if they disagree based upon an exercise of an honest conscience. But I cannot form my opinions, and I cannot follow my conscience if I react to my hates. I do not like England, but I love America, and I cannot let my dislike of England becloud my love of America. It must be a clear conscience; it must be an honest conscience; it must be a conscience free of influence, free of any influence which prevents its normal operation and its voluntary and free expression.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the honorable representative from Massachusetts yield for one question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I regret I cannot yield now as I have only 2 minutes.

There are some men who say they are going to vote against this bill because they do not like the labor policy of the administration. Let me say to these gentlemen, stop, look, and listen; pause for a moment. You are reacting to your personal feelings just the same as I would react if I voted because of my feelings toward England or because some one did not like the President or hated the President and reacted to that feeling. I ask gentlemen who have taken that position to stop, look, and listen. This is a bill concerned with the national defense. The other is an important part of our picture, but that has nothing to do with the vote today, and I hope the gentlemen who have taken that position and are voting against this bill for that reason, only, will not carry into execution the intentions they have expressed on this floor.

O Mr. Speaker, this is a momentous occasion in the history of our country. This is an occasion which might change the destiny of our Nation and the destiny of the decent forces of the world.

We inherited this country from the past, as I have said, a great Nation, an invulnerable Nation, an indestructible State of States, an invulnerable country of countries. It will continue to be such as long as you and I of this generation and of future generations of America, when a crisis confronts us, perform our duties in an effective manner, in a militantly effective manner, and do everything from a realistic angle that is necessary for the best interests of our country.

This bill is necessary. This bill is a measure for peace. This bill is a measure for the self defense of our country. This bill is one it is necessary to pass in order for all of this generation to perform their duty and to preserve our democracy.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks upon this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining 4 minutes that I have.

I have been in this House over 8 years now, and I have enjoyed my associations and experiences here. It matters not from my country's standpoint whether I come back here after this term, and it does not matter so much, so far as the fate of the Nation is concerned, whether or not any individual Member on either side comes back. During the years I have been here I have often looked up at the face of the Father of my Country. When I did so I did not primarily think of his great Farewell Address, or his inaugural addresses, or of the many other wonderful documents that he left, but most of all I thought of a simple saying of his, "Labor to keep alive 'n your breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience." My friends, laboring to keep alive that spark, disregarding political expediency, or difficulties that may befall from whatever source, I could not but vote to turn down the Senate amendments, because it is my opinion that they are equivalent to war—war by the back door, the back door of deception. If Congress is going to send the country to war, we should have the courage to vote a straight declaration of war that would fool nobody. That is the way I feel about it.

There has been a lot of talk of a letter the President will send here before the debate is over, of what our Democratic leader has said, of what our Speaker will say in closing this debate. I feel something like a pigmy during my 4 minutes here, sandwiched in between these two great men. I feel like a pigmy in this solemn moment, but pigmy though I be, I must speak my heart and convictions. Mr. Speaker, though I love and admire you; my leader, though I love and admire you; my President, though I love and respect you, too, and have followed you in every request you have made of me, upon every step that he has asked the

Congress to supplement your foreign policy, yet, first of all, my duty is not to you; it is to my country. All that I ask of my fellow Members here today in voting on this great, this momentous question, is to do as George Washington advised—consult that living spark within yourselves and do your duty.

When the bill came to our committee of the House our President asked for the arming of ships. I voted for that. My Secretary of State did not ask for these Senate amendments, but he asked for the arming of ships. And in a question, I said: "Mr. Secretary, rumors abroad in the Capitol of this great land are that this is just a maneuver, and the Republicans are saying that the Senate is coming back with something else and will cram it down our throats." The Secretary denied any knowledge of such a plan, and I believe him. Not my prediction, but the prediction of many here has come true. The Senate has sent to this body amendments to the Neutrality Act that in my humble opinion mean war. The time may come when I shall vote for war, but not now; not until we get unity among our own people; not except as a last resort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. And if you will pardon me for taking this time, if you will just pardon me, I will not again transgress the rules of the House; but let me say, in closing, to my President, to my Speaker, to my Democratic leader, to every Member of this House, to the 130,000,000 people of my country who cannot speak this afternoon, if the words I have spoken here and the feeble fight I have made against these Senate amendments constitute treason—"if they be treason, then make the most of it."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is pleased to recognize the Speaker of the House of Representatives for 11 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker and my friends upon both sides of the aisle, I would not impose myself upon you even for these few minutes if I did not feel that perhaps I might clear away a few things that may be troubling some of my friends.

I repeat also what the majority leader has said: I am glad of the high plane upon which this debate has been conducted. To my beloved friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], with none of whose arguments I agree, I was glad to see the ovation given him as a man and as a patriot.

I would not stand here this afternoon and advocate concurrence in these Senate amendments if I did not believe with every fiber of my being that the defeat of those amendments would bring us closer to trouble than the adoption of them.

A great deal has been said about the position of the President. Does the President want these amendments? Does he advocate them? Those questions have

come mostly from my friends on the Democratic side. Last evening late the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and I addressed the following letter to the President of the United States:

A number of Members have asked us what effect failure on the part of the House to take favorable action on the Senate amendments would have upon our position in foreign countries, and especially in Germany.

Some of these Members have stated that they hoped you would make a direct expression upon this matter.

To which we received the following reply:

I had had no thought of expressing to the House my views of the effect, in foreign countries and especially in Germany, of favorable or unfavorable action on the Senate amendments.

But in view of your letter, I am replying as simply and clearly as I know how.

In my message of October 9, I definitely recommended arming of ships and removing the prohibition against sending American-flag ships into belligerent ports. Both I regarded as of extreme importance—the first I called of immediate importance at that time. This did not lessen the importance of the second. Another month has gone by, and the second I regard today as of at least equal importance with the first.

In regard to the repeal of sections 2 and 3 of the Neutrality Act, I need only call your attention to three elements. The first concerns the continued sinking of American-flag ships in many parts of the ocean. The second relates to great operational advantages in making continuous voyages to any belligerent port in any part of the world; thus, in all probability increasing the total percentage of goods—foodstuffs and munitions—actually delivered to those nations fighting Hitlerism. The third is the decision by the Congress and the Executive that this Nation, for its own present and future defense, must strengthen the supply line to all of those who are today keeping Hitlerism far from the Americas.

With all of this in mind, the world is obviously watching the course of this legislation.

In the British Empire, in China, and in Russia—all of whom are fighting a defensive war against invasion—the effect of failure of the Congress to repeal sections 2 and 3 of the Neutrality Act would be definitely discouraging. I am confident that it would not destroy their defense or morale, though it would weaken their position from the point of view of food and munitions.

Failure to repeal these sections would, of course, cause rejoicing in the Axis nations. Failure would bolster aggressive steps and intentions in Germany, and in the other well-known aggressor nations under the leadership of Hitler.

Judging by all recent experience, we could, all of us, look forward to enthusiastic applause in those three nations based on the claim that the United States is disunited as they have so often prophesied.

Our own position in the struggle against aggression would be definitely weakened, not only in Europe and in Asia, but also among our sister republics in the Americas. Foreign nations, friends and enemies, would misinterpret our own mind and purpose.

I have discussed this letter with the Secretary of State and he wholeheartedly concurs.

May I take this opportunity of mentioning that in my judgment failure of the House to take favorable action on the Senate amendments would also weaken our domestic situation? Such failure would weaken our great effort to produce all we possibly can and as rapidly as we can. Strikes and stop-



pages of work would become less serious in the mind of the public.

I am holding a conference tomorrow in the hope that certain essential coal mines can remain in continuous operation. This may prove successful.

But if it is not successful it is obvious that this coal must be mined in order to keep the essential steel mills at work. The Government of the United States has the backing of the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States, including the workers.

And then the concluding line:

The Government proposes to see this thing through.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

And if it is of interest to anyone to know my position on both capital and labor in this titanic, this fateful struggle for democracy and decency, it is that I am ready to follow or to lead in any movement by legislation, or sanely otherwise, that will keep defense production going in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1 additional minute remaining.

Mr. RAYBURN. In the moment, let me say this: Let us not cast a vote today that will mean rejoicing in Germany, or Italy, or Japan. Let me say that I believe with all my heart, this moment, that the failure to enact these amendments will have repercussions too frightful to contemplate, and might break up the most serious conferences that have ever been held that are being held at this moment between the representatives of Japan and the representatives of the United States of America. Let us show to the world by our vote, at least a majority vote, where we stand. Let me appeal to you, whether you love one man or hate another, to stand up today for civilization as it is typified by the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired—all time has expired.

The Chair feels it appropriate to read the last provision of the rule adopted for the consideration of the pending resolution:

And at the conclusion of such debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to concur.

The question is on the motion to concur in the amendments of the Senate.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A vote "yea" on this roll call is a vote to concur in the so-called Senate amendments. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

The roll call is ordered. Those in favor of the motion to concur in the Senate amendments will, as their names are called, vote "yea"; those opposed will vote "nay."

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 194, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—212

Allen, La.	Flannery	Mills, Ark.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Folger	Mills, La.
Arnold	Ford, Leland M.	Mitchell
Baldwin	Ford, Miss.	Monroney
Barnes	Ford, Thomas F.	Murdock
Bates, Ky.	Fulmer	Myers, Pa.
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	Neison
Beckworth	Gathings	Neorrell
Belter	Gavagan	Norton
Bell	Gearhart	O'Neal
Bland	Gibson	O'Toole
Bloom	Gifford	Pace
Boehne	Gore	Patman
Boggs	Gossett	Patrick
Boland	Granger	Patton
Bonner	Grant, Ala.	Pearson
Boykin	Green	Peterson, Fla.
Brooks	Gregory	Pierce
Brown, Ga.	Haines	Plauché
Bryson	Hancock	Plumley
Buck	Hare	Poage
Buckley, N. Y.	Harris, Ark.	Priest
Bulwinkle	Harris, Va.	Ramsay
Burch	Harter	Ramspeck
Burgin	Healey	Randolph
Byrne	Hébert	Rivers
Byron	Hefferman	Robertson, Va.
Camp	Hendricks	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon, Fla.	Hobbs	Rogers, Okla.
Cannon, Mo.	Holbrook	Romjue
Capozzoli	Houston	Russell
Casey, Mass.	Izac	Sabath
Celler	Jackson	Sacks
Chapman	Jarman	Sanders
Clark	Johnson	Schuetz
Claypool	Luther A.	Schulte
Claett	Johnson	Sheppard
Cochran	Lyndon B.	Sikes
Cole, Md.	Johnson, Okla.	Smith, Maine
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Smith, Pa.
Collins	Kefauver	Smith, W. Va.
Cooley	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cooper	Michael J.	Spence
Courtney	Kerr	Starnes, Ala.
Cox	Kilburn	Stearns, N. H.
Cravens	Kilday	Sullivan
Creal	Kirwan	Tater
Crosser	Klein	Tarver
Cunningham	Kocalkowski	Terry
D'Alesandro	Kopplemann	Thom
Davis, Ohio	Kramer	Thomas, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Thomason
Delaney	Larrabee	Traynor
Dickstein	Lea	Vincent, Ky.
Dies	Leavy	Voorhis, Calif.
Dingell	LeCompte	Vreeland
Disney	Lesinski	Wadsworth
Domengeaux	Lewis	Wasielowski
Douglas	McCormack	Weaver
Downs	McGranery	Weiss
Drewry	McIntyre	Wene
Duncan	McKeough	West
Durham	McLaughlin	Whelchel
Eaton	McLean	Whittington
Eberharter	McMillan	Wickersham
Edmiston	Maciejewski	Williams
Elliot, Mass.	MacIora	Woodrum, Va.
Ellis	Magnuson	Wright
Fitzgerald	Mahon	Young
Fitzpatrick	Manasco	Zimmerman
Flannagan	Marcantonio	
	Meyer, Md.	

NAYS—194

Allen, Ill.	Canfield	Dworshak
Andersen	Carlson	Elliott, Calif.
H. Carl Andersen	Carter	Elston
August H. Andrews	Case, S. Dak.	Engel
Angell	Chenoweth	Englebright
Arends	Chipfield	Fellows
Barden	Clason	Fenton
Barry	Clevenger	Fish
Baumhart	Coffee, Nebr.	Fogarty
Beam	Coffee, Wash.	Forand
Bender	Colmer	Gale
Bennett	Copeland	Gehrmann
Bishop	Crawford	Gerlach
Bolton	Crowther	Gilchrist
Boren	Culkin	Gillie
Bradley, Mich.	Cullen	Graham
Bradley, Pa.	Curtis	Grant, Ind.
Brown, Ohio	Day	Guyer
Buckler, Minn.	Dewey	Gwynne
Burdick	Dirksen	Hall
Butler	Ditter	Edwin Arthur Hall
	Dondero	Leonard W.
	Doughton	

Halleck	Martin, Iowa	Scott
Harness	Martin, Mass.	Schafer, Mich.
Harrington	Mason	Shanley
Hart	Merritt	Shannon
Hartley	Michener	Sheridan
Heldinger	Moser	Short
Hess	Mott	Simpson
Hill, Colo.	Mundt	Smith, Ohio
Hill, Wash.	Murray	Smith, Va.
Hinshaw	O'Brien, Mich.	Smith, Wis.
Hoffman	O'Brien, N. Y.	Somers, N. Y.
Holmes	O'Connor	South
Hook	O'Hara	Springer
Hope	O'Leary	Stefan
Howell	Oliver	Stevenson
Hull	Osmer	Stratton
Hunter	Paddock	Sumner, Ill.
Jarrett	Peterson, Ga.	Summers, Tex.
Jenkins, Ohio	Pfeifer	Supplin
Jenks, N. H.	Joseph L. Pfeiffer	Sweeney
Jennings	William T. Pittenger	Talle
Jensen	Ploeser	Tenerowicz
Johns	Powers	Thill
Johnson, Ill.	Rabaut	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Ind.	Rankin, Miss.	Tibbott
Johnson, W. Va.	Rankin, Mont.	Tinkham
Jones	Reece, Tenn.	Tolan
Jonkman	Reed, Ill.	Treadway
Kean	Reed, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Keefe	Rees, Kans.	Vorys, Ohio
Kelley, Pa.	Rich	Walter
Kelly, Ill.	Richards	Welch
Kennedy	Rizley	Wheat
Martin J. Keogh	Robertson, N. Dak.	White
Kinzer	Robinson, Utah	Wigglesworth
Knutson	Robson, Ky.	Wilson
Kunkel	Rockefeller	Winter
Lambertson	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolcott
Landis	Rolph	Wolfenden, Pa.
Ludlow	Sasser	Wolverton, N. J.
Lynch	Sauthoff	Woodruff, Mich.
McGehee	Scanlon	Worley
McGregor		Youngdahl
Maas		

NOT VOTING—22

Anderson, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.	Schaefer, Ill.
Blackney	Kleberg	Scrugham
Cartwright	McArdle	Secrest
Costello	Mansfield	Smith, Wash.
Faddis	May	Snyder
Flaherty	Nichols	Vinson, Ga.
Imhoff	O'Day	
Jacobsen	Satterfield	

So the motion to agree to the Senate amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kleberg (for) with Mr. Johnson of California (against).

Mr. Smith of Washington (for) with Mr. Secrest (against).

Mr. Faddis (for) with Mr. Mansfield (against).

Mr. Imhoff (for) with Mr. Blackney (against).

Mr. May (for) with Mr. McArdle (against).

Mr. Vinson of Georgia (for) with Mrs. O'Day (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Snyder with Mr. Jacobsen.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Flaherty.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Scrugham.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE ACT OF MARCH 24, 1934

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 339, Rept. No. 1414), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that

the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5825) to amend section 19 (a) of the Philippine Independence Act of March 24, 1934, as amended by the act of August 7, 1939, and to amend the act approved June 19, 1934, so as to authorize certain sugar excise-tax funds and other funds to be used for military- and naval-defense purposes in the Philippine Islands. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CELLER, Mr. McLAUGHLIN, and Mr. BLOOM asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a speech made by the Under Secretary of War.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address delivered by the Honorable Arthur Sutton in Boston.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. McARDLE] is unavoidably absent. If present he would have voted "nay" on the resolution just passed.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of bills on the Consent Calendar on Monday next be dispensed with.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I would like to have the gentleman inform us what we might expect as the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The price-control legislation will be called up next week.

There is no rule out as yet, but the Rules Committee, I understand, will meet on Monday. So there will be nothing on Monday. I understand there is nothing on the Consent Calendar of importance and by dispensing with that business it will enable Members to govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. On Tuesday the gentleman expects to call up the price-control bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; next Thursday is Thanksgiving Day, and a lot of Members are interested in that. We are in the hopes of getting through with the price-control bill next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are you going to observe both Thanksgiving Days?

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope my friend will not press that question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman expect to dispose of the price-control bill in 2 days?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman does expect that the House will be in session Friday and perhaps Saturday of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would rather not commit myself now as to what will happen on Thursday or Friday. I hope that we will not have anything for Thursday at least. Whether we can go into Friday, I would rather not commit myself now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman tell us when the labor legislation which was promised just before this neutrality vote was taken will come up for consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. I made no promises.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not refer to the gentleman's promises.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan is to be congratulated on his perseverance, and I admire and respect him for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I asked the Labor Committee this morning about the same thing, but I did not get anywhere.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no control over the Committee on Labor, and I respect the chairman and the members of the Committee on Labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So do I.

Mr. COX. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman is in a position to indicate when it would suit the leadership for the Vinson bill to be called up, to be used as a vehicle for getting effective legislation, because with the adoption of this bill, unless the President adopts a very strong labor policy about strikes in defense industries, we are simply sending the young manhood of this country to the slaughterhouse.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a lot to what the gentleman says. I could not make any promise in connection with that, except that we shall know more in a day or two, and the less said now, probably would be the easiest mended.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come when we can and should meet this labor situation frankly, and when we should be in-

formed by the leadership of the House whether it is the purpose of the leadership to designate a day in the near future when it will be agreeable to the leadership, in accordance with what I understood to be the statement of the Speaker a few minutes ago, to take up and dispose of labor legislation, using the Vinson bill, which is now on the calendar with a rule for its consideration, as a vehicle for such legislation as this House and the country may deem vitally necessary at this time.

I know the majority leader recognizes as well as the rest of us that the labor situation is serious. I think the time has come when we ought to have a show-down, and ought to know when and if the leadership is going to give us the green light on labor legislation which is now on the calendar of this House and has been there for months.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as I am concerned, the gentleman knows that a rule has been reported out on the Vinson bill. Under the rules of the House, any member of the Committee on Rules can call up that rule any time after 7 legislative days have transpired. Seven legislative days have transpired. The gentleman from Virginia, himself, is a member of the Committee on Rules. The gentleman answered his own question. It is completely within his control, or the control of any other member of the Committee on Rules.

I might go a little further. I would not want to let it stand there. I know there are reasons why it would not be fair. The gentleman has been cooperating, and I appreciate it very much. I believe if the gentleman will wait until Monday we might be in a better position to answer that question, because something said now might only cause excitement and alarm.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LESINSKI. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Labor may I say that there is no legislation in the Labor Committee, but other committees have usurped the power of trying to legislate for labor, and they will never do it.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that as far as the Labor Committee of this House is concerned we will never get any labor legislation until we get a new committee.

Mr. DINGELL. I think that is a direct aspersion on a committee of this House.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the effective closing remarks of the majority leader and the Speaker of this House on the legislation which we passed a few minutes ago. I distinctly heard the Speaker say he was—and I quote his words—"ready to lead in any movement by legislation or sanely otherwise that will keep defense production going in the United States." Most of the Members arose from their seats and applauded his words. I trust the Speaker. I believe this House in a very few days will with courage attack this problem. Loyal labor and responsible unionism deserve our strongest support. Unwar-



ranted defense strikes must be stopped, and we must act to that end.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this House today made an answer to Hitler's challenge to our security and the peace of the world. As a Member of this House, I call on the Speaker and the leader of my party to answer the challenge of John Lewis to constituted authority in America and the right of the people of America to produce at once for security's sake.

Mr. HOOK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, now that we have heard from all the great labor leaders—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Except one.

Mr. HOOK. I think we should know that the people of the United States have something to say on this question. I believe that at this time we should meet the question of strike or antistrike legislation with calm deliberation, because how in the world are we going to have a national-defense program unless we have production, and the laboring men of this Nation are the only ones who can give it to us? Just because there may be one or two labor leaders who are selling honest labor down the line we should not antagonize honest labor. I trust the Speaker and the floor leader of this House to act in the best interests of the laboring people of this Nation.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this simply to ask the distinguished majority leader when we may expect a hearing on the floor here of H. R. 3.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from Alabama has asked that question because it is my intention to permit that rule to be called up when the price-control bill is out of the way, with the understanding that if labor legislation comes in—and I am sure my friend will recognize that such a situation is not improbable—naturally that measure will take precedence. I may also say that an appropriation bill is expected to be reported out around the 19th or 20th of this month, but as soon as possible the next bill after the price-control measure is out of the way will be H. R. 3. I am giving notice now that all may be prepared for that bill being called up sometime shortly after the price-control bill is out of the way.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman has been very kind and has made every effort to facilitate the consideration of this bill, and I want to assure him I appreciate his statement.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HILL of Colorado, for 1 month, on account of official business.

To Mr. COLE of New York, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. GALE, for 3 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. BALDWIN, for 3 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. MITCHELL, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. MAGNUSON, for 3 weeks, beginning November 22, 1941, on account of illness in his family.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute to make a statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] phoned me this morning that the reason he was absent from the House today is on account of the serious illness of his mother.

#### THE CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that business in order on Monday next, Consent Calendar day, be dispensed with.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I resent the words uttered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], and I ask that the words be taken down.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The request is too late, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that business having intervened since the time the gentleman's words were uttered and the request of the gentleman from Michigan made, the request comes too late.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks made this afternoon a letter from a prominent pioneer in Idaho.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some resolutions from the W. C. T. U. of Grady County, Okla.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative business and any special orders heretofore made I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of

the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5553. An act providing an appropriation for additional members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution to repeal sections 2, 3, and 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

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

H. R. 5553. An act providing an appropriation for additional members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 14, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, November 14, 1941, to continue hearings on proposed amendments to Securities Act, 1933, and Stock Exchange Act, 1934.

##### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The Committee on Agriculture will have open hearings on Monday, November 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., to consider the 4-H Club and Rural Youth Act, H. R. 4530.

##### COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold public hearings in room 247, House Office Building, Tuesday, November 18, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 6009 entitled "A bill to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra-hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes."

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5837. A bill to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 3564. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; without

amendment (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 339. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 5825, a bill to amend section 19 (a) of the Philippine Independence Act of March 24, 1934, as amended by the act of August 7, 1939, and to amend the act approved June 19, 1934, so as to authorize certain sugar excise-tax funds and other funds to be used for military and naval defense purposes in the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1414). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6021. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Wacassassa River and its tributaries, Florida, and of adjacent areas in Gilchrist and Levy Counties, Fla., for flood-control, for run-off, and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

H. R. 6022. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Oklawaha River and its tributaries, Florida, and of adjacent areas in Alachua and Marion Counties, Fla., for flood control, for run-off, and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 6023. A bill to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories and possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist in the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Heavenly Father, Thou who art the source of calm repose, our peace in war, our gain in loss, impart unto us Thy soul-cheering comfort, measured unto us by the suffering and sacrifice of Thy Son. We pray Thee to inspire in us the song of a blessed and enduring hope for the poor and needy ones the world over. Thou who hast fashioned men and taught their hearts to twine about one another, bring us all to such trust, to such generous response to poverty and distress, that the fruitage of gladness and good will shall root, grow, and blossom in the very heart of humanity. By our sympathy, by our fidelity, by our unity, by our common fraternity, and by all the blessings of heaven above, grant that we may unfold all things for the relief and joy of those who bear no name and are wrecked in the pathway of life.

While men labor for the bread that perisheth, we pray that our powers may turn to the riches of God, which are the lasting treasures of the soul. Thou infinitely Holy Father of us all, who desireth above all things to give Thy earthly children joy unspeakable, peace which passeth understanding, the manifestation of Thyself which the world cannot perceive, oh may none of us be found to have labored in vain. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5890. An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1916. An act to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 768. An act for the relief of William E. Thomas; and

H. R. 1852. An act for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr., and others.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief opinion rendered by Judge Marvin Jones, of the United States Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Mayors' Committee for National Defense and Fight for Freedom Week, in Baltimore last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial published in the September and October issue of the Labor Record, together with certain editorials published in other papers, which are worthy of consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a speech that I delivered before a district farmers' meeting on the subject of agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENDER was granted permission to extend his own remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the Christian Century of November 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an editorial written by me on the subject of free speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, legitimate business is short of paper supplies. Mayor LaGuardia's department for inflaming the civilian population urges the saving of old paper, but they do not practice what they preach.

I have just received a letter from an official of a small town in my district, reading as follows:

Last week without any requisition or solicitation, 3,500 of the smaller of the 2 enclosed posters and several as yet uncounted hundreds of the larger posters were delivered to the home of the chairman of the local defense council. Even if it were desired to plaster every store in town with one of these posters, 100 at the outside, would be sufficient. If every one of the many thousands of municipalities having defense councils receives a proportionate number of posters—as presumably they have or will—the terrific waste is apparent. No wonder there is a shortage of paper which is seriously handicapping the legitimate needs of private industry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a short address I made in Clifton, N. J., last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein two short quotations from the lips of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein an address I delivered last night over the National Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of a brief address which Mr. Leyton Patten delivered at the University of Chattanooga.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own