

H. R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Albis, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3001. A bill for the relief of James P. Melican; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3002. A bill for the relief of Maximo Abrego; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Lueberta Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3004. A bill for the relief of John W. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3005. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:
H. R. 3006. A bill for the relief of John M. Dussault; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE:
H. R. 3007. A bill granting a pension to Leah Kesterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL:
H. R. 3008. A bill for the relief of Marie C. Millbauer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:
H. R. 3009. A bill for the relief of Joseph John Mullin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PIERCE:
H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution for the relief of North Pacific Grain Growers, Inc.; 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:

181. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of California State Senate, relating to the proposed Loma Prieta State Forest, Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

182. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Passaic County, N. J., Petroleum Industries Committee, calling for equitable taxation for the highway users of New Jersey in any new tax legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

183. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the New Jersey State Legislature, opposing the ratification of any treaty with the Dominion of Canada or the passage of any legislation which may provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

184. By Mr. PIERCE: House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the Oregon Legislature; to the Committee on Agriculture.

185. By Mr. WELCH: California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 8, relating to excess-profits-tax legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

186. Also, California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13, memorializing the Secretary of the Navy to establish an airdrome at San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

187. Also, California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 16, memorializing the Congress to render continued aid to Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

188. Also, California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 17, relating to Sacramento River flood-control project; to the Committee on Flood Control.

189. Also, California Assembly Joint Resolution No. 19, memorializing and petitioning Congress to enact legislation giving to draftees and others entering the military and naval service of the United States adequate insurance protection for themselves in the form of permanent total-disability insurance as well as life-insurance protection; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1941

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

O Thou whose kingdom is our hearts' desire, whose way with men is love: Grant to us all, amid the clashing forces which together constitute the world, that the little we can do may be sound and just and generous, always allied to the power that makes for good, which is Thy will, so that in every experience, whether of joy or pain, we may be brought closer unto Thee.

Let us value no treatment of Thy grace simply because it gives or denies us what we want, but in all Thou sendest, knowing Thy perfection, make us sure that in every disappointment Thou art still loving us; in every darkened hour Thou art still enlightening us; in every enforced idleness Thou art still using us; and in every death, with its distracting grief, make us ever surer that Thou dost give us life, even as in His death Thou gavest life eternal to Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, in whose name and for whose sake alone we dare to pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2788) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SENATE SPECIAL SILVER COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the resignation of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] from the Senate Special Silver Committee. The Senator from Maryland has stated that he is resigning in order that he may become a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. The Chair appoints as members of the Senate Special Silver Committee the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. BARKLEY. There was already a vacancy on that special committee, and the resignation of the Senator from Maryland creates another one, which I understand the Chair is now filling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky is correct.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA—AMENDED PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amended petition filed by counsel for petitioners against WILLIAM LANGER, respondent, a Senator from the

State of North Dakota, relative to his right to a seat in the Senate, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

TRUST FUNDS DERIVED FROM COMPENSATING TAXES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to carry to the surplus fund of the Treasury certain trust funds derived from compensating taxes collected pursuant to section 15 (e) of title I of the act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 40), as amended, upon certain articles coming into the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EDUCATIONAL ORDER PROGRAM, WAR DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of disbursements on the educational-order program as of December 31, 1940, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF CREDIT OPERATIONS, INDIAN OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of credit operations under the authority of certain acts, Office of Indian Affairs, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

CANCELATION OF REIMBURSABLE CHARGES AGAINST INDIANS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, for the approval of Congress, copy of an order of the Secretary of the Interior dated April 1, 1940, canceling certain reimbursable charges against individual Indians described therein, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Commission for the period ended October 25, 1940, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL (S.
DOC. NO. 9)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

TABLES OF BANKRUPTCY STATISTICS—UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, submitting, pursuant to law, tables of bankruptcy statistics with reference to bankruptcy cases commenced and terminated in the United States district courts during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of the business of the company, together with a list of the stockholders for the year ended December 31, 1940, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BALANCE SHEET, THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of the company for the year 1940, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the company for the calendar year 1940, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1940, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the year ended December 31, 1940, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the year ended December 31, 1940, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following Senate joint memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senate Joint Memorial No. 3

To the President of the United States and the Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session:

Whereas there have been 7 outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States since 1900; the outbreak of 1914 spread to 22 States and the District of Columbia; in the California outbreak of 1924 the disease spread to the deer ranging on the national forest, where it was necessary to establish 42 camps, employ 204 hunters, and to kill the deer running on this range; a total of 22,214 animals were destroyed; and

Whereas the tremendous ravages of this disease are seen in the number and variety of species of animals affected—cattle, hogs, sheep, and goats are susceptible, as also are deer, elk, and antelope, horses, dogs, coyotes, and cats are particularly dangerous as carriers of the infection, while man himself is not immune; and

Whereas it has been estimated by Dr. John E. Mohler, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, that the total cost to this country of the seven outbreaks which have occurred since 1900 would exceed \$200,000,000; and

Whereas since the California outbreak of 1929, which was traced directly to swine being fed on garbage unloaded from a ship just returned from Buenos Aires, Argentina, the Continental United States has been free from this disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the thirty-third general assembly (the house of representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized, and strongly urged to oppose any modification of the existing embargoes applying to all countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following senate memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senate Memorial No. 4

Senate memorial to the President of the United States, Vice President, National Congress, Secretary of Agriculture, and others named in this memorial, requesting proper sugar legislation and more equitable quotas for sugar-beet acreage, and further requesting a normal expansion and an adequate protection of the sugar industry

Be it enacted by the Senate of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana:

Whereas the sugar-beet industry has become firmly established in 14 counties of the State of Montana and constitutes the major crop grown in irrigated valleys. Thirty-seven percent of the population of the State resides in these districts and are directly and indirectly dependent upon the income from sugar-beet production; and

Whereas there are two major agricultural crops in Montana, namely, sugar beets and wheat. Because of the curtailment of sugar-beet acreage for the older beet-growing districts and the absence of sugar-beet acreage for new irrigated districts, an agricultural emergency is hereby declared for farmers in

the irrigated districts in the State of Montana; and

already is a huge surplus commodity, and the growing of wheat under irrigation does Whereas it is financial ruin to compel irrigated farmers to plant wheat which not pay the cost of production; and

Whereas it is our firm belief that the real picture of this situation has not been presented to the honorable Secretary of Agriculture in Washington; and

Whereas sugar beets have been produced in Montana over 25 years; this crop is well adapted to Montana climatic conditions; it requires a proper rotation for better farming and fertilization of the soil; a sugar-beet crop provides beet tops, pulp, and molasses, which fits into livestock feeding of thousands of cattle and hundreds of thousands of lambs; and

Whereas the growing of sugar beets under normal expansion of acreage and adequate protection for the industry will guarantee farmers a fair price for their beets, guarantee American laborers a living wage, and solve a serious and vexing problem; and

Whereas we strongly maintain that the larger part of the sugar industry in the United States belongs to the American farmers and American labor; and

Whereas we vigorously oppose refined sugar entering the United States from any of our insular possessions; we urge that only raw sugar come into this country, and the refining of same be done by American refineries and the labor given to American laborers; and

Whereas we quote from page 5 of the speech by Senator THOMAS of Idaho, given July 29, 1940, quoting L. J. Taber, master of the National Grange:

"Since 1934 we have reduced the duty on imports of sugar from Cuba from 2 to 0.9 cent per pound. Between September 3, 1934, and December 31, 1939, the Treasury sustained a loss of revenue in this connection amounting to \$133,924,000. In the meantime the retail price of sugar to the consumer has not been reduced to the extent of a single mill. The chief beneficiaries have been some of the biggest banks of Wall Street, which own the major portion of the Cuban sugar industry"; and

Whereas the sugar program has not helped either the grower or the consumer. The radical reductions in the sugar tariff has destroyed millions of dollars of purchasing power among the growers in the sugar-beet industry. The contention that increased trade with Cuba justifies the present low tariff and acreage restrictions for farmers is a theoretical and economic mistake. The record shows that the present sugar program cost the United States \$42,800,000 per year to carry on its trade with Cuba during the last 3 years. The demand for a change in this program becomes a public necessity for the United States, and an economic emergency for all beet growers. Under the present acreage quotas from Washington, beet growers are ordered to reduce acreage, and the sales quotas on sugar for refineries have been less than the production of sugar in many districts, thereby compelling refineries to borrow millions of dollars on sugar stocks until the Department grants additional sales quotas. Further increases on sugar quotas for Cuba is wholly inconsistent with the building of a prosperous agriculture in the United States, and will destroy the sugar industry in continental United States; and

Whereas after careful checks and rechecks it is found that over 20,000,000 people are engaged in the sugar industry or reside within the sugar-producing districts in the United States. The growers in these districts annually purchase machinery from factories and merchandise of all kinds from wholesale centers of the country to the extent of \$81,000,000 per year. This is much greater than the total of our annual exports

to Cuba. Any reduction in acreage or decrease in price of sugar is an economic detriment to the welfare of the United States; and

Whereas we vigorously demand that the allotment for 1941 sugar acreage be increased not less than 20 percent, we request an additional acreage allotment for new irrigation projects where farms are properly prepared and the acreage acceptable to the field men representing local refineries; and

Whereas the Sugar Act has not been administered so as to secure for American sugar producers the small benefits it is supposed to give them. Quotas have been constantly adjusted to depress the prices of sugar. Certainly, with the defense program, provision must be made to increase the production from our sugar-producing districts in the United States; and

Whereas we, the memorialists of the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, urge that the Congress of the United States set up a proper sugar program; this program to permit a normal expansion of acreage and production and an adequate protection for the sugar industry. We maintain this program will correct the wrongs now being sustained by farmers, processors, and wage earners engaged in growing and manufacturing domestic sugar. With a proper sugar program, thousands of farmers will normally increase their acreage and sugar production. Purchasing power of the growers will be greatly increased. Hundreds of millions of dollars now invested by the United States Government in irrigation projects will be repaid. Indebtedness to local creditors will be retired. A large increase in employment and a general upward trend in business will be brought about, all of which will effect an increase in business for the country generally; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and State, and to each Senator and to each Representative of the National Congress now in session; that 200 extra copies may be printed for members of the senate, to mail to sugar-beet associations, factories, and wholesale centers in the United States now selling machinery and merchandise of all kinds to domestic sugar-producing districts.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following house concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Kansas, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 4

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to preserve and protect our American system of government in the enactment of defense legislation, particularly House bill 1776, commonly known as the lease-lend bill

Whereas there is now pending in Congress House bill 1776, which provides that it is to further promote the defense of the United States, "and for other purposes," and "without regard to previous laws" giving one man the power to "sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of any defense article to any government"; and

Whereas we favor aid to Britain that will not involve our country in war, and which is not inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense, and the maintenance of our American form of government; and

Whereas we realize and appreciate the imperative need of speed and cooperation in the development of the defenses of the United States; and

Whereas we have heretofore withstood attack from without and disunity within, and in such crises our leaders have never desired nor demanded the surrender by our people

of their right of self-government or the delegation of unlimited powers; and

Whereas such resolution would permit the delivery of "any plan or information pertaining to any defense article" to any foreign country at the sole discretion of one man, and would grant to him sweeping powers in time of peace greater than any man has in Britain, which is at war, all without limitation as to time or provision for restoring to the people in the future the unlimited powers thus given to one man: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the senate concurring therein), That we are opposed to the delegation of the unlimited dictatorial powers contained in House Resolution No. 1776, commonly known as the lease-lend bill, and that the power to "sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of any defense articles to any government" * * * "without regard to previous laws" should be retained by the Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That our national-defense program should be carried out and material aid should be furnished to Britain without placing such unprecedented, all-embracing, and unnecessary powers in the hands of one man, and without a complete surrender by Congress of all its legislative powers, duties, and responsibilities; be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to not pass House bill 1776 in its present form; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit properly authenticated copies of this resolution to each branch of the Congress, to each member of the Kansas congressional delegation and to each of the United States Senators from Kansas and to the Governors of the States adjoining the State of Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate memorials of several citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 275, the so-called lend-lease bill, and also against any action tending to involve the Nation in war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to separate Communist-front and other radical organization members from service under the National Labor Relations Board, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

TARIFF ON DAIRY PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF POLK COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Polk County Association of Commerce of my State and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the proper committee.

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

Whereas the Polk County Association of Commerce is vitally interested in the welfare of the American dairy farmer; and

Whereas it has been called to the attention of the board of directors of this association that proposals are being made by members of our National Government to lower the present tariff on dairy products in order to permit imports of dairy products from South American nations; and

Whereas the lowering of said tariff would reduce the income of our Wisconsin dairy

farmers and adversely affect the dairy market: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association is unalterably opposed to any and all proposed reductions in the existing tariff on dairy products: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. Alexander Wiley, United States Senator; Hon. B. J. Gehrmann, Member of Congress; Hon. Julius P. Hell, Governor; Hon. A. J. Connors, State senator; and Hon. D. D. Kennedy, assemblyman.

The foregoing resolution was offered at the January 24, 1941, meeting of the board of directors of the Polk County Association of Commerce and passed by unanimous vote.

R. A. PEABODY,

Secretary.

MILLTOWN, WIS., January 28, 1941.

AID TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition on the subject of aid to Great Britain, which happens to be addressed to me by students of Needham Senior High School, of Needham, Mass. I ask that the petition may be printed in the RECORD, with the names attached.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

Today the people of Great Britain are engaged in a titanic struggle with the subjects of one of the most ruthless tyrants of all time. This particular tyrant has done more to retard the progress of civilization in his own vassal state than did all his predecessors combined. In the 7 years that he has been lord of Germany he has persecuted religious and racial groups; he has destroyed the works of Germany's most renowned writers because they belonged to a race which he hates; he has forced into exile some of the greatest men of Europe, and this forced exile hastened the death of Austria's greatest psychoanalyst; he has committed innumerable crimes against his own people, as well as against humanity; he has degraded the women of Germany by forcing them to bear illegitimate children, so that the population might be increased; he has transformed young men who would have grown into clean adulthood into lustful beasts; he has done more to ruin the civilization of the world than any tyrant since Attila. And against him and his goose-stepping troops are arrayed the gallant people of Great Britain.

The British people are fighting the cause of civilization as well as that of democracy; for it is possible to have a high form of civilization in a country ruled by an autocrat. The Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte of France was an honorable dictator; the master of Germany is a dishonorable tyrant. His very existence retards the progress of civilization, for with him in power the peoples of the world have been forced to rearm and even to go to war. Peace can never exist with him in power. It is Germany's fault that he is where he is today, and Germany is suffering through privation, as she has for 7 long years. Though the ill-informed people of Germany do not realize it, Great Britain is fighting for their liberation. The British people must be victorious.

The people of Great Britain are risking their lives, their property, and their fortunes. Many have given their lives, and thousands more will before this war is over. The price is great, but the British people are willing to pay it. The British are fighting for us, too. They are fighting for every existing democracy, from the great United States of America

down to the little African Republic of Liberia. If Great Britain wins, we win. If she loses, we will be marching to the tune of the Horst Wessel within 5 years after. A British victory will mean peace. A German victory can mean nothing less than the downfall of everything decent, wholesome, and honorable.

To insure an ultimate British victory, we must do everything in our power to lighten the burden of war. Our friend and defender, Great Britain, needs airplanes, arms, and munitions, medical supplies, and food-stuffs. Because Great Britain is a debtor nation, she is prevented by the Johnson Act from purchasing war materials in this country on credit. That the strain on the British treasury may be alleviated, we, the undersigned students at Needham Senior High School, Needham, Mass., propose that a bill be introduced in Congress, the object of the introduction of this bill being to repeal the aforementioned Johnson Act. We further propose that such a bill stipulate that aggressor nations and/or nations provoking war be barred from consideration. This means that only nations such as Great Britain would be considered as worthy of aid. We propose that the power to distinguish between aggressor nations and those defending the principles of democracy be vested in the President of the United States and in the Secretary of State. We also propose that the power to make such extensions of credit be vested in the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury. This would eliminate the hours of debating which would be sure to take place in Congress if the Congress were given the power to vote on a bill.

American public opinion cannot be associated with the Johnson Act, for most Americans want to aid Great Britain in every possible manner. To repeal this obnoxious law is the least we can do.

Therefore we, the undersigned, students at Needham Senior High School, Needham, Mass., in heartfelt accord with the aims of the valiant people of Great Britain, do herewith affix our signatures and hope, in so doing, to add strength to the fight for repeal of the Johnson Act. We, who are representatives of the vast majority of American high-school students in that we favor all aid possible to Great Britain and any sister democracies joining her in battle, do herewith petition you, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, to do all in your power to help insure the preservation of our democratic way of life.

This petition is respectfully submitted by the following students:

Richard Milne, John David Milne, Robert Mackintosh, Harold LeFord Burr, William MacGray, Leo Ward, Kenduah Williams, Allison C. Ringer, Alfred Mills, Calvin C. Paige, Robert C. Oliver, Robert N. McClellan, Jr., Alan McIntosh, Wm. Deederling, Jr., David Hutchins, Gordon Scott, Robert Goodwin, Beth Gates, John M. Bailey, Jr., Gertrude Hazzard, Ruth S. Wheeler, Robert A. Watkins, Marjorie Wheeler, Robert H. Warwick, William Whitney, Dick Parlin, Lawrence Gay, Robert McNelly, Edward O'Neil, David Dyer, Douglas Page, Paul Richweegen, Jr., Mary Elizabeth Liljequist, Doris B. Maher, Beulah MacWilliams, Dorothea Lugent, Virginia Sparrow, John J. Dermody, Robert Rush, Bette Williams, Brian A. H. Cartwright, Francis Hersey 3d, A. J. Godfrey, Richard L. Silvo, Donald M. Johnston, James Dearing Maloney, James William Parker Maloney, Everett R. Goodwin, Craig W. Moodie, Jr., James A. Peirce, R.

Sherman Heard, Robert Youlden, Edwin Ryan, David Willard, D. Savage, David Edmund Thompson, David S. Reimstrom, Jane Muloney, George Doull, George Trumbour, Jr., Manson H. Carter, Jeanne McNamara, Margo Gately, Charles Newton, Donald Rugen, Joachim Dodd.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 49, submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] on January 21, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate were, on line 4, after the words "rate of", to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,880", and after the words "per annum", to strike out the remainder of the resolution, so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia hereby is authorized to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,880 per annum.

The amendments were agreed to. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 700. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved August 27, 1940, entitled "An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 701. A bill granting a pension to Florence G. Miller, widow of Capt. Edward Y. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I introduce two bills, one increasing the number of cadets at the Military Academy at West Point for the District of Columbia from 5 to 9, and a similar bill applying to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, increasing the number of midshipmen from the District of Columbia from 5 to 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 702. A bill to increase the number of cadets allowed at the United States Military Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 703. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 704. A bill for the relief of Mary Many Wounds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs. (Mr. OVERTON introduced Senate bill 705, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 706. A bill for the relief of Blanche W. Stout; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 707. A bill granting a pension to J. M. Logan; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 708. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arreas; and

S. 709. A bill to enable Mike Agaloff and others to enter and remain permanently in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 710. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California," approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 711. A bill to incorporate the American International Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 712. A bill to provide that moneys received from the national forests and paid to the State for the benefit of the counties in which such forests are situated may be expended for purposes other than public schools and public roads;

S. 713. A bill to authorize the acquisition of forest lands adjacent to and over which highways, roads, or trails are constructed, or to be constructed, wholly or partially with Federal funds, in order to preserve or restore their natural beauty, and for other purposes; and

S. 714. A bill to provide that moneys received from the national forests and paid to the States for the benefit of the counties in which such forests are situated may be expended for purposes other than public schools and public roads; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 715. A bill for the relief of William Joseph Caisse;

S. 716. A bill for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 717. A bill for the relief of Dollie C. Pichette; and

S. 718. A bill for the relief of Edgar E. Squire; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 719. A bill to establish a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 720. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, for the purpose of imposing a tax on santolin and salts thereof imported into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 721. A bill to provide a preliminary examination and survey of Neskwonin Creek, Oreg., with a view to the control of its floodwaters;

S. 722. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works on the Walla Walla River and tributaries, Oregon and Washington; and

S. 723. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish-cultural station at or near Clatskanie on the Clatskanie River in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 724. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles Martin Corbett;

S. 725. A bill for the relief of Marlon C. Hunter;

S. 726. A bill for the relief of Guy D. Martin;

S. 727. A bill for the relief of Julia A. S. O'Brien; and

S. 728. A bill for the relief of Dave W. Stearns; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 729. A bill to authorize the distribution to persons admitted to citizenship of the patriotic poster entitled "Look the Truth in the Face"; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 730. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28,

1937; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 731. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the right of occupancy with beneficial incidents to reservations due certain tribes and bands of Indians in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 732. A bill to amend section 17 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 733. A bill to correct the military record of William T. Dickson;

S. 734. A bill for the relief of Thomas D. Durand;

S. 735. A bill for the relief of George H. Taylor; and

S. 736. A bill authorizing the appointment of certain persons as second lieutenants in the Regular Army Air Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 737. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey a certain tract of land to the State of Oregon for use as a public park and recreational site; and

S. 738. A bill prohibiting the charging or collection of fees for admission to certain historic and archeologic sites, buildings, and properties; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

S. 739. A bill to correct the service record of Thomas Patrick Heaney;

S. 740. A bill for the relief of Alan Welch Smith; and

S. 741. A bill for the relief of Owen Ewart Smith; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 742. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jemima Bason;

S. 743. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Carson;

S. 744. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Richard Collier;

S. 745. A bill granting a pension to Carrie Gibbon;

S. 746. A bill granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Hubbard;

S. 747. A bill granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Lamar;

S. 748. A bill granting an increase of pension to Willmette J. Miller;

S. 749. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Morgan;

S. 750. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jean M. Vitou; and

S. 751. A bill to provide pension benefits for certain Spanish-American War veterans equivalent to those granted to Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 752. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 753. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboin Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 754. A bill authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Potomac River at or near Sandy Hook, Md., to a point opposite in Virginia; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 34, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

FLOOD CONTROL OF LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the Committee on Commerce, a bill to modify the project for flood control of the lower Mississippi River.

The bill follows the recommendations of a resolution adopted by the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association at its meeting held December 18 last at New Orleans. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the certified copy of the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 705) to amend the project for flood control of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the acts of June 15, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the acts of June 15, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, is hereby amended so as to provide that the project for flood control in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River existing at the present time in accordance with the provisions of said act is hereby modified and, as thus modified, is hereby adopted, as follows:

Pending the completion of the ultimate plan for flood control in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is authorized to make revisions in the grades and sections of the main-line Mississippi levees on both the east and west banks and to adjust and equalize the unequal freeboards which now exist, or may hereafter develop. Between the latitude of the Arkansas River and a point at or south of Deer Park, La., revision, adjustment, and equalization shall be made so as to obtain net grades of existing front-line levees generally of such height above the computed crest-flow line of the project flood as the Chief of Engineers may deem advisable as affording reasonably safe protection against such project flood.

The Boeuf floodway in the project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and the Eudora floodway, as well as the back-protection levee extending from the head of the said Eudora floodway north to the Arkansas River in the project, adopted by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended, are hereby abandoned.

The levee on the south side of the Arkansas River shall be enlarged in grade and section so as to afford, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, reasonably safe protection against the project flood of the Mississippi River.

From time to time additional protection against floods shall be given simultaneously to, and equitably distributed between, the Yazoo River backwater area and the Red River backwater area under such plans as may be approved by the Chief of Engineers.

The total authorizations heretofore made for the flood-control project of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River shall not be increased by reason of any provision in this act, but any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made or authorized for said project may be expended upon any feature of the said project, notwithstanding any restrictions, limitations, or requirements of existing law.

The resolution presented by Mr. OVERTON is as follows:

Be it resolved by the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association in session duly called and convened, That this association does hereby make the following recommendations for further flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River:

(1) That the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army be authorized, pending the completion of the ultimate plan of such flood control, to make revisions in the grades and sections of the main-line Mississippi levees on both the east and west banks and

to adjust and equalize the unequal freeboards which have resulted, or may hereafter result.

(2) That between the latitude of the Arkansas River and a point at or south of Deer Park, La., such revision, adjustment, and equalization shall be so made as to obtain net grades of existing front-line levees generally of such height above the computed crest flow line of the project flood as the Chief of Engineers may deem advisable as affording reasonably safe protection against such project flood.

(3) That the levee on the south side of the Arkansas River be so enlarged in grade and section as to afford, within the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, reasonably safe protection against such project flood.

(4) That any appropriations heretofore or hereafter authorized or made for the flood-control project of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River may be expended to prosecute any feature of said project, notwithstanding any restrictions, limitations, or requirements of existing law.

(5) That existing laws providing for flood control of the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries be so amended as to carry into effect these recommendations; especially shall the provisions of existing law providing for the construction of the Boeuf floodway and Eudora floodway be repealed.

(6) That additional protection against flood be given simultaneously to, and equitably distributed between, the Yazoo River backwater area and the Red River backwater area under such plans as may from time to time be devised and recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

(7) That copies of this resolution, certified by the secretary of this association, be forwarded to the Mississippi River Commission, the Chief of Engineers, the Secretary of War, the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives, and the Commerce Committee of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement explanatory of the bill and without reading it to the Senate I ask unanimous consent that the statement also be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The statement presented by Mr. OVERTON is as follows:

The bill authorizes a modification of the adopted project of flood control in the lower Mississippi Valley. It does not authorize any additional appropriations to be made for the project. On the contrary, if the bill is enacted, it will save millions of dollars in the cost of the lower Mississippi flood-control program, and at the same time prevent the dedication to floodway purposes of approximately 2,000,000 acres of land in southeastern Arkansas and eastern Louisiana.

The law presently authorizes the construction of either of two floodways known as the Boeuf floodway and the Eudora floodway, the Eudora having been authorized as a substitute for the Boeuf floodway. As designed, the Eudora floodway begins in southeastern Arkansas below the Arkansas River and runs 10 miles wide and 100 miles long, embracing 850,000 acres of land in southeastern Arkansas and eastern Louisiana, and empties its water into an area of some million and a quarter acres known as the Red River backwater area. Although the Eudora was authorized in 1936, no work at all has been done toward beginning its construction.

The bill, if enacted, will authorize the abandonment of the Eudora floodway as well as the Boeuf floodway. In lieu of such a floodway, the bill provides for the readjustment, building up, and strengthening of all the main-line Mississippi River levees

above the Arkansas and below the Arkansas down to approximately the mouth of the Red River. It specifically provides for a net grade in levee construction from the Arkansas down to near the mouth of the Red of sufficient height to give safe protection against what is known as the project of superflood. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission, stated at the December meeting of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, that this substitute plan of levee enlargement will afford equally as good protection as the floodway plan.

The 13 cut-offs and other channel rectification in the Mississippi River between the Arkansas and the Red have so reduced in recent years the flood level between the Arkansas and the Red Rivers that no diversion channel between these two rivers is now necessary. There were approximately 1,000,000 cubic feet per second surplus water that had to be taken care of south of the Arkansas in a project flood at the time the Boeuf and Eudora were planned. The cut-offs have reduced this surplus to about 450,000 cubic feet per second, and this excess can now be safely confined between enlarged levees along the main channel of the Mississippi.

The cost of levee enlargement will be considerably less than the sum of \$103,000,000 allotted for the construction of the Eudora floodway. It is the purpose of the bill to free this \$103,000,000 so that as much thereof as will be necessary will be used for the new plan of heightening the grades and strengthening the sections of the main-line levees. After this work is done, there will be a sufficient sum left over out of the \$103,000,000 authorized for the Eudora to give additional protection to the Yazoo and Red backwater areas. The bill authorizes such protection of these backwater areas as the Chief of Engineers may from time to time determine to be proper and expedient.

It is contemplated that under this bill the levee grades to which I have referred will be readjusted so as to give about 1 foot freeboard above the estimated flow line of the project flood, or about 6 feet above the computed level of the 1927 flood confined. The latter flood was the greatest flood of record in the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that this bill has been prepared so as to give equal consideration and impartial treatment to both the east and west sides of the river.

EXCLUSION OF ALIENS IN APPORTIONING REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CAPPER. I introduce a joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to exclude aliens in the counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States.

The joint resolution introduced by me proposes to submit the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Aliens shall be excluded from the count of the whole number of persons in each State in apportioning Representatives among the several States according to their respective numbers.

I might state at this time that I have been attempting for more than 20 years to have Congress submit such an amendment to the States. If it should be submitted, I venture the prediction that it would receive the necessary approval of three-fourths of the States almost as speedily as the legislatures of that many States meet.

LXXXVII—30

The stop-alien-representation-in-Congress amendment simply provides that representation shall be based upon the whole number of citizens instead of upon the whole number of persons in each State.

Under the present provision of the Constitution, representation in the House is based upon the whole number of persons in each State as shown by the latest decennial census preceding the year in which reapportionment is made.

The effect of the present provision is that a State which has 600,000 aliens counted—or a major fraction thereof—is entitled to an extra Representative in Congress over and beyond the number it would have if only citizens were counted in making the apportionment. A State with more than 950,000 aliens would get two extra Representatives in Congress; also two extra electors in the electoral college.

These Representatives of aliens, of course, are taken from the States with native-born and naturalized alien populations.

The registration of aliens, which was completed last month, will, I understand, show about 5,000,000 aliens—foreign-born persons who have not become naturalized.

The best estimate I have been able to obtain is that 17 or 18 Representatives in the next Congress will be taken from States which have few aliens and given to those States with large alien populations.

This manifestly is unfair to American citizens.

The glaring unfairness of the system of basing legislative representation upon the count of persons instead of the count of citizens is shown by the fact that the States of New York, Massachusetts, and California, which have cities with large alien populations, do not count aliens in apportioning State representatives to the popular branch of their State legislatures. Up-State New York does not allow alien populations in New York City to give New York City extra representation in the State legislature and take that number away from the part of the State populated more largely by citizens of the United States. Yet these same States take extra Representatives in Congress away from States that do not have large alien populations.

It is even more important in the National Legislature than in the States that representation be based upon citizenship instead of upon aliens plus citizens. This for the simple reason that the alien populations, when counted in apportioning Representatives in Congress, also give such States a corresponding number of extra electors in electing President and Vice President of the United States.

The stop-alien-representation-in-Congress amendment should be submitted to the States for ratification at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State

for apportionment of Representatives among the several States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2788) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE LEND-LEASE BILL—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 275) further to promote the national defense of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 64), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

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

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. BULOW submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

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

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 66), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized during the Seventy-seventh Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be

paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF ELECTION POLLS AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67), which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators shall be appointed by the Vice President of the United States, and said committee is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to polls, straw ballots, and published reports which have purported (1) to indicate how persons would vote, were expected to vote, or were likely to vote in the last general election, including the primary election, in which Presidential electors, Members of the Senate, or Members of the House of Representatives were to be elected or in which candidates for any of such offices were to be nominated or elected, or (2) when such polls have purported to measure or indicate the state of public opinion about matters of national importance, and (3) especially from what sources the managers of such polls received the money to make such polls, the character of such polls, whether by straw balloting or by sampling, and every fact and circumstance concerning the purchase, sale, and distribution or publication of such polls, and also including the poll affiliations, or the then support of candidates in such elections by the newspapers, if any, which were subscribers to such polls or financially interested in the procurement of such polls, giving the names of such papers, if any, subscribing to such polls and the amount of money invested by each in such said subscriptions.

SEC. 2. Said committee is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of (1) money used by the two principal political parties in the United States, together with the sums used by any affiliated groups supporting each party, whether such groups were State or national in their operations, to the end that the exact amount of money expended by each party and its affiliated group or groups may be definitely ascertained and fixed.

SEC. 3. The said committee is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the operation and effect of, and violations of, the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended and supplemented by the act approved July 19, 1940, commonly known as the Hatch Acts, and (2) the amounts, contributions, loans, advances, gifts, and expenditures made for political purposes during the year 1940 expended by each political party and by each political organization, State, regional, or national, in the interest of the national candidates of the Democratic and Republican Parties.

The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable its findings, together with any recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the session, 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 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 committee shall not exceed \$50,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Mexico and the United States, delivered by Senator CHAVEZ before the New York Federation of Music Clubs, in New York city, on January 31, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNOR STASSEN'S SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 2, 1941, under the heading "Stassen backs Roosevelt on foreign policy," which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY JOHN W. SCOTT ON WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT AND THE NEW RIVER CASE

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Hon. John W. Scott, a member of the Federal Power Commission, under the heading "Water-power development and the New River case," published in the Public Utilities Fortnightly of January 30, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY CYRUS M'CORMICK ON AID TO ENGLAND

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Aid to England Is Self-Defense for the United States," delivered by Cyrus McCormick, Republican national committeeman for New Mexico, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY FRED BRECKMAN

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by Fred Breckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, on January 18, 1941, on the subject The New Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY NORMAN M. LITTELL ON GERMAN INVASION OF AMERICAN BUSINESS

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The German Invasion of American Business, delivered by Norman M. Littell, Assistant United States Attorney General, before the Indiana State Bar Association on January 25, 1941.]

EXPORTS TO RUSSIA

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, yesterday, Sunday, I received a telegram from a citizen of Portland, Oreg., which reads as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., February 1, 1941.

Today the Russian ship *Angarstroy* is loading at terminal No. 4 some \$400,000 worth of tin plate for export to Russia. It is my understanding that there is a scarcity of tinplate for defense purposes and that the Defense Commission is asking funds to provide a reserve of the same. If I am correct, is it not pertinent to ask why the permit has been issued for export of this cargo of tinplate?

WALTER G. REDMOND.

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

Mr. HOLMAN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. That is but a part of the recent lifting of the moral embargo

against Russia, which has so amazed this country, and is nothing more or less than appeasement of Russia by the United States.

Mr. HOLMAN. I thank my good friend the Senator from New Hampshire for his timely observation.

Mr. President, last Tuesday I received a letter from a member of my family, which reads as follows:

Hunt—

In explanation, I will say that Huntington Malarkey is my nephew and an overseas veteran of the last World War, and today a man of considerable financial importance—

Hunt was at our house tonight and was greatly disturbed and anxious that I should write you, as he had been over to attend to some business at the Columbia Airport today and saw 25 or 30 cars rolling by loaded with rather queer-looking freight. On investigation, it proved to be airplane beacons on steel towers—hundreds of them—bound for Vladivostok, Russia—thence to Japan. John Burgard—

In explanation, I may say that the Honorable John Burgard is chairman of the Portland Dock Commission and is one of Portland's most beloved and prominent citizens.

John Burgard took Hunt to see other shipments to Russia—all equally alarming—copper, steel, iron, etc.

Mr. President, these are specific examples of correspondence from many worried and patriotic Americans. It seems to me that some spokesman for the present administration should inform the Senate and the people of the country about a few fundamental facts concerning the present national-defense program. We are advised that aluminum, antimony, chromium, coconut-shell char, manganese (ferrograde), manila fiber, mica, nickel, optical glass, quartz, crystal, quicksilver, quinine, rubber, silk, tin, tungsten, and wool are strategic materials which we must import for our domestic necessities and for our national defense program, because we do not produce them either at all or in sufficient quantity for our imperative and urgent needs.

It will be noted that tin is listed as a strategic material or mineral; yet this very day we are exporting tin to Russia. Why do we export tin now to Russia?

For the purpose of being explicit, I request any Senator prepared to speak for the administration to answer the following questions, which I ask only after I have been unable to secure the information from the Departments:

Why have we exported iron and cotton to Japan, while at the same time we have authorized a two-ocean navy, and the construction of a new set of locks for the Panama Canal to accommodate the larger warships which we have ordered so as to match the larger warships which Japan has built with the iron we have sold to her? And cotton is required in the manufacture of explosives.

Why do we do these things?

While we are being compelled to give all aid to Britain so that Britain can maintain a blockade of northern, western, and southern Europe, why do we supply

the so-called aggressive powers with material and essential materials by way of Asia?

It seems to me our efforts to aid Britain are made futile by our simultaneous aid to Britain's enemies—which are not necessarily our enemies.

Did we not supply France with airplanes and essential materials prior to the recent conquest of France by Germany? Are not some of the very planes and war supplies we sent to France now being used by Germany against England?

May not the airplanes and war material which we now supply England, Japan, and Russia later be used against us?

Are we now giving away articles which later we may need most urgently for our own defense?

It seems to me there is confusion in our efforts to defend America. If there is misunderstanding or lack of knowledge of the true situation concerning these things, now is a good time for the administration to take the Senate and the American people into its confidence in these particulars.

I desire to be cooperative in the defense of America to the utmost of my energy and ability. An understanding of these apparent inconsistencies will assist me in that duty.

CAMP WILLIAM JAMES, VT.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, recent news dispatches and newspaper columns have indicated criticism of an experimental C. C. C. camp at Sharon, Vt., known as Camp William James. This camp lies in the hills between the towns of Sharon and Tunbridge.

I trust that such criticism is directed at this camp because the critics are uninformed as to the facts. I am a Vermonter, and the good people of my State have asked me to make clear these facts.

While I was Governor of Vermont, the young men who initiated this camp talked with me more than once regarding their hopes and plans. They are a clean-cut group of college men, representing more than one racial group and more than one creed. No one could meet these boys without being impressed by their honesty and sincerity of purpose.

As to why they elected to pioneer at Tunbridge with their camp, let me quote their own words from an article in the Dartmouth Pictorial:

No one reason brought us all to Tunbridge. Some of us had studied problems of flood control and wanted to continue this study by work on some specific project. At the suggestion of Mr. Philip Shutler, Vermont State planning commissioner, who visited us at Dartmouth, we planned to make a report of the effects of the proposed Tunbridge Dam on the life of the town. Others of us simply desired the experience of farming, feeling that such an experience, quite for its own sake, would make for a healthy and interesting summer.

But regardless of why we came, our plans were all alike in at least one respect. None of us looked beyond the summer, none of us expected that we would be in Tunbridge today. We are here today because, coming from 4 years of classroom work and out of city homes, we were unable to foresee just what life on a farm would mean to us. For the whole summer we did the chores, we pitched hay, we helped at odd jobs, we had fun learning to square dance at the Grange.

For the first time we felt the thrill of getting close to the land, of building our bodies, and of sharing the good times and worries of the sturdy folks of the Vermont hills. And because we shared this life so fully we began to see it in a different light.

Through our work we made our friends, and from our friends we came to see that our work was much more than simply the means to a healthy summer or a chance to study flood control. Work was much needed. Our work was important to the farmers with whom we lived. Moving off the highways into the back hills, talking to the folk, we learned of the tremendous need for labor in this area, labor to improve rural roads, to build and repair houses and barns, to do painting, and to work on the farm itself. We were 6. We might much better have been 60.

College men from the city, who had never before done manual labor, worked and lived with Vermont farmers, and both groups enjoyed a profitable experience. Because we actually lived this experience together, because it came to us first-hand and unexpectedly, it seemed much more real and much more important than any of the original plans that brought us here. And through talking over our life here with local citizens and with one of our teachers at school, we came to realize how the benefits of our experience, both to us and to the townsfolk, could be ensured for the future on a much greater scale.

As a lifelong Vermonter I know what it was that seeped into the lives of these boys, why they chose to give their time to this camp rather than seek more lucrative positions in our economic world.

They won the confidence of their hill-town neighbors. They enlisted the advice and counsel of Prof. Eugene Rosenstock-Huessy, of Dartmouth, a Vermont resident. A misinformed columnist has stated that Professor Rosenstock-Huessy appears to be an admirer of the efficiency of the Hitler youth-training methods. May I say that Professor Rosenstock-Huessy is about as great an admirer of Hitler or anything Hitlerian as is Franklin D. Roosevelt. In fact, it was Professor Huessy's attempts to build a self-reliant youth of Germany that brought him afoul of Hitler and resulted in his virtual expulsion from that country.

Last September a meeting of farmers and villagers from Tunbridge and several neighboring towns was held in Tunbridge town hall. Some 500 native Vermonters met there. I was invited to attend, and was prevented from doing so because I had just undergone a serious operation.

Dorothy Thompson came from her home in Barnard, a few miles away, and was one of the evening's speakers. College boys and lifelong farmers also spoke.

At the close of the meeting, 320 persons present signed a document entitled "Vermont Pioneers Again for America," directed to President Roosevelt, and reading as follows:

To His Excellency the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

Mr. PRESIDENT: The State of Vermont is the first State of the Union in which manhood suffrage was made universal; one century and a half have passed, and again we people of Vermont realize that something must be made universal—the opportunity for service.

For generations our State has sent our pioneers to innumerable farms in the West. Now, we feel opportunity for pioneering may be discovered right here in Vermont.

Three hundred and twenty Vermonters at a rally in Tunbridge on September 25, 1940, have received reports of representative speakers for the farming communities, for the enrollees of C. C. C. camps, and for the students of our colleges, about pioneering among our back-hill farms. They have outlined a plan of cooperation among rural communities, college men and city youth. The plan includes advantages for all three groups.

The main speaker of the rally, Miss Dorothy Thompson, has shown us the nationwide implications of this opportunity.

We have also ascertained that no one department of the Federal or State Government would be able to answer our request satisfactorily, because our plan is too comprehensive for any one of them to handle alone. You are known to favor a Nation-wide universal—not merely military—service. Since we nourish the hope that our scheme may show the way to a practical and popular realization of such a service, and since, through personal sacrifice and hard work, the service is already under way locally, we request that a delegation be received by you to hear our plan.

The result of this petition was that the President gave the plan his approval. It was also supported by Mrs. Roosevelt. In this connection, let me say that, so far as I know, not a single town within the range of Camp William James has ever voted the Democratic ticket.

The camp was authorized. As Governor, I approved the use of State buildings to help it get started. After preliminary work by the college boys, it was opened for service the first week in January.

Last week articles of association were filed at Montpelier, Vt., with the Secretary of State by Council and Camp, Inc., of Sharon, Vt. Its purposes, as set forth in the articles, are:

To educate and train young people to be good and useful citizens and to be self-supporting by instruction, demonstration, and purposes to promote and teach decent living and patriotic endeavors and independent as well as organized effort for the welfare of the State of Vermont and the United States of America; to reclaim, rebuild, and restore to usefulness abandoned farms, houses, and industries; to develop and build new industries, new agricultural endeavors, and activities for the betterment of the individual trained and the community in which the training occurs, and to work in cooperation with Camp William James in Sharon and Council of Nine Townships connected therewith.

The incorporators are Nathan P. Dodge, a hard-headed, sound-thinking Vermont Yankee who goes into things with his eyes open; Robert R. O'Brien, Dartmouth, 1940; and Dorothy Canfield Fisher, one of the most loved and respected women in America today.

Anyone who states that these three persons are backing any project not dedicated to the highest type of American ideals is simply unfamiliar with the facts and the people.

This week I had a letter from Ed Flint, of Tunbridge. Ed is the local creamery manager and is known to a hundred thousand people as manager of the Tunbridge World's Fair. I should like to quote from his letter to me in regard to Camp William James:

I have been very interested and a close student of the work; in fact, so much

interested that my two sons have enrolled and are there now. The college boys tell me that they have gotten from the work on our farms that Yankee something that Coolidge said Vermont had enough of to supply the whole Nation if all the other States ran out of it.

It is this Vermont individualism that they are willing to give a year's work for. In fact, one boy told me that he could not get anywhere else, even in college at \$1,500 or more a year. They consider that that alone pays them well.

There are other plans being worked out to this project, but if this spirit of work, thrift, genuine Yankee tradition, can be instilled in other camps, their accomplishment of that alone will be worth many times that which is being put into it.

I attended a dance given there in the mess hall last Saturday night. There were 80 there—camp boys, men, women, girls, and boys from Tunbridge, Royalton, Sharon, Strafford, Wilder, Springfield, Vt., and Hanover, N. H.

I watched what went on; I saw no boy and girl leave the hall until it was over. Neither did I see or smell liquor of any kind on anyone. One of the callers was Ed Packer, of world's fair fame and at the past inaugural ball; also Mr. Fisk, preacher at the White Church, called several changes in western style. I think it as clean a dance as I ever attended. Two of my daughters attended. I am writing this in good faith and think it O. K. for Mr. Engel to investigate the project. * * * I will be pleased to give you or anyone any information I can.

Mr. President, Camp William James is experimental as yet. It should have opportunity to prove itself; and if this camp fulfills its purposes satisfactorily, America needs a thousand more camps like it. I hope to see the time when every boy in America, be he rich or poor, will have the opportunity to spend a full year working in our forests or on our farms. By that means we can build men in mind and muscle; we can instill tolerance, understanding, self-reliance, and leadership into their character.

EMERGENCY CARGO-SHIP CONSTRUCTION

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, there is on the calendar a joint resolution making an appropriation to the United States Maritime Commission for emergency cargo-ship construction. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) making an appropriation to the United States Maritime Commission for emergency cargo-ship construction, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senators, I think an explanation may further the consideration of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution appropriates funds for the construction of 200 emergency-cargo ships in addition to the ships which have been authorized under the standing mercantile-marine program. There is a program looking to the construction of 200 ships by the United

States Maritime Commission. This program is in addition to that one.

The joint resolution provides a direct appropriation of \$313,500,000. It contemplates the construction as expeditiously as possible of 200 ships, the design of which is as simple as possible. As a matter of fact, the design of the ships is not a modern design. It is not comparable to the design of the usual ships provided for under the Maritime Commission. The completion of those ships takes from a year to a year and a half or 2 years. The purpose of this construction is to provide cargo ships to meet a growing emergency in the least amount of time and with the least expenditure.

These ships will cost probably 50 percent less than the regular ships. They will not be equal in speed to those of the regular design. They will have simpler engines and less electrical equipment. They are so designed as to interfere to the least possible degree with the naval construction program and with the regular mercantile marine program.

An allocation has been made by the President of some \$36,000,000 for the construction of shipways in neighborhoods where construction is not now under way, in order that these ships may be constructed at points where labor and material are available without interference with the tremendous demand for skilled ship workers in other parts of the country.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Where are these ships to be used?

Mr. ADAMS. They are to be used in world commerce. The explanation of that statement is this: Due to the war conditions in Europe, there has been a tremendous sinking of commercial shipping; and these ships are intended not to replace ships in the war-zone areas but to replace them in the American mercantile areas. Admiral Land, who came before our committee, in answer to questions said that cutting off shipping in Europe both from South America and from North America had increased the demand for American bottoms in excess of the amount that had been cut off by the Neutrality Act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. Are these ships to be constructed in private yards?

Mr. ADAMS. They are.

Mr. McNARY. Are any of them to be constructed in publicly owned yards?

Mr. ADAMS. The situation as to the yards is not set forth in the joint resolution; but in the report and in the testimony there are designated seven yards, all in southern waters. There had been allocated for the construction of shipways some \$36,000,000. They are to be constructed by private contractors, but with the understanding and the contract agreement that they are to be constructed without profit to the contractors. They are to be constructed at actual cost by the contractors for the yards. They hope to, and I have no

doubt will, obtain their profit from their cost-plus, fixed-fee contracts for the construction of ships. The yards will be under the control of the Government. The Government will furnish the funds. The Government will own the yards. There is a sort of divided ownership. The Government is not to be the owner of the ground, but the Government will be the owner of the ways themselves, under lease or some form of contract.

Mr. McNARY. Why are they all to be constructed in southern yards?

Mr. ADAMS. The statement was made that all the northern yards were not only filled but choked with the work of the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission; that there was a demand for skilled workmen in the northern yards in excess of the ability to supply it; and that the Maritime Commission were going into the areas where yards did not exist to see if that situation could not be met.

Let me state the locations to which allocations have been made. I am mistaken in saying they are southern altogether, because I think there are some along the shores that are washed by the warm Pacific current, which I think of as southern by reason of their verdure and attractiveness.

First on the list is Portland, Oreg. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Last Wednesday we passed an authorization, House bill 1437, of about \$900,000,000 for auxiliary shipping. Am I to understand from the Senator's statement that the appropriation we are now considering is in addition to that program?

Mr. ADAMS. It is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And separate from it?

Mr. ADAMS. It is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me ask the Senator the same question I submitted to the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] in connection with that program. Are these ships for the use of the United States, or are they in contemplation of a reservoir of resources which shall be available for general aid to foreign so-called democracies?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I made the same inquiry of Admiral Land, and he said that these ships were to be operated by American shipping and for the carrying of American shipping.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And that they are essential to the American necessity?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes. I am giving to the Senator the statements which were made before the committee, and which are contained in the Budget estimate which came to us in support of the measure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, it is the Senator's view that we are making an appropriation for facilities essential to our own country, and for the use of our own country.

Mr. ADAMS. That is what I am told.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Just one moment, if the Senator will pardon me. One of the oc-

casions for providing these ships is the fact that of the ships which had been heretofore built by the Maritime Commission, 50 have been turned over to the Navy and 12 to the Army, for their purposes. Those ships were of a better grade than the ones now contemplated. It is said to us frankly that in order to avoid interference with the naval program and with the established maritime program, these ships, as a matter of design, are practically obsolete, and the officials do not anticipate a usable life beyond the emergency. They say the ships have a life, so far as floating and going about is concerned, as long as that of any other type, but it is said that these ships, which are 10 and 11 knot ships, are inferior to the others and have less electrical equipment. So in speaking of these ships Admiral Land used the term "obsolete." I will read his statement. I asked the Admiral:

What about their probable life, Admiral? Admiral LAND. I call these 5-year-life ships, because I do not like them. They will probably live just as long as any other ship, because they will float that long, but they are not up-to-date in design; they are somewhat obsolete in design before we start.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, let me ask the Senator a supplementary question. Are these ships required because of any plan to relieve other nations of their ship necessities for their trade routes?

Mr. ADAMS. We were told not.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I seek some information about the amendment marked "Sec. 4." What other departments or agencies of the Government have been authorized by law "to construct, reconstruct, repair, equip, and outfit" vessels?

Mr. ADAMS. I will state the situation. The Maritime Commission has constructed vessels for the Navy. I assume they are vessels of the less important types, perhaps transports, and tenders, and oil-carrying ships. In constructing them necessarily the Commission used its own funds. The Maritime Commission said—

In using our funds for construction of the authorized ships for the Navy, we find that we are charged, against our appropriation or our contract authorizations with these amounts, and while the Navy repays, we have found that on the books of the Comptroller General this money has gone from us. So we want to have our funds maintained for Maritime Commission expenditures.

So the amendment provides that ships built under this condition shall be charged against the agency or department for which they are constructed.

Mr. AUSTIN. The amendment also contains an authorization, does it not?

Mr. ADAMS. There is an authorization in section 3.

Mr. AUSTIN. I mean section 4, which starts "The Commission is authorized to construct," and so forth.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was wondering whether there were any other departments or agencies of the United States save the Navy for which the Commission

is now to be authorized to construct ships.

Mr. ADAMS. I cannot answer. I can readily see that they might be asked to construct vessels for the Coast Guard, or the Fish Commission, or for the Lighthouse Service, or some such agency which might need shipping. But the evidence before us limited the matter to the Navy.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. If the press dispatches are accurate, as I assume they are, the Senator knows that since the passage of the so-called Neutrality Act large numbers of American ships have been sold to foreign countries, and large numbers, again, have been transferred to other flags and registered in other countries such as Panama. Does the Senator have any information on that subject?

Mr. ADAMS. Not accurate information. In the course of the hearing there was a comment on a certain number of ships which were sold, I think, to Belgium or to some other country. That is the only case of which I have any recollection. I was also told in the committee that the ships which were sold were not modern, up-to-date ships, but were the older ships.

Mr. BAILEY and Mr. WHITE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ADAMS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina to answer the question just asked.

Mr. BAILEY. As chairman of the Committee on Commerce I have had to do with the matter of the transfer of ships from our flag to other flags, and I remind the Senate that when the transfers were first proposed the administration, speaking through the Secretary of State, protested against the transfers. So there have been very few transfers, and there have been none for the purpose of making contribution one way or the other in the unusual situation abroad. There have been some transfers; there have been transfers of title by sale, but I do not think there has been any transfer by way of indirectly contributing to one side or the other in the war.

As for the sale of the ships, when the Neutrality Act was passed we had on hand, as I recall, a little more than 100 old ships, survivors of the Shipping Board administration. We did not consider them worth having. They were old, and it was the opinion that if they were put into the trade they would compete with the new ships, and probably make it impossible for the new ships to operate even reasonably under the aid of the Government. So they were impounded. But upon the increase in the activities of the belligerents and the sinking of an immense amount of tonnage, there arose a demand for those ships, and they were sold. They were not sold by way of depriving our merchant marine of any-

thing; they were sold by way of getting rid of ships which were well worth their temporary use under the circumstances. We received a good price for them, and the money has been used for building new and modern ships. I think the number of those ships is about 80 or 90, and, as I recall, we have on hand perhaps 20 or 30. These are the facts about the matter.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to add a paragraph from Admiral Land's testimony, supplementing what the Senator from North Carolina has said. Speaking of the decrease in the number, the admiral said:

That decrease is primarily accounted for by the transfer, with the approval of the Maritime Commission, of obsolete tonnage. In many cases the foreign flag operators have disposed of their own tonnage and are buying new tonnage. In other cases tonnage in intercoastal domestic commerce has been sold abroad in order to get some stability in our domestic and intercoastal commerce. That has resulted in the last 18 months in the Commission's approval of transfers in round numbers of about 900,000 tons, but the average age of all that tonnage is about 21¼ years.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator any idea whether that tonnage is any more obsolete than will be the new boats on which we are proposing to spend \$300,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. The obsolescence may be of two kinds. One obsolescence is of design; the other obsolescence is due to age.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not probable that the boats we sold were exactly as valuable for present purposes, or would be if we had them, as those for which we are about to spend \$300,000,000 now?

Mr. ADAMS. I have no opinion to express about that.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator any idea how much money we got for the 900,000 tons of shipping that was sold?

Mr. ADAMS. I have not.

Mr. TAFT. Probably one-tenth of the \$300,000,000 we are now proposing to spend.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. If I understood the Senator correctly, he stated in his opening remarks that the demand for American bottoms in legitimate American trade had so increased as to make it necessary to build these additional ships now. Did I understand the Senator correctly?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct. I will say to the Senator that as I understand the testimony the demand is increasing, because many foreign ships heretofore engaged in the South American trade have been withdrawn from that trade, and others have been sunk. The withdrawals and sinkings are continuing. The demand for American ships has now more than exhausted the American capacity, and the demand is increasing.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. May I ask the Senator from Colorado if it is not also true that Great Britain, for instance, has had many of her ships in the Pacific trade, that some of them are now being withdrawn and put into the Atlantic because of war necessities, and, therefore, there is somewhat of an increased demand for American ships in the Pacific?

Mr. ADAMS. That is my understanding.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to make a brief observation in the time of the Senator from Colorado, if I may. I am familiar, as the Senator is, with the controversy concerning the shipyards to be built, and I should like to point out for the RECORD, and for the Maritime Commission, and those who will have charge of this program, that the officials of my State take a contrary view to that of the Maritime Commission concerning the availability of men for shipyard work.

Persons associated with the labor department of my State have made a survey for the purpose of ascertaining how many men skilled in the building of ships are available. They point out to me that there is in Connecticut a large yard which was successfully used during the last war, but which is not now in operation, and the use of which is being discouraged by the officials in Washington on the ground of a labor shortage.

I am familiar with the fact that Admiral Land of the Maritime Commission has information from the Federal Labor Department that there is a shortage of ship-construction labor in the Northeast, but I should like to say for the RECORD, and for his information, and for whatever it may be worth, that men associated with the Labor Department of my State point out that in Connecticut there is a yard now almost in condition for ship construction, and that there are thousands of unemployed men who could work on the kind of ship construction provided for in the pending measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, line 22, after "otherwise)", to insert the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 22, after the word "management", to strike out the comma and the words "and sale or other disposition."

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, in the committee we had some discussion in reference to striking out those words. They were stricken out on my motion. I was disturbed because of the recurrence of the words "other disposition," which I had noted in certain other pending measures, and I felt that the words were perhaps wrongfully placed in the measure.

Since that time—and I am speaking only for myself—the Maritime Commission has sent a letter to me pointing out what they think is the necessity for the inclusion of those words. They point out that the shipbuilders who are building these yards, without profit and at

actual cost—that is the theory of it—feel that when the program is completed there should be an opportunity for them to repurchase the yards from the Government, and the Maritime Commission therefore stated that they contemplated inserting in the contracts with the individual shipyards some provision in reference to the purchase by the contractors of these shipways.

I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD the letter addressed to me from the Maritime Commission.

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

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, February 1, 1941.
The Honorable ALVA B. ADAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ADAMS: This is with reference to the question you raised at our conference today concerning the meaning and effect of the words "and sale or other disposition of such plants and facilities," appearing in clause 3 of section 1 of House Joint Resolution 77. The purpose of the clause is to enable the Commission to agree with the shipbuilder who is constructing the emergency facilities as to the disposition of such facilities when the emergency is over. Present shipbuilding facilities are ample to take care of the normal needs, and the shipbuilders who are contracting to build these emergency facilities (without profit, except from future ship construction at these plants) desire some assurance that they will not be disposed of at low prices to others, who would thus be in a position to compete on an unequal basis with the shipbuilders who have built and maintained their own facilities for normal needs.

Article 13 of the standard contract which we have entered into for construction of the facilities sets forth the manner in which the Commission contemplates exercising the authority. That article reads as follows:

"ART. 13. Final disposition of facilities. (a) Upon the determination by the Commission that the facilities are no longer necessary for the purpose of the national defense, or (b) upon the expiration of the option referred to in article 12 hereof, if the Commission shall not exercise the same within the period referred to in said article 12, or (c) upon the expiration of the period during which the contractor shall have been obligated to maintain and preserve the facilities covered by this contract, if the Commission shall exercise such option, whichever of said events shall first occur, the facilities shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this article. In such event the Commission will make a final inventory of the facilities and determine the fair value thereof. For the purposes of such inventory and determination, the facilities shall be classified as follows: (i) Those facilities which are readily removable, and (ii) those facilities which are not readily removable.

"The Commission will furnish the contractor with copies of the inventory and of the appraisal. If it is mutually agreed that the contractor purchase the facilities, or any part thereof, from the owner, it shall pay to the owner an amount agreed upon under such terms and conditions as shall be prescribed by the Commission; but, if such an agreement cannot be reached, the Commission may and, if required by the contractor to do so, shall immediately enter upon the real estate of the contractor and within 90 days thereafter demolish or remove any facilities installed thereon not so purchased by the contractor: *Provided*, That the real estate on which shall be located the facilities or such thereof as shall be demolished or removed shall be restored so as to leave the same in as good condition as immediately prior to the acquisition, construction, or installation of

the facilities thereon: *Provided further*, That should the Commission deem it to be in the public interest such Government-owned facilities, or any portion thereof, may, in lieu of their demolition or removal, be leased to the contractor upon terms to be mutually agreed upon."

You also asked whether the inclusion of these words as one of the purposes for which the moneys appropriated would be available would accomplish the purpose that we seek to accomplish. Since the sale or other disposition which we propose to make of the facilities will be incidental to the construction of them, and will be included in the contract providing for such construction, I think that section 1, standing alone, would be sufficient. However, section 2, making section 207 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, applicable to the activities and functions which the Commission is authorized to perform under the joint resolution, and the further provision that the "Commission is authorized to carry on the objects, activities, and functions herein provided for" would, to my mind, remove any doubt as to the adequacy of the joint resolution to authorize the Commission to make the contemplated sale or other disposition of the facilities. Section 207 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, reads as follows:

"Sec. 207. The Commission may enter into such contracts, upon behalf of the United States, and may make such disbursements as may, in its discretion, be necessary to carry on the activities authorized by this act, or to protect, preserve, or improve the collateral held by the Commission to secure indebtedness, in the same manner that a private corporation may contract within the scope of the authority conferred by its charter. All the Commission's financial transactions shall be audited in the General Accounting Office according to approved commercial practice as provided in the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 444): *Provided*, That it shall be recognized that, because of the business activities authorized by this act, the accounting officers shall allow credit for all expenditures shown to be necessary because of the nature of such authorized activities, notwithstanding any existing statutory provision to the contrary. The Comptroller General shall report annually or oftener to Congress any departure by the Commission from the provisions of this act."

If you have any further questions, please have your office telephone me and I shall be glad to furnish any additional information you desire.

Very sincerely yours,
CARL F. FARBACH,
General Counsel.

Mr. ADAMS. I wish to suggest to the Senate that, inasmuch as this measure will probably go to conference, perhaps, if the Senate were willing, it concur in the amendment, and then allow the matter further to be discussed in conference.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 4, after the word "laws", to strike out:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay directly or indirectly the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or belongs to any organization which advocates, the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing the United States Government by force or violence.

And to insert:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary or

wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from this appropriation shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I merely wish to remark that I consider that a worthless amendment. Mr. Harry Bridges would promptly make an affidavit to get himself within the terms of this provision. We are not getting anywhere when we leave it to the "fifth columnist" to go ahead and make a prima facie case for himself with his own affidavit, for that is what this proposal is, and we might as well point it out.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I think perhaps the situation in the committee should be explained. The original amendment, which the committee recommended be stricken out, was placed in the bill by motion made on the floor of the House. It was simply the flat declaration that—

That no part of this appropriation shall be—

Paid to anyone who advocates or belongs to any organization which advocates the overthrow of the Government. We were told by the Maritime Commission that standing in that form it would be almost impossible to administer the provision. If it were necessary to make absolute proof to the satisfaction of the General Accounting Office that no worker, contractor, materialman, or owner of land leased for use in connection with the building program, was in any way connected with these organizations it would not be possible to administer the provision.

While everyone was in accord with the purpose of the provision the difficulties of its administration were insurmountable and other language was substituted by the committee. It is in substance the same language which is contained in the W. P. A. legislation. The same question arose in connection with that legislation. As the Senator from North Carolina says, it is a thing which is of little value, and yet we are confronted with the alternative of inserting a positive provision which would impose a tremendous burden on the Accounting Office, or putting it in the form where by an affidavit the individual can prima facie clear himself.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. In the Committee on Appropriations I took the same view that the able Senator from North Carolina now takes. The amendment, as suggested before the full committee, ended with the provision that an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, or is not a member of an organization which does. I took the position that anyone who is a member of an organization which advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence would not hesitate to make such an affidavit, and I, therefore, suggested that a penal clause be inserted, and I think that penal clause to a large extent answers the objection raised by the Senator from North Carolina. The penal clause is:

That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from this appropriation shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

I wish to say en passant that I hope such a provision will be inserted in all other appropriation bills under which labor is to be employed.

Mr. BAILEY. That provision is contained in the measure before us?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; the penal clause is in the joint resolution. I think the Senator from North Carolina overlooked the penal clause that is in the committee amendment which I just read. If a person who makes an affidavit is in fact a member of an organization which advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, the fact that he makes an affidavit does not protect him from criminal prosecution if he accepts employment and is paid any wages which are made available by this appropriation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 7, after the word "under", to strike out "this act" and insert "section 1 of this joint resolution."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 9, after the word "functions", to strike out "herein."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 4, after line 19, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 3. In addition to contract authorizations for carrying out the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, contained in previous acts the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of said act in an amount not to exceed \$65,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, before passing to section 3, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from

Colorado to the language appearing in lines 17, 18, and 19 of section 2. The words are:

And any provision of law relating to the disposal of surplus Government property.

The way the section has been drafted it appears that the Commission is authorized to carry on the objects, activities, and functions provided for in section 1 of this joint resolution, without regard to certain provisions which are expressly enumerated, and without regard to any provision of law relating to the disposal of surplus Government property. Is that not so?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. What is the purpose, let me ask the Senator, of including the words "and any provision of law relating to the disposal of surplus Government property"?

Mr. ADAMS. I will quote the statement which was made to the House committee by the General Counsel for the Maritime Commission, which appears on page 24 of the House hearings:

The following question was asked by Representative TABER:

Now, do not you think this waiver of any provision of law relating to the disposal of surplus Government property is a pretty liberal provision? Why do you need that?

The General Counsel, Mr. Farbach, answered:

The purpose is to enable us at this time to enter into a contract with the present shipbuilder as to the disposal of the facilities when the emergency is over. The present shipbuilding facilities, I am told, are ample to take care of normal needs, and the shipbuilders are not going to be very anxious to go into the constructing of these additional facilities if they know that at the end of the emergency or, say, 5 years from now, whenever the time comes, we are going to dispose of those facilities to anyone who wants to get into the shipbuilding business.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator understand that the language which I have quoted includes even the very ships whose need we are discussing here?

Mr. ADAMS. I do not think so; I do not think they would have a right to dispose of ships as surplus Government property. This is limited to surplus property. They do have specific authority to dispose of ships which are not surplus property. As the Senator knows, the Mercantile Marine Act was a direct subsidy act; that is, instead of paying directly to the shipbuilders the Maritime Commission builds the ships and then sells them for a sum approximately equivalent to what the ships could be built for in foreign yards. That has resulted in selling the ships at a discount from actual cost of from 25 to 50 percent.

Mr. DANAHER. That is under the act of 1936.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which is a modification of the earlier act.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it safe to assume that the Senator so construes the language and that it has been so testified that it is the purpose that this particular phrase shall be applied only to the facilities of the shipbuilding yards and not to the ships themselves?

Mr. ADAMS. That is what we were told by the General Counsel for the Commission.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. Mr. ADAMS. If the Senator will permit me to make a further observation, my own personal experience as to shipbuilding, living where I do, is somewhat limited, and the Senator has the advantage when he talks of shipbuilding, because the mercantile marine industry in my State is quite restricted, even though the Supreme Court has recently handed down a decision in which any of the trout-fishing streams which could be made navigable by law could be declared to be navigable.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say, by way of reply, that I am sure the versatile Senator from Colorado includes in his repertoire complete knowledge of all essentials dealing with the passage of the pending joint resolution, including shipbuilding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. The Commission is authorized to construct, reconstruct, repair, equip, and outfit, by contract or otherwise, vessels or parts thereof, for any other department or agency of the Government, to the extent that such other department or agency is authorized by law to do so for its own account, and any obligations heretofore or hereafter incurred by the Commission for any of the aforesaid purposes shall not diminish or otherwise affect any contract authorization granted to the Commission: *Provided*, The obligations incurred or the expenditures made are charged against and, to the amount of such obligation or expenditure, diminish the existing appropriation or contract authorization of such department or agency.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the joint resolution read a third time?

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

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of providing as rapidly as possible cargo ships essential to the commerce and defense of the United States there is hereby appropriated to the United States Maritime Commission, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$313,500,000, to remain available until expended, which amount shall be additional to the \$500,000 allocated from the Emergency Fund for the President in the Military Appropriations Act, 1941, and \$36,000,000 to be allocated during the fiscal year 1942 from funds available for the payment of obligations incurred for the purposes hereof under the contract authorizations under such emergency fund for the President, the total of such sums, aggregating \$350,000,000, to be known as the Emergency Ship Construction Fund, United States Maritime Commission, which fund shall be available for the payment of said contract

authorizations and for (1) the construction in the United States of oceangoing cargo vessels of such type, size, and speed as the Commission may determine to be useful in time of emergency for carrying on the commerce of the United States and to be capable of the most rapid construction; (2) the production and procurement of parts, equipment, material, and supplies for such ships; (3) the establishment, acquisition, construction, enlargement, or extension of plants or facilities, on land whether owned by the Government or otherwise owned (including the acquisition by purchase or condemnation of real property or any interest therein), to be used for the construction of ships or for the production of parts, equipment, supplies, or material therefor, and the maintenance, repair, operation (under lease or otherwise), and management of such plants and facilities; and (4) all administrative expenses in connection with the program provided herein including personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere: *Provided*, That the employment of personnel engaged in the maintenance, repair, operation, or management of plants or facilities shall be without regard to the civil service and classification laws: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from this appropriation shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 207 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1117), and the act of October 10, 1940 (Public, No. 831), shall apply to all the activities and functions which the Commission is authorized to perform under section 1 of this joint resolution; and the Commission is authorized to carry on the objects, activities, and functions provided for in section 1 of this joint resolution, without regard to the provisions of sections 355, 3648, and 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; section 7 of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), relating to the purchase of prison-made goods; the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), requiring performance and other bonds on public works; section 321 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), relating to the lease of Government property, and any provision of law relating to the disposal of surplus Government property.

SEC. 3. In addition to contract authorizations for carrying out the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, contained in previous acts, the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of said act in an amount not to exceed \$65,000,000.

SEC. 4. The Commission is authorized to construct, reconstruct, repair, equip, and outfit, by contract or otherwise, vessels or parts thereof, for any other department or agency of the Government, to the extent that such other department or agency is authorized by law to do so for its own account, and any obligations heretofore or hereafter incurred

by the Commission for any of the aforesaid purposes shall not diminish or otherwise affect any contract authorization granted to the Commission: *Provided*, The obligations incurred or the expenditures made are charged against and, to the amount of such obligation or expenditure, diminish the existing appropriation or contract authorization of such department or agency.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE ADMINISTRATION OF J. ROSS EAKIN

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I note that the next order of business on the calendar is Senate Resolution 54, extending the authority to investigate the administration of J. Ross Eakin as superintendent of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The resolution has been favorably reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 131, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to June 18, 1939, with respect to the examination of certain facts concerning J. Ross Eakin, is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by \$2,000.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. 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 REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor, reported favorably the nomination of Claude Van Parsons, of Illinois, as First Assistant Administrator of the United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency.

INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive A (77th Cong., 1st sess.), the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, which was read the second time, as follows:

INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT

The Governments of Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, the United States of America and Venezuela, CONSIDERING that in view of the unbalanced situation in the international trade in coffee affecting the economy of the Western Hemisphere, it is necessary and desirable to take steps to promote the orderly marketing of coffee, with a view to assuring terms of trade equitable for both producers and consumers by adjusting the supply to demand, Have accordingly agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

In order to allocate equitably the market of the United States of America for coffee

among the various coffee-producing countries, the following quotas are adopted as basic annual quotas for the exportation of coffee to the United States of America from the other countries participating in this agreement:

Producing country:	Bags of 60 kilograms net, or equivalent quantities
Brazil.....	9,300,000
Colombia.....	3,150,000
Costa Rica.....	200,000
Cuba.....	80,000
Dominican Republic.....	120,000
Ecuador.....	150,000
El Salvador.....	600,000
Guatemala.....	535,000
Haiti.....	275,000
Honduras.....	20,000
Mexico.....	475,000
Nicaragua.....	195,000
Peru.....	25,000
Venezuela.....	420,000
Total.....	15,545,000

For the control of the quotas for the United States market, the official import statistics compiled by the United States Department of Commerce shall be used.

ARTICLE II

The following quotas have been adopted as basic annual quotas for the exportation of coffee to the market outside the United States from the other countries participating in this agreement:

Producing country:	Bags of 60 kilograms net, or equivalent quantities
Brazil.....	7,813,000
Colombia.....	1,079,000
Costa Rica.....	242,000
Cuba.....	62,000
Dominican Republic.....	138,000
Ecuador.....	89,000
El Salvador.....	527,000
Guatemala.....	312,000
Haiti.....	327,000
Honduras.....	21,000
Mexico.....	239,000
Nicaragua.....	114,000
Peru.....	43,000
Venezuela.....	606,000
Total.....	11,612,000

ARTICLE III

The Inter-American Coffee Board provided for in Article IX of this Agreement shall have the authority to increase or decrease the quotas for the United States market in order to adjust supplies to estimated requirements. No such increase or decrease shall be made oftener than once every six months nor shall any change at any one time exceed 5 percent of the basic quotas specified in Article I. The total increase or decrease in the quotas shall remain in effect until superseded by a new change in quotas, and the quotas for any quota year shall be calculated by applying to the basic quotas the weighted average of the changes made by the Board during the same year. Except as provided in Articles IV, V, and VII, the percentage of each of the participating countries in the total quantity of coffee which these countries may export to the United States market shall be maintained unchanged.

The Board shall also have the authority to increase or decrease the export quotas for the market outside the United States to the extent that it deems necessary to adjust supplies to estimated requirements, maintaining unchanged the percentage of each of the participating countries in the total quan-

tity of coffee to be exported to that market, except as provided in Articles IV, V and VII. Nevertheless, the Board shall not have the authority to distribute these quotas among determined countries or regions of the market outside the United States.

ARTICLE IV

Each producing country participating in this Agreement undertakes to limit its coffee exports to the United States of America during each quota year, to its respective export quota.

In the event that, due to unforeseen circumstances, a country's total exports of coffee to the United States of America exceed in any quota year its export quota for the United States market, that quota for the following year shall be decreased by the amount of the excess.

If any producing country participating in this Agreement has exported in any quota year less than its quota for the United States market, the Board may increase that country's quota for the immediately following quota year by an amount equal to the deficiency for the preceding quota year, up to the limit of 10 percent of the quota for such previous year.

The provisions of this Article shall also apply to the export quotas for the market outside the United States.

Any exportation of coffee to the market outside the United States which may be lost by fire, inundation or any other accident, before arriving at any foreign port, shall not be charged against the quota of the respective country corresponding to the date of shipment, provided that the loss is duly established before the Inter-American Coffee Board.

ARTICLE V

In view of the possibility of changes in the demand for coffee of a particular origin in the market outside the United States, the Board is empowered, by a two-thirds vote to transfer, on the request of any participating country, a part of that country's quota for the United States market to its quota for the market outside the United States in order to bring about a better balance between supply and demand in special types of coffee. In such cases, the Board is authorized to make up the resulting deficiency in the total quota for the United States market by increasing the quotas of the other producing countries participating in this agreement in proportion to their basic quotas.

ARTICLE VI

Each producing country participating in this Agreement shall take all measures necessary on its part for the execution and operation of this Agreement and shall issue for each coffee shipment an official document certifying that the shipment is within the corresponding quota fixed in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement.

ARTICLE VII

The Government of the United States of America shall take all measures necessary on its part for the execution and operation of this Agreement and shall limit, during each quota year, the entry for consumption into the United States of America of coffee produced in the countries listed in Article I to the quotas as established in the said Article or as modified pursuant to other provisions of this Agreement, it being understood that notice of any modified quotas will be communicated by the Board to the Governments of the countries participating in this Agreement.

The Government of the United States of America also undertakes to limit the total entry for consumption of coffee produced in countries other than those listed in Article I of this Agreement to a basic annual quota of 355,000 bags of 60 kilograms net or equivalent quantities. The quota on such coffee shall be increased or decreased by the same

proportion and at the same time as the global quota of the participating countries for the United States market.

In the event that due to unforeseen circumstances any quota is exceeded during any quota year, that quota for the following year shall be decreased by the amount of the excess.

ARTICLE VIII

In the event that there should be foreseen an imminent shortage of coffee in the United States market in relation to its requirements, the Inter-American Coffee Board shall have the authority, as an emergency measure, to increase the quotas for the United States market, in proportion to the basic quotas, up to the quantity necessary to satisfy these requirements even though in this manner the limits specified in Article III may be exceeded. Any member of the Board may request such an increase and the increase may be authorized by a one-third vote of the Board.

When, owing to special circumstances, it may be necessary for the purposes of the present Agreement to reduce the quotas for the United States market by a percentage greater than that established in Article III, the Inter-American Coffee Board shall also have the Authority to exceed the percentage of reduction beyond the limits established by the said Article III, provided that this is approved by the unanimous vote of the Board.

ARTICLE IX

The present Agreement shall be under the administration of a Board, which shall be known as the "Inter-American Coffee Board", and which shall be composed of delegates representing the Governments of the participating countries.

Each Government shall appoint a delegate to the Board upon approval of the Agreement. In the absence of the delegate of any participating country, his Government shall appoint an alternate who shall act in place of the delegate. Subsequent appointments shall be communicated by the respective Governments to the Chairman of the Board.

The Board shall elect from among its members a Chairman and a Vice Chairman who shall hold office for such period as it may determine.

The seat of the Board shall be in Washington, D. C.

ARTICLE X

The Board shall have the following powers and duties in addition to those specifically set forth in other Articles of this Agreement:

(a) The general administration of the present Agreement;

(b) To appoint any employees that it may consider necessary and determine their powers, duties, compensation and duration of employment;

(c) To appoint an Executive Committee and such other permanent or temporary committees as it considers advisable, and to determine their functions and duties;

(d) To approve an annual budget of expenses and fix the amount to be contributed by each participating Government, in accordance with the principles laid down in Article XIII;

(e) To seek such information as it may deem necessary to the proper operation and administration of this Agreement; and to publish such information as it may consider desirable;

(f) To make an annual report covering all of its activities and any other matters of interest in connection with this Agreement at the end of each quota year. This report shall be transmitted to each of the participating Governments.

ARTICLE XI

The Board shall undertake, as soon as possible, a study of the problem of coffee surpluses in the producing countries participating in this Agreement, and shall also take

appropriate steps with a view to working out satisfactory methods of financing the storage of such surpluses in cases where such action is urgently needed to stabilize the coffee industry. Upon request, the Board shall assist and advise any participating Government which may desire to negotiate loans in connection with the operation of this Agreement. The Board is also authorized to render assistance in matters relating to the classification, storage and handling of coffee.

ARTICLE XIII

The Board shall appoint a Secretary and take all other necessary measures to establish a Secretariat which shall be entirely free and independent of any other national or international organization or institution.

ARTICLE XIII

The expenses of delegates to the Board shall be defrayed by their respective Governments. All other expenses necessary for the administration of the present Agreement, including those of the Secretariat, shall be met by annual contributions of the Governments of the participating countries. The total amount, manner and time of payment shall be determined by the Board by a majority of not less than two thirds of the votes. The contribution of each Government shall be proportionate to the total of its respective basic quotas, except that the Government of the United States of America will accept as its contribution an amount equal to 33½ percent of the total required contribution.

ARTICLE XIV

Regular meetings of the Board shall be held on the first Tuesday of January, April, July and October. Special meetings shall be called by the Chairman at any other time at his discretion, or upon written request of delegates representing not less than five of the participating Governments, or fifteen percent of the quotas specified in Article I, or one third of the votes established in Article XV. Notice of all special meetings shall be communicated to the delegates not less than three days before the date fixed for the meeting.

The presence of delegates representing not less than 75 percent of the total votes of all the participating Governments shall be necessary to constitute a quorum for a meeting. Any participating Government may, through its delegates, by written notice to the Chairman, appoint the delegate of another participating Government to represent it and to vote on its behalf at any meeting of the Board.

Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, decisions of the Board shall be taken by a simple majority of the votes, it being understood that, in every case, the computation shall be calculated on the basis of the total votes of all the participating Governments.

ARTICLE XV

The votes to be exercised by the delegates of the participating Governments shall be as follows:

Brazil.....	9
Colombia.....	3
Costa Rica.....	1
Cuba.....	1
Dominican Republic.....	1
Ecuador.....	1
El Salvador.....	1
Guatemala.....	1
Haiti.....	1
Honduras.....	1
Mexico.....	1
Nicaragua.....	1
Peru.....	1
United States of America.....	12
Venezuela.....	1
Total.....	36

ARTICLE XVI

The official reports of the Board to the participating Governments shall be written in the four official languages of the Pan American Union.

ARTICLE XVII

The participating Governments agree to maintain, in so far as possible, the normal and usual operation of the coffee trade.

ARTICLE XVIII

The Board is authorized to appoint advisory committees in the important markets, to the end that consumers, importers and distributors of green and roasted coffee, as well as other interested persons, may be given an opportunity to express their views concerning the operation of the program established under this Agreement.

ARTICLE XIX

If the delegate of any participating Government alleges that any participating Government has failed to comply with the obligations of the present Agreement, the Board shall decide whether any infringement of the Agreement has taken place, and, if so, what measures shall be recommended to correct the situation arising therefrom.

ARTICLE XX

The present Agreement shall be deposited with the Pan American Union at Washington, which shall transmit authentic certified copies thereof to the signatory Governments.

The Agreement shall be ratified or approved by each of the signatory Governments in accordance with its legal requirements and shall come into force when the instruments of ratification or approval of all the signatory Governments have been deposited with the Pan American Union. As soon as possible after the deposit of any ratification the Pan American Union shall inform each of the signatory Governments thereof.

If, within ninety days from the date of signature of this Agreement, the instruments of ratification or approval of all the signatory Governments have not been deposited, the Governments which have deposited their instruments of ratification or approval may put the Agreement into force among themselves by means of a Protocol. Such Protocol shall be deposited with the Pan American Union, which shall furnish certified copies thereof to each of the Governments on behalf of which the Protocol or the present Agreement was signed.

ARTICLE XXI

As long as the present Agreement remains in force, it shall prevail over provisions inconsistent therewith which may be contained in any other agreement previously concluded between any of the participating Governments. Upon the termination of the present Agreement, all the provisions which may have been temporarily suspended by virtue of this Agreement shall automatically again become operative unless they have been definitely terminated for other reasons.

ARTICLE XXII

The present Agreement shall apply, on the part of the United States of America, to the customs territory of the United States. Exports to the United States of America and quotas for the United States market shall be understood to refer to the customs territory of the United States.

ARTICLE XXIII

For the purpose of this Agreement the following definitions are adopted:

(1) "Quota year" means the period of twelve months beginning October 1, and ending September 30 of the following calendar year.

(2) "Producing countries participating in this Agreement" means all participating countries except the United States of America.

(3) "The Board" means the Inter-American Coffee Board provided for in Article IX.

ARTICLE XXIV

Subject to the eventuality covered by Article XXV, the present Agreement shall remain in force until October 1, 1943.

Not less than one year prior to October 1, 1943 the Board shall make recommendations to the participating Governments as to the continuation or otherwise of the Agreement. The recommendations, if in favor of continuation, may suggest amendments to the Agreement.

Each participating Government shall signify to the Board its acceptance or rejection of the recommendations referred to in the immediately preceding paragraph within six months after the date of the receipt of such recommendations. This period may be extended by the Board.

If said recommendations are accepted by all the participating Governments, the participating Governments undertake to take such measures as may be necessary to carry out said recommendations. The Board shall draw up a declaration certifying the terms of said recommendations and their acceptance by all the participating Governments, and the present Agreement shall be deemed to be amended in accordance with this declaration as from the date specified therein. A certified copy of the declaration together with a certified copy of the Agreement as amended shall be communicated to the Pan American Union and to each of the participating Governments.

The same procedure for making amendments or for the continuation of the Agreement may be followed at any other time.

ARTICLE XXV

Any of the participating Governments may withdraw from the present Agreement after prior notification of one year to the Pan American Union which shall promptly inform the Board. If one or more participating Governments representing 20 percent or more of the total quotas specified in Article I of this Agreement withdraw therefrom, the Agreement will thereupon terminate.

ARTICLE XXVI

In the event that because of special and extraordinary circumstances the Board should believe that the period fixed by Article XXIV for the duration of this Agreement might be reduced, it shall immediately notify all the participating Governments which, by unanimous agreement, may decide to terminate this Agreement prior to October 1, 1943.

TRANSITORY ARTICLE

All coffee entered for consumption into the United States of America between October 1, 1940 and September 30, 1941, both inclusive, shall be charged against the quotas for the first quota year.

All coffee exported to the market outside the United States between October 1, 1940 and September 30, 1941, both inclusive, shall be charged against the quotas for the first quota year.

Done at the City of Washington, in English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French, the twentieth day of November 1940.

For Brazil:
(S) E. PENTEADO. [SEAL]
For Colombia:
(S) M. MEJIA. [SEAL]
For Costa Rica:
(S) OCTAVIO BEECHE. [SEAL]
For Cuba:
(S) PEDRO MARTINEZ FRAGA. [SEAL]
For the Dominican Republic:
(S) A. PASTORIZA. [SEAL]
For Ecuador:
(S) C. E. ALFARO. [SEAL]
For El Salvador:
(S) HÉCTOR DAVID CASTRO. [SEAL]

For Guatemala:
 (S) ENRIQUE LÓPEZ HERRARTE. [SEAL]
 For Haiti:
 (S) E. LESCOT. [SEAL]
 For Honduras:
 (S) JULIÁN R. CÁCERES. [SEAL]
 For Mexico:
 (S) A. ESPINOSA DE LOS MONTEROS. [SEAL]
 For Nicaragua:
 (S) LEÓN DE BAYLE. [SEAL]
 For Peru:
 (S) EDUARDO GARLAND. [SEAL]
 For the United States of America:
 (S) SUMNER WELLES. [SEAL]
 For Venezuela:
 (S) LUIS COLL-PARDO. [SEAL]

I hereby certify that the foregoing document is a true and faithful copy of the original in the English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French languages¹ of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, which was signed at Washington and deposited with the Pan American Union on November 28, 1940.

[SEAL] PEDRO DE ALBA,
 Secretary of the Governing Board
 of the Pan American Union.
 WASHINGTON, D. C., December 30, 1940.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this agreement was entered into by this country and 14 coffee-producing nations. It has been very strongly urged by the Secretary of State. We had a hearing on the treaty. No opposition was expressed to the treaty, and I hope it will be ratified.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief comment about the treaty. In a situation of this sort I think it is advisable that we should know what we are doing, and particularly that the beneficiaries of our favor in Central and South America should equally know what we are doing.

There is no doubt about the high purpose of this coffee agreement between 15 countries, 14 of them producers and one of them a consumer, we being the consumer. The immediate and direct result of the agreement is to raise the price of coffee in the United States \$25,000,000 in round numbers. That is the purpose of the agreement. I am not criticizing the purpose, because collaterally the necessity for it is the maintenance of a sound economy in these coffee-producing countries. What I am undertaking to make plain is simply that this is essentially, at the moment, a \$25,000,000 contribution on our part toward the stabilization of economies in Central and South American coffee-growing states.

The Senator from Mississippi is correct in stating that there was no opposition to the treaty in the committee. I am not now opposing it. I think, however, that when we proceed with an act of grace of this character it should be quite plain that the American people are footing the bill.

This is an experiment in the restabilization of coffee prices. There are about 25,000,000 bags of coffee in the world. Due to the loss of European markets, there is a market for only 15,000,000 bags. A carry-over of 10,000,000 bags will remain to plague the situation from year to year until it is fundamentally corrected by some sort of control.

¹ Spanish, Portuguese, and French texts not printed.

This treaty does not touch the fundamental problem. It is simply a temporary arrangement seeking to raise the price of coffee to a point which is not unreasonable, but which, by experience and practice, has been found to be a reasonable price, so that to this extent, at least, the economy in the coffee-producing countries of the Western Hemisphere may be assisted as I have indicated. The price at the moment is about \$25,000,000.

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

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

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Mississippi will permit me, I wish simply to interject that I do not think the bald statement made by the Senator from Michigan is a fair picture of the situation. While the treaty will raise the price of coffee to consumers above the price at which it has been selling in view of the demoralized world market for coffee, it will not raise it above the normal price of coffee in this country or in the world prior to that demoralization, as the testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations showed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think I said exactly that. I attempted to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator's first statement, while not intended to do so, would be likely to leave the impression that this treaty levies on the American people a subsidy of \$25,000,000 above the normal price of coffee and the price they would be required to pay except for this world situation. I think the testimony showed that, even with the increased price which may result from the treaty, the price will not be as high as it was over an average period in normal times, when coffee found its market throughout the world.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think there is any disagreement between the Senator from Kentucky and me, so I will repeat my statement. The stabilized price of coffee under this agreement probably will be a normal price compared with the average price over the years. The fact remains that the treaty increases the price of coffee to the American coffee-consuming public \$25,000,000, in round numbers.

Mr. BARKLEY. It increases it above the low price to which it descended as a result of this particular situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It increases it above the price the American public was paying for coffee the day this treaty was signed and promulgated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Instantly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Instantly.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think the treaty increases the price to the consumer. The retail price is unaffected by the treaty, and must inevitably remain unaffected by the treaty. It does increase the wholesale price. That is to say, bringing some stability into the coffee market resulted in an increased price of approximately \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000 to the producers of coffee in the Central and

South American countries, the Western Hemisphere producers of coffee; but it must be remembered that coffee at that time was at the all-time low price, due to trade demoralization, the closing up of markets in Europe.

It is true that the treaty does not affect the general problem of the coffee-producing countries. Indeed, it cannot do so. The only thing the treaty does is to allow the South American, Central American, or Western Hemisphere producers to fix a quota on their imports into our market; but that quota is not fixed even at the normal imports from those countries. It is fixed at a point in excess of the normal imports from those countries.

This treaty does not affect imports from Puerto Rico or Hawaii—our own coffee-producing areas. The production from those areas comes in unaffected by the treaty. The treaty imposes no burden upon the United States except to bear a fixed proportion of the expense of maintaining an international coffee association, so to speak, for a period of 3 years. The treaty itself is limited to 1943, with an escape clause which permits any country to get out from under it on 1 year's notice if it desires so to do.

Of course, our part of the expense is nominal, estimated at about \$20,000 per year. The importance of the treaty is the stabilization of the markets in South America, and is to enable the South American and Central American countries in whose general economy coffee plays such an important part to maintain their level of purchases with us, looking at the matter from our standpoint. Of course, we are interested also in the maintenance of economic and political stability in the coffee-producing countries. I believe in some one of the South American or Central American coffee-producing countries coffee furnishes approximately 90 percent of the exports, as the Vice President very well knows from his general study of this question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is any information available to the Senate as to the effect of this treaty and of the quota system upon consumption in the United States?

Mr. HARRISON. I think that question was asked in the committee, but I am not sure the answer was taken down.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Can the Senator inform the Senate whether or not the quota supply will so restrict the importations of coffee, and so affect the price, that American citizens will not be able to secure coffee? In other words, I assume that there are some persons living in this country who are not now able to buy coffee. Is not that correct?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I presume that is correct, although the price of coffee now is very low, and the reason why we have entered into this agreement is to try to help out these coffee-producing countries so that they may obtain a fair or reasonable price for their coffee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator that as I glance over this quota agreement I inevitably think of the quota system which we have imposed with respect to sugar; but in that case the primary reason for the quota system was to protect the American grower of sugar beets and sugarcane so that our farmers who are engaged in the production of sugarcane and sugar beets may be assured the American market. With the exception of the production of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, we have no area in the United States which is at all interested in the production of coffee. Therefore the effect of the quota system is to require our consumers to pay a price which they might not otherwise have to pay in order to stabilize the economy of the South American countries which export coffee to the United States. It may be a perfectly desirable thing to do; but I think it is of interest to us to know what the effect of a quota system of this kind is likely to be upon those who may desire to purchase coffee in the United States.

Mr. HARRISON. Personally, I should think there might be a tendency for coffee to go up in price a wee bit; but no startling revelations were made to us to the effect that that would be true. All the coffee-producing countries—I think they are 14 in number—met and agreed on this plan, and it was urged because of the necessity of improving the economic condition of those countries.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I note that this agreement is presented to us as a temporary measure. The phrase "a temporary measure" is repeated two or three times in the report.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How long is "temporary," may I ask?

Mr. HARRISON. Three years is the limit of the agreement, and I think a country may withdraw in 1 year. That is my recollection of the terms of the agreement.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. It is purely a temporary matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the pending treaty. Many of my constituents are engaged in the handling of coffee. New Orleans is the largest coffee importing market in the United States.

Is it not a fact that, even though the amount of 15,900,000 bags of coffee is fixed as our quota, if said quota does not prove sufficient and the price of coffee should rise, there is a provision in the treaty whereby the quotas can be increased so as to adjust the supply to what our requirements are?

Mr. HARRISON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that by adjusting the supply of coffee to our requirements it is hoped to keep the prices of coffee at a normal level and do away with the abnormal fluctuations of the prices of the commodity.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Louisiana wants to know whether there is a clause which will, in a way, police the arrangement if the price of coffee gets too high. What does he mean by "too high"? Again we are back to what the Senator from Wyoming was asking.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the advance in price to consumers to which the Senator from Michigan referred awhile ago was based on the price of coffee as it is today, which is far below normal. What I would term "an excessive price" or "too high prices," as the Senator from Michigan would have it, would be prices in excess of what the normal price of coffee is, and the normal price can be easily ascertained by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the Senator's opinion. There is nothing in the treaty which sets out any such rule, is there?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; but as I understand the treaty, as I have just indicated, if the agreed quota of coffee is not sufficient for our consumptive requirements, more coffee can be imported. The main factor that would make coffee rise in price would be its scarcity, and since the treaty provides for methods whereby quotas can be increased, that in itself would probably have the tendency of regulating the price at a normal level. As I understand, the quota provided for in the treaty is about what we normally consume.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is indirectly correct. It all depends upon what the supervisory authorities think is the proper price for coffee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana this question: Does the treaty set up a commission or board which will have authority to decide when the price of coffee goes too high in the United States and when additional importations may come in?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; not as to price fixing. However, a board is provided for which would have the authority to increase importation. The reason coffee is selling for an abnormally low price today is because of the vast amount of coffee now on hand. There is no limit to the amount that can be imported.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. South America cannot ship coffee to Europe, as in the past, so that the quota of fifteen-million-and-some-odd-thousand bags for our requirements is necessary in order to bring back the prices to as near normalcy as possible. As the Senator well knows, the purpose of the treaty is to stabilize the price of coffee.

Mr. NORRIS. When the Senator says the purpose is to make it stable, he means the idea is to increase it to what he calls a normal price?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; to make it come up to the normal price.

As I understand, a monthly index of prices is kept by the Department of Commerce as to all commodities.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the moment the price of coffee on that index would increase above the normal price, more coffee could be permitted to enter, and, of course, that would have a tendency to lower the price of the commodity.

Mr. NORRIS. My question was directed to that subject, but the Senator does not seem to have understood it, probably because I did not make it plain. Who is to decide when the price of coffee gets high enough so that additional importations may begin? Who is to give permission to the importers to bring more coffee in? Who will decide that?

Mr. HARRISON. The board is the one to decide.

Mr. NORRIS. How is the board constituted? Who is the board?

Mr. HARRISON. The board is composed of men who are engaged in the coffee business in the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Do the consumers have any representative on the board?

Mr. HARRISON. I think not. But I may say that among the members of the board, according to countries, the United States has 12 votes out of 36, and there is provision in the agreement that only one-third are required in order to change the terms of the treaty with reference to the quotas.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the Senator from Mississippi think that if the members of the board from our country are coffee dealers—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I am asking a question of the Senator from Mississippi, and I should like to have an answer, when I shall be glad to yield.

If the board consists of coffee dealers, does the Senator think it would be fair to entrust to them the power to increase or decrease importations and thus raise or lower the price of coffee to the consumers in the United States?

Mr. HARRISON. Let me read article 9 of the treaty, which I think will explain the situation. It is as follows:

The present agreement shall be under the administration of a board, which shall be known as the Inter-American Coffee Board, and which shall be composed of delegates representing the governments of the participating countries.

Each government shall appoint a delegate to the board upon approval of the agreement. In the absence of the delegate of any participating country, his Government shall appoint an alternate who shall act in place of the delegate. Subsequent appointments shall be communicated by the respective governments to the chairman of the board.

The board shall elect from among its members a chairman and a vice chairman, who shall hold office for such period as it may determine.

The seat of the board shall be in Washington, D. C.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator read the provision which gives the board authority to stop importations or to permit them to increase?

Mr. GEORGE. If I may do so—

Mr. NORRIS. Very well; I shall be glad to have the chairman of the committee do so.

Mr. GEORGE. It is found in article 8:

In the event that there should be foreseen an imminent shortage of coffee in the United States market in relation to its requirements, the Inter-American Coffee Board—

Which is provided for in article 9, which the Senator from Mississippi just read—

the Inter-American Coffee Board shall have the authority, as an emergency measure, to increase the quotas for the United States market, in proportion to the basic quotas, up to the quantity necessary to satisfy these requirements even though in this manner the limits specified in article III may be exceeded. Any member of the Board may request such an increase and the increase may be authorized by a one-third vote of the Board.

We have one-third of the votes on the board. The board is to be composed of 36 members, and the United States is to have 12.

Mr. NORRIS. Our members are all to be coffee dealers, I judge.

Mr. GEORGE. They would be such as the President would appoint.

Mr. NORRIS. The President is to appoint them?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I should think the consumers would be represented.

Mr. NORRIS. I should think so. If someone is to appoint them, he certainly would give the consumers representation. Now, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I asked the Senator to yield to me to suggest, as has just been stated to the Senator, that the board is to be essentially an inter-American board, appointed by the Governments; but it will still remain true, as the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Mississippi have well pointed out, that the members of the board are very likely to be the persons primarily and personally interested in the sale of coffee to American consumers. Apparently nothing has been revealed as yet indicating that there will be any spokesman on the board who will have a voice in fixing the prices of quotas from the point of view of the consumer.

Mr. NORRIS. I should dislike very much to have the dealers in any commodity be those who would, in effect, fix the price the consumer would have to pay for the commodity; and I am afraid that would be the effect of the proposed treaty, although I confess I have not studied it.

I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations what happened in the committee in regard to this treaty; were any hearings held?

Mr. GEORGE. An informal hearing was held, with a representative from the State Department present, and a great many questions were asked by the Senators present, there being a representative meeting of the committee, that is, a rather full meeting.

Mr. NORRIS. And the committee were unanimous?

Mr. GEORGE. The committee were unanimous. In article 1 of the treaty, as the Senator would have seen if he had had time to examine it—

Mr. NORRIS. I have not had time to examine it at all.

Mr. GEORGE. It will be found that the coffee-producing countries outside the United States are given allocations, and it is specifically set forth in article 1 of the treaty what amount is allotted to each country as the amount it may bring into the United States annually. The total amount is fixed at 15,545,000 bags. That is said to be in excess of the normal importations from all of these countries.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me it is important that we be sure whether that is true. As I understand, 15,545,000 bags of coffee is the total allocation to all the countries exporting coffee to the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. In the treaty that total exportation to the United States is allotted to the several coffee-producing countries, and then follows the provision for the creation of an inter-American coffee board, and the votes of the several countries upon that board are set forth in article XV. It will be noted that the United States is given 12 out of the 36 votes of the board. I think the agreement itself rather goes into all these questions rather elaborately.

Mr. NORRIS. Is there anything in the treaty that would contemplate or would make it possible for the members of the board representing the United States to have meetings of their own, to have hearings, and to ascertain what might be the sentiment or the belief of the people of the United States as to the price of coffee?

Mr. GEORGE. The board is to meet in Washington. As I understand, under the treaty a two-thirds majority is required to do anything affirmatively affecting the quotas or to make important decisions; so with the one-third of the total vote given to the United States, we have a check upon what may be done.

It will be found in article XVIII that—

The board is authorized to appoint advisory committees in the important markets, to the end that consumers, importers, and distributors of green and roasted coffee, as well as other interested persons, may be given an opportunity to express their views concerning the operation of the program established under this agreement.

Mr. NORRIS. The full board is so authorized. Article XVIII does not give that authority to our members?

Mr. GEORGE. No; that authority is given to the full board in the first instance, and if it appoints an advisory committee the advisory committee is not confined to our membership.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator believe it would be proper, or that the treaty contains authority for our members to hold hearings of their own?

Mr. GEORGE. I think undoubtedly so.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator thinks they could do that?

Mr. GEORGE. I think undoubtedly so if they wish separately to advise among themselves, and inasmuch as the treaty is limited to October 1, 1943, with the escape clause, and inasmuch as our

own coffee-producing areas in Puerto Rico and Hawaii are not placed under quota, and that the general quota allotted to all the Central and South American producers is in excess of the normal, it would appear that the coffee consumers in the United States are fairly well protected.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the figure of 15,000,000 and some odd thousand bags of coffee was fixed as our quota, the amount that was consumed by this country in the past was taken into consideration?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; it was.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the way by which this amount was fixed?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And by fixing the amount of our quota at what we normally consumed, it was felt that the price would remain stable, and as a matter of fact return to normalcy.

Mr. HARRISON. That is correct.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Even if the war in Europe came to an end tomorrow, and there were a greatly increased demand for coffee from Europe, the treaty would still continue until 1943?

Mr. HARRISON. The treaty would continue for 3 years, although under the escape clause this country could withdraw from it a year from now.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is there any precedent for a treaty of this kind, by which in the past we have agreed with other nations to accept only limited amounts of a certain product, or is this a new precedent for treaties with other nations?

Mr. HARRISON. We are desirous of helping these coffee-producing countries return to economic stability. That is the moving reason.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true, for instance, that if the American people happen to like Colombian coffee better than coffee produced elsewhere they cannot get more than a limited amount of Colombian coffee? We are limiting ourselves, as I see it, to saying to Colombia, "We will take only a certain amount of Colombian coffee, no matter whether the people of the United States happen to develop a taste for Colombian coffee." Is that a correct interpretation of the treaty?

Mr. HARRISON. Under this agreement the parties to it have a right to shift their policy.

Mr. TAFT. We have no voice in that, because we are binding ourselves to abide by the votes of the board, so if our members of the board want to bring about a change they will not have power to do so.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator from Ohio that the quota of Colombia or Brazil is based upon the prior importations of each of those countries into the United States, and the State Department advises that all the coffee-producing countries are highly satisfied with the agreement.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I was not concerned with the other coffee-producing countries, but rather with whether we were limiting our consumers to particular things given them by the Government of the United States. In other words, it seems to me we have here exactly that international regimentation of trade which it is argued will result from a German victory—if there should be a German victory—and which we should by all means avoid. Now we ourselves are entering into a treaty to set up exactly that kind of regimentation of international trade.

Mr. GEORGE. We merely approve the agreement made by the coffee-producing countries, and the allocation to each country is based on its prior average exports to the United States.

Mr. TAFT. But we bind ourselves not to accept more than a certain amount from each country.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. We tie our hands.

Mr. GEORGE. We bind ourselves during the terms of the treaty; that is, to October 1, 1943.

Mr. HARRISON. I may say to the Senator from Ohio that the State Department's representative told us that the Department circularized the coffee industry in the United States, and that not a single protest was raised against the agreement.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Ohio inquires about precedents. Of course, there is a rather tenuous precedent in the fashion in which we have covenanted to foster the sugar industry in Cuba under a system largely encouraged by a former very distinguished and amiable Secretary of Agriculture. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

A GENEROUS GESTURE TO SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the answer to the Senator from Ohio is that in the field of sugar there was an international agreement which I think in principle is practically identical with this, with the exception which I have already pointed out, namely, that the United States entered into the international sugar agreement, and the Congress passed the sugar-quota law for the specific purpose primarily of protecting the economic status of our own producers. I think that in the condition in which the world finds itself now, there can be no doubt that agreements of this kind are necessary and desirable.

I feel that this treaty should without question be ratified, but my questions have been prompted by the fact that I should like to make it very clear that in agreeing to this treaty the people and the Government of the United States are making a very generous gesture toward the coffee-producing countries. I assume that the principal purpose of this treaty is to promote Western Hemisphere solidarity, and I think that is a very desirable end, and one that should be encouraged. Nevertheless it is clear that

the United States, which without any question is the greatest market for coffee in the world, is agreeing to maintain the price of coffee for the coffee-producing countries, by limiting the amount of coffee which may be brought into the United States. It is also agreeing by this treaty to limit the amount of coffee that may be brought into the United States from countries outside the Western Hemisphere to 355,000 bags. We are committing the administration of this treaty to an international board, on which we have only one-third of the membership, and we are paying one-third of the expense. All of this we do because we want to encourage the economy of the Western Hemisphere countries producing coffee.

May I ask the Senator from Mississippi if I have not with a fair degree of accuracy stated what is true?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his excellent contribution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is there any other consideration that passes to the United States in this treaty, except the stabilization of the economy of the other nations?

Mr. HARRISON. That was the main and dominant thought.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say this, if the Senator from Mississippi will permit me, that there are two very definite considerations. First, the purchasing power of the various countries was given definite consideration, because coffee is such a vital factor in their economy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I made that statement in connection with the stabilization of the general economy.

Mr. GEORGE. In addition to that, to the extent that Puerto Rico and Hawaii are dependent upon the coffee market it is a protection to them, because if all the coffee produced in Central America and South America were dumped on the American market, I think that Puerto Rico and Hawaii would not be able to produce and sell coffee even at cost of production.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, under this agreement, if it shall be ratified, as I have no doubt it will be, Puerto Rico and Hawaii may send into the United States as much coffee as they produce?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; with no restriction.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, by this treaty we have clearly and fully protected the rights of American producers in the American possessions?

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly, because there is no restriction on what they may bring into this country.

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly, because there are no restrictions on what they may bring into this country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to add a further word, then I shall take my seat. I think that that is a very excellent precedent; and I know that the two able Senators who have been explaining the treaty to the Senate will agree with those of us who represent sugar-producing States in the Union that, in the further consideration of legislation upon the subject of sugar, we shall give primary consideration to the protection of the rights of American producers.

The point I wish to make is that, if we are willing to adopt a quota system for the benefit of the producers of coffee in Western Hemisphere countries, we shall surely not hesitate to improve the sugar law for the benefit of our own producers. Let no one suggest that American producers of sugar beets and sugarcane are not entitled to the same treatment we have extended to South America.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will save time by asking a double question which may be answered as one. Is it not a fact that the coffee plant is a perennial instead of an annual, and that it is to the advantage of the American consumer to have a stable source for its coffee supply such as this treaty is intended to preserve?

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is undoubtedly correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The agreement is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the agreement will be reported to the Senate.

The agreement was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Legislative Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive A, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, by representatives of this Government and the governments of 14 other American republics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the agreement is ratified.

POSTMASTERS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 6, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1941, as follows:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Homer Clark, Blue Lake.
Charles J. Lebew, La Mesa.
Mattie Mae Migge, Lomita Park.
Blanche Vincent, Sharp Park.
Edith M. Kennedy, Weimar.

MISSOURI

Lottie Breedlove, Rogersville.

WEST VIRGINIA

John D. Farmer, Mullens.
Christopher C. Hunley, Sharples.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, only the eternal Christ, with the redemptive thought and the redemptive passion in His will is equal to our needs. O Thou who knowest the beginning and the end and who holdest in Thy grasp the destiny of men, prepare us with fortitude and with patience to meet whatever may come to us this day; give us the strength to do our duty as it is given us to see it. Oh, keep our heart fountains full of the refreshing streams of loving kindness which abide after the fashion of this world is frayed and faded. Eternal God of wisdom and truth, give Thy holy counsel to our President, our Speaker, and the Congress, that the rule of government may be for the preservation of peace, for the promotion of national happiness, and for good will. Be with all our citizens throughout our land; we pray that they may be blest and sanctified in the knowledge of Thy holy law. Hear our unspoken prayers with their deeper hopes, quivering in faith, in silence and in loneliness as they reach toward Thee; and Thine shall be the glory forever. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 31, 1941, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. The first is that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of yesterday. The second request is that I may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make on the bill H. R. 1776 and include therein excerpts from the hearings, also statements made by other parties whose statements I regard as germane to the discussion of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

INCREASING THE DEBT LIMIT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOUGHTON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 2959) to increase the debt limit of the United States, to provide for the Federal taxation of future issues of obligations of the United States and its instrumentalities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 20), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all points of order against the bill be waived, and I also ask unanimous consent that there be 3 hours of general debate on the bill, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and one-half by myself.

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

Mr. TREADWAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the request of the chairman of the committee is agreeable to the minority members, with the reservation about which we talked this morning, that in case we find a little later in the day that 3 hours will not be ample time, as divided between the two sides, we can consider an extension of the 3-hour period.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There will be no objection to that on this side.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what are the subjects which would come under the points of order that the gentleman wishes waived?

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is provision in this bill for payment of the expenses incurred in marketing these bonds. A similar provision is contained in the present law with respect to the issuance of the baby bonds.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, you are intruding on the Committee on Appropriations, and you want to have the point of order waived against that violation?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; to the extent of providing for the expenses necessary in issuing the bonds provided for in this bill, if it becomes law, and placing them on the market. There is a similar provision in the present law with respect to the baby bonds. There is nothing new about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much will the expense be?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I cannot tell the gentleman that. He should direct that inquiry to the Secretary of the Treasury. I am unable to state what it will be.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. As the chairman has pointed out, this is similar to the provision with respect to the baby bonds. As to the amount, that will have to be determined by the Committee on Appropriations when the request is made for the funds.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that the only point of order that is sought to be waived?

Mr. COOPER. That is the only provision of the bill that could be subject to a point of order, and that is by reason of the fact that it is an appropriation to provide for the payment of the expenses involved in the issuance of these bonds.

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

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

Mr. TREADWAY. Supplementing what the gentleman from Tennessee has said, may I say that the reason the chairman is making this request is, as I understand, to avoid the necessity of asking the Committee on Rules for a rule on the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When is the gentleman going to bring up the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I hope to bring it up at the conclusion of the consideration of the bill that is coming up today, if it is agreeable with the House leadership.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That means that the bill cannot possibly come up here in less than 3 or 4 days?

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is no thought of that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then I cannot see any hardship will be imposed on the gentleman if he goes through the regular channels and gets a rule for the waiving of the point of order.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We will do that if there is objection, of course.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, the bill being privileged and the report being presented from the floor, there is no necessity for a rule. The minority and majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means agreed on these two points, with respect to this appropriation matter and the time for general debate. Therefore, in harmony with the agreement which has been reached, there would be no special point in asking for a rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not believe the gentleman is quite correct when he says there is no necessity for a rule, because the gentleman has just said there would be necessity for it.

Mr. COOPER. I say there would not be if consent were granted with respect to these two points.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that, but if you do not get that consent you will be obliged to have a rule.

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is necessity for a rule if any Member of the House wishes to object.

Mr. COOPER. Certainly. It is the purpose of the request to avoid that.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, we have brought up this matter with an appreciation of the fact that if we had objected to it in the committee, all they would have had to do would be to get a rule.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It would cause just that much unnecessary trouble.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not discussing the legislation, but the point I am trying to bring out is that we have rules in the House and I do not like to see them set aside unless there is a necessity for it.

If there was a time element involved I could see where the gentleman might very well submit the unanimous-consent request, but the gentleman could go tomorrow and get a rule and have the bill ready to be brought up in the regular way when the House will be in a position to consider the same.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Of course, that is a formality that the ranking minority member of the committee and myself had already agreed upon but, of course, we can appear before the Rules Committee if the gentleman wishes to exercise his prerogatives in the matter.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, here is the position of the minority of the committee, not attempting, of course, to speak for our distinguished ranking minority member, but there had been an understanding about the bill and it could come in without a rule except for one portion of the bill, and that is a part that makes the measure effective in one respect and if anybody objected we would have to go and get a rule for the measure; in other words, probably 99 percent of the bill is privileged, but there is probably 1 percent that is not privileged.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think the committee has more claim for asking unanimous consent than most of similar requests which are presented here. I want to serve notice, however, that with respect to the various important legislation coming up we must give it mature and careful consideration. I want the legislation to come up ordinarily in the regular way. I am not going to object in this particular instance, because it would be privileged in fact except for this one item, and that fact restrains me from objecting. Hereafter I think legislation, defense legislation or whatever it may be, in the interest of good legislation and orderly procedure, should come up in the regular way.

Mr. DOUGHTON. May I say to the gentleman, in order to be perfectly fair, that we discussed the matter fully with the minority members and had their approval of the course that the chairman is taking with respect to this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not question that at all, but I want to have it understood that this important legislation we will consider in the next few months should go through the regular channels and be considered in the regular way. We should not take it up with unanimous consent. However, I am not going to object in this instance.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, since I represent a school of thought that is not represented by either the majority or the minority, and since I appeared before the committee, I hope the gentleman will allot me a reasonable time to present my views when the bill comes up.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman will be treated fairly, I can assure him.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order today, the Consent Calendar, may be suspended.

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

There was no objection.

FILING OF MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege of filing minority views on the bill just reported by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am dropping into the hopper today a resolution requesting the Attorney General to appear before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization for the purpose of testifying with respect to the citizenship of one Fritz Kuhn. It does appear that certain people have been given unusual consideration. This goes for such men as Harry Bridges and we would like to find out why these people are given this consideration, and we propose to do it now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. Cox addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

MONTHLY REPORT OF GOVERNMENT FINANCES

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been the custom for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations at the end of each session of Congress to make a report on the fiscal affairs of the Government. With the advent of our very greatly enlarged expenditure program incident to national defense and the financing of it, I felt that Congress periodically should have statements which would concisely portray our financial situation as to receipts, expenditures, public debt, and so forth, as that program progresses. Customarily in the past the Congress and the country get a detailed and a general picture of that program in January when a new Budget comes in, and from that time on there is scattered public information through Treasury reports and other governmental sources that is not periodically correlated and made available. It seemed to me, in view of the tremendous proportions of our projected financial program and the augmentations and revisions that may necessarily occur in it from time to time, that it would be of value and interest to the Members of Congress, the press, and the public, generally, if the Budget situation could be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each month during the session so as to bring the important data down to date as of the end of the previous month. The Secretary of the Treasury has agreed, in consultation with the Bureau of the Budget, to furnish me this data,

and I have the first statements to the end of December last.

There are six statements dealing with, first, actual receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year 1940 and receipts and expenditures for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 on an estimated basis; second, the effect on the public debt of financing the deficit; third, the statutory debt limitations; fourth, the general fund balances; fifth, obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Government; and sixth, a combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies.

The figures in these statements will be official data furnished by the Government agencies charged with the responsibility of these finances. I believe they will prove useful when compiled and published in this form periodically and may eliminate misunderstandings and erroneous conclusions that are sometimes reached because of recourse to dispersed data from governmental sources which, while bearing on the same subject, are often misleading because they proceed from a different basis of calculation.

Personally, I feel that the year 1941 will be looked upon in history as the year of destiny of the human race on this planet, and I feel that our fiscal activities should be given to the country correctly each month as we go along.

I may say that I presented this matter to the Committee on Appropriations, and I feel that I have their approval in making this presentation to you, so I ask unanimous consent that the statements to which I have referred and the accompanying letter from the Secretary of the Treasury may be inserted in the RECORD and printed in an appropriate style of type that will enable them readily to be studied and that as these reports come each month during the remainder of the session they may be inserted in the RECORD. [Applause.]

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Washington, January 31, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with your suggestion and after consultation with the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department has arranged to furnish you monthly with statements relating to receipts, appropriations, expenditures, public debt, contingent liabilities, the balance in general fund, and similar fiscal data as reflected by the Treasury's official accounts.

The publication of such statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within a few days after the close of each month, as a regular order of business while the Congress is in session, would provide the Members of Congress with a ready reference to the latest official information concerning the Government's financial affairs. It would also be helpful to them in avoiding the misunderstanding which sometimes arises when data obtained from different sources reflecting different bases are used.

For example, information relating to governmental receipts and expenditures is frequently calculated on different bases. Unexpended balances available under appropriations are sometimes stated on the basis of

warrants issued by the Treasury, while at other times they are determined on the basis of obligations incurred by spending agencies or on the basis of checks issued by disbursing officers. The available balances under these methods of computation differ to a considerable extent.

The unexpended balances of appropriations are oftentimes confused with the working balance of the general fund. Appropriations are, in effect, authorizations for the withdrawal of funds from the Treasury. The working balance is in turn the cash in the custody of the Treasurer of the United States which is available for meeting disbursements. The financing of the Treasury is arranged so that the Treasurer maintains a working cash balance sufficient for current requirements, but this balance is usually smaller than the aggregate amount of unexpended balances of appropriations.

The statements enclosed herewith should be regarded only as a beginning. After the joint studies now being conducted by the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget under the Executive Order of August 13, 1940 (No. 8512), have progressed sufficiently, the Department will be in a position to furnish additional information relating to the Government's financial condition and operations. This would include certain types of assets and liabilities not now reflected in the Treasury's accounts. Of particular interest in this connection would be periodic statements of the status of appropriations showing obligations incurred, unobligated balances, and obligations outstanding.

Statement No. 1 attached is a classified summary of receipts and expenditures. It compares—

(1) Budget estimates for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 and actual figures for the fiscal year 1940; and

(2) Actual figures for the first 6 months of each of the fiscal years 1940 and 1941.

The actual figures will be brought up to date from month to month as the year progresses, thereby providing (a) information relating to the receipts and expenditures for the current year and comparison with (b) the same period of the preceding year, and with (c) estimates for the full fiscal year. This will afford a convenient method of enabling Members of the Congress to pursue the progress of financial operations of the Government in relation to the Budget estimates.

Statement No. II shows how financing the deficit affects the public debt. This statement begins with the net deficit shown in statement No. I. It indicates the extent to which the net deficit has been met through borrowings and reductions in the Treasury's cash balances. It also shows the debt at the beginning and the close of the period.

Statement No. III sets forth the statutory debt limitation, the amount of the debt outstanding which is subject to the debt limitation, and the balance of the borrowing authority; i. e., the amount of additional debt which may be issued pursuant to existing limitations. The borrowing authority is segregated as between the general debt limitation under section 21 (a) of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the national-defense limitation under section 21 (b) thereof.

Statement No. IV is the analysis of the general-fund balance and the changes therein during the period. It sets forth the bal-

ances at the beginning and the close of the period classified as to working balance, increment on gold, and seigniorage. It also shows how the general-fund balance was affected by (1) borrowings, (2) excess of receipts or expenditures in the trust accounts, etc., and (3) the net deficit as set forth in statement No. I.

Statement No. V shows the contingent liabilities of the Government; i. e., the outstanding securities issued by corporations and credit agencies which are guaranteed by the United States as to principal and interest.

Statement No. VI is a summary of the combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies based upon the latest official reports received by the Treasury. It shows the total assets of such corporations and agencies; the liabilities (including reserves), and their net worth. The liabilities are segregated according to obligations guaranteed by the United States and obligations not so guaranteed. The net worth is also classified as to the amounts of the Government's proprietary interest and of the proprietary interests not owned by the Government.

This Department is glad to cooperate in any plan which will provide the means of keeping the Congress currently informed concerning the finances of the Federal Government.

Very truly yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, JR.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Chairman, House Committee
on Appropriations, Washington, D. C.

I. General Budget summary—Receipts and expenditures

[On basis of daily Treasury statements, i. e., checks paid by Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years			July 1 to Dec. 31 ¹	
	Budget estimates		Actual 1940	Actual 1941	Actual 194
	1942	1941			
Receipts:					
Income tax.....	4,509.5	3,055.0	2,125.3	1,040.6	800.2
Miscellaneous internal revenue.....	3,029.3	2,871.0	2,344.6	1,516.4	1,275.9
Taxes under Social Security Act.....	816.4	755.9	712.2	347.9	317.5
Taxes upon carriers and their employees.....	144.9	135.3	121.0	66.5	57.2
Customs.....	295.0	302.0	348.6	158.6	177.6
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations.....		360.5	53.6	7.4	4.3
Other.....	176.6	173.5	219.5	98.3	111.5
Total receipts.....	8,971.7	7,653.2	5,924.8	3,235.7	2,744.2
Less net amounts transferred to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.....	696.3	640.3	537.7	311.1	268.0
Net receipts.....	8,275.4	7,012.9	5,387.1	2,924.6	2,476.2
Expenditures:					
Departmental.....	849.5	879.5	809.9	427.9	405.6
Agricultural program.....	1,078.6	1,149.9	1,430.5	613.7	709.0
National defense:					
Navy.....	3,402.4	2,086.3	891.5	839.9	394.6
War.....	5,915.1	3,766.1	667.1	863.9	294.9
National-defense funds for the President.....	229.6	185.8		25.1	
Selective Service.....	32.0	21.3		3.3	
Other agencies.....	232.2	304.4	(?)	(?)	(?)
Supplemental items ²	1,000.0	100.0			
Total.....	10,811.3	6,463.9	1,558.6	1,732.2	689.5
Interest on the public debt.....	1,225.0	1,100.0	1,040.9	490.6	455.2
Federal Loan Agency.....	8.5	9.3	14.2	4.4	8.3
Federal Security Agency.....	873.1	846.0	799.3	452.3	389.4
Federal Works Agency.....	1,230.9	1,688.5	2,007.3	886.7	1,051.8
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	40.0	40.0	39.1	19.9	
Veterans' Administration.....	568.6	565.1	556.7	276.9	277.4
Transfers to trust accounts.....	274.6	216.2	207.9	168.7	179.4
Return of surplus funds from Government corporations.....		339.5		203.0	
All other.....	517.3	683.4	533.8	270.6	295.4
Total expenditures ³	17,485.5	13,202.3	8,998.2	5,140.9	4,480.2
Net deficit (excess expenditures over receipts) ⁴	9,210.1	6,189.4	3,611.1	2,216.3	2,003.9

¹ In comparing actual receipts and expenditures for parts of a fiscal year with estimates for the full fiscal year, consideration must be given to the fact that moneys are not received and expended evenly throughout the year. For example, the larger amounts of income-tax payments are received in March and June quarters of each fiscal year. While certain expenditures occur evenly from month to month some are seasonal and others vary according to circumstances.

² Actual expenditures under this item are included under "Departmental" and other appropriate classifications.

³ Expenditures from supplemental items will be distributed during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 to the classifications applicable.

⁴ Credits, deduct.

⁵ Exclusive of debt retirements pursuant to sinking fund and other appropriations.

II. Effect of financing the deficit on the public debt

[On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years			July 1 to Dec. 31	
	Budget estimates		Actual 1940	Actual 1941	Actual 1940
	1942	1941			
Net deficit (statement I).....	9,210.1	6,189.4	3,611.1	2,216.3	2,004.0
Changes in cash accounts during period:					
Add: Increase in general fund balance during period.....	37.8	41.2	1947.5	37.7	1362.1
Total.....	9,247.9	6,230.6	2,663.6	2,254.0	1,641.9
Deduct: Excess of receipts over expenditures in trust accounts, etc., during period.....	37.8	41.2	135.6	196.9	138.9
Total financed by increase in public debt.....	9,210.1	6,189.4	2,528.0	2,057.1	1,503.0
Add: Public debt at beginning of period.....	49,157.0	42,967.5	40,439.5	42,967.5	40,439.5
Public debt at end of period.....	58,367.1	49,156.9	42,967.5	45,024.6	41,942.5

¹ Decrease, deduct.

III. Statutory debt limitations

[Under sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, as of Dec. 31, 1940]
[In millions of dollars]

Limitation:	
General limitation, sec. 21 (a).....	45,000.0
National - defense limitation, sec. 21 (b).....	4,000.0
Total.....	49,000.0
Deduct:	
Gross public debt outstanding Dec. 31, 1940.....	45,024.6
Unearned discount on U. S. savings bonds (difference between current redemption value and maturity value).....	911.7
Total.....	45,936.3
Less—debt outstanding not subject to statutory limitation.....	587.8
Total.....	45,348.5
Balance of borrowing authority:	
Under general limitation, sec. 21 (a).....	887.2
Under national-defense limitation, sec. 21 (b).....	2,764.3
Total.....	3,651.5

IV. General fund balance

[On basis of daily Treasury statements. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Full fiscal years			July 1 to Dec. 31	
	Budget estimates		Actual, 1940	Actual, 1941	Actual, 1940
	1942	1941			
Balance in general fund at beginning of period:					
Working balance.....	1,178.4	1,162.7	2,159.5	1,162.7	2,159.5
Increment on gold.....	143.3	142.8	142.4	142.8	142.4
Seigniorage (silver).....	610.2	585.2	536.3	585.2	536.3
Total.....	1,931.9	1,890.7	2,838.2	1,890.7	2,838.2
Increases:					
Borrowings—net increase in public debt.....	9,210.1	6,189.4	2,528.0	2,057.1	1,503.0
Net receipts, trust accounts, etc.....	37.8	41.2	135.6	196.9	138.9
Total.....	11,179.8	8,121.3	5,501.8	4,144.7	4,480.1
Decrease:					
Net deficit (statement No. II).....	9,210.1	6,189.4	3,611.1	2,216.3	2,004.0
Balance in general fund at end of period.....	1,969.7	1,931.9	1,890.7	1,928.4	2,476.1
Analysis of general fund balances at end of period:					
Working balance.....	1,195.8	1,178.4	1,162.7	1,188.0	1,768.2
Increment on gold.....	143.7	143.3	142.8	143.0	142.5
Seigniorage (silver).....	630.2	610.2	585.2	597.4	565.4
Total.....	1,969.7	1,931.9	1,890.7	1,928.4	2,476.1

V. Obligations of corporations and credit agencies guaranteed as to principal and interest

[As of Dec. 31, 1940. In millions of dollars.]

Corporation or agency	Limit of authority	Obligations outstanding ¹		
		Total	Matured ²	Unmatured
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	1,400.0	696.2		696.2
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.....	2,000.0	1,269.6	0.2	1,269.4
Federal Housing Administration.....	³ 4,000.0	12.9		12.9
Home Owners' Loan Corporation.....	⁴ 4,750.0	2,615.0	15.2	2,599.8
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	5,566.3	1,096.8		1,096.8
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	61.8			
U. S. Housing Authority.....	800.0	226.3		226.3
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	⁵ 200.0			
Total.....		5,916.8	15.4	5,901.4

¹ Exclusive of obligations owned by the Treasury.² Funds have been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for payment of all obligations guaranteed by the United States, representing outstanding matured principal amounting to \$15,400,000 and interest of \$3,000,000.³ Limit of authority to insure mortgages. Debentures may be issued and tendered only in exchange for insured property acquired through foreclosure.⁴ The Corporation was authorized to issue bonds for an amount not to exceed \$4,750,000,000 to be exchanged or sold to obtain funds for financing home mortgage loans or for the redemption of any of its outstanding bonds. Its authority to make loans

expired on June 13, 1936, and the above limit may be increased for the purpose of retiring its outstanding bonds by an amount equal to the amount of the bonds to be retired, which would not affect the net amount outstanding after June 13, 1936.

⁵ Limit which may be outstanding at any one time with respect to the insuring of mortgages and the issuance of debentures.⁶ The total amount of assets of these corporations and agencies is in excess of the total amount of liabilities, including obligations guaranteed by the United States. See statement VI.

VI. Combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies

[As of Nov. 30, 1940. In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Assets	Liabilities		Net worth	
		Obligations guaranteed by the United States ¹	All other (including reserves)	Proprietary interest of the United States	Other
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	927.0	696.9	130.0	100.1	-----
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.....	1,514.7	1,276.9	41.3	196.5	-----
Federal Housing Administration.....	69.9	12.8	2.8	54.3	-----
Home Owners' Loan Corporation.....	2,707.4	2,635.9	50.6	20.9	-----
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	1,661.7	1,099.7	308.9	253.1	-----
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	357.4	-----	15.4	342.0	-----
U. S. Housing Authority.....	369.1	226.8	4.7	137.6	-----
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	261.7	-----	90.7	171.0	-----
Federal land banks.....	2,230.1	-----	1,818.8	206.3	214.0
All other.....	3,170.7	-----	927.5	2,044.0	199.2
Total.....	13,278.7	5,949.0	3,390.7	3,525.8	413.2

¹ Includes accrued interest.² Includes \$57,300,000 held by the Treasury.

NOTE.—The foregoing figures are compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury Department from the respective corporations and agencies. The amounts covering obligations guaranteed by the United States differ from those shown in table V for the reason that they are stated as of Nov. 30, 1940, instead of Dec. 31, and include accrued interest, and also obligations held by the Treasury.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THE LATE WILLIAM GIBBS M'ADOO

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say farewell to a friend. To me and to thousands of other citizens of California, and of the Nation at large, the death of former Senator William Gibbs McAdoo is a personal bereavement. I personally have known him for many years and have known him well. He was a resident of my congressional district. Whatever differences of opinion anyone may have entertained concerning any of the views of William Gibbs McAdoo on public questions, no one could question his ability, his sincerity, or his courage. Although never yielding from his principles or deviating from his determined course, he was always, despite the greatest provocation, courteous, considerate, and charitable to everyone. In all things and at all times he was, in the truest sense, a gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, William Gibbs McAdoo will be missed, and deeply missed, by the wide circle of friends which was his in every walk of life as a result of his devoted and distinguished service to the State of California and to the Nation.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS BEFORE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON H. R. 1776

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back fa-

vorably (Rept. No. 21) a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 15), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 15

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 Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 1776) entitled "A bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that these are for the benefit of the Members of the House and that they are to be distributed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is correct. That is the normal manner of distribution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix by publishing a short article from the Atlanta Constitution relating to the birth and early life of the late Hon. William Gibbs McAdoo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include Senate Joint Memorial No. 3 from the State of Montana, in support of the Committee on Investigation of un-American Practices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARKANSAS VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised that Governor Carr, of Colorado, has taken it upon himself to declare a state of civil war and has asked the Governors of 16 Western States to join him in what he unfortunately calls a "bloodless civil war" against the proposed Arkansas Valley Authority.

Governor Carr bases his opposition on a pseudo fear that it would disturb the water rights of his great State. It is evident from what he says that Governor Carr is either misinformed as to the broad purposes of the Arkansas Valley Authority and the good that would come from it to the people of Colorado, or he has become the mouthpiece of the Power Trust.

If the people of Colorado have all the water they want for irrigation, if they do not desire to cooperate in control of the floods, if they want to continue to pay exorbitant power rates, if they do not want to make more effective existing efforts toward water and wind control, if they want no further industrialization of Colorado, and if they do not want to in this manner aid the national defense, then Governor Carr's statements would be consistent with their views. But I know this is not the case.

The people of Colorado, for instance, in 1938 used approximately 582,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid approximately \$18,000,000. Under the T. V. A. rates they would have paid less than \$9,500,000, and they would have saved \$8,500,000. The A. V. A. can bring them rates just as cheap as the T. V. A.

Governor Carr's difficulty seems to be that he is thinking in terms of days of the Civil War, while his people are thinking in terms of 1941.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief on the old-age-pension law in Minnesota, as presented to the Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different topics and to include therein brief excerpts from editorials and letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a report from a daily newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein extracts from three letters from constituents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include a resolution of protest from the United Irish-American Societies of New York City against the bill H. R. 1776.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief communication from a constituent, B. F. Phemster.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a radio speech I made on Saturday last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on the bill to raise the public-debt limit.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 of the California State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a quotation from Thomas Jefferson, Mark Twain, and others, compiled by Fred E. Knight, of Highspire, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER IN THE GALLERIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement to the guests in the galleries that he trusts may carry throughout the week. Any evidence in the galleries of approval or disapproval of what is occurring on the floor of the House is in violation of the rules of the House. Applause of approval or evidences of disapproval are in direct violation of the rules of the House. The Chair trusts that those in the galleries will help the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union in carrying out the rules of the House.

PROMOTION OF THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 89.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 89

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 consideration of H. R. 1776, a bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without inter-

vening motion except one motion to recommend, with or without instructions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York, ranking member of the Committee on Rules. At the present time I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. This rule makes in order H. R. 1776, a bill to promote the defense of the United States. The rule is a broad and liberal one. It provides for 3 days of general debate, after which it will be taken up and read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. This rule was granted by unanimous vote.

Last Thursday the Committee on Foreign Affairs filed its report, and on Saturday printed hearings were available to all Members. In view of that, and as the provisions of the bill have been commented upon by the press and radio, I feel that nearly every Member is familiar with it.

H. R. 1776 FALSELY LABELED A WAR MEASURE

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed unfortunate that a few men, while professing a desire for national defense, who have even heretofore unjustly accused the President of delaying the defense program, now classify this bill as a war measure. They say they are anxious to give all possible aid to Great Britain, but at the same time seek to tie the hands of the President, who is, after all, Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and who to a greater degree is opposed to war than any of these gentlemen. For unknown reasons they are opposed to granting him additional powers, and endeavor to set themselves up as possessing great knowledge of foreign affairs and conditions, notwithstanding that he has been from the beginning of hostilities abroad in a position to receive direct information—authentic and reliable reports through diplomatic channels—from our foreign offices, intelligence bureaus, and foreign observers.

When we considered the repeal of the Embargo Act the hue and cry was raised that we were rushing toward war, and that we did not have the defense of the country in mind. Those who criticized the Neutrality Act are silent about it now, for it is generally conceded that the law has safeguarded us. But now they attack the present bill in the same manner. The appeasers, the Lindberghs, Landons, Verne Marshalls, and even some Members of this House, go so far as to cry that this is a war measure. They have been proven wrong in the past, but still fight the President at every opportunity. Let me ask you: Who is in a better position to know of world conditions and their possible consequences insofar as this Nation is concerned? Would you say that Senator Wheeler, Colonel Lindbergh, Verne Marshall, or Mr. Davis are as qualified to speak as the President, General Pershing, Secretary Hull, and Rear Admiral Yarnell?

Surely no man in the history of our Nation has enjoyed the confidence of the country to a greater degree than the President has, and rightfully so. Even his enemies—those so strongly opposed to his humane policies and the New Deal—dare not question his patriotism and devotion to our country's interests.

I do not expect anything but attacks and criticisms heaped upon him by totalitarian propagandists, and by some misguided but well-meaning men and women, but it is hard for me to understand that men who should be aware of the dangers that are threatening our Nation should, as it appears to me, for political reasons, lend themselves at this critical time to creating even the smallest degree of dissension in our land.

EFFORTS OF THE PRESIDENT FOR WORLD PEACE

Colonel Lindbergh, who gained the applause of the Nation by being the first to fly across the ocean, suggested that the President should make an effort to bring about a negotiated peace, ignoring all the efforts the President has made. Or perhaps he may have been out of the United States on those occasions. But for his information and all others who advocate that such an effort be made, I wish to call their attention to the real efforts the President has constantly made in that direction. I particularly want to read you some extracts from a few of his speeches.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he intends to include in these statements in respect to the President's peace policy excerpts from the President's quarantine speech at Chicago?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And his stab-in-the-back speech in Virginia?

Mr. SABATH. I shall read from his Chicago speech of 1937, when he pleaded for preparedness and called attention to the war conditions abroad.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And does the gentleman intend also to include in his remarks the stab-in-the-back statement made in Virginia?

Mr. SABATH. No. I shall not include in my remarks all the statements the President has made, of course. But I do call attention to the fact that he did appeal to Mussolini, at which time he was assured that Italy would not enter the war.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Some 6 months before the invasion of Austria the President clearly and intuitively foresaw the war shadows over Europe. In his address in Chicago in October 1937, in which he outlined his attitude toward aggressor nations, he said:

It is my determination to pursue a policy of peace and to adopt every practical measure to avoid involvement in war. It ought to be inconceivable that in this modern era, and in the face of experience, any nation could be so foolish and ruthless as to run the risk of plunging the whole world into war by invading and violating in contravention of solemn

treaties, the territory of other nations that have done them no real harm and which are too weak to protect themselves adequately.

War is a contagion, whether it be declared or undeclared. It can engulf states and peoples remote from the original scene of hostilities. We are determined to keep out of war, yet we cannot insure ourselves against the disastrous effect of war and the danger of involvement. We are adopting such measures as will minimize our risk of involvement, but we cannot have complete protection in a world of disorder in which confidence and security have broken down.

America hates war.

These utterances have been repeated and emphasized by the President in language as strong and stronger, time and time again.

During Hitler's attempt at the rape of Czechoslovakia, the President desired to use his good offices in trying to mediate the situation. He communicated with Hitler on April 14, 1939:

Nothing can persuade the peoples of this earth that any governing power has any right or need to inflict the consequences of war on its own or any other people save in the cause of self-evident home defense. * * * I think you will not misunderstand the spirit of frankness in which I send you this message. Heads of great governments in this hour are literally responsible for the fate of humanity in the coming years. They cannot fail to hear the prayers of their peoples to be protected from the foreseeable chaos of war.

HITLER'S FALSE PROMISES

I, for one, feel that the President has done everything humanly possible—and not even Colonel Lindbergh or others could have used a more strong appeal than President Roosevelt has—for a continued peace. But in view of Hitler's past record, we know that no assurances or promises that he would give would be carried out or could be relied upon. How can we negotiate or even think of entering into negotiations with representatives of a government whose every utterance and action is based on lies, swindles, torture, tyranny, deceit, and brutality? Have we forgotten the long chain of promises, promise after promise, made and broken by the present German Government?

It began with one of the earliest and most subtle of statements made by Hitler on February 10, 1933, just a few days after coming into power:

The first and last point of the Government's program is that we won't lie and we won't swindle.

On May 17 of the same year as evidence of his good faith he said:

The German Government wishes to settle all difficult questions with other governments by peaceful methods. * * * The German people have no thought of invading any country.

This was repeated over and over, yet on October 14, 1933, Germany left the League of Nations, and on August 17, 1934, at Hamburg, Hitler continued to say:

The German Government, like the German people, are filled with the unconditional wish to make the greatest possible contribution to the preservation of peace in this world.

But in March of the following year, Hitler announced most exacting and de-

tailed plans of conscription. On January 30, 1936, Hitler said:

We want to be a peace-loving element among the nations. We cannot repeat that often enough.

Two months later Germany reoccupied the Rhineland and denounced the Locarno Pact.

In addressing a crowd at Breslau later on, Hitler said:

It is one of the most elementary principles that nations should allow each other to live within their own territories as they wish to live.

And after giving assurances in no uncertain terms to Schusnigg, Germany invaded Austria on March 11, 1938.

During the Czechoslovakia crisis this is what the Fuehrer had to say:

We want to live our own life, and we want other people to do the same.

Then came Munich. We need not tell that story over again. After Munich Hitler continued:

We have assured all our immediate neighbors of the integrity of their territory as far as Germany is concerned. That is no hollow phrase; it is our sacred will.

The Sudetenland is the last territorial claim which I have to make in Europe. I have assured Mr. Chamberlain, and I emphasize it now, that when this problem is solved, Germany has no more territorial problems in Europe.

Then several weeks later, in the form of a New Year's greeting to his people on January 1, 1939, Hitler said:

In general we have but one wish—that in the coming year we may be able to make our contribution to this general pacification of the whole world.

Thirty days later he continued:

Only the warmongers think there will be a war. I think there will be a long period of peace.

And then just 42 days later Hitler seized Czechoslovakia, and 6 days later annexed Memel.

In reply to President Roosevelt's plea for peace in a personal telegram sent to Adolf Hitler, Hitler had this to say:

Mr. Roosevelt believes that the "tides of events" is once more bringing the threat of arms, and that if this threat of arms continues a large part of the world is condemned to a common ruin. As far as Germany is concerned I know nothing of this kind of a threat to other nations.

As proof of this Hitler communicated with all other nations bordering on German soil, asking whether each feared or had any apprehension concerning its sovereignty. Each, of course, during the tenseness of the situation replied in the negative. Hitler then stated:

All states bordering on Germany have received much more binding assurances, and, above all, suggestions, than Mr. Roosevelt has asked from me in his curious telegram.

THE FATE OF NATIONS RECEIVING HITLER'S BINDING ASSURANCES

Well, here is a very brief review of some of the things that happened shortly thereafter to those nations that had received such binding assurances.

The Sudetenland was invaded on October 1, 1938, and Conrad Henlein, Nazi

leader, made Governor. Czechoslovakia, invaded on March 14, 1939, was given Baron von Neurath, German Nazi leader, as "protector." After mediation, Hitler appointed Dr. Joseph Tiso, a Slovakian Nazi leader, as "premier" of Slovakia. The occupation of Danzig was effected in September 1939, and Albert Forster, a native Nazi leader, was elected President of the Senate. Poland was invaded September 27, 1939, and Dr. Hans Frank, a German, was appointed Governor General. Denmark was invaded on April 9, 1940, and a German, Gen. Leonard Kaupisch, commander of the German Expeditionary Forces, was appointed Governor. Norway was invaded on May 2, 1940, and a Norwegian Nazi, Vidkun Quisling, was first placed in command, to be followed by Josef Terboven as German Governor General. The Netherlands was invaded on May 15, 1940, and Arthur Seyss-Inquart appointed German Commissar for the duration of the war. Belgium was invaded on May 28, 1940, and a German, Gen. Alexander Falkenhausen, was appointed military commander.

This then, is the history in brief of those small countries that received such binding assurances from Hitler.

As just another instance of Hitler's words compared to Hitler's acts, let us listen to what he had to say of Russia:

We see in Bolshevism a bestial, mad doctrine which is a threat to us. * * * I cannot make a pact with a regime whose first act is not the liberation of workmen but of the inmates of jails * * * we cannot negotiate with Jewish Communist leaders. * * *

There are two worlds. In Bolshevik Russia there is devastation, grim murder, and ruin. Here is laughter, happiness, and beauty.

Only a short time thereafter, to the amazement of the world, signatures were affixed to the now famous Russo-German Pact of August 21, 1939.

Before the pact with Russia, Hitler had this to say of Poland:

The Polish state respects the national conditions in this country, and Danzig and Germany respect Polish rights. Thus it has been possible to find the way to an understanding which, emanating from Danzig, in spite of the assertions of many mischief makers, has succeeded in removing all friction between Germany and Poland, and made it possible to work together in true amity.

Then, of course, in September of the same year Poland was invaded. On the same day Hitler announced to the world:

I will not war against women and children. I have ordered my air force to restrict itself to attacks on military objectives.

But the bombing of Polish open towns began on the first day of the war and on September 3 the *Athenia* was sunk.

Last week in his speech Hitler served notice that any vessel of this Nation which attempted to penetrate the war zone would be sunk. Certainly we have had every indication that any attempt to appease him would be useless. On March 18, 1938, on the floor of this House, I stated:

EXPRESSED BELIEF IN SECRET CONSPIRACY 3 YEARS AGO

Three years ago I voiced belief that a secret or tacit agreement existed between Hit-

ler, Mussolini, and Japan, but my warning went unheeded. The strategy practiced by those countries conformed exactly to that predicted by Professor Masaryk, who was intimately aware of Germany's ambitions.

In the Orient Japan pursued a course toward domination of the yellow races, apparently with preassurance that Italy and Germany would so engage the attention of the European democracies that interference in China would be impossible.

In Ethiopia Mussolini's war machine grinded to its conquest while Hitler's silence gave approval.

Internal dissent in Spain, nourished by the dictator countries, finally flamed into civil war, and the legions of Italian and German soldiers took stand in battle against the established government.

Hitler, demanding the return of Germany's lost colonies, only cloaked his purpose of European aggression, and it was long ago clear that he would one day climax the years of planned propaganda in Austria by an invasion of that country. His seizure of Austria is but a prelude of more ambitious plans. Peace- and liberty-loving Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and the other small independent nations now see his shadow across their lands—Memel, Danzig, and the Polish Corridor, Alsace-Lorraine, and the much-desired Ukraine.

It was apparent at the time that the threat extended to the Netherlands, Norway, and Belgium, but I hoped against hope that my fears were unfounded. Unfortunately everything I predicted, and even more, came to pass. I called attention then to the dangers to our country if Great Britain should be defeated. Today I am more positive of Nazi-Fascist dangers than I was even then, 3 years ago. Over 2 years ago the newspapers reported huge sums of money rumored to be deposited in nations throughout the world by the Hitler-Goebbels gang. It was clear then that this money was intended for propaganda and bribery, and only 9 short months ago Colonel Donovan, after a thorough investigation, reported that over \$200,000,000 had been spent for propaganda, not only in this country but in the South and Central American republics. We know the success he has had in other nations through the use of propaganda, which includes the deception of real patriots. Let us not be misled in this country by the same clever propaganda. We see in some of the arguments brought forward against this bill the stamp of foreign origin.

Just as Kaiser Wilhelm was misled into believing that his agents here would be able to weaken morale and create disension and discord to a point where internal chaos would promote German aims, so Hitler is deceiving himself. I do not fear that in the long run the American people will be misled, but we must be on our guard, and this is one instance where we must let our reason and love of democracy, liberty, and peace guide us in our conclusions, and not be influenced by foreign propaganda.

OUR SITUATION IF BRITAIN IS DEFEATED

If Britain loses, the invasion of South America is something we will have to contemplate. Remember, they would be closer to that continent than we are. They have organized powerful "fifth columns" in our sister republics there, and the South American armies certainly could not cope with the military might of Germany. Moreover, once established

there an invader could threaten the Panama Canal and from bases in northern South America could bomb our Caribbean bases and even the Gulf coast cities and the west coast. At the same time we would face Nazi attacks from Iceland and the Azores.

With Britain defeated and our own fleet divided between the Atlantic and the Pacific, air bases in Newfoundland and on the shores of Hudson Bay—and this is not a flight of the imagination—would threaten a great sweep of our country. The industrial northeast and the great cities of the Middle West would be within easy range of bombers.

Those who oppose this bill point to the fact that we are building a two-ocean navy and thousands of planes. They say we need only to look to our own defenses. Well, we are building a two-ocean navy. But it will not be ready until 1946. And we are building thousands of planes. But it will not be until 1942 that our plane-manufacturing capacity can equal that of the Nazis. In the meantime, we have got to keep war away from our shores, and the only way to do so is to see that Britain is given every possible aid. We must send them planes, tanks, guns, food, in ever increasing quantities. And it is no more an act of war for us to do so than it is for Russia and Sweden to supply Germany with the materials of war, as they are now doing. We must do everything within our power to keep England's fleet on the ocean, a first line of defense for this continent against warring aggressor nations. Listen to what Gen. John J. Pershing had to say:

I say to you, solemnly, that today may be the last time when by measures short of war we can still prevent war. If there is anything we can do to save the British Fleet, we shall be failing in our duty to America if we do not do it.

Listen to Rear Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, commander, Asiatic Squadron, United States Navy, 1936-39:

If Britain loses this war, we will face years of danger, with our Nation converted into a huge armed camp and a major part of the revenue spent for armament.

It is my fervid prayer that Americans throw aside all the propaganda that has been manufactured to defeat measures such as this, measures vital to the safety of America. This rule should be adopted and the bill passed. It is but one of many measures we should enact to guard against the danger of an aggressor threatening the Western Hemisphere.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 7 minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to this rule. It is an open rule providing for 3 days of general debate.

The Speaker has indicated to the minority that he would be very liberal, and that in case the Members wanted additional time we might sit late into the evening.

There is no disposition by the minority in any way to obstruct or delay the consideration of this bill, and we hope that it will be disposed of this week. I am taking time under the rule to discuss

the bill so that more time will be available to others in general debate.

At the beginning of this momentous debate, involving the destiny of America, I plead that the bill before us be considered on its merits or demerits without resort to personal abuse or vilification. The issues presented, of preserving our free institutions, representative and constitutional government, and keeping out of war, are so great and far reaching as to transcend all party lines. It is with humility and a prayer in my heart that I open the debate against what I term to be in its present form the dictator-war-bankruptcy bill.

I have felt from the beginning that this bill, the most important that has been brought before the Congress during the 20 years that I have been a Member, and one of the most important in the history of our Republic, must be largely determined on the floor of the House after full and free debate, and not in any committee of the House. Of the 14 Democratic votes cast for the bill in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a majority of them come from south of the Mason-Dixon line, with a population of approximately one-sixth of the Nation and where there is less opposition to intervention and war than in the rest of the country.

From reports I have been receiving there is a rising tide of resentment against this bill in the North and West, as a camouflaged attempt to get us into war without requiring the consent of Congress and as a slick device to further regiment America.

After weeks of hearings, I have reached the conclusion that the passage of H. R. 1776 without further amendments is a war measure and would be a betrayal of the constitutional power to declare war granted solely to the Congress, and would at the same time tend to destroy American democracy and free government in the United States.

The Members of Congress have a solemn and sacred responsibility not to surrender the control of the sword or the purse to the President and thereby establish a totalitarian system of government in America. It would mean the beginning of the end of our republican form of government based on three separate and independent departments of government.

This dictator-war-bankruptcy bill is a repudiation of every fundamental American concept of constitutional government. Under the guise of aiding democracies and fighting dictatorships abroad, it destroys democracy at home and sets up an American dictatorship.

I refuse to believe that Members of Congress will not safeguard their own constitutional rights by proper amendments, knowing that the passage of the bill would be the death knell of representative government in the United States and virtually the end of Congress as a deliberative and legislative body.

If the Congress grants the President such sweeping and blanket powers it will have no more authority left than the German Reichstag. There is no precedent for such action in peace or war in America.

Henceforth the Congress would be a mere rubber stamp to register the decrees and edicts of the President, if he condescends to ask for them. I do not believe that the flame of liberty has burned so low that the Congress will knowingly surrender its war-making powers to any one man. When that time comes the Congress should dissolve and confess its incompetency to continue as a legislative body.

Stripping Congress of its war-making powers or control of the purse was not mentioned in the Presidential campaign. President Roosevelt has no mandate from the people to demand such sweeping powers, nor has the Congress to commit the Nation to such an indefinable, limitless, and, therefore, uncontrollable program.

I submit that the objective of the bill, extending credit to Great Britain in order that she might secure munitions, planes, and ships, can easily be obtained and actually expedited, provided the dangerous and limitless powers granted the President are eliminated. The responsibility for destroying national unity and delaying the enactment of the bill rests squarely with the President and not on the Congress, for asking such excessive and unconstitutional powers. The President does not need such powers to extend all possible aid to Great Britain short of war and consistent with our own national defense.

There has been no public demand for the transfer of the war powers from Congress to the President. The American people have not been consulted, nor have the millions of American youth who will have to do the fighting. [Applause.]

I agree with John Bassett Moore, probably the best-known authority on international law and almost as great an authority on constitutional law, that—there can be no doubt that, under the guise of certain phraseology, the pending bill assumes to transfer the war-making power from the Congress, in which the Constitution lodges it, to the Executive.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States declared that—

This bill, if enacted into law, by the very power it proposes to grant, creates the possibility of this Nation entering into war without further action by the Congress.

Even the New York Herald Tribune, the most consistent pro-British and interventionist newspaper in America, denounced the transfer of excessive, dangerous, and unprecedented powers to the President, and called the bill a downright tragedy because it destroyed national unity and created discord throughout the land.

I have never known any bill about which there has been so much hypocrisy, misrepresentation, and shameless falsehood.

Secretary Knox only a few days ago demanded the passage of the bill immediately in order to save England from invasion within the next few months. There is nothing in the bill that will make available any war supplies to Great Britain before the early part of 1942 except the transfer or giving away of our Navy, which the President has said he would not do.

Eighty percent of the American people are in sympathy with the gallant fight that the British people are making, but 90 percent do not believe that it is our war and want to stay out. If it is our war, we should have gone into it long ago. However, we did not start it and the American people have never authorized any ambassador or anyone else to involve us.

I have no patience with the hypocritical, craven, and cowardly attitude of some of the witnesses for the bill, who unblushingly stated because Hitler's mighty army could overrun Denmark, Holland, and Belgium, its next-door neighbors, that it would cross 3,000 miles of ocean to invade us.

Our security has been and must always be entirely dependent on our own Navy, our own armed forces, and today upon 130,000,000 loyal and free Americans who hate all foreign forms of dictatorship and aggression.

We have much more to fear from the war makers from within than from our enemies from without. [Applause.]

There is no such thing as a halfway war, or not sending millions of American soldiers to fight all over the world once the Rubicon of war is crossed. As long as we maintain the greatest Navy in the world I fear no invasion from Hitler, but I do fear that the interventionists such as the Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson and the Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox will involve us in war on two continents at the same time, if this bill passes without the amendments that we will offer to restore the war-making power to Congress.

The proponents of the bill praised it as a peace measure. How do they account for its violent support by such open warmakers as General O'Ryan, Dorothy Thompson, and former Ambassador Gerard, who, not satisfied with helping to involve us in one war 23 years ago, now wants to put us into another?

I respect the intellectual honesty and refreshing candor of my distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], who strips the hypocritical peace buncombe from the bill and calls it by its right name—a war measure—and supports it as such.

If the dictator-war bill passes unamended in the Congress, I predict that within 6 months we will be involved in war in Europe and Asia; that the Government will take over our vital industries; that our civil rights will be suspended, and that we will have dictatorship in America comparable to the Nazis and Communists.

I appeal to all Members of Congress, irrespective of party, to act solely for what is the best interests of America, and not to make a scrap of paper out of the Constitution, and not to vote for this dictator-war-bankruptcy bill without adequate amendments.

I shall conclude by quoting from the words of two great Americans, both profound defenders of the Constitution, Abraham Lincoln and Daniel Webster.

Lincoln had this to say:

At what point, then, is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us it must spring up among us. It cannot come

from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher.

Daniel Webster, whose faith in America and the Constitution are known to every schoolboy, said:

I shall know but one country. The ends I serve shall be my country's, my God's, and truth's. I was born an American. I will live an American. I shall die an American, and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me to the end of my career. I mean to do this with absolute disregard of personal consequences.

I am opposed to this war-dictator bill, unless drastically amended.

I favor lending \$2,000,000,000 to Great Britain for war supplies immediately.

As long as I am a Member of Congress I shall exert every influence at my command to build up our national defense and to keep America out of war unless attacked, as foreign wars are the surest way to destroy the Republic and to bring ruin, bloodshed, and bankruptcy to the American people.

War is not inevitable, nor is the passage of this bill, without effective amendments. That is the propaganda of the defeatists, interventionists, and war makers.

This bill must not pass in its present form, if we are to keep out of war and preserve our liberty, democracy, and American way of life and system of government for Americans yet unborn.

We are still a young nation, only in the morning of its glorious destiny. If there is any country worth living in, preserving and defending, it is the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman states that he is in favor of making a loan of \$2,000,000,000 to Great Britain. Did I understand him correctly?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the gentleman opposed repeal of the Johnson Act and also opposed giving any loans to Great Britain heretofore?

Mr. FISH. I am very glad the gentleman asked that question, because if he had not asked it I was going to speak on it anyhow and right at this point.

Those of us in this House who opposed repeal of the arms embargo believed that assurances were given to foreign nations that the Arms Embargo Act would be repealed, and that that was one of the causes of the war. We further believed that if assurances had not been given, the war as we know it today would not have broken out in all probability, but there would have been some settlement over Danzig, and if war had taken place it would have been in the direction of the Ukraine and Soviet Russia. Those of us who voted against repeal of the arms embargo repeatedly stated on the floor of this House that we believed that was the first step toward involving us in war; that the next step would be the lending of money, either through private sources or by the Government, which is this bill; and the third step, we said, would be to take us into foreign wars.

Mr. Speaker, step by step we are marching down that road to war. We predicted when we opposed repeal of the arms embargo just that. I am confident today that the situation throughout the world would be entirely different if we had not repealed that part of the Neutrality Act, and that Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France would still be free and independent nations. We believe if this bill is passed unamended we will be in this war within 6 months' time, and with it the doom of our free institutions and tying up from now on the destiny of America with the eternal wars in Europe and Asia. We are well on the road to quarantine the world with American blood and treasure.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that war had broken out before the arms embargo was repealed?

Mr. FISH. We had already considered the neutrality bill in the House. By a very close vote it went over to the Senate, where it was pending, then war broke out; but assurances were given that the arms embargo would be repealed, and I do not believe that the allied nations would have gone to war if we had served notice on the world at that time that we would not participate in foreign wars by becoming the potential slaughterhouse of the world.

Of course, when the arms embargo was repealed it became the law of the land, and I and those who fought against it believe in upholding the laws of our country. By the repeal of the arms embargo, foreign warring nations could come over here and buy our war supplies. From that time on I have upheld the law and I have advocated letting these nations come here under that law to buy all of our war materials.

I am even willing to go further, provided we do not surrender our constitutional power over the purse and sword, and provide \$2,000,000,000 immediately in order that Great Britain may buy munitions, airplanes, and merchant ships, but, under the provisions of this bill, none of which will be available before the beginning of next year.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House heard all of the testimony offered before the committee?

Mr. FISH. I did.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Was it contended by any witness who appeared either for the bill or against the bill that passage of the bill was necessary to facilitate the production of arms and implements for war in this country?

Mr. FISH. I do not think they did. From what I understand, we have all the power right now, or perhaps I should say the President has all the necessary power and can exert that authority and does not need the excessive powers contained in this bill, which would permit him to give away part of our Navy, and permit

foreign warships to come into our ports for repairs and make bases of our ports—in other words, bringing the war over to America. The President has the power today to produce anything he wants in America.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I understand, then, it was not contended that passage of this bill is necessary to increase or facilitate production of arms and armament in this country?

Mr. FISH. It was not. Mr. Knudsen stated that he had all necessary power now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 21 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I wish to answer these harsh, rash remarks of the gentleman, and if he has no one else I move the previous question.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, to me this bill (H. R. 1776) is a war measure, not a defense measure. It is ironical that in the year 1776 we declared our independence and in H. R. 1776 we declare our dependence upon Great Britain. In the one instance we gained our freedom, and in this instance we run the risk of losing it. [Applause.]

I am unalterably opposed to this lease-lend bill because of the vast delegation of power, the inherent financial liability, and its threatening potentialities of involving this Nation in war. Should we become involved in this war to preserve democracy abroad, I am convinced we shall lose our own democracy.

Under this bill Congress abdicates and delegates its constitutional powers to the President. No President in the history of this country has enjoyed such power, even in wartime, as this measure delegates. "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law," section 3 provides that the President may sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of any defense articles to the Government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States. Defense articles are so broadly defined as to embrace practically everything in the United States that could conceivably be used for the purpose of national defense. This bill authorizes the President not only to dispose of any or all of our Army and Navy equipment, but also to procure any defense article for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States. The committee amendment limiting this authority to contractual obligations incurred before July 1, 1943, is in fact no limitation at all because all the damage will have been done long before that date and the obligations incurred may last indefinitely. Since many of the proponents of this measure have declared that Great Britain is our first line of defense, how long will it be before our Army and Navy equipment is transferred to that assumed first line of defense?

I am unwilling to acknowledge this European war as our war. I do not accept the theory that the British Navy

is our first line of defense. If we strengthen our own national defense and adhere to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine we can ward off any threat of invasion in this hemisphere.

Proponents of this bill argue that it will speed aid to Britain. Britain needs planes, tanks, and ships. Orders for these have already been given priority under existing law. Shipments have been limited only by our industrial capacity, and not by a lack of Executive authority. Under the circumstances, what is the motive behind this bill unless it is to place at the disposal of Great Britain our naval and military equipment—the essentials we need to defend our own shores.

If we jeopardize our own national security by risking our defense equipment in the European or Asiatic war, how long will it be before we send American boys to protect that equipment? Men will follow our national-defense equipment just as surely as night follows day.

If we become involved in the European war, we will automatically become involved in the Far East. Can we afford the gamble involved in this bill? Are you willing to concede that this is our war, and that England is our first line of defense? Are you willing to abdicate your constitutional rights and delegate this war-making power to the President? My answer is "No." I refuse to silence the voice of the people of my district by voting for this measure. [Applause.]

The inherent financial liability under this bill to the taxpayers of this Nation is unlimited. The argument offered that Congress still holds the purse strings is fallacious. Under this bill the President can transfer billions of dollars worth of our commodities, as well as naval and military equipment, for which we have already appropriated the money. Does anyone doubt that if our defense equipment is stripped Congress would refuse to replace that needed equipment by voting the necessary appropriations? If this bill passes, Congress will be absolutely unable to limit the amount of money that may be donated to foreign governments in the form of defense articles. I do not concede that we are justified in giving the American taxpayers' money to any foreign country.

If our democracy is to survive, we must build up our own national defenses and strengthen our internal economy. The last war has cost this Nation about \$30,000,000,000. We have not yet recovered from the maladjustments resulting from that war. H. R. 1776 would shift the financial burden of the war to the American taxpayers. With a \$60,000,000,000 national debt staring us in the face, how much of the burden of foreign wars can this Nation assume before it becomes bankrupt?

We now have the will, the men, the equipment, and the money necessary to defend this country against the invasion of any foreign power, or any group of foreign powers. We have the richest and most powerful nation in the world, with half the world's industrial production capacity, and the strongest and most efficient Navy. We have the high-

est living standards of any country on the face of the globe. Why should we tremble in fear of any nation that would be so foolish as to attempt an invasion of this hemisphere? Strict adherence to the Monroe Doctrine kept this Nation out of European wars for a hundred years. I believe in maintaining that doctrine, which tolerates no interference in the Western Hemisphere by any non-American power, and likewise places an obligation on the United States not to interfere in wars of Europe or Asia. The United States will fight to uphold the Monroe Doctrine, but this bill scraps the Monroe Doctrine. Likewise, it punctures the Neutrality Act, the Johnson Act, and every other law in conflict with it.

If further financial aid to Great Britain, or to any of the other countries not specified by but embraced in this bill, can be justified, let us consider a measure for that purpose with the objectives clearly defined. The delegation of power in the bill before us is so sweeping that if it passes Congress will have surrendered representative government.

I fear passage of this bill, with its war-making possibilities, will be the fatal step that involves us in war. I volunteered and served in the last war. My ancestors came from the British Isles. My sympathies are with England in her valiant fight against the dictator powers. I hope she wins, and that the cause of democracy will triumph in Europe. However, my allegiance is to the United States [applause], and I am not willing to involve this Nation in war on the theory that Hitler can be conquered by such action. I am convinced that if we become involved in this war to preserve democracy abroad we will lose it at home. I hate nazi-ism, fascism, and communism. Nations that impoverish themselves and impair their financial stability in war become the easy prey of such ideologies.

Let us remember some of the lessons we learned in the last war. We entered that war to make the world safe for democracy. What was the outcome? The rise of communism, fascism, and nazism in Europe. Our reward was \$12,000,000,000 of defaulted debts, billions of dollars in worthless foreign securities, and the ingratitude of the world. We have not yet recovered from that war.

Should we become involved in this one and suffer as did the European powers in the last war, could our constitutional democracy withstand the economic and political repercussions that follow in the wake of war? [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as between my colleagues the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE], together with Mr. Lindbergh and Mr. Marshall, on one side, with their attacks on the bill, and on the other side General Pershing, Rear Admiral Yarnell, Secretary Hull, and the President, I am inclined to follow the last four gentlemen and men like them who have the information and who are just as loyal and patriotic Americans as any that can be found anywhere. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, for 3 days this proposition will be debated. I presume that other gentlemen will lay down reasons for opposition to this bill similar to those given by the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Nebraska. I presume both of these gentlemen would say they are in favor of all aid to Britain short of war. Then, to further that argument, they say that this bill delegates to the President of the United States some power which, if abused, will get us into war.

During these 3 days I shall be listening to this debate, and I want somebody to point out to this House what reason it is that would motivate the President of the United States, by the employment of some devious method, some deceit, or something else, to tell the people of the United States repeatedly that he is unalterably opposed to our sending men to Europe. Let them tell the Members of this House what it is that causes him to mislead the people, if he is not telling the truth. Is there some deep, sinister reason? Is this fellow who is the President of the United States not an American citizen? Does he not love this country? Is he not as strong for democracy as any of the gentlemen who will oppose this bill? Tell them, if you will, what further could come to the President of the United States if some sort of a totalitarian government were set up here. Is he going to send the Congress home? Let us not use catch phrases.

I will be here, and I will be happy to hear any gentleman in opposition to this bill give sound reasons why the President would want to do these terrible things that they say he likely will do if this bill becomes law. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I made and insert therein editorials from today's New York Times.

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

There was no objection.

PROMOTION OF THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I 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. 1776) further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1776, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, bill H. R. 1776 translates into concrete form our national policy of aid to Britain.

If Congress is to carry out the will of the people and is to shed more light than heat on the problem, we should all examine and know precisely what the policy is that we are trying to carry out and just how the bill does it.

Our present national policy—a policy formulated by the people of this country through their elected officials—is clear and clean-cut: (1) We are for staying out of physical combat, and (2) we are for all possible and effective material aid to Britain and those other nations who are resisting the forces of aggression.

Now let's look at this policy a little more closely. There has been a lot of loose talk about acts of war and other highfalutin terms. War in terms of either a formal declaration or physical combat, or both, is an essentially practical and horrible thing. In these days, physical combat is not merely a matter of the abstractions of the erudite international lawyers. There are two angles from which we can look at war in a realistic sense. From Germany's standpoint, for example, she doesn't need excuses such as so-called acts of war to engage us in physical combat. If Germany thinks she needs any excuses, she has had a long practice of making them up. The fact is that in a technical sense the destroyer transaction has been called an act of war by many in this country. However, even the German propaganda office criticized the transaction not from the standpoint of what this country did, but on the contrary said that Britain had gotten the short end of the deal by selling its birthright for a mess of pottage.

From Germany's viewpoint, we know, as a matter of horse sense, that she isn't going to engage us in combat—excuses or no excuses—unless she thinks that it is in her best interests to do so. If she engages us in combat, she knows that our Navy, and our air force, and our manpower, and our productive system working under the highly emotional drive of a war psychology will be thrown in against her. In this light, Germany unquestionably views and will continue to view what this country does in aiding Britain.

Consequently, it isn't hard-headed completely to tie up aid to Britain with the risk of war. Even without aid to Britain—in other words, by no action at all—the risk of war is greater than it is by our giving material aid to Britain. If Germany defeats Britain, does anyone doubt that we would have to continue spending more billions than we are now spending for our own defense? If Britain, by her gallant effort, holds out or wins, does anyone doubt that we will be getting precious time to prepare ourselves, or that we will cut down our expenditures for defense? In terms of our people, if Britain wins, do you think we will be fighting them within our lifetime? If Germany wins, will our manpower be fighting them in our lifetime? Britain's heroic fight is not only giving us time and more time to prepare our defense, but her expansion of our plants and her generous contributions to us of things like the Rolls-Royce Merlin Aircraft Engine, the power-driven turret,

and other invaluable information has immeasurably helped to push forward our own defense program. It is obvious that aid to Britain has not been a one-way proposition. As each day goes by we are better prepared. Despite the confusing talk on the subject there can be little doubt that the stronger we get and the stronger we are, the more likely we are to prevent war for this country. Unfortunately, Hitler understands only one language—force. If we are strong enough, he is going to hesitate before taking us on. Aiding Britain is giving us the time to get strong enough.

In the light of this policy, let's look at what H. R. 1776 provides as compared to the general talk in a vacuum about the bill. Ask any of the historic critics of the bill who shout dictatorship, war, and the other emotional generalities some questions like this: What do you think section 4 of the bill provides in words of one syllable that the man in the street can understand? It provides that any war equipment which is transferred to Britain, for example, cannot be transferred to any other foreign country without the consent of the President. Is that dictatorship, does that put us in the middle of the road to war? What rational objection can there be to such a provision?

What does section 5 of the bill provide? It provides that if any war equipment is sold or transferred to Britain, an accurate record should be kept by the Administrator of Export Control, showing in detail the quantity disposed of, the character of the equipment, its value, the terms of the disposition, and the destination of the disposition, and that this information should be reported to the Congress. Is that a copy of Mr. Hitler's totalitarian methods? Are we in war if we do that?

What does section 6 of the bill provide? It provides that the Congress is authorized to appropriate the necessary money to carry out the purposes of the Act and that any moneys collected from the disposition of war equipment under the bill shall go into a 2-year revolving fund out of which more equipment can be manufactured or purchased. This means that Congress retains the power which the Constitution gives it over the purse strings. It means that detailed budget estimates have to be submitted to the Director of the Budget. These estimates have to be carefully reviewed by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress and Congress has to vote its approval or disapproval before the money is available to manufacture or purchase more of the equipment which can be disposed of under the bill. Is the retention by Congress of this careful supervisory and determination power over the money which is necessary to make this bill completely effective Hitlerian? Is it subverting the Constitution to give Congress control over the purse strings?

What does section 7 of the bill provide? It provides that the Secretaries of War and Navy in any agreement for disposing of war equipment to Britain, for example, must fully protect the patent and other rights of American manu-

facturers. Is this a dictatorial deprivation of the property of American manufacturers? Is this an unconstitutional disregard of the rights of our citizens?

What does section 8 of the bill provide? It provides that the Secretaries of War and Navy are authorized, for example, to purchase arms, ammunition, and implements of war in Bolivia or Canada, for example, if the President deems it necessary in the interest of the defense of the United States. If to make planes we find that we don't have enough tin or aluminum, and Bolivia or Canada can produce and sell tin or aluminum to us, the President can authorize the purchase of it if he deems it necessary in the interest of our defense. Is such a practical recognition of the interest of our national defense dictatorship—an unconstitutional act?

What does section 9 of the bill provide? It provides that the President may formulate rules and regulations which are necessary to carry out the provisions of the act and may empower a department or agency of the Government to act for him, if necessary, under the act. This rule-making power, as the Supreme Court has often said, is limited to filling in the details of the operation of the act consistent with its terms and purposes. Obviously, the rule-making power would not give the President the power to send an expeditionary force abroad, because there is nothing in the act that even remotely suggests that the President is given such a power. The rules and regulations which can be formulated under the bill are those which directly relate to the specific purposes of the bill and the specific powers granted under it. The power to delegate certain functions is a purely practical proposition. The President is, after all, only one person and cannot single-handedly administer the whole Federal Government. That is why we have great executive departments and agencies. Thus, for example, the President might well delegate to the Secretaries of War and Navy, acting with their technical experts, the power to formulate standard specifications for aircraft engines which would meet, in one set of specifications, the needs of this country and the needs of Britain.

There are only nine sections in the bill, and I have already raised questions about six of them. Now let's look at the other three. Section 1 of the bill provides that:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as "An Act to Promote the Defense of the United States."

Section 2 of the bill is the one that contains the definitions. And, of course, definitions have no meaning except in their relationship to the essential parts of the bill.

That leaves one section of the bill—section 3. Without a doubt, this is the most important section. It could have been drawn in muffled words so that only a Philadelphia lawyer could understand it. However, it is drawn as clearly, as bluntly, as straightforwardly as lucid English can make it. It could have provided that the President be given the power, acting through the Secretaries of War and Navy, to dispose of military

equipment of the Army and Navy to Britain upon such terms as he deems satisfactory. Unquestionably, the broader power to dispose would have carried with it the less important power to manufacture the equipment. However, to make it clear and to avoid any doubts as to what the legislation was intended to do, it specifically provides that notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other department or agency of the Government to (1) manufacture in our arsenals and factories or purchase from private manufacturers war matériel for Britain and for any other country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States; (2) to test, inspect, prove, etc., such war matériel; (3) to communicate to Britain, for example, information about how to use equipment transferred to it; (4) to transfer the equipment to Britain for payment in kind, property, or any other direct or indirect benefit to the United States; and (5) to authorize Britain to take the equipment to England in its own bottoms. You will note that all the powers are related to the power of disposition. It would be meaningless and futile to say that the President could dispose of 50 tanks in exchange for some rubber if the War Department, for example, could not place an order for the tanks, could not lease them when they are finished, could not tell the British how to use the tanks, and could not let Britain take them over to England in her own vessels.

The only other power which is granted by section 3 that doesn't relate to disposition is the one enabling the President to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to repair British men-of-war in our navy yards. If we are to give material aid to Britain in a way that doesn't increase our risks of physical combat with Germany, this is the clear-cut way of doing it.

Great stock has been placed in the prefatory phrase to this section of the bill that notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may authorize the Secretaries of War and Navy to dispose of war equipment to Britain and those nations whose defense is vital to the defense of the United States. Don't let that talk scare you by any means. Those are words of the lawyer's art, but are easily understood by laymen. They mean something quite definite. They mean that a bill, such as this one, covering the disposition of military and naval equipment to foreign governments, temporarily suspends specific statutes covering the same subject matter or inconsistent with it. They do not mean that all prior laws are automatically repealed or put out of the window by these magic words. Thus, for example, a great deal of shouting has been done on the basis that these words would empower American battleships to convoy British merchantmen to England. Nothing could be farther from the truth. There isn't a single thing in this bill

which in any way even remotely suggests that the powers of this Government to convoy are in any way increased, enlarged, or changed. Under existing law, the President, as Commander-in-Chief of the Navy under the Constitution, has the power to authorize our Navy, for example, to convoy American vessels. Thus, for instance, if our trade routes to South America were harassed by pirates, the President could order our destroyers, cruisers, or battleships to convoy an American flagship to South America. That is one of the things the Navy is for. But that has nothing to do with the bill now before Congress. In fact, the bill contains a specific amendment stating that it in no way authorizes conveying by naval vessels of the United States.

On the other hand, the prefatory phrase, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law," would make inoperative that section of the law passed by Congress last summer which requires a certificate of the Chief of Staff or the Chief of Naval Operations before the Government can dispose of any military or naval equipment. Now, of course, that section providing for a certificate in terms of the Constitution and in terms of sound administration, doesn't make very much sense. To require a constitutional officer to get a certificate from a subordinate officer before the superior officer can act is not good constitutional law. Furthermore, if the purpose of the bill is effectively to aid Britain and China and Greece with supplies and matériel, it does not make very much sense to say that every time an obsolescent plane is transferred to one of these countries, the President or the Secretaries of War and Navy would first have to get a certificate from one of their subordinates. As a practical matter, of course, consultation will be had with the experts who know the field before the disposition is made to see to it that what is done is in the best interests of our own defense.

Under the central power of disposition which is given to the President and which has been characterized as completely dictatorial, several facts should be kept in mind. In the first place, there has been a great deal of confusion about the difference between the normal powers of the President in relationship to domestic affairs in normal times, and those of the President in the field of foreign affairs and national defense. Even in relationship to domestic affairs, there are thousands of instances of grants of discretionary power by the Congress to the President. However—

It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power, but with such an authority plus the very delicate, plenary and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations. * * * It is quite apparent that, if in the maintenance of our international relations, embarrassment—perhaps serious embarrassment—is to be avoided and success of our aims achieved, congressional legislation which is to be made effective through negotiation and inquiry within the international field must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom

from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved.

When the President is to be authorized by legislation to act in respect of a matter intended to affect a situation in foreign territory, the legislator properly bears in mind the important consideration that the form of the President's action—or, indeed, whether he shall act at all—may well depend, among other things, upon the nature of the confidential information which he has or may thereafter receive, or upon the effect which his action may have upon our foreign relations. This consideration, in connection with what we have already said on the subject, discloses the unwisdom of requiring Congress in this field of governmental power to lay down narrowly definite standards by which the President is to be governed.

Now who do you think said that? Some hysterical warmonger who is in favor of H. R. 1776? Certainly not. It was said in 1936 by Mr. Justice Sutherland, speaking for the United States Supreme Court in the case of United States against Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation et al.

The history in this country of the grant of discretionary power to the President in matters of foreign affairs and defense is one of long standing. In 1794, the President was "authorized whenever in his opinion the public safety shall so require" to embargo all ships and vessels in ports of the United States, including those of foreign nations—

under such regulations as the circumstances of the case may require and to continue or restrict same whenever he shall think proper.

In 1795, Congress provided that notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the President should have the discretionary power to permit the export of arms, cannon, and military stores if he deemed such prohibition connected with the security of the commercial interests of the United States. From 1794 right on up to the present, there are hundreds of acts granting the President discretionary power in the fields of foreign affairs and defense. If you wish to read them in detail, you will find them all set forth, with approval by the Supreme Court, in the Curtiss-Wright case.

Argument has also been made that this section 3 of the bill empowers the President to give away the Navy. That our President now or any other President would think of doing such a thing is sheer nonsense. There is no question about the fact that the bill empowers the President to authorize the Secretaries of War or Navy to dispose of equipment which their Departments now have on hand or on order if it is in the best interests of our own national defense to do so. The reason for the grant of this power is the same reason as that given by the Supreme Court in the Curtiss-Wright case. There may be many and very complex situations where it will be highly desirable in the interest of our own defense to dispose of equipment which the Army and Navy already has on hand. Thus, for example, in a situation such as the destroyer transaction,

our own defense was substantially benefited in two very practical ways: (1) We acquired invaluable bases which extended our line of defense miles away from our own coast; and (2) at the same time, we supplied to Britain great assistance in its convoy and other naval work in such a way that we helped to get additional time for ourselves to build our own defenses. In this time that we so purchased, we are daily getting newer and more modern destroyers to replace the over-age ones that were disposed of in exchange for bases. It is equally conceivable, for example, that if we develop and get into production on a new type of pursuit ship or long-range bomber that is better than anything we now have on hand in sufficient quantities to meet our needs, it might be desirable to transfer some of these older pursuit ships or bombers in exchange for more bases, for rubber or tin, or for other benefits to our own defense. The situation today is fast-moving and complex. Decisions can only be adequately and efficiently made by those men who know the facts, who have the technical knowledge and experience, and who are acting in the interest of our own defense. To suggest that every time an obsolescent four-engine bomber is to be transferred to Britain, Congress should determine whether it should be disposed of and upon what terms, is the sheerest impracticability either from the standpoint of keeping us out of war through dictatorial or unconstitutional powers or effective aid to Britain in our own defense.

The fact is that there are innumerable checks imposed by the bill and by other laws. In the first place, the bill enables the President to act through the Secretaries of War and Navy. No President and no Secretary of War or Navy is going to dispose of any past or future equipment without consulting their technical advisers who know most about our defense matériel. None of these people are going to sanction the disposition of military or naval equipment to the extent that it denudes or weakens our own defenses. No order for new equipment can be placed under existing law unless it is first approved by the Office of Production Management and by the War and Navy Departments, who will be the agencies actually placing the orders.

Under the Constitution and existing law, neither the Secretary of War nor the Secretary of the Navy can place an order or make a commitment unless their Departments have the money to do so. The only way they can get this money is for Congress to appropriate it. As a general practice, Congress appropriates money for each fiscal year. So, in consequence, when people talk about a time limit on the President's powers, there is in fact a time limit imposed by the constitutional and legislative provisions relating to appropriations. However, to avoid any doubt on this, there is an amendment in the bill terminating the powers granted on July 1, 1943. There are also many other limitations upon the exercise of the powers granted under the bill. Matériel can only be disposed of when it is in the interest of our national

defense to do so, and when it is disposed of to a nation whose defense is vital to the United States. Obviously, there would be no power under the bill enabling the Government to dispose of airplanes, for example, to Germany, Italy, or Japan. Similarly, there would be no authority under present circumstances for disposing of naval equipment to Tahiti. Such fantastic speculation and hypothetical assumptions are the foundation stones of many of the critics of the bill.

The bill is short, direct, and to the point. The people of the United States, with their fundamental horse sense, know that, in the light of our clear-cut national policy to keep out of war and effectively to aid Britain, the bill is the most efficient and forthright way to execute our policy in a manner consistent with our long history of the democratic way of doing things. They know that bill H. R. 1776 is the best way to safeguard our land and our liberty. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 1 minute to ask a question which he desires to propound to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the disposition of the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield time; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois for the purpose of asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, or I will address the question to the committee, during the last several days I observed there was a conference between the British Ambassador, the Senate chairman of Foreign Relations, and the House chairman of Foreign Affairs. After all, that is rather extraordinary procedure. I am wondering whether that conference was invoked as a result of invitation from the Hill and whether or not anything was disclosed there that might be material to the discussion that will take place on this floor.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I think the only thing that is unusual about any procedure is for the gentleman from Illinois to ask such a question. I think it is very improper.

Mr. TABER. Why not?

Mr. BLOOM. I am answering this, and that is "why not," and please obey the rules of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 1 minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute. I want to answer this question.

If the gentleman from Illinois and the other gentlemen who want to get into trouble keep on being suspicious about

anything that any nation is doing, such as this question today, that is the quickest way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Ambassador from the Court of St. James's, following the usual custom, called upon the Vice President, the Speaker, and, I believe, the leader of the House, and then the Ambassador called upon the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Saturday morning I received a telephone call asking me whether I would be pleased to receive the new British Ambassador. Naturally, your chairman is not going to allow the Ambassador of England or of any other country to outdo him in politeness, and when any man suggests he wants to come and see me at my office, as your chairman I am going to say, "Yes."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself sufficient time to answer. We might as well get at the bottom of this thing.

The British Ambassador called at my office. He did not sneak in. The press knew he was there, and everyone knew he was there, and we sat down and had a nice talk. The principal topic of conversation, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] wants to know what it was, was about Magna Carta. Maybe the gentleman has heard of Magna Carta at some time or other [laughter]; and we were talking about the exhibit of Magna Carta at the World's Fair in New York City. Then the Ambassador said:

Will you kindly let me know what the timetable is?

I never heard of the expression "timetable." And then the Ambassador said:

I would like to know what the procedure is; what is the procedure in the House?

Which, as everyone knows, is a matter of general knowledge. Then I knew what he meant, and I explained to the Ambassador that we have 3 days of debate and then it comes up under the 5-minute rule, open for amendments, and explained to him just what the procedure in the House would be with reference to the bill.

Now, that is the secret that the gentleman from Illinois wants to know about, and that is the kind of a secret that I want the world to know about; and please remember that we do not carry on the deliberations of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House behind closed doors. That is my answer.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that there is no Member of this committee or of the Congress who would regard my question as improper. It was uttered in absolute sincerity. In my humble judgment it has tremendous bearing upon the issue that confronts the country today. No one can deny that it is extraordinarily unusual procedure for the ambassador of a foreign country to contact the chairmen of committees dealing with foreign relations for the purpose of discussing "timetables." Now, it appeared in the press of Saturday, as I recall, and again of yesterday,

and today I find another item on page 3, of the Washington Daily News for today, under this caption:

Halifax's indiscretion will lose some votes for aid-to-Britain bill.

So out of that background this question was propounded because if the British Ambassador did discuss timetables, if he did discuss the precariousness of the situation, if he did discuss the urgency of action, and gave to these two gentlemen matters of information that are not available to the House, then the fact that the destiny of America hangs in the balance, and the fact that there is no issue which concerns the Republic today which is so grave and momentous as the one now before us, demands that the Congress be advised what the Ambassador from Great Britain may have said to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

So, Mr. Chairman, in the utmost good faith I submitted the question to the gentleman from New York, because I think it is a very proper question at this momentous hour and I say further to my good friend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the question was asked in the utmost sincerity and good grace, and while the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, gives to it a certain casual implication, yet the photographers must have been there. I do not impute for a moment that it was a staged incident at all, but the Ambassador spent 15 minutes with Senator GEORGE and discussed timetables, and if something was discussed that is of moment to the Congress, we should know it and we should know it now, at the inception of the discussion of this rather crucial question. [Applause.]

The item referred to above and the editorial from today's issue of the Washington Daily News are as follows:

WHY THE HURRY-UP TALK?

Lord Halifax must know quite well that there is not the slightest possibility of Congress refusing to vote aid—enormous aid—to England.

He must know also that, if the advertised invasion of the island is to be undertaken soon, there is precious little that Congress can do to accelerate our service of supply before that show-down occurs.

So we are moved to curiosity about the noble Ambassador's visits to congressional offices, where he has been making personal inquiries about the legislative "timetable" on the aid-England bill.

It is highly unusual, and in ordinary circumstances might be regarded as highly irregular, for a foreign ambassador to proceed in this manner. For domestic persons with axes to grind at the Capitol we have a name—lobbyists. But at least Lord Halifax is open and aboveboard, and we aren't disposed to criticize him for going direct to the source for his information.

What we do question is the need for a speed-up of the legislative process.

If it is true—and we have heard nothing convincing to the contrary—that even if the lend-lease bill were passed this afternoon it would not increase American shipments to England in the next few months, then what's the hurry?

It is human nature that the administration, having settled upon this policy and written this bill, should want to get the debate over

and done with. But it is also understandable that there are differences of opinion in Congress concerning the form the measure should take. And it will take time to explore and debate, in the normal way, all these differences.

If it were possible, by passing a bill in a hurry, to conjure up overnight a lot of new bombers and what not for England, there would be some point to the hurry-up talk. But since the bill deals with eventual and not immediate supplies, it doesn't seem clear why Congress should give this possibly fateful measure less than the fullest discussion.

HALIFAX'S INDISCRETIONS WILL LOSE SOME VOTES FOR AID-TO-BRITAIN BILL

(By Ludwell Denny)

Indiscretions of British Ambassador Halifax will lose votes for the administration lend-lease bill. Just how costly his "lobbying" activities will be is one of the things leaders on both sides are trying to figure out.

Congress is notoriously jealous of its functions, and is always especially touchy toward foreign pressure. The President's failure to consult congressional leaders in drafting "the most important legislation ever debated by this body" has made them even more sensitive than usual.

Into this complex of resentment and raw nerves stalked the inexperienced and impervious stranger from Britain with the understandable but dangerous desire to speed up the processes of American democracy.

Perhaps in times less tense Lord Halifax's calls upon the chairmen of the Senate and House committees considering the British-aid bill would have been dismissed as courtesy rather than resented as lobbying. Or perhaps if the gentlemen with whom he had conferred had been more discreet than Chairman BLOOM, the envoy would not now be the victim of such unkindly reactions.

Under the circumstances, however, the America First Committee in its attack on the Ambassador is merely pulling into public view the undercover congressional criticism. This committee has informed Senator GEORGE and Representative BLOOM that their conferences "to discuss a congressional timetable with the principal potential foreign beneficiary of this measure" were "highly improper," and has requested them to make a public report on the conversations.

Secretary of State Hull has been asked by the committee to investigate the conduct of the Ambassador and "to make public a report of your inquiry and to take appropriate action."

REPRESENTATIVE VIEWPOINT

Of course the America First Committee is a private and partisan organization. But its point of view is representative of a considerable group in Congress.

Even many Members of Congress who are still on the fence between the President and the anti-interventionists are uncomfortable about British pressure and propaganda. They are in the mood to go a long way if let alone. But they don't intend to risk any smear campaign, or voters' reaction back home, on charges of taking orders from a foreign government.

Because of the unique honors accorded him by the Presidential welcome aboard ship, and the usual American hospitality reflected in the public response during his first weeks here, His Lordship may have been kept in ignorance of the suspicion in many quarters.

A MUNICH MAN

Some of the most pro-British Americans distrust him as a "Munich man," and they suspect he is still an "appeaser," which is their word for anyone who even discusses the eventuality of a negotiated peace.

Anti-interventionists from the opposite side object to him as a British propagandist trying to get us into the war.

Many liberals are suspicious of him because of his long record as a Tory imperialist.

American labor cannot forget that British labor distrusts him as an enemy and campaigned to drive him out of the Cabinet.

And a good many others are troubled by his status here—the fact that he is not simply an Ambassador but a present member of Britain's inner war cabinet.

Paradoxically, the things that have ensnared him here are precisely the opposite of those expected. The predicted frigidity and snobbish airs which might have protected him from congressional sightseeing have been lacking. Instead, the bouncing American ways—so distasteful to British aristocracy—have not found favor with Congress when assumed by His Lordship.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, in order that undue importance may not be laid on the courtesy call from the Ambassador from the Court of St. James, I rise to call the attention of the membership of the House and of the country at large that this bill was reported out last Thursday, that the executive sessions of the committee and the public hearings had been finished, and the vote had been taken, and 2 days before this visit the procedure as to how the bill was going to be acted on in the House had been decided. The Rules Committee had acted, and everything had been done in connection with this bill before the courtesy call of the Ambassador. I think it is very unfair to impute undue importance to this call of the Ambassador upon the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring to the attention of the House again the fact that during the nine meetings that were held after June 12 last summer, during this crucial period of our foreign affairs, by the Foreign Affairs Committee, with the exception of one meeting, no information was brought to us regarding international affairs from our own representatives of our Government departments; but, as the House well knows, several representatives of the governments of Europe appeared before our committee and gave us information. I have maintained steadily, Mr. Chairman, information regarding foreign affairs should come to us from our own departments and that we should not have to go to representatives of foreign governments for information as to what is going on in Europe and Asia.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Did I understand the gentlewoman from Massachusetts to say that the Foreign Affairs Committee had representatives of foreign

governments before it in the hearings on this bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; I say prior to this, and from June 12, 1940, we had only nine meetings up to the consideration of this bill. Several of those meetings were held of necessity as a result of resolutions of inquiry introduced by myself and by others. Those resolutions were acted upon adversely.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am talking about this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. From June 12, 1940, up to the consideration of this bill we had only nine meetings of our Foreign Affairs Committee, during a time of vital importance to this Nation, in our preparedness program—during a period vital to the action taken by the House regarding our foreign affairs. We have been kept steadily in the dark, as the gentleman knows, so far as our committee is concerned, regarding the progress of our national affairs.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As I recall, the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, was before our committee and discussed this bill at length.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am speaking of the time prior to that. He did not appear before our committee for 2 years prior to the hearings on H. R. 1776—this lend-lease bill under discussion—

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Oh, the gentlewoman is talking about ancient history?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Ancient history. I think the past few months—the past few years—have been of vital importance to our entire defense program. We would have been far better prepared today if we had had the information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to define my personal position with reference to our foreign policy in general, and to the far-reaching issues involved in this bill in particular.

I am not an isolationist. I am not an interventionist. In our foreign policy which determines our relations with the rest of the world, and which ought to transcend all partisan considerations, I am not even a Republican nor a Democrat. I am an American. [Applause.] As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for the past 16 years, it has been my purpose to support only such measures as, in my best judgment, would safeguard the well being here at home of 130,000,000 American people, and, at the same time, would strengthen the influence for freedom and peace of the United States throughout the great family of nations.

I admit at once that under present world conditions, so complicated, confused and threatening, it is beyond finite intelligence to think completely in terms of the whole problem; and even the wisest and best intentioned among us will probably be wrong half of the time in their conclusions.

We cannot fairly evaluate the provisions of this bill, H. R. 1776, except as it is viewed against the tragic background of what is now going on in the world. It ought to be self-evident that the present world-shattering conflict is not simply a war between certain foreign nations, waged to decide issues affecting only the particular nations involved. If that were the case, the promulgation of this bill and the vast and costly defense program of which it is supposed to be a part, would become an absurd and dangerous bit of political play acting.

This is in every truth a "world war." It is being waged by the most powerful and most completely equipped military alliance ever known. And it is being waged for the one express purpose, publicly proclaimed by the aggressors in unmistakable terms, of creating a new world order, so that no section of the human race can eventually hope to evade or escape its evil impact.

This new world order, according to its chief proponent, Mr. Hitler, is to consist of the complete enthronement of the Nazi brand of totalitarianism everywhere in the world. This is to be accomplished by the subjugation and enslavement of every free self-governing society, including the United States of America, by means of armed force, "fifth column" infiltration, and economic pressure.

Already as a curtain-raiser to this program of world domination we have seen more than a dozen free self-governing European nations overrun and their people broken in spirit by defeat, disease, hunger, and economic ruin. Already countless millions of Chinese men, women, and children have been slaughtered and their home land occupied by the Japanese, Axis partner. Already the new world order war has been carried into Africa. China has not yet surrendered. Greece is fighting gloriously for her national independence. And Britain still stands, under frightful pressure, the last line of defense between the power-mad aggressors and their weaker victims on three continents.

So far as humanly possible, let us face the facts without prejudice or evasion. Spiritually this is a war of atheism against Christianity. Politically it is a war of despotism, dictatorship, and tyranny against the ideals and institutions of free self-governing democracy everywhere. Economically it is a war of state socialism of varying types against every form of private enterprise; private ownership of property, and free labor. In the largest sense, this is a battle to the death between world slavery and world freedom.

The final issue of this war will determine the destinies of the whole world for generations to come. If Britain falls and Hitler, by the defeat of Britain, wins his announced objective, mankind everywhere will be plunged into an age of hatred, fear, and force. The clock of human progress will be set back a thousand years. And America can no more escape contact with this universal tragedy than a ship can escape contact with the tides upon which it floats. [Applause.]

With the rest of the world completely under totalitarian rule, and with totali-

tarian navies master of the seven seas, the United States will have to conduct its entire foreign relations, both diplomatic and economic, upon totalitarian terms. In such foreign trade as may be permitted us, our farms, our factories, and our working people will be forced to compete with starveling slave labor the world over, and with prices fixed for our products by unfriendly dictatorial fiat.

The only other alternative for the United States will be to withdraw like a hermit nation within our own borders, and confine our entire economic enterprise and energy within the limits of our own needs.

Whatever unwelcome and un-American way of life may be forced upon us by a Nazi victory, two results are inevitable: We will be forced permanently to maintain an enormous and ruinously costly defense establishment, on land, on the sea, and in the air, and our American standard of living, now the highest in the world, will be forced to lower levels than ever known. This will of course mean continuous unrest and disunion among our people, with all its attendant evil consequences.

Motivated by a profound instinct of self-preservation and by the edict of sound reason and judgment, our people are united upon certain fundamental policies. Believing that peace is the only basis upon which a free democratic way of life can successfully function, or permanently exist, we are opposed to war as a means of settling international disputes. And we are equally opposed to sending our citizens abroad to fight in any war except in defense of our own country and of this Western Hemisphere against armed attack. [Applause.]

We are united in completing without delay our present vast and costly program of defense. And as a part of our defense program, by which to buy time for its completion, we are united in our purpose to give all possible aid to Britain consistent with our own security. Our one desire, shared in alike by every class, interest, and section, is to remain a free people in a free world. Personally I am in complete accord with every one of these positions.

Against this background of world tragedy and ruin and united American public opinion, the President suddenly projected his lend-lease bill, H. R. 1776, "To promote the defense of the United States and for other purposes," which bill has become the cause and center of one of the most notable debates in our entire history.

The reasons advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury and others representing the administration in support of this bill are simple enough—Britain desperately needs our material aid in increased quantities and at the earliest possible moment if she is to successfully resist the invasion threatened by the Axis Powers within the next few months. Britain has already paid American producers for war materials \$1,300,000,000 in cash. She has, in addition, paid American manufacturers \$600,000,000 for new buildings and equipment to be used by them in producing war materials for British use. Britain has contracted for \$1,300,000,000 worth of

additional war material yet to be delivered by American producers. This reduces Britain's dollar resources to the point where, in order to pay for the increased war material so desperately needed, she must obtain American credit. This much-needed credit to Britain is forbidden by the Johnson Act and the Neutrality Act.

In order to avoid the necessity of repealing or amending these two laws, the President, in his lend-lease bill, resorts to a brilliant subterfuge. He proposes to have all purchase, sale, transfer, or distribution of war materials of every kind, for our own defense or for aid to Britain, entrusted to him with unlimited power to handle the entire matter as he may decide is best for the ultimate defense of America. Under this law Britain will buy nothing direct from American producers beyond what she has already contracted for. The President will buy everything from these producers that he decides Britain ought to have. He will pay for these materials with money appropriated by Congress out of the United States Treasury, and he will lend, lease, or otherwise transfer to Britain this material on such terms as he may decide.

The bill in its original form sets absolutely no limit to the enormous power which it confers upon the President. There is no limit as to time. There is no limit as to the amount of money authorized to be handed over to him to be expended at his discretion.* There is no provision for reports to Congress, nor for his continuous cooperation or consultation with Congress. In fact, in the bill as written, Congress renounces its constitutional obligations to control the sword and the purse. The sole remaining function of Congress, under this bill, in its original form, will be to appropriate from time to time such sums of money as the President may demand, to be spent entirely at his discretion.

So far as the present administration is concerned there is nothing unusual in the proposals of this bill. For 8 years we have been living in an unbroken series of so-called emergencies. Just when and how the country is to emerge from an emergency has not yet been revealed [Applause.] The one invariable method by which the President has met all emergencies has been to ask for a grant of more power and more money by Congress. And the New Deal majority in Congress, for 8 long years, with few exceptions, has rubber-stamped its way around or through every emergency by granting whatever power and money the President desired.

Now there are signs that the worm is about to turn, or at least to make a half turn. The lend-lease bill, in its original form, will have to be amended in vitally important ways before it becomes law. There ought to be a definite time limit set to the extension of the powers granted the President. An amendment covering this point has already been inserted by the Foreign Affairs Committee. There ought to be some reasonable limit set to the amount of money to be authorized. There ought to be some provision in the bill covering the categories of materials to be transferred to Britain and other

free governments now bearing the burden of holding back the common enemy until we have time to prepare our own total defense on land, sea, and in the air. And certainly Congress, by means of a special nonpartisan committee, or otherwise, ought to retain its right and safeguard its duty to consult with and advise the Chief Executive in these momentous matters affecting the well-being of every American citizen.

Under our Constitution the Chief Executive is clothed with tremendous powers. In war these powers are enormously increased. In the present critical situation someone must have the power to act and to make decisions. Obviously, the President, whoever he may be, is the logical person to be entrusted with this necessary authority. But even under these circumstances of tragic urgency we must not be asked to abandon our constitutional system of checks and balances by reducing Congress to a condition of impotence. Give the Chief Executive all the new powers that may be necessary to get the job done promptly and efficiently, but keep the right to recall and to limit these powers where it belongs—in the hands of Congress. [Applause.]

It is most regrettable that our national unity of spirit and purpose should be disturbed, as it has been, by the proposals set forth in this bill and by the manner in which the bill was prepared and presented to the Congress and the people. H. R. 1776 has become the occasion, if not the cause, of a confusion and disunity of public opinion amounting almost to an attack of emotional hysteria. The whole Nation is buzzing and stinging like a hive of bees shattered by a well-directed brickbat. Embarrassing questions are being anxiously asked by all sorts and conditions of citizens. Some of these questions are as follows: If this is a measure for national defense, why were not the members of the minority party in Congress consulted in its preparation? Surely they and the 22,000,000 voters whom they represent are as patriotic and as strong for defense of our common country as are those of the majority party.

If this bill is for the purpose of insuring American aid to Britain, why did it not simply provide for a loan or gift of money to Britain, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to be expended by her Government or official representatives on their own responsibility and as they might decide to be to their best advantage?

Certainly, under present world conditions neither the American Congress nor the people are in a mood to be niggardly as to the size or terms of such a loan.

Citizens everywhere are asking why, in order to defend America by aiding Britain, is it necessary to clothe the Chief Executive with unlimited dictatorial powers never before conferred upon a President in time of peace.

In the light of these and similar questions, and the disturbed public opinion which prompts them, I could not bring myself to vote for this bill in its original form. I resent being placed, by a piece of clever partisan strategy, in a position where I cannot vote for vitally important

legislation which I sincerely desire and which the vast majority of our people desire unless, at the same time, I am forced to vote for what I am convinced is a dangerous and unnecessary political innovation.

Why, in order to obtain the wholesome meat of sound and necessary legislation, must we be continuously forced to accept political poison artfully concealed within its provisions?

I desire with all my heart to vote for legislation which will give Britain immediately the help she needs and upon terms that will strengthen rather than slow down her heroic defense of democracy and freedom. I hope with all my heart that the majority leadership in this House, whose patriotism and integrity are beyond question, will permit such reasonable amendments to the present bill as will make possible its unanimous passage by the House. Such wise and tolerant action will reunite and reassure our people and will serve notice to all the world that this is still free America and free Americans are on guard. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. With pleasure.

Mr. MAY. I was very much impressed by the gentleman's great argument, particularly the one that referred to the fact that in the event England was invaded and conquered we would be for the next many years, perhaps, subjected to the control of our markets and the regulation of our commerce by a totalitarian system of government. Does not the gentleman think that in addition to that situation we may be up against what is known as the barter system in Europe now that will go even further and to the extent of destroying our monetary system, as far as foreign trade is concerned?

Mr. EATON. I think it is impossible to overestimate the unfortunate results of a condition, such as the gentleman describes, to our people and to our economy.

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

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey seemed greatly concerned about what would happen to this Nation economically in the event of German domination of Europe.

Mr. EATON. German domination of the world.

Mr. BARRY. German domination of the world. Since 1932, just before the war broke out, this Nation has increased its foreign trade from \$1,500,000,000 to \$3,000,000,000. During that time it competed with China, where they pay the lowest wage scale in the world, with Japan, where they pay one-third the wage scale that we pay, with Russia, with Nazi Germany, with India, where they pay approximately \$1.25 per week, and we have doubled our trade. Now, I ask the gentleman just why we could not continue to compete in the world markets

with dominant Germany, in view of those facts?

Mr. EATON. My answer to that is that a large proportion of that increased trade went to Japan in the way of scrap iron and necessary materials for the slaughter of the Chinese. [Laughter and applause.] A great deal of it went to China for the purpose of slaughtering the Japanese. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that a few moments ago it was seen proper to inject into the debate upon this very important bill a criticism of the chairman of our committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] in receiving a courtesy call from the newly appointed Ambassador from the Court of St. James. As was stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], this bill had already been reported to the House by our committee before the call of the Ambassador upon our chairman.

During the hearings and the consideration of this bill the chairman of the committee and the majority members of the committee have all cooperated in seeing that there was the fullest and fairest hearing and courtesy extended to everyone. It was agreed by all that the hearing was full and fair to both sides. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] improperly sought to inject that incident at this particular time in the consideration of this very important bill, since it has nothing whatsoever to do therewith.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, the grave responsibility which rests upon the Congress in the consideration of this bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] said that this was the most important bill ever considered by the Congress of the United States. With that statement I agree, but I do not agree with his reasons for so believing. He bases its importance upon reasons why he thinks it should be defeated. I base mine upon reasons why I think it should be passed.

This measure, in my judgment, is so vital to the defense of the United States, and its immediate passage is so imperative that I am overwhelmed with the magnitude of its importance, and I approach its discussion with a consciousness of my own inability to adequately present it to the House. There are so many various angles to the bill that it is difficult to tell how best to treat it.

I have been thinking about this bill, both in the committee and out of the committee, and I have never in my life given more serious and earnest thought to any one measure since I have been in Congress than to the bill we are now considering. I have reached a very definite conclusion with reference to the bill and, in the time allotted me, I want to advance the grounds upon which I have reached the conclusion that the bill should be passed.

I shall ask, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I want to complete my full analysis of the bill and my reasons for

supporting it, that I be not interrupted until I have concluded. Later in the debate I shall be glad to answer any questions that may be asked concerning it.

I want to present to the House four propositions upon which I shall base my reasons. The first is that there is grave danger to the defense of the United States at this time. The second is that this bill is the best way to meet that danger. Third, this bill is not, as its enemies charge, a dictator bill. Fourth, this bill is not a war measure.

The gentleman from New York always deals in superlative language and denunciation. I thought in this instance, however, he was exceedingly severe when he said there had been more hypocrisy, more misrepresentation, and more blatant falsehoods about this bill than any that had been considered. Had he been sitting on my side of the aisle I would not have been surprised at that sort of statement, because there have been misrepresentations; there have been exaggerated statements with reference to this bill by its opponents, and the country would not be misled thereby if they knew the true facts concerning the bill and its purpose. I am astonished at the ingenious and shifting tactics used by those who seek to accomplish the defeat of this bill.

Referring now to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], who is my good friend and has just addressed you, I thought the first half of his speech was excellent—I applauded that—but some of his statements in the latter portion of his speech were not entirely in harmony with my judgment.

On one proposition we must agree before we can consider this bill from any angle. This country is in danger. If the United States of America is not in danger there is no need, no justification even, for a consideration of this bill; and I want to show you how the enemies of the bill have shifted their position, using first one reason and then another reason why the bill should not be passed. I hope you take time to read the hearings, for if you do you will find that a great portion of the time of the gentlemen opposing the bill was taken up trying to point out that there was no danger to the United States, regardless of who won the war in Europe. They asked questions of the witnesses to develop our isolation and the thousands of miles of ocean that separate us from warring countries, and sought by all of them to show that we were in no danger, trying thereby to lull their own conscience in opposing the bill, and to instill into the American people a feeling of false security; and that no attack being threatened, a necessity did not exist for the legislation.

After the exhaustive hearings were concluded and the testimony of experts having completely refuted their position, they now, in the minority report, favor aid to Britain, but apparently base it on sympathy for the British, and nowhere in the report is such aid based upon our own self-defense.

Those of us who favor the bill have, I am sure, just as much, and I think more, sympathy for Britain than those who oppose it, but we feel that the expenditure of such vast sums of money would not be justified unless they contributed, as we

believe they do, to the vital defense of our own country.

The minority report, or at least the major portion of it, must have been written by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I say this not only because I am familiar with his phraseology, but because he still contends in the report, as he did in the examination of the witnesses in the hearing, that our country is not in danger. Buried in the middle of one of the paragraphs on page 1 of the minority report are these words:

I quote:

Our naval and military experts agree that our Nation is in no danger of attack.

I challenge the accuracy of the statement that our naval and military experts agree that our Nation is in no danger of attack; and, on the contrary, I assert that every military and naval expert who appeared before our committee except Colonel Lindbergh, if he be entitled to be classified as a military and naval expert, which I do not admit, testified that our country was in danger of attack, not immediately, perhaps, but certainly, if the British Isles fall or if the British Navy is captured or destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, I leave the question of whether or not the naval and military experts stated that our country was not in danger to the printed hearings and also to the consciences of the members of the committee who heard two witnesses whose names do not appear in the printed hearings, who were heard in executive session, Gen. George Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the Army; and Admiral Stark, the Chief of Naval Operations.

In refutation of the claim in the minority report that our naval and military experts agree that our Nation is in no danger of attack, I want to refer briefly to excerpts from the hearings upon that question, where the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] sought unsuccessfully to obtain such admissions from Secretary of War Stimson that such was the case. I quote from the bottom of page 96 and the top of page 97 of the hearings:

Mr. FISH. Mr. Secretary, you said in your remarks that the British Fleet stands alone against the German Fleet's control of the Atlantic.

Secretary STIMSON. I think I said substantially alone.

Mr. FISH. That is the quotation that I wrote down from your address. Does the Secretary believe that any foreign nation could land troops on our coast?

Secretary STIMSON. Not now; probably not.

Mr. FISH. Any time this year?

Secretary STIMSON. I would not dare say that it could not at any time this year.

Mr. FISH. Our Navy is six times greater than Germany's Navy, and it takes a navy three times as large to come over here; but assuming a landing of 50,000 troops here, could not our Army now, at any time this year, take care of 50,000 foreign troops?

Secretary STIMSON. I think it probably could, if you mean by that that there was a land invasion. But I would like to ask my friend if he thinks that an invasion by infantry is the only possible invasion of America today?

Mr. FISH. If the Secretary is referring to propaganda—

Secretary STIMSON (interposing). No; I am not referring to propaganda. I am referring to air attacks.

Further down on page 97 of the hearings I read the following:

Mr. FISH. Mr. Secretary, the reason I stress that is because, as I understand, reading the headlines in the press, it seemed that the reason for this measure in its present form, was the fear of an invasion from some foreign power; some foreign power invading America. It seems to me that to advocate the bill in its present form because there is fear of this invasion, which is the case according to the statements that are being issued on the subject—it seems to me that I should ask you if you think, if you believe, that we are in danger of any immediate invasion?

Secretary STIMSON. I think we are in very great danger of an invasion by air in the event that the British Navy should be destroyed or surrendered.

And the same line of questioning is pursued further. I shall not take time to go over it, because time has a habit of slipping away.

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

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Not now. Read the testimony of Secretary of the Navy KNOX in the hearings. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] asked him questions similar to those I have already read; he asked Secretary KNOX if we were in danger of attack, and he said not at once, but the testimony of Secretary KNOX, the Secretary of the Navy, before our committee, was to the effect that if England falls or if her navy is captured or destroyed, we are in immediate danger.

There is no doubt that we are in danger not only from the Atlantic but from the Pacific if England falls and the British Navy is captured. It is well known, and I think this is no secret, that the Axis Powers are now bringing pressure upon Japan to try to get her to take aggressive action against the United States. If England should fall as France fell, Japan would follow the example of Italy and we would be attacked in the Pacific. So our danger is not only from the Atlantic but from both the Atlantic and the Pacific. We have at this time a one-ocean Navy, with two oceans to defend, with two continents to defend; and if the Panama Canal should be put out of commission, we would have one of our navies bottled up in one ocean and no navy in the other.

Mr. Chairman, we must not fool the American people or lull them into a feeling of false security by saying there is no danger, because there is danger, and, as Secretary Stimson said, "The danger and the conditions now are far more critical than they were in 1917." We stand at the crossroads; we stand at a time the most critical in the period of not only our own country but of the world and of civilization itself. The only question that Americans ought to be willing to consider is the following: Is this the best way to meet that danger?

For 16 months we have been supplying planes and munitions to England, and, as stated by the gentleman from New Jersey, that country has already expended in cash \$1,300,000,000 for the purchase of war materials here. It has built plants here amounting to seven or eight hundred million and it has placed orders that are now being filled to the extent of \$1,300,000,000; but the undisputed testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury,

based upon figures he submits, which you will find in the hearings, and this testimony is not denied, shows that the purchasing power of England has been exhausted, that it cannot place an order today for additional war materials which it so badly needs in carrying on the war for its very existence. Until this bill is passed, or unless some means is given by which it can get these materials with which to defend itself and defend us, it cannot buy any more and will fall. As stated by the gentleman from New Jersey, this will give us time to prepare. Until that is done we are in the gravest danger.

How are you going to do it? They say, "Grant credit." The gentleman from New Jersey says, "Give them a credit of \$2,000,000,000." Let me talk to you just a moment about the advantages of this bill. It does not grant credit. This is a grant of material.

There are one or two ways by which this may be done. As stated in the minority report you may grant \$2,000,000,000 worth of credit. This bill says grant materials. We tried the granting of credit before and it did not work so well. We want to try now another plan. Of course, England's credit now is far worse than it was in 1917. England has been bled; England has had to pay cash; England's buying power is gone; but England has certain raw materials. She has tin. There is rubber. There are island possessions and there is the property they have in this country amounting to eight or nine hundred million dollars that England has invested here in munition plants. That property is here, but it is not money. Do you think the manufacturers are going to take the promise of a country that has exhausted all of its buying power and say, "We will take your promise to pay"? They are not going to do that. Businessmen and manufacturers are cold-blooded, as everybody expects them to be. So if you say that you want to give them credit, who are you going to get to furnish the materials on credit to a country in that situation? England's credit is exhausted and her buying power is gone, and the purpose of this bill is to grant her and other democracies vital to our own defense war materials with which to defend themselves. What good will it do to grant England credit when her credit is already exhausted?

There is another great advantage in the plan under the bill to grant materials rather than credit, as set forth by Secretary Stimson, Secretary KNOX, William S. Knudsen, and other Government witnesses, under what is called unified purchasing and production. On page 87 of the hearings Secretary KNOX explains this in detail.

The Government witnesses testified that the plan under this bill, to have all production and sales under our own Government, rather than to have competitive buying by our Government and the other governments, will expedite production to a marked degree, and eliminate delays and confusion now existing in the manufacturing and supplying of war planes and other war materials. This plan will mean the prompt distribution of munitions to countries whose

defense is important to us, and as was so well said by Secretary Stimson, will constitute one great funnel through which all the production of such materials in this country will be ordered, and through which the materials, when finished, will flow from the production lines. And munitions can then be apportioned among ourselves and other democracies whose defense is important to us.

Testimony was given that under the plan which has been followed, of competitive buying, that is, of orders placed by our Government and the other governments, much delay, confusion, and excuses have been given by the manufacturers as to delays in production, but when the plan is in force as provided by this bill, the manufacturers will look to but one agency, and that is our own Government, and the contracts will be made with our Government, and no other intervening agency will give them grounds for excuses for delay, production will be expedited, and the troublesome question of priorities will be eliminated.

Here is the situation they have had to contend with: The testimony of the experts shows that for the past 16 months there has been much confusion, and there has been much delay in the filling of orders. Why? Because we had competitive buying. England was buying and other countries were buying. Their contracts were made directly with the manufacturers. Our orders were also placed with these manufacturers. The manufacturer would say that he had this understanding with a buyer and that buyer which required this, and he was not able to produce a certain thing. He had a good alibi. Then the question of priorities has been a troublesome one.

This bill proposes that all war materials or defense materials described in section 2 shall be funneled through one buying order, which is the United States of America, and that then those materials will go out, saving whatever is necessary for our own defense and granting what we think is best for us to the other countries whose defense is vital to ours.

They say that Congress ought to do this. They ask, Why delegate this power to the President? They ask, Why do you not let Congress preserve its powers? The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] was very extreme in his statements, and, talking about extreme statements, he said the Congress will have no more authority if you pass this bill than the German Reichstag. Does any Member here believe that? Why, the German Reichstag cannot even meet, except when Mr. Hitler tells them they can meet, and I do not think he has permitted them to meet lately.

Opposition to the bill centers largely on the alleged ground that Congress abdicates its powers and grants, as the minority report claims, "unlimited, unprecedented, and unpredictable powers" and in their enthusiasm further state that the President has the right "literally to seize anything in this country and to give it to any other country, without limit in law."

There is nothing in the bill that gives the power to the President to seize property from individuals and give it away,

and there is no foundation for such a charge.

Congress does not abdicate its power; it simply confers power upon the President to manufacture, sell, or furnish, through Government agencies, defense articles, on such terms and trades as the President and the foreign governments may agree upon. Congress has the right to revoke this authority at any time, and Congress does have "control of the purse and control of the war-making powers of Congress," the minority report to the contrary notwithstanding.

The bill does not surrender our democratic way of life, as the minority claims, but I might suggest that if the Axis Powers win, then our American way of life is jeopardized.

The Congress cannot make trades with foreign governments and its duly authorized agent alone can do so, even in peacetimes. With a war raging and conditions changing daily, it would be futile for Congress to attempt to pass upon these various transactions in the transfer of property. The consideration of this bill is an evidence of the futility of such a plan, as the delay necessarily incident to the passage of legislation cannot be avoided. This bill was introduced on January 10, and the House will not finish its consideration before February 8, if then, and no one knows how many weeks of time will be consumed in the other body in its consideration. The time element has been stressed by every Government witness with reference to speed in the passage of this legislation, and yet it will likely take 60 days to pass it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, let me talk a minute about what the President is going to do. He may sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of such defense articles. Then section (b) says:

The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory.

In other words, we want to let him trade with the country for whatever they can give us, either island possessions, air bases, or raw materials, such as tin or rubber. Congress could not make a trade. Congress would not have the time to go out and say, Will you give me this or that? When a trade is to be made, somebody must have the authority vested in them to do it, and a legislative body certainly cannot make trades.

THE PRESIDENT IS THE PROPER PERSON IN WHOM THIS AUTHORITY SHOULD BE VESTED

Since it would be impracticable for Congress to carry out or to make agreements or trades with reference to granting materials to such other countries, and since speed is essential, and the authority so to do should be vested in one person, under our Constitution and our governmental history, who is more appropriate to whom this authority should be given than the President of the United States? He is made by the Constitution the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy,

and his power as such is neither restricted nor limited in the slightest degree. Under our Constitution, and in conformity with the history of our Government, from George Washington to the present time, the President has had complete and exclusive authority in dealing with foreign governments. He, of all persons in the Government, is the only one to whom reports are made by all departments of the Government. He knows, and has the means of knowledge, of affairs existing in foreign governments, and our delicate relations with them. He has reports of the War Department and of the Navy Department, and he is the one person in the Government through whom is funneled all matters pertaining to the foreign affairs, the War Department, and the Navy, and what more appropriate funnel could be established than the President of the United States? To grant him such authority is to conform to our Constitution and usages throughout the existence of the Government. Then why not place this power in him.

They talk about having a joint congressional committee to meet and determine these things! Why, they would get together, and one would say one thing and another would say another, and there would be some partisanship mixed up in it before you knew it.

Let us follow the precedent we have always followed. They say there is no precedent for it. We passed a bill at the last session of Congress upon which this bill is based, and it was supported by the gentleman from New York, and others, who are now fighting this bill. That bill was with reference to furnishing war materials to the South American countries. We have used the identical plan in this bill but we are applying it with reference to countries other than South America, whose defense is vital to our own. We did that because they did not have any credit. We did that for our defense. Now we say it is necessary for our defense to apply that same method to England and to the other democracies whose defense is vital to our own.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not stop to do it now, but later I shall insert a list of emergency powers that have heretofore been granted not only in the instance regarding South America but with relation to powers granted to the President in emergencies both of defense and of an economic character. Even in economic emergencies we have granted him vast powers. In 1933, when the economic crisis came and when representatives of Wall Street and others came here and said, "Save us," these gentlemen over here who are fighting this bill voted to place vast emergency powers in the President. Will the President abuse the powers granted in this bill? Will he consult with the military, naval, and other experts of the Government in carrying out its terms and provisions?

I wish every Member of this House could have heard the testimony concerning the President's consultation and dependence upon advice given him and whether or not he has consulted with the War Department, the Navy Department, and the other departments with reference to what he has done during the

present crisis. I wish you could have heard the testimony that we heard from all these departments when the question was asked them about whether or not the President has conferred with them and whether or not he has yielded to their judgment. I submit it shows that he has been most considerate, and that he has depended upon them and followed their judgment just as he would do under this bill if it is passed.

LIMITATIONS ON THE PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY

The President, under the bill, is not granted unlimited authority, as the opponents of the bill contend, but the authority so granted him by the bill, as amended by the Foreign Affairs Committee, restricts his authority in the following particulars:

First. The President is not given the authority to act directly under the bill. He is empowered to authorize action by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of the department or agency concerned. In acting this way the President will have to get the advice of the respective Cabinet officers and their technical staffs.

Second. The fundamental and basic limitation on the power of the President to authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of the governmental agency to act under the bill, as set forth in section 3 (a) and section 8, is that the action must be found to be "in the interest of national defense."

Other people talk about their being for America. Some of those who are fighting the bill say, "We are for America." I want the American people to know that those of us who are sponsoring this bill are just as much interested in America, and just as loyal to it, and that the passage of this bill is necessary, in my judgment, for the preservation of America. [Applause.]

Third. Any aid which the War or Navy Departments may be authorized to give under section 3 (a) of the bill is also limited to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States.

Fourth. The authority of the President under section 3 may be exercised only with respect to a "defense article" or "defense information," as those terms are defined in section 2 of the bill.

Fifth. The "defense information," with respect to which the President's authority relates, is limited under section 2 (b) to information pertaining to any defense article furnished under section 3.

Sixth. Before the War or Navy Departments can place any contract for military or naval equipment under the bill, they must receive the advice and approval of the Office of Production Management.

Seventh. In authorizing the War or Navy Departments to transfer defense articles or to communicate defense information, provision must also be made, in accordance with section 7 of the bill, adequately to protect the patent rights of citizens of the United States.

Eighth. By an amendment to section 3, approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee, it is provided that no defense article, not manufactured or procured

under paragraph (1) of section 3, shall in any way be disposed of, except after consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy, or both.

Ninth. Any disposition of defense articles by the War or Navy Departments must be on terms which the President deems satisfactory and must result in a direct or indirect benefit to the United States.

Tenth. Any defense articles disposed of to a government whose defense is vital to the defense of the United States cannot be transferred by it to anyone else without the President's consent.

Eleventh. By amendment to section 3, approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee, a clarification is inserted which states that nothing in the bill shall authorize conveying vessels by naval vessels of the United States. Strictly speaking, that is not a limitation on the President's powers, since nothing in the proposed act would seem to authorize such conveying; however, in that it clears up a possible ambiguity, it may be considered as a limitation in the bill on the powers granted the President thereby.

Twelfth. By amendment to section 3, approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee, the President cannot exercise any of the powers conferred by section 3 (a) after June 30, 1943, except to carry out a contract or agreement made before July 1, 1943.

Thirteenth. The President is required to transmit once every 90 days to the Congress a report of operations under the act, except such information as he deems not compatible with the public interest to disclose.

Fourteenth. The head of any department or agency of the Government acting for the President must, by section 5 (a) of the bill, immediately inform the Administrator of Export Control when any defense article or information is exported.

Fifteenth. The bill cannot be completely carried out except through appropriations made by the Congress.

Sixteenth. No receipts from the disposition of defense articles can go into the 2-year revolving fund without the approval of the Director of the Budget.

Seventeenth. The authorization for the acquisition of arms, ammunition, and implements of war abroad, contained in section 8 of the bill, is limited to countries to which section 3 is applicable, and may only be exercised when the President deems it "in the interests of the defense of the United States."

There are two points that I should like to answer. One is that this is loosing the purse strings. The report here states that we surrender the purse strings. This bill is merely an authorization bill. No money can be expended by the President unless Congress, in a subsequent bill passed by the Congress and approved by the President, makes the appropriation. Congress itself has the check. It will fill in the amount to be expended later, when the appropriation is made. Congress will still be in power. Congress will not be like the German Reichstag. Congress will operate under this bill as it has always done. The only powers the President will have are those limited

in section 3, where we give him our general power of attorney to act in this particular instance in granting materials to countries whose defense is vital to our own, upon such terms as may be agreed upon.

Now let me answer the second point, and this is one they have used to scare the people. The two points on which they have sought to create sentiment against this bill are, first, that we are in no danger anyway, that it does not matter whether or not England falls, that we are all right, that we are isolated, with oceans on both sides of us, that we are thousands of miles away from danger, they cannot get to us.

NOT A WAR MEASURE

The other point is that if you pass this bill you have gone right into war. Those are the two sentimental appeals they make.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that neither of these appeals is justified when all the facts are known and understood about this bill. Of course, no one can tell whether or not we are going to be involved in war in the future. In this changing world, with conditions changing overnight, it is a mere guess as to what will or will not happen.

I assert that there is nothing in this bill by which Congress surrenders its war-making powers. They say we surrender our war-making powers. We could not if we wanted to. The Constitution of the United States vests that authority in Congress, and we cannot surrender that which the Constitution has placed in us, and we have not surrendered that power here, or attempted to do so.

I am as much opposed to war as any opponent of this bill, but we are dealing with realities. It is not a theory, but a condition that confronts us at this time. Hitler, as head of the Axis Powers, will likely declare war whenever in his judgment it is best for him to do so, and nothing that we have done in the past, or what we propose to do under this bill, will affect his decision. It will be guided solely by his own selfish and sordid interests. In my judgment, there is nothing in this bill which will hasten or accentuate our involvement in war.

We have already for 16 months been furnishing these same materials we are going to furnish under this bill, except that heretofore such materials have been paid for in cash, and under this bill the materials will be furnished on such trades or agreements as the President may make with the countries to which they are furnished. And furnishing them in this means will facilitate our own arming and also expedite the furnishing of materials so badly needed to those countries whose defense is vital to our own.

This bill will do what is needed now by England, and we say it is a peace measure. Why? Because if England falls we know that we will likely be involved in war both from the Atlantic and the Pacific, but if this bill passes and England stands, which God grant that she may [applause], and I believe she will, then there is no danger of invasion here, because as long as the At-

lantic Ocean is controlled by the British Fleet, I think our Navy can take care of the other side, and we are in no danger; but when the British Navy falls then the crisis comes and you are likely to have war from both sides of the ocean and in South America, where we are pledged to give them protection.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to talk to you longer. I feel very earnestly and very intensely that this measure ought to be passed, that it ought to be passed quickly, that it is not an abuse of power, that we are not delegating any of our powers but still reserving the right to make the appropriations. We are simply giving the President power in section 3 of the bill to do five things and as to those five things, while the expression is used, "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law," that expression, as was said by the chairman of our committee, is an expression analogous to that used in the appropriation bills, "out of any money not otherwise appropriated." We say in this bill, in section 3, "notwithstanding any law," and so forth, the President shall have this authority. What does that mean? It simply means that with respect to these five things mentioned in section 3, if there is any other law that would prevent his doing those things, during the life of the bill they are temporarily suspended. This does not repeal any law, but simply gives him the clear right to go ahead and do them. It does not repeal the neutrality law, it does not repeal the Johnson Act, it does not repeal the Walsh-Healey Act or any of those acts. It simply refers to those provisions that might prevent us from exporting certain things. For instance, we have a law now that you cannot export to a foreign country certain things built in this country and there are laws like that that might be in direct conflict with the power granted here and, of course, such laws would be suspended. They would not be repealed, but during the lifetime of this law, they would be suspended.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARRY. My distinguished friend from Texas has quoted Secretary Stimson time and time again. Mr. Stimson is a distinguished citizen of my State. He is 74 years of age. He is one of our greatest corporation lawyers. He was Secretary of State for less than 2 years and Secretary of War for less than 1 year. In all seriousness, I ask the gentleman, does that to his mind qualify him as a military expert?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am glad the gentleman has asked the question. Secretary Stimson has had service in three different administrations. He served as Secretary of War in the administration of President Taft, he served as Secretary of State in the administration of Mr. Hoover, and he is now serving as Secretary of War in the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In addition to that, let me say to my friend that Secretary Stimson's testimony, which he has given as to present conditions, is based not alone upon his experience, but after consultation with the

Chief of Staff of the Army and with other military experts, and he voices not his individual opinion, but he voices the opinion of those upon whom he depends, and let me say this: It is strange to me that when our Army and Navy experts are all agreed that this bill is the best way to do it, and upon them rests the responsibility of protecting our country, why should we want to put up our judgment in contradistinction and in contradiction to those who are experts and have been thinking about these things and have worked them out? I hope my friend from New York, following his usual good judgment, will this time vote with us.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to ask the gentleman if this bill contemplates that before the Congress makes appropriations to carry out the purposes of the bill that British credits and British property in this country will be first exhausted?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The bill gives the President authority to take into consideration all of those matters, and that is a matter that he will have to work out with these foreign governments. Of course, the Appropriations Committee, I take it, when the bill comes up for appropriations, will take into consideration that very point and will ask them what they have to offer or what they can do and what they have done.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Answering the gentleman's question, if he will kindly read the hearings, he will find that Mr. Morgenthau's statements in the hearings will answer that question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say that the intent of Congress would control in the matter, and I would prefer—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 1 additional minute.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am familiar with the hearings, but I am inclined to think that the intent of Congress and the discussions here will be of more benefit than the statement of somebody before a committee.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Now, I have this further question. Before the American people are taxed and appropriations are made, is it contemplated that the investments of British citizens in the United States shall first be exhausted in undertaking to supply the materials that are to be loaned or that are to be provided under the terms of this bill?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I do not know with reference to the investments of individual citizens of a country, but I take it that the President in the exercise of this great power, which we have vested in him, and realizing as he does that he wants to do what is best for our country and our people, will go into all those questions and that is the very reason I think it is best to have one man to do that

rather than for the Congress to try to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. They ought to be taken into consideration.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute additional.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. MAY. In view of the possible widespread ramifications of the enforcement of this legislation and the multiplied difficulties that will naturally arise in connection with it, does the gentleman not think it should contain a provision expressly repealing the Johnson Act, to enable British-born American citizens who live in this country and British sympathizers to help finance England?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The Johnson Act, as the gentleman knows, does not forbid our Government from extending credit, but it does forbid the citizens of this Government from doing that. I understand the gentleman's view on that and I may go with him, though I am not making any promises now. The passage of this bill will not necessitate or require the repeal of the Johnson Act, since it is not involved if the proposed plan is followed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. If I can enlighten the gentleman from Ohio I would be delighted to do so.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman, if I understood him, said that Public Act No. 83, the so-called South American bill, granted credit because they did not have any credit.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Oh, no. If I said that, I was in error. It grants material, just as this does, rather than credit.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman recall that these words are in Public, No. 83:

Provided further, That no transaction authorized herein shall result in expense to the United States nor involve the extension of credits by the United States.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No credits were granted. It granted materials, just as this bill does, and authorized this country to furnish war munitions to South American countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] 1 minute to ask a question.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. If I interpret the gentleman's remarks correctly, he said there

was much confusion in the distribution of priorities which resulted in delay on that account. Was that the gentleman's statement?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; in part. I said in giving orders and in filling orders, that is, with competitive buyers, there had been delay, and the executives of the departments had testified before our committee it would expedite the furnishing of munitions if the buying power was all placed in one agency, as this bill does.

Mr. MOTT. And I say to the gentleman that statement is directly contrary to the testimony of every naval officer and every plane manufacturer who appeared before the Naval Affairs Committee 2 weeks ago. They were asked that question directly. They said there was no confusion.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I did not hear the testimony before the Naval Affairs Committee, but I distinctly recall that in the hearing on this bill before the Foreign Affairs Committee, experts from the War Department and others testified just as I have stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, and I do this for the purpose of thanking the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] for reading the colloquy, the questions and answers, which occurred between the Secretary of War and myself. The purpose of those questions was to bring out the fact that we were not about to be invaded, and to put an end to this gospel of propaganda and fear that is being spread throughout the Nation. The Secretary of War finally admitted, and it was all boiled down, that there was no fear of invasion by sea or by land but only by air through South America; and, as a matter of fact, this alleged invasion by air of South America is farther away than if European nations had tried to invade us by air from Germany or France at the present time. They merely get farther away when they get into the jungles of Brazil and of a large part of South America. In addition, I say this to the House, that Colonel Lindbergh over a year and a half ago advised the administration to acquire air bases along the northern coasts of South America, which has not yet been done. Believing as I do in the Monroe Doctrine, if any foreign nation seeks to violate that doctrine by erecting military or naval air bases in South America, then I would be in favor of using our Navy to prevent it and going to war if foreign nations insist on building war bases in Latin America or elsewhere on this continent. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may continue without interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman declines to yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House of Representatives, I rise to discuss H. R. 1776, a bill

brought before us as "An act to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes."

That there may be no misunderstanding of my attitude either in this House or in the country at large, I shall take a moment to make clear my conception of the responsibilities and the duties of the position it is my great privilege to fill.

The oath we all took in this Chamber on January 3 bound us to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic"; to "bear true faith and allegiance to the same"; and to "faithfully discharge the duties of the office."

It is my understanding that insofar as I might agree to the relinquishment by this House of control over what has been called the purse and the sword I should be violating that oath. I can think of no momentary expediency that could justify such action.

Now, further, I believe wholeheartedly in the principle of two-party government. I believe it is one of the cornerstones upon which our Republic rests.

I was elected on the Republican ticket and am proud to be a member of the party fathered by so simple and so magnificent a man as Abraham Lincoln.

Oh, we've made all too many mistakes, we Republicans. We could have done so much better. But I say to you in all earnestness, "Let him who is without sin amongst you cast the first stone."

When I came into this House I came not just as a Republican but primarily as an American, with 300 years of pioneering and building and stewardship in my blood.

Whatever I am today is the result of the opportunity given to Americans to build freedom under law, combined with centuries of conviction that the justification of opportunity is the use one puts it to.

I repeat, I took my seat here in this House as an American, not as a partisan politician, and I propose to occupy it as such, regardless of the labels of various kinds that are hung about the necks of all who fail to fall in with the desires of the present administration.

One of the labels is "isolationist." Another, "interventionist." Both are extremes; neither is any more applicable to me than it is to thousands of other Americans who are as unwilling as I am to give into the hands of unknown forces all that has been and is the United States.

Have citizens of this country no longer the right to protest when those in power are attempting hysterically to tell free-born men and women that this one suggested method is the only way by which we can defend ourselves and give England the help she so dramatically needs?

Like many of you, I promised my constituents that I would use whatever influence is mine to keep us from active participation in the European war. With what light and judgment I have, I intend to keep my word to them in this as definitely as I shall keep my oath to uphold the Constitution.

In spite of the fact that H. R. 1776 comes to this body from the administration without any consultation with the minority during its drafting, the minority

members of the committee have considered it entirely in its relation to what can best be done, and done quickly, to help England and to preserve this Republic.

As a minority member I protest the constant reiteration that, because we are upholding the right of the people to know both sides—because we are living up to our recognized duties as a minority, we have it constantly hurled at us that we are playing partisan politics.

What has become of fair play in this Nation, that has been so proud of its sportsmanship?

Now let us consider this bill—H. R. 1776—prophetic number—for once again, even as in the year 1776, we are face to face with issues that involve our freedom for centuries to come.

"An act to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes." Routine as the last phrase is, it gives a leeway that has been used time after time in the past 8 years to transfer bits of congressional power to the Chief Executive. This time, more than ever before, it is these "other purposes" that are the meat—yes; the heart—of the bill.

The bill as submitted is in its essence confused, at a time when all measures should be clear and frank statements of purpose and intent.

If there is delay in this whole matter of reinforcing England, it is due largely to the administration's unnecessary demand for complete power contained in the "other purposes."

Those who are responsible for the writing of H. R. 1776 and for the continued efforts to force or coerce this Congress to agree to the relinquishment of its powers and its responsibilities are responsible for whatever delays may be involved in the protest of the people against this onslaught upon our free institutions.

Opposition to this bill is not confined to the minority, and let me say clearly that most of this opposition is not objection to "buying time" by helping England, but it is a determined effort on the part of an awakened and awakening citizenry to refuse to sanction the primary purpose of H. R. 1776, which is to put into the hands of one man the decisive powers of their own elected representatives.

We have been told that the bill does not deprive Congress of its powers of appropriation. Do the proponents really believe that Americans are so childish as to credit this? Oh, we shall have to appropriate by the billions, but not for the purposes described in the bill. Have no illusions, citizens of the United States, such appropriations have all been made. A very little study brings to light some forty billions that would be at the disposal of the President. No, gentlemen; the naiveness of your explanations does not stand up against simple common-sense examination.

Why did not the administration ask the Congress with clarity and forthrightness for an appropriation covering England's immediate needs? The issue would have been clear, the mechanics simple.

Why does not the administration give the country facts instead of hysteria?

I so trust the heart and the intelligence of our people that I believe their response

would be immediate and the flow of necessary material would soon be on its way.

Instead, the administration demands the same power Hitler demanded and received in 1933 with the same deceptive clause limiting the time.

The administration's so-called amendments do not alter the bill at all. As a matter of fact they tend to deceive the people still further, suggesting as they do that nowhere is there power to convoy, a power which the Secretary of the Navy testified would be an "act of war," and which for instance we are told the President already possesses.

At no point has there been any suggestion of willingness on the part of the administration to make our defense the main issue, and set aside the "other purposes" as untimely.

Many of us who consider H. R. 1776 a dangerously subtle menace to our freedom—and through us to the freedom of the world—many of us, I say, have an almost passionate desire to give expression to the gratitude we feel to the source of the concept of freedom that is ours.

We have not forgotten whence came the ideas written into our Constitution and Bill of Rights. Go back to the Magna Carta and see how clear is the path from Runnymede to Philadelphia and on to Capitol Hill.

Little England. Surely the world owes her too much for us to let her perish for lack of present and speedy help.

Oh, yes; there is much that is not pleasant about the methods of the British Empire. I have no brief for it as such. But I do say to you that the little island kingdom was the womb of our life, the birthplace of the rights of the individual.

And I say further that there is being reborn in those islands today a spirit, a courage, and a beauty that all who believe man to be an integral part of the life of divinity should not only salute, but should uphold.

So make no mistake regarding my opposition to this bill. I am not opposing aid to England. I am opposing a bill which will not bring help to England in time—a bill whose real and hidden purpose is the enslavement of free Americans under a smoke screen of so-called defense.

My party is as willing as you are to help England, perhaps even more honestly so, but we believe it can be done better and faster without the relinquishment of our constitutional rights.

To those of us who recognize the gravity of England's immediate situation, coupled with the knowledge of our own criminal lack of defense material and the consequent need for time, the clouding of issues caused by this wholly unnecessary demand for dictatorial powers on the part of the administration is unforgivable.

The negligence of those in authority in matters of our defense as well as their inability to organize and put into effect an adequate program is a poor argument for giving them complete powers over every phase of whatever they may glibly call defense.

Nor is the language of the bill comforting.

Have you ever loaned anything to a friend without beclouding, if not destroying, that friendship? The very sound of the word makes enemies.

Let us see that England receives immediately that which will make her continued resistance possible. Not only for her security, but to give us time to build our own defenses too long neglected. If it means life to her she will accept whatever exchanges and securities may best cover our needs.

But let us make our terms with a long look ahead and with a largeness of heartfulness that of itself will make for better understanding in tomorrow's world.

Above all let us have a bill that is forthright and open, one that will bring results.

We need time. England needs help. Very well, let us get to the point.

I shall not discuss possible methods as there are others who will do this. It is my purpose to clear your minds a little, and the minds of those who will read and study what we do here, to challenge you of the Congress perhaps to be honest with yourselves and with the simple, earnest folk you represent.

To this end I beg you to remember that we are under oath to protect the United States from all her enemies, those who may attack her from within just as much as those who may attack her from without.

Because these words, familiar as they are, have perhaps slipped through your minds without touching your understanding, or resting in your hearts, I read them. They are from Lincoln's address The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions, before the Young Men's Lyceum at Springfield, Ill.:

At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us it must spring up amongst us: it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide.

We seem to have reached the point Mr. Lincoln anticipated.

Men and women of this Congress, in this H. R. 1776 there is more at stake right here in these United States than even in England.

I say to you that those who are forcing this bill upon us are risking the future not only of England but of this hemisphere, and they are putting in jeopardy the freedom of all the world. [Applause.]

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish every man and woman in this country could have heard the speech we just listened to, delivered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton]. I hope every Member who was not listening carefully to that speech will take the RECORD in the morning and read it. I commend it to you. [Applause.]

MOBILIZATION FOR DEFENSE OR FOR WAR?

Mr. Chairman, only twice in our history as a nation and a people have we been in peril comparable to that in which we find ourselves today. The first time was when the issues of the War of the

Revolution hung in the balance while the immortal Washington and his barefooted, starving troops fought not only the British redcoats and King George's Hessian mercenaries, but discouragement, despair, hunger, and cold as well.

The second time was when the issues of the Civil War hung in the balance and the immortal Lincoln, with his shawl draped about his gaunt figure paced his lonely vigil through the corridors of the White House, in the stilly hours of the nights, wrestling with the agony of grief, fear, and doubt, and praying to Almighty God for the strength and the light to lead this Nation out of war, back to reunion, back to the paths of peace, and the blessings of unity and fraternity.

The issue in the Revolutionary War was whether or not we should win freedom and liberty. The issue in the Civil War was whether or not we should remain united in freedom and liberty. The issue today is whether we shall cling to freedom and liberty or whether it shall be wrested from us by powers from without, or whether we shall lose it by lack of wisdom from within. That, in blunt words, is the issue we face today.

As we consider the military and economic and social issues involved in whatever course we take, we realize that our greatest danger is intolerance, hostility to free, honest discussion, refusal to compromise, division by sections and classes among our people, and thus divided, a plunge back into an accursed tyranny from which we were freed by the devotion, the blood, and the sacrifices of our heroic forefathers.

We are hearing much these days about the need for unity. Let us not make any mistake in our concept of unity; let us not be misled by any false definitions of the term.

Unity does not mean blind agreement or silent acquiescence with policies, methods, or objectives which outrage our sense of logic or our better judgment. Unity means discussion; some disagreement, perhaps, as to methods; final compromise on the policies, the methods, and the objectives shown to be the best and wisest by fair, frank, full, free discussion; then the concerted, wholehearted effort by all to achieve those purposes and objectives.

To adopt any other course in these perilous times, blindly to entrust our liberties, our economic and social welfare to the judgment of one man, influenced as he may be in secret by those who have not been chosen by the people as their representatives, prone to anger or other emotions, as he might be, is to risk fatal errors which would wreck the Nation, snuff out our liberties, and land us under a dictatorship as bad or worse, perhaps, than the ones we are helping Britain and her Allies to oppose.

If ever there was a time when the safety of the Nation and the future welfare of our own generation and those to come require an able, aggressive, intelligent, and patriotic opposition, that time is now. Far from it being disloyal or unpatriotic to oppose policies or methods or objectives which we believe dangerous to the very existence of our constitutional Government and the Bill of

Rights, it would be disloyal, unpatriotic, and, indeed, cowardly and pusillanimous not to oppose such policies, methods, or objectives if we sincerely believe they would ruin the Nation.

We cannot afford to permit abuse, violent disagreement, or charges of being "fifth columnists" or appeasers to deter us from honest and careful examination of proposed policies, methods, and objectives. We cannot afford—if we wish to remain free men and women—to shrink from the unwelcome task of disagreeing with even our best friends, or our highest officials, if we believe they are advocating the adoption of policies, methods, and objectives which would ruin this Nation.

To disagree with policies or methods or objectives does not necessarily imply that we consider dishonest those who propose such policies or methods or objectives. Honest men may be sincerely mistaken. Mistaken men may be sincerely honest. But we must never forget that rogues and self-seekers are always alert to take advantage of the mistakes of honest and sincere men and women for their own selfish ends. So, then, it is but the part of wisdom, it is simply the operation of that free constitutional method which we have come to call the American way, for the Congress fully to carry out its function as a coordinate, independent branch of the Government, and as the direct representatives of the people, to examine, debate—and amend, if it is found wise—the proposals of the Executive that he be clothed with authority which would amount, in effect, to the powers of a dictatorship in conducting our course in the war.

Anyone who proposes that the Congress abdicate its functions to the Chief Executive, or anyone who condemns the insistence of the Congress on examination and necessary amendments on proposals of the executive department of the Government—anyone who advocates that course is simply advocating complete abandonment now of our constitutional American form of government, and the adoption of a dictatorship which might or might not be a limited despotism.

Presidents are charged with the conduct of foreign relations, by and with the advice of the Congress, particularly the Senate. In the past when we have gone actively into war they have been clothed with greater powers of action in order to meet situations or conditions such as must be handled promptly. The present occupant of the White House has acquired during peacetime greater powers than have been given to any other President during peace or war. He now asks, through the medium of H. R. 1776, powers far transcending those he now has, and we are still at peace so he says. I believe that to grant him the powers incorporated in this measure will result, not only in taking this country actually and actively into the wars in Europe, in Africa, and in the Orient, but by such action we then will have embarked upon a policy of interfering in foreign wars wherever they may be, whenever in the judgment of the Chief Executive such action will contribute to our national de-

fense. In this connection, there are some facts which we will do well to remember. One is that the people are overwhelmingly against—and they have constantly been overwhelmingly against—our getting into this and other foreign wars with our men and arms.

It is true the majority of the people elected Mr. Roosevelt President of the United States for a third term. But it is also true that they meant to elect a President and not a dictator. We must remember that not a single proposal contained in the bill now pending before the Congress to clothe the President with powers to take us into the war whenever and however he chooses, to give to any country he may choose any part of our own defense mechanism, already built or now building, or which may in the future be built, and to give to other nations of the world any part of our wealth he may see fit—not a single one of those issues was even mentioned by either Presidential candidate, let alone discussed or passed upon by the people before the recent election. The people were impressed with the expressed determination of both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie to give aid "short of war" to the opponents of the dictatorships. We were to take steps to aid Britain, but they were to be steps "short of war." Those were the slogans and the policies on which Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie campaigned, and on which Mr. Roosevelt was reelected. And we have not heard the term "methods short of war" uttered from the White House since the election votes were counted.

The people were told by both Presidential candidates and their authorized spokesmen that our first objective—our primary policy—was to achieve an adequate defense for ourselves first of all. Not once was the issue of giving away our defense or a considerable part of it mentioned, and the people had no chance to pass on that question in the last election. And I venture the opinion, my colleagues, that if the policies we are asked to adopt now had been proposed by Mr. Roosevelt before the election, the country—the people—would have been heard from in no uncertain terms. Since none of these proposals were placed before the people for their approval or disapproval before the election, in all good conscience and wisdom they ought to be debated at sufficient length in the Congress now to enable the people ample opportunity to secure full information regarding these proposals and then to register their will with the Members of the House and Senate.

Of course, what we are facing is a propaganda blitzkrieg. We are told that there is not time to consider these proposals or to modify them if necessary. We are told that "it is later than you think." They would have us believe that Mr. Hitler is practically ready to sail into New York Harbor within a few days after England submits to his bombs. That is plain and simple nonsense.

As Gen. Hugh Johnson wrote the other day:

No showing of necessity whatever is made for this abject abdication of congressional war powers, and the attempted showing of

necessity for speed in enacting this legislation won't stand the slightest inspection. The next critical period in this war is between now and May and—bill or no bill—there is not another thing or moment we could add to what Britain could enjoy, receive, or even order from us in that interim, unless it is our intent to strip our Navy of fighting craft and our Army of planes, tanks, and guns, of which it has too little even to begin training the men it is calling to arms. Any such intent has been specifically denied except, for example, as to "five out-of-date" planes. So was the intent to swap the 50 destroyers denied. We don't rely on that. The power is there to give away our arms.

Many years ago, the great English student of American government, James Bryce, saw and voiced the fallacy of such arguments for speed at the expense of care in such decisions. He said in his *American Commonwealth*:

If a nation desires perfect stability it must put up with a certain slowness and cumbersomeness; it must face the possibility of a want of action where action is called for. If, on the other hand, it seeks to obtain Executive speed and vigor by a complete concentration of power, it must run the risk that that power will be abused and irrevocable steps taken too hastily.

Now, my friends, there was, not very long ago, another man, a man in whom the people had great confidence, who solemnly warned this Nation against being lured into a foreign war. I quote him:

The Congress of the United States has given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war.

The President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality.

Nevertheless—and I speak from a long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry, and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fools' gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this or that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning, that come from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the meditation, the prayer, and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day-to-day decisions.

At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the Great War of 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

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.

Those words of warning, Mr. Chairman, were voiced at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, by Franklin D. Roosevelt when he was a candidate for his second term.

They were true words when he uttered them. They have been true ever since. They are true in the situation in which we now find ourselves.

The question is frequently asked: "Are we mobilizing for defense or war?" In my opinion, we are mobilizing for war. As a matter of fact, we are in the war now. The only steps we have not yet taken, but which we undoubtedly will take if the war long continues, is to send in our ships and our men, our planes and our pilots. Every careful student of affairs in the National Capital agrees that we have been taken into the war, not by act of Congress, not by consent of the people, but by the President of the United States.

It is now too late to debate or to decide whether it is right or wrong, wise or unwise, for us to have gotten into this war. We are in it and we must now pursue the wisest course we can foresee to get through it and out of it without losing our liberties or our constitutional form of government, and without finding ourselves faced with such economic chaos and such a monstrous Federal debt by the end of it that we will experience inflation, repudiation, ruin, and dictatorship.

The administration has proposed this so-called lease-lend bill in which it is sought to have the Congress vest the

President with the dictatorial power to lease, lend, or give away any equipment, implements of war, munitions, food, clothing, anything and everything we possess, to any other country, particularly Great Britain, Greece, and China, and perhaps, if not probably, others, which he personally and alone may decide deserves or requires them.

We have been told—and I do not hesitate to say that I think it is a slur upon the intelligence of the American people—that these nations, Britain, Greece, China, and such others as we shall aid, will return "in kind," or in something else, the value of all these munitions and implements and supplies of war. In short, we are going to lease or lend these highly consumable implements and supplies to people who already owe us billions for similar supplies and money loaned to and consumed by them in the past. We are going to let these consumable implements and supplies be the collateral security for the leases and loans, and we are going to expect these other countries, who are now unable to pay for these things, as we are told, to be able after a long, exhausting, and devastating war, to be better able to pay for them, or to return them in kind.

Think of that proposition now: After these nations, which are supposedly not now able to pay for these implements, munitions, and supplies, have consumed them during a long and devastating war, and after such war has been ended, with all the nations bled white of manpower, with their industries blasted to dust, with debts beyond human computation, they are to be expected to find the money and the manpower to build similar or other equipment, to purchase or manufacture other supplies and return them to us. Now, do you folks believe they will do that? Do you believe we will ever get, in money or in kind, the repayment by a dime or a dollar for these billions and billions of dollars' worth of supplies and equipment, together with the other billions some of these nations already owe us from the first World War? You know, of course, that we will not. Those who propose this legislation know that we will not.

Now, we are told, of course, that since Britain and Greece and China are fighting "our" battle, we should aid them with supplies and implements of war, and supplies for their civilian populations. This theory did not originate in those warring countries. The peoples of those countries did not first voice that theory. It originated in this country in the minds of those internationalists who would take us all the way into this war. It was the product of their minds. Now, if their theory is correct, it is cowardly and utterly selfish for us to want to lease or lend those other nations the supplies and the implements and the munitions with which to fight our battles.

You see, the administration's arguments do not hold together. They do not make logic or sense. If these other countries are fighting our battles to preserve our liberties, we should not lease or lend them the supplies and the implements and the munitions with which to fight those battles. In that case we

should give them all these things. And if that is so, why should our administrators not be frank and honest with us and tell us that we should and will give these billions of dollars worth of supplies and munitions and implements to these countries without expecting a dime in return? In either event, they know we will not receive a thin dime in return, and the people certainly have a right to be told if billions of dollars worth of their labor and supplies and implements and munitions of defense are to be given away to other nations and peoples.

Despite the efforts of the propagandists to create the impression that the President is to give away all these billions—the fact still remains that it is the people's money being spent; it is the people's supplies and implements being thus distributed by the President; it is the people, the taxpayers of the present and the future—you and I, and our children and our children's children and their grandchildren, who will do the paying for all these things which we are to lease and lend and give away.

Personally, as a Member of this House, I find something sinister and very suspicious in these efforts to fool and deceive the people, to lead them into a situation step by step, when those who are doing the leading know perfectly well that in the end the people will be told that they never should have expected repayment for all of these implements and munitions and supplies which the allied nations were given with which to fight "our" battles.

Now there is another, and possibly graver, question beside the one we have just discussed.

After the war is over, and inasmuch as our own high officials have shouted from the housetops that this is our war, that those other peoples are fighting this war for us, and after the industries and the farm lands of these battling nations have been blasted into dust and unproductive, powder-poisoned soil, after the food-stuffs have been destroyed, the cities leveled, in these other countries, what shall we expect? Will we not be told that these other nations fought our battles, and that we can do no less than feed the hungry hordes of Europe and the Orient—in the countries on both sides? We did that after the first World War. Will we not be told that unless we do that again, unless we further impoverish ourselves to rebuild the wrecked cities, the devastated industries, and the ruined farms of Europe and the Orient that their desolate hordes will combine against us and by economic means wreck us?

Will we not be told that it is too awful to contemplate that we in America should be sitting over here with food and clothing and industries, more or less unimpaired, while men, women, and children in all these other countries are starving and dying?

Will we not have another propaganda blitzkrieg to compel us to admit millions upon millions of these malnourished, weakened, and sickened men, women, and children to our shores—even into our very homes perhaps—on the ground that

they suffered for our war, that they fought our battles?

Is there anyone here who believes such a campaign of propaganda will not take place as surely as the sun rises and sets?

And is there anyone here who does not believe that the same arguments which are now dragging us into this war will drag us into the position of feeding and clothing the destitute peoples of the other war-stricken parts of the world? And is there anyone here who doubts that all this is invited by those American internationalists who proclaim that those other peoples are fighting our war.

The implications of the administration's declarations on these points are too clear to be mistaken. We are to be made the "arsenal" for the world. We are to be made the banker for all the allied countries of the world. And after the war ends, regardless of our own internal conditions and our own stupendous public debt, which may reach \$200,000,000,000 before this affair is over, we will inevitably be asked to be the commissary for the world and to continue to be the banker for the world. And we will most certainly be threatened by the military and economic and social diseases and the onslaughts of the other nations unless we do agree to sink down to the levels of these war-torn peoples, feed and clothe them, divide what we have with them—and then take sides when they begin again to quarrel over what each of them shall get out of Uncle Sam's commissary.

It is time for plain talk, Mr. Chairman. It is time to look fearlessly at these naked, dangerous facts and guide our own course accordingly before it is too late.

Now, for another question.

If we go further into this war, we will adopt a so-called industrial mobilization plan which is, in fact, a complete blueprint for the establishment of a military despotism in this country.

Do you here today believe it wise for us to give up liberty and freedom at home and establish a rigid dictatorship in order to protect ourselves and the rest of the world from dictatorship abroad?

Do you believe that if these dictatorial powers are granted by Congress to the President he will come back at the end of the emergency and voluntarily return these great powers to the Congress? Or will there be found another emergency?

Let me again quote a paragraph from General Johnson's column:

There is talk about guarding against any such designs by limiting this all-out economic war dictatorship and partial military and naval dictatorship to 2 years.

Many of the emergency powers granted since 1933 have been so limited. All have been extended. Why? Because the granting of such massive powers with a time limit is also a grant of power to force the extension of that time limit. It has proved so with us over and over again during 8 years of grants of emergency powers with a time limit—even to the extent of extending all presidential powers for a third term.

The tendency of this administration has been always to ask for more powers than are necessary even for its avowed purposes. The tendency has been, as now and as to the third term, to assert a reluctance to accept such powers—then the tendency has been to press them to the limit of their grants and refuse

to give up any. On that history and in such a crisis, if ever a bill needed robust debate, this is that bill. On our march to "dictatorship to avoid dictatorship," it is "later than you think."

Now what is the answer to these puzzling and gravely dangerous questions?

Let me make my own position perfectly clear. I happen to have served as a volunteer through two wars—the Spanish-American and the World War. I mention that fact lest someone be tempted to call me a "fifth columnist" or an appeaser.

If and when I am convinced that we should go into this war with all we have because it is the best way to protect our own liberty first—and then that of other peoples—then I am for going in with all we have—and not on the lease-lend plan, either. [Applause.]

If and when I am convinced that Britain and Greece and China are fighting our battle, I shall be among the first to advocate giving them every help possible—and doing it with our eyes open to the fact that we will never get a dime in return for what we provide them.

But I want to be sure we are not being blinded to very obvious facts by the blitzkrieg of propaganda which floods the country. We know how secret diplomacy and lying propaganda—systematic lying propaganda—lured us into the first World War. I want to be sure we are making the wisest decisions this time. I want none of this practice of rushing through Congress, without adequate examination and debate, any plan the administration sends up with the message that suggests at least that Hitler is too near to New York harbor with ships and an army for us to lose a moment in enacting into law the presidential demand. I for one am highly suspicious of such methods and I intend to fight so far as I can for giving the whole people a fair and honest view of what is proposed and what the consequences of adopting these proposals would be. It may be later than we think, but it is not too late yet to tell the people the truth; to scrutinize carefully these demands for dictatorship powers; to look before we leap; and to exercise caution in making sure we are not letting loose of our liberties for all time.

If the Congress enacts the so-called lease-lend bill authorizing the President to take us into aggressive war, to give away our defense, to create any amount of public indebtedness he sees fit, and to send help to whatever countries he shall choose, wherever those countries may be located, it will prove a sorry day for this generation and many generations to come. We will then have embarked upon a national policy of financing warring nations throughout the world whenever the President may determine that by so doing we contribute to the national defense.

If this bill should be adopted, I hope it will have been amended to provide that the President shall acquaint the proper committees of both Houses of the Congress with a complete statement every 30 days of his intentions to lease, lend, or give away supplies, implements, or munitions of war of whatever nature, together with the names of the countries to which he intends to lease, lend, or give such supplies, and the amounts.

I think the pending bill should also be amended to provide that the President, together with the appropriate officials of the Army and Navy, shall report to the proper committees of each House of the Congress every 30 days the extent of our equipment and the supplies for our own territorial defense, as well as our production for defense—and this should include the officials of the O. P. M.—Office of Production Management—the amount of that defense being leased, loaned, or given away; what countries are being leased, loaned, or given these defense implements and supplies; and the effects upon our own national defense. I think the pending bill should be so amended as to assure this course; and if I am able to secure further time later during this debate, I shall give the House my reasons for asking that this be done.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I believe that the facts I have given you, the issues I have presented, are facts and issues that ought to be given to all of the people of this country. Abraham Lincoln foresaw just such a situation as we are in today, and, warning against it, he said:

It has long been a grave question whether any government, not too strong for the liberties of its people, can be strong enough to maintain its existence in great emergencies.

The test of the American way has come. The trial is before us. The question is whether or not we can meet the threat of dictatorship abroad and the danger of too great a concentration of power at home with that wisdom which will assure Lincoln's government of, by, and for the people.

And so, Mr. Chairman, in his words—

Let us have the faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in considering this legislation the first thing we should have should be a simple, straightforward statement of what its proponents seek to accomplish by it. When we have gotten that, then we can begin to have constructive debate as to what should be in the legislation. So far the presentation on the part of the proponents has failed to give that information. I am expressing the hope that as the debate proceeds the proponents of the legislation will give us a direct and specific statement of the things that they hope to accomplish by it. Then we will be able to consider it really and progressively. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, in considering the proposition now before us and in reaching a decision upon it I sincerely wish it were only a simple question of deciding whether or not we were going to take this Nation into war. That would be a very easy decision to make. The

answer would be no; but, Mr. Chairman, this question is a question much deeper than a mere decision like that.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see how anyone can approach this question in a statesmanlike attitude unless we approach it from the viewpoint of how we can prevent war from coming to this Nation. That is a question the answer to which is not entirely ours to make. Circumstances beyond our control will, more than likely, decide that question. Let no one believe otherwise. The Congress, under the terms of the Constitution, is charged with the national defense. I submit to you that the national defense of this Nation is much broader than it seems to be. The term "to defend" means to secure, to preserve. We might defend this Nation for a time within the boundaries of this Nation, but we cannot preserve it in that manner. As a result of such program, we would meet the inevitable end of all nations throughout the history of the world which have tried to defend themselves from within their own boundaries. We would be destroyed. We would meet the same fate that France met. We would meet the same fate that Poland met. We would meet the same fate that history has recorded for every nation that has been so short-sighted regarding national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the Members of this House who consistently stood before this body in years gone by and endeavored to warn them and the Nation of the impending storm; but, Mr. Chairman, we were as voices crying in the wilderness. Our voices fell on deaf ears, on the ears of a Congress, the thoughts of which were geared only to labor matters, relief matters, and social-reform matters. As important as these matters may be, nevertheless they received more than their share of attention and the Congress has neglected the national defenses and has neglected consideration of questions such as this and refused to believe that such a situation as this could confront us. After all, there are none so blind as those who will not see.

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

Mr. FADDIS. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania served with distinction in the World War in the combatant forces. He has been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, as I recall, during his entire membership in the House. He is familiar, both as a soldier and a legislator, with reference to the question of national defense and national dangers. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would give us his opinion as to whether or not there is any danger to this country now which will require the passage of this bill.

Mr. FADDIS. I am very glad to answer the gentleman from Texas. I want to say I believe there is, absolutely. I sincerely believe, with all my heart, that if this Nation permits Great Britain to be defeated we will be the next victim of the Axis onslaught. I believe that it will not only come from Europe, but it

will come also from Asia. I believe we will be attacked from the neighborhood of Europe by the powers that will have within their control anywhere from three to four hundred million people, and I believe we will at the same time, be attacked from the Pacific by powers which will control more people than that. Oh, I do not mean it will come within the next year, but I believe it will come sooner than the American people want to believe it will come, and that we will not survive the attack.

I think the time has come when the American people and their legislators will have to stand up and look at things as they really are and not at things as they desire them to be. [Applause.] I think the time has come when we should abandon all sham and hypocrisy and all demagogery on these matters. The dangers are too real, too vital, and the tragedy is too near. Oh, it is all very easy and very appealing to stand before this body or to announce to the people of the United States that we are for keeping this Nation out of war. That is too easy; in fact, I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, if the time ever comes when this Nation is actually invaded—and I believe the time may come—if we do not do our duty here and now, when that time comes we cannot then answer to the American people: "Oh, we did everything possible to keep you out of war," because the American people expect us to be wise and courageous enough to keep war away from this Nation and to do our duty here today. The American people are not a bunch of milksops. They are a strong, virile people, and people of courage.

There is no denying, and no one who has a comprehensive view of this situation today can deny, that we have a vital interest in the outcome of the struggle in Europe, Asia, and Africa. No one can deny that Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese have announced to the world that they intend to create a new order, that they intend to redistribute the properties and the resources of the world in a manner which will benefit them and their kind. Who can doubt from their own statements that if these dictators are victorious in the conflicts now raging abroad they will put the entire world under their dominion; that they will govern the world with a chosen few of their own kind; that they will deny to the other peoples of the world all of the comforts, the conveniences, the luxuries, the privileges, and liberties that we now enjoy? Who believes but that they will govern the world with a chosen few of their own kind and for those chosen few alone? They, and only they, will have the privilege of the ballot, will have the privilege of education, will have the privilege of bearing arms. Can we doubt that when they have announced it themselves, when they have instituted a program of this kind and are right now carrying it out with every means within their powers, and have put it into effect in every nation which they have conquered thus far? Oh, my colleagues, are we to sink to the apathy of the French people after the construction of the Maginot line? The French people with a proud history of sacrifice for their nation, the French people with a proud

history of military achievement behind them, a French Army which was accredited with having the best-trained officers in the world. They were placed in a position where they were unable to defend their own nation because they had staked all of their hopes for national defense on the Maginot line.

They had only to look back through military history, as far back as they could go, to see written on the pages of that history, without a single, solitary exception, where disaster and destruction were the inevitable results of surrendering the initiative. I say those people were so influenced by the pacifistic propaganda of the twenties that they based all their hopes and expectations of national defense on something that failed them entirely when the day of trial confronted them. They certainly should have known, if they knew anything, that the troops that surrender the initiative, that the troops that go on the defensive, have robbed themselves of any opportunity to win an engagement. When the spirit of the age was mechanization and movement they resorted to a war of position. They geared their national defense to the communistic, socialistic, pacifistic, isolationist mind and today they are under the iron heel of their conqueror.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. A representative of the Belgian Government told me that where they made their first mistake was in 1937 in terminating their defensive treaty with England and France. I asked him why that was so. He said it was so for two reasons, first political, second military. He said the cry was "Belgium for the Belgians," and they cited the case of Holland; she made a treaty with Germany, she was a nonaggressor, and was not involved. Then Hitler's promises to these countries have not been kept in a single instance. As someone has said, he keeps his threats but breaks his promises.

Mr. FADDIS. That is exactly true, and the entire political philosophy of the nation that Hitler governs today is builded on the political philosophy of Frederick the Great, who said that a treaty was made only to be broken at the convenience of those who signed it. On that political philosophy the German Nation was builded, and that philosophy has been followed. Why, O why, would anyone be foolish enough to believe him? Just before Hitler invaded the Low Countries, Denmark, and invaded Norway he had assured not only those nations but the entire world that he had no designs whatever on their territory. Yet as soon as the situation would permit, as soon as it suited him to do so, he invaded those nations, broke every treaty that had been concluded with them, violated every pledge he had given them, violated every law of God and man in order to seize those foolish neutral nations. Those foolish, trusting, heedless nations lay there supine and helpless up to the day of invasion, when they at one time might have joined the enemies of the Reich and invaded Germany, and perhaps have won the war. Throughout the first winter of

the war people laughed about a comic-opera war. The Allied troops lay opposite the German lines doing almost nothing. They were talking about how well they fared, how well they were set up, when had they taken the offensive they might have invaded Germany and ended the war at that time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I am sure the gentleman remembers how they called it a phoney war.

Mr. FADDIS. That is true; they called it a phoney war, but it is far from phoney today. It is only too real to all of them.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I appreciate the fact that we can profit by the psychological lessons that had to be learned by those countries; but the gentleman does not feel for a minute, does he, that our position in a military sense is at all comparable to that of France and the Low Countries? I would be delighted to have the gentleman discuss our military situation. He certainly does not feel that we are at all comparable to those countries whose boundaries are contiguous to Germany?

Mr. FADDIS. Of course, I would not maintain that our position is similar in that respect, no, indeed, but certainly, the gentleman, being a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, recognizes the fact that if or when Hitler conquers Europe he will be sadly lacking cereals, oil, cotton, and various other textiles. He will recognize the fact that he has a large population on his hands and he will have to get his commodities somewhere. Where is he going to look to get them? He cannot get them on the continent of Europe. He is going to look across the Atlantic Ocean to the only place where they are. He is going to get them, just the same as he went out to get Norway, Holland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland, France, and every other territory within his grasp. I say to the gentleman that no man can stand here today and say with any surety that Hitler intends to invade this Nation, but I do solemnly say to this body here today that the chance that he may do so is a chance that we dare not take. We must get ourselves in a position whereby we will make it impossible for him to invade this country and the only way we can do that is by assisting Great Britain in her fight against him. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JONKMAN. Assist Great Britain for what purpose? To defeat Germany?

Mr. FADDIS. Absolutely; assist Great Britain to defeat Germany.

Mr. JONKMAN. All right. If the gentleman undertakes that, is he going to finish it?

Mr. FADDIS. As far as I am concerned; yes. I am willing to go as far as

is necessary to assist Great Britain to defeat Germany and I may say to the gentleman right here that I see no hope of Great Britain or any other nation winning this war until they form an army of invasion and invade Europe and defeat Germany on their own soil. Wars are only won on the ground of the enemy.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman has just given the first specific aim of this bill—total war against Germany.

Mr. FADDIS. I am not giving the aim of this bill at all. I am giving my own personal opinion, that is all. The gentleman asked me the question if I believed in defending Great Britain. I believe in defending Great Britain with every resource this country can muster because it is the only way we can provide for our own national security.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FISH. Is the gentleman in favor of our going to war?

Mr. FADDIS. Not at the present time.

Mr. FISH. How does the gentleman maintain then that without our Army Great Britain can invade the Continent and drive 8,000,000 Germans out of it?

Mr. FADDIS. I did not maintain that Great Britain could do that.

Mr. FISH. That is what the gentleman said, that England had to invade the Continent.

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman misunderstood me as he misunderstood the Secretary of State.

Mr. FISH. I was listening to what you said. What did you say?

Mr. FADDIS. You were listening to what you wanted to hear me say.

Mr. FISH. No. I knew in advance what you were going to say. Does the gentleman still maintain that Great Britain can invade Europe and drive the Germans out of there without our help?

Mr. FADDIS. I certainly did not. I specifically stated they could not.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman believes, then, that if it becomes necessary to prosecute Britain's war against Germany to a successful termination, we should send our troops to bring that about, and he would be in favor of it?

Mr. FADDIS. I stated here that I am in favor of doing whatever is necessary to preserve Great Britain. I firmly believe that if Britain falls, we will fall also. There is no length I will not go to in order to preserve Great Britain. I am satisfied it is necessary.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman stated in response to a question from the gentleman from New York that he was not in favor of going to war just now. When is the gentleman in favor of going to war against Germany and under what circumstances?

Mr. FADDIS. That is a question the answer to which depends upon circumstances and expediency.

Mr. MOTT. I should have put it that way. I should have said, under what circumstances?

Mr. FADDIS. I am in favor of going to war whenever it becomes apparent that that is the only means by which we can keep war out of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. MOTT. When that time comes, and from the gentleman's statement I take it he thinks the time has not yet come, does not the gentleman think that he should reserve to himself as a Member of Congress the right to say when that time has arrived, and declare war then?

Mr. FADDIS. I undoubtedly will have that right as a Member of the Congress because the Constitution of the United States which states that the Congress has the power to declare war is still in effect and regardless of the oft-repeated statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], it is not yet a scrap of paper.

Mr. MOTT. But the gentleman will agree, I think, that wars are no longer declared. I mean, a declaration of war is not considered necessary by the aggressor powers.

Mr. FADDIS. That is true.

Mr. MOTT. Does not the gentleman see that under this bill we can easily go to war or find ourselves in the war without the necessity of a declaration of war by the Congress?

Mr. FADDIS. I may say to the gentleman that no matter what happens, it will be necessary for the Congress to provide the money to carry on a war.

Mr. MOTT. But it would not be necessary to declare war?

Mr. FADDIS. Congress still has the power under the terms of this bill, the same as it has had ever since we have been a nation. I do not fear that this Nation will ever be taken into war against the will of the Congress and the people.

Mr. MOTT. But it would not be necessary to declare war at all in order to do that.

Mr. FADDIS. I will ask the gentleman a question. I should like to ask a few questions myself once.

Mr. MOTT. Go ahead.

Mr. FADDIS. Can the gentleman imagine circumstances coming about that would make it necessary for this Nation to go to war?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; I can.

Mr. FADDIS. Therefore, why should we stand here today and blind ourselves to the reality of the situation? We are lulling ourselves and the people of this Nation into a sense of false security. We are not doing our duty as legislators and we are not doing our duty as American citizens unless we face the truth and speak the truth.

Mr. MOTT. I am not lulling myself. I can imagine, as the gentleman says, a number of circumstances which might arise that would make it necessary and make it to our advantage to go to war; but my contention is that when that time comes the Congress should have the power to say whether we are going to go to war or whether we are going to do an

act the inevitable consequence of which is war. We should determine that ourselves and not delegate it to the discretion of the President.

Mr. FADDIS. I quite agree with the gentleman, but I do not agree with him that this bill will do what the gentleman evidently implies it will do. It is not taking from the Congress the power to declare war.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman allow me to cite an example and ask him a question?

Mr. FADDIS. In a minute the gentleman can get his own time to make a speech, and he can take these matters up then.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BLOOM. Does not the gentleman know that the Congress could not delegate the power to someone else to declare war?

Mr. FADDIS. That is what I am trying to say.

Mr. BLOOM. It is ridiculous to stand on this floor and make such a statement as that, because it is utterly impossible.

Mr. MOTT. That is a very technical construction.

Mr. BLOOM. It is not technical.

Mr. MOTT. I think the gentleman would be interested in this:

Under this bill the President has authority, if he so desires in the future, without consulting the Congress and without regard to any law, to cause the repair and reconditioning of British battleships in New York Harbor. I voted for the bill in the Committee on Naval Affairs last year that would provide for these necessities if the time ever came when we should use them.

Mr. FADDIS. I congratulate the gentleman on his excellent judgment and fine statesmanship.

Mr. MOTT. As for delegating the war-making power to the President, if we pass this bill and leave that to his discretion and he does undertake to recondition British battleships in New York Harbor, the result is going to be a bombing of New York Harbor. I think the gentleman will admit that even a suicide squad could bomb it.

Mr. FADDIS. No; I cannot yield to the gentleman to make a speech in my time. I yielded only for a question. I believe the gentleman himself will have to admit I have been exceedingly lenient in my interpretation of what a question is.

Replying to the gentleman's question about whether or not I will admit that that will bring about a bombing of New York Harbor, I certainly will say that it will not bring about a bombing of New York Harbor. The gentleman, after mature consideration, is well enough acquainted with the facts and with the various forces engaged to know that at the present time, however badly Germany might want to bomb New York Harbor, it is totally impossible for her to do so because she has no forces she could bring over here to bomb New York Harbor at the present time.

Mr. MOTT. May I say to the gentleman that bombers are now being delivered—

Mr. FADDIS. I decline to yield right now.

Mr. MOTT. I thought the gentleman said he would yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon will be in order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania declines to yield.

Mr. MOTT. I understood the gentleman to say that he did yield. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FADDIS. I am afraid the gentleman, like the gentleman from New York, is trying to misunderstand me.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman has been very generous with his time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, again I demand the regular order.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENDER. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has painted the picture of the possibility of war for our country. Does the gentleman feel that we are now prepared for a major emergency?

Mr. FADDIS. By no means, but I believe that this will go further toward getting us prepared for a major emergency than anything we have done in the past, and probably anything we will do in the future, short of actually going to war. [Applause.]

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does not the gentleman feel that we have, under this legislation or in any other way, a delicate balance to preserve to build up our own defenses, at the same time giving what additional help we can to Britain?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes; and I have every confidence that that will be done.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, what I want the people of this Nation and the Members of this body to give due consideration to is the dangerous position this Nation is in. It is something that alarms me and that has alarmed me for a long time. It is the fact that under present conditions we have in the Pacific an unfriendly power that is so highly organized in that sector of the world that if we should undertake to send ships west of Hawaii against her will she could absolutely prevent us from carrying on commerce in that quarter of the globe, the quarter of the globe whence comes all of our rubber, a large part of our tin, a large part of our tungsten, all of our sisal, all of our quinine, and many other important strategic commodities. To close our eyes to this situation would be foolish. We must face the realities which confront us if we are to provide for our security. Japan is getting stronger day by day. She has lately extended her

might far to the south and is a threat to our commerce and a menace to the peaceful nations of the world. About a year ago I spoke upon this subject and prophesied the advance she recently made.

This is something we must not overlook in the crisis we are facing today. We must not overlook these facts and we must not allow ourselves to be blinded any more by considerations that have nothing to do with the subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. FADDIS. And in consideration of the world situation we must not look upon the measure as a measure for assistance to Great Britain alone, but a measure for the assistance of any of those nations throughout the world that are today fighting to preserve democracy—democracy, the only system of government that we believe to be worth while, the only system of government which we believe can furnish mankind with those things that make life worth living, the only system of government suited to our needs today. Here we have a measure that is designed to preserve democracy throughout the world. We do not know today to what lengths we may have to go to preserve democracy, but this measure will enable us to take another step in preserving democracy by preserving England, that nation that is today the very keystone of democracy throughout the world, and to maintain near the continent of Europe a key position which can be used at the proper time to launch an attack against the forces of totalitarianism and preserve the freedom of mankind, democracy, and Christianity.

Now, in concluding, Mr. Chairman, I want to implore the members of this Committee that in a time like this they consider this measure with as much sincerity as they can muster, and to remember that the fate of the nations which have fallen in the past can be written in the words "too little" and "too late"—too little consideration to the vital matters which were perhaps a little less distinct than the matters directly at home; too little consideration given to those matters which required sacrifices; too little courage in an emergency; too late to make decisions; too late to stand by your friends; too late to concentrate sufficient force on the strategic crossroads of the world. Too little and too late. God forbid that this Nation should fall from such causes. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States has been for some time considering the bill known as H. R. 1776, called the lend-lease bill, more properly called the lend-lease-give bill, with emphasis on the "give."

I am curious to know by what principle of mathematics the proponents of the bill selected the number H. R. 1776. Was this a little bit of psychology to play upon the American people by arousing patriotic thoughts growing out of the old historic date, 1776, which we all remember as the

birth year of our Declaration of Independence? It seems passing strange that this particular number just by chance has been given to this bill.

The lend-lease feature of this legislation is entirely erroneous and misleading. Practically every person agrees that there will be no return, either in money or otherwise, on the munitions and implements of war we furnish Great Britain and her allies. The proposed lend-lease bill is, in effect, a proposal of setting up a dictatorship in domestic affairs and giving the President full and complete power over foreign affairs.

This bill contains far greater potential consequences for good or ill, so far as our American form of government is concerned, than the Court-packing bill embraced and more than any other measure proposed in many years past. In my judgment, should this bill be passed in its present form, it would, in effect, abrogate the constitutional provisions requiring the three independent and coordinate branches of government—the legislative, judicial, and executive—because of the power conferred upon the President both in domestic affairs and in foreign affairs.

All thinking Americans have great cause for concern today. Here in Washington and throughout the country we constantly hear propagandists state that America should enter into the European conflict. Already some of our leading officials have bluntly stated that it is time that America should declare war. I remember back in 1917, when the propagandists then told us that America should enter the World War to "save the world for democracy." We did enter the war; mobilized 4,000,000 fine American boys; sent 2,000,000 of them across the ocean, thousands of whom never returned; spent billions of dollars, only to awaken to a realization of the fact that the war to end war was futile; that the constantly recurring and insistent wars of Europe still would continue as they have continued for centuries past.

I think that every interested American citizen would agree that there has never been a time in the history of this Nation when it has been as necessary as it now is that we proceed with great caution; that we face frankly all the dangers; that we discuss fully and candidly where we are headed and what the effect will be, not only now but in the future. The American people do not want war. They are sympathetic with the proposition to give aid to Great Britain and to other countries fighting under the name of democracy, but they are not willing that American boys be again sent to European soil to fight a war to end war that will never end as long as the political set-up of Europe remains as it is now, and as it has been for many years in its various conflicting rivalries incident to European soil.

The words which I am about to quote formerly stirred the American people. They are words taken from an interesting state document:

The object of this war is to deliver the free people of the world from the menace and the actual power of a vast military establishment controlled by an irresponsible government, which, having secretly planned to dominate

the world, proceeded to carry the plan out without regard either to the sacred obligations of treaty or the long-established practices and long-cherished principles of international action and honor; which chose its own time for the war; delivered its blow fiercely and suddenly; stopped at no barrier, either of law or mercy; swept a whole continent within a tide of blood—not the blood of soldiers only but the blood of innocent women and children also, and of the helpless poor. This power is not the German people. It is the ruthless master of the German people. It is no business of ours how that great people came under the control or submitted with temporary zest to the domination of its purpose, but it is our business to see to it that the history of the rest of the world is no longer left to its handling.

Do those words sound familiar? Those are the words of Woodrow Wilson, uttered more than 20 years ago. It is 1917 repeating itself.

Let me make myself definitely clear. All my sympathies are with Britain, Greece, and China. They are fighting a gallant fight against great odds, and I pray, as does every citizen, that they may win it. I would like to see all dictators and aggressors removed politically from the face of the earth. I am willing, as are practically all Americans, that all or any nations fighting aggression be allowed to purchase such weapons as we can spare. I do not believe, however, that we should give away our own defenses, nor allow carefully manufactured fear or propagandized hysteria to destroy the best defense we possess, namely, plain, ordinary common sense. I have heard no reputable military authority who thinks that we are in immediate danger of invasion from anywhere; but I do believe and have so voted for an adequate national defense, a national defense that gives us the finest and most efficient Army, Navy, and Air Corps; a national defense so strong that no foreign aggressor dare attack us on American soil; but I am bitterly opposed to America's participation in the European conflict, and bitterly opposed to those direct measures that have for their sole purpose the gradual leading of America into war.

I am opposed to the Congress of the United States passing H. R. 1776, or any other bill that would virtually be an abdication by Congress of those specific powers and duties which are conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States. I am against this delegation of power to any man or group of men no matter how wise, how great, how powerful they may be, or think they may be. To me such an abdication by Congress would be a betrayal of the American people, in direct violation of the basic law of the land.

Let me call your attention to those words which we heard so much during the recent political campaign; those words which the most discerning intellect could not wisely interpret; the words "short of war." During the 2 or 3 months of the national campaign the administration constantly promised aid to Britain "short of war." Just where "short of war" was, no one knew, but the American people were sympathetic to Britain. Now, however, since the campaign is over, we notice that some of the newspapers

are dropping all pretense of aid "short of war." Now they say to us that we should give Britain all our aid or complete help. This term has been relegated to the realm of broken promises, past emergencies, and forgotten slogans.

The secret negotiations which are being conducted between the administration and the Government of Soviet Russia are arousing grave suspicions among many Members of Congress and other observers throughout the country. The administration itself is being very seriously embarrassed, and its spokesmen are refusing to make direct answer to those who want to know something of our international policy. First, Soviet Russia is a complete dictatorship, is as utterly opposed to democracy as it is possible for any government to be. Secondly, it is as bloody a dictatorship, as oppressive a dictatorship, as aggressive a dictatorship as any in the world. Third, the Soviet Government has coldly and deliberately double-crossed the British Government not once but twice or three times. Fourth, the Soviet Government has refused to keep its solemn promises made to the present administration when recognition was accorded Russia.

It was then promised that Russia would prevent her communistic leaders from interfering in American political affairs, or using American embassies or consulates for that purpose, and yet, notwithstanding all these things, our country has removed the moral embargo imposed upon Russia and has conducted secret negotiations with Russia. There are those in Washington who believe the Stalin dictatorship will double-cross the United States of America as quickly and as coldly as it did England.

The Congress of the United States has been very liberal in its appropriation for the Army and the Navy. We have built one of the finest navies in the world, a navy of which the American Government and American people are justly proud; a navy which as of January 1, 1941, consisted of 322 combatant ships, 15 battleships, 6 aircraft carriers, 18 heavy cruisers, 19 light cruisers, 85 new destroyers, 75 old destroyers or converted destroyers, 37 new submarines, and 68 old submarines. There are also 173 auxiliary vessels, exclusive of patrol boats and district craft, making a grand total of 495 major vessels.

This splendid Navy is for the protection of the United States and of the American people; and yet, under the terms of the lend-lease bill, the American people could awake any morning and find that some of these fighting ships had been turned over to Great Britain or to other European democracies.

Section 3 (a) of the pending bill states:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may from time to time, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, authorize the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other department or agency of the Government:

1. To manufacture in arsenals, factories, and shipyards under their jurisdiction, or otherwise procure, any defense article for the government of any country whose defense the United States deems vital to the defense of the United States.

2. To sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to any such government, any defense article.

So that, under this clause, not only could our mosquito boats be transferred to Great Britain, as they have been, but any part or all of our Navy.

This is too much power to give into the hands of any one man. The American Navy is primarily for the safeguarding of the American Nation and should be preserved for the American Nation. Under the lend-lease bill, the Navy could be used to convoy belligerent ships any place in the world.

Last year, when we were discussing the neutrality bill, the one feature of the cash and carry provision was to properly protect America; that those nations who desired to purchase from us must come here, pay cash, and convoy their goods in their own ships at their own risk. This bill would wipe away that provision of the Neutrality Act. The moment our Navy is used to convoy belligerent ships or to convoy ships carrying munitions of war to foreign countries, that moment, in the event of the destruction of one of our boats, would be used as the basis of inflaming the American people to an immediate declaration of war.

Under the lend-lease bill the administration could provide harbors, repairs, and refueling within territorial American waters to the warships of any nation engaged in war, thus making our country an active participant in this war. The American Nation consists of fine, courageous citizens, loyal to their Constitution and to their Government. They believe in the great heritage of the American Nation, a nation which in 150 years has increased from 3,000,000 people scattered along the Atlantic coast to a nation of more than 131,000,000 people.

Our people are sympathetic to those countries fighting for the preservation of democratic institutions. They are willing to extend aid to them by every reasonable means and to use the administration's own words "short of war." But our people do not believe that American boys should again be sent to European soil. They do not want to see a duplication of the tragic days of 1917 and 1918. They want to preserve the integrity of our own Nation. They are opposed to legislation the direct purpose of which would be the abrogation of the rights of Congress and the centering upon the head of the executive department dictatorial powers the like of which has never occurred in American history.

I wish to quote from the minority views filed to accompany H. R. 1776:

We are for all aid to Britain short of war, and short of sacrificing our own defense and our own freedom. The British, in their valiant struggle which has aroused our deepest sympathy, need planes, guns, and war material.

We are for this objective without delay. We believe this objective can be accomplished without granting enormous power to the President, which the founders of the Republic wisely decreed should remain with the Congress as the representatives of the people. If there is any delay in reaching

this objective it would be caused by this unprecedented bid for Presidential power.

We would willingly support a straightforward bill which would grant Britain \$2,000,000,000 worth of credit.

This would eliminate the step of giving the President absolute power over every concern in this country manufacturing war materials. This would not permit him to be the director of the war in England, a position which is fraught with great danger to the American people. If we assume the direction of the war, we underwrite the success of the war. The ultimate result must be the American people will pay the full costs of the war and that means we will be obligated to put our material resources and our men into the struggle.

Granting credits, which England needs, will fully meet the situation of today and it will lessen materially the likelihood of our going into the war. Our naval and military experts agree that our Nation is in no danger of attack; that with our vast resources and geographical position our situation is not comparable to that of nations of Continental Europe.

This power requested is too much to give any man at a time when the country is at peace. As Secretary Cordell Hull once said: "This is too much power for a bad man to have, or for a good man to want."

Using the slogan of "Aid to Britain," and under the title of "Promoting Defense," this bill gives the President unlimited, unprecedented, and unpredictable powers—literally to seize anything in this country and to give it to any other country, without limit in law. He may sell or give away our Navy, our planes, our arms, our secrets, and use any proceeds from such sales for similar purposes he need come to Congress only for appropriations to restore our Navy, our planes, our arms.

John Bassett Moore, world-famous authority on international and constitutional law, says: "The pending bill assumes to transfer the war-making power from the Congress, where the Constitution lodges it, to the Executive * * * The tide of totalitarianism in government * * * has not only reached our shores, but has gone far to destroy constitutional barriers, which, once broken down, are not likely to be restored."

Remember, we cannot repeal war; we cannot repeal bankruptcy; and we cannot repeal dictatorship. Under this bill we surrender our democratic way of life now, for fear of a future threat to our democratic way of life. The oldest and last constitutional democracy surrenders its freedom under the pretext of avoiding war, with the probable result that the newest dictatorship will soon go to war.

I am opposed to H. R. 1776, the lend-lease-give bill, and shall vote against it unless perfecting amendments may be adopted which would take away the dangerous provisions of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, we are today considering one of the most momentous problems that has ever faced the Congress of the United States. Under the proposed legislation Congress is asked to grant to the President in peacetime, such power and authority as was never heretofore known in our history. In adopting this legislation, you are placing unprecedented and unnecessary power in the hands of one man. This power and authority, if granted, will be done at one of the most crucial periods in the history of our civilization.

The proponents of this bill tell us that the principal objective is that of furnishing aid to Great Britain. I ask you, Members of the House, to read the bill carefully again. There is nothing in this measure about granting aid to England. Assuming, however, that such is the intention of the bill, then I contend that sufficient power and authority has already been granted to give such aid to England and her Allies. If it is a matter of speeding aid to Britain, I just do not believe there is anything in this bill—as a matter of fact, I do not think it is so contended by those favoring it—that the passage of this bill will provide for more prompt and effective delivery of arms and munitions to Great Britain than is being furnished right now. If our defenses are not being built fast enough, and our munitions and materials of war are slow in manufacture, the adoption of this legislation cannot cure that situation.

If it is a question of furnishing financial aid to Great Britain, that question ought to be checked up to Congress directly, and Congress should face the problem squarely. It is the Members of Congress, as representatives of a great people, who ought to determine that question.

If it is contended that it is our obligation to intervene in this war, let Congress determine that question, too. The American people sympathize with Great Britain. I believe they want to do everything possible to help England win the war, and think they want to furnish materials and whatever help she needs, short of war. Personally, I think we should do everything we can to help her, without obligating this country to send our men and boys to the battlefields of Europe.

It is an appropriate time, right here and now, to determine just what is meant by the term "short of war." If we do not determine that question, and if we do not determine just how far we expect our country to become involved and implicated in this terrible world crisis, it is my belief that you and I are going to be required to decide before very long whether or not we shall send our boys, unprepared as they are, to the slaughter fields of Europe. You and I, as well as the people of this country, ought to weigh pretty seriously just what it would mean to the United States of America if we place ourselves in a position whereby we are obligated to send our men and boys to take part in that horrible conflict.

I would like to direct your attention to another feature of the bill that is not so important as the one I have just mentioned. It is the unlimited amount of expenditure of funds permitted under this bill. The proponents of the bill tell us the measure only authorizes this expenditure. You and I know, from our own experience, that when expenditures are authorized and promised, they are afterwards appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, if it is a matter of giving money to Great Britain, why not allocate an amount that this Congress feels it wants to give to that country and vote on it? Let the peoples' representa-

tives, who are, after all, responsible to the folks whom they represent, decide how much money and what materials we are going to allow to Great Britain and the Allied countries, as well as determine the basis upon which such materials and money are to be granted.

Mr. Chairman, I have no sympathy with the ruler of Germany or any of his kind. Like the rest of you, I want him defeated, just as promptly as possible. But, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that if our country is plunged headlong into the conflict that has enveloped the eastern continent, we will lose our last vestige of democracy. I think we should grant every possible and reasonable aid to Britain. I think we should do it as quickly as we can. At the same time, I think we should build and maintain our national defenses so they will become impregnable. We should adhere to the Monroe Doctrine in word and in spirit. Above all things, we must maintain our democracy. That democracy is on trial this afternoon.

I believe we should not forget that we have important, complex, and mounting problems within our own borders. We must not lose sight of them. While we realize that our country cannot exist in isolation, we must protect America first. We must keep this great Nation of ours on an even keel, so that when the warring nations of the world have become sick and tired of war, with all its horrors and suffering, and shall decide that war, after all, never settled anything, then it will be for the United States of America—if she maintains her democracy—to help lead the nations of the world down the pathway to permanent peace.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a political question in any sense of the word. It is too important for that. If I thought the passage of this bill were for the best interests of the United States of America, I would gladly support it. I cannot share that view of it. I do not believe the terms of H. R. 1776—unique in its number—are in keeping with the spirit of 1776 as we have always understood it. [Applause.]

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my maiden address to the House of Representatives is to speak in behalf of the national defense, of free labor and free industry not only in the United States but among our good neighbors the democracies of South and Central America.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, in a formal statement made January 15, estimated that the total British investments in railroads, public utilities, and other industrial ventures in South and Central America amounted to over \$4,000,000,000. In fact, in many cases British capital controls the enterprise.

The actual owners of these investments have been British citizens, but during the past year, as a national-defense measure, the British Treasury has commandeered and is in possession of the stocks, bonds, and shares representing this ownership.

I think the world agrees that this European war is basically an economic one and that there is nothing that the Hitler Government wants more than to gain economic footholds throughout the world, and particularly in our Western Hemisphere.

If a disaster should occur to Great Britain, it is my belief that the first form of indemnity demand of the German Government would be the delivery of the shares of stock, contracts, or agreements representing British ownership of railroads and industries in the nations of South and Central America.

Possessed of the evidences of ownership, Hitler would have won a war in the Western Hemisphere without firing a shot, and free labor and industry of our western republics will have as their bedfellows the robotlike workmen in the profitless factories which is the goal of the totalitarian state.

As dangerous as this situation may appear, I believe there is an adequate defense.

This country for many months has served as the asylum for gold belonging to foreign banks. Let us go a step further. Let us authorize the President to organize a joint board of custodian-trustees composed of the representatives of the 21 American republics. This board, during the period of the war, will take title and management and safeguard the British securities or utilities in North and South America.

There is no thought in my mind that these securities would in any way serve as collateral to loans or advances, but merely that they would be safeguarded from falling into the hands of nations unfriendly to our democratic ideals of free labor and free industry.

In fact, if any country should be in a position to redeem from the British Government any of its bonds or notes which are part of the securities held in trust, such transactions would be permitted.

At the proper time in the reading of this so-called lease-lend bill I shall offer an amendment which I think will take the securities of British nationals out of harm's way. This amendment is an enlargement of the proposal I have previously made to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The amendment I will propose is as follows:

At the end of subsection 3 (b) insert the following subsection:

SEC. 3 (c). To protect the economic welfare of the United States and the other American republics and to provide for the common defense of the Western Hemisphere, the President is authorized to negotiate the transfer to the joint custodianship of the 21 American republics, for the duration of the wars abroad and such time thereafter as they may deem necessary, the stocks, bonds, shares, land titles, contracts, or agreements representing any rights or interests in or ownership of any national or private enterprise located within what is geographically known as the Western Hemisphere, which are owned or controlled by or subject to the disposition of any such foreign government or any of its nationals.

If the amendment I propose is adopted no economic battle will be won without the firing of a shot on this side of the

Atlantic. The citizens of our own country and those of our neighbors in this hemisphere can rest confident that free labor and free industry have been protected from the sudden intrusion of totalitarian ideology. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I read with a great deal of interest the gentleman's statement with reference to this subject which was submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have been thinking about it since and I want to ask the gentleman this question: Did I understand the gentleman to say just now that these assets owned by England or by the British Empire, which we now have, which will be turned over to this new commission or body to be created, might at some future time be redeemed by anyone who happened to fall heir to them?

Mr. DEWEY. No; what I wish to provide for is this: There are in the possession of the British Treasury, for instance, many bonds of the Argentine Government, and the Argentine Government is selling meats and grains to the British Government, and the holders of the Argentine bonds turn over those bonds in payment for the exports from the Argentine. This could continue even if these securities were turned over to the trustees. That is all I meant by that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Could a situation be worked out through your plan something like this? I think it is clearly evident to anyone who is studying this subject that through the Export-Import Bank and the Inter-American Bank, which I understand is to be implemented very shortly, we will undoubtedly send to South American countries and Latin-American countries many billions of dollars of dollar exchange. If British subjects own a great deal of Latin-American securities, issued by industries of Latin America and units of governments of Latin America—such as utilities, railroads, insurance companies, and what-not—and the time comes around when there might be a clearance of obligations as between the British Empire subjects and the American people, and the American people and Latin-American, and Latin-American people back to the people of the United States, then why cannot all these securities be brought together under a commission of some kind? Suppose it does represent the 21 western nations, why in due course could not a clearance be made of those obligations, provided the 21 western countries deem it advisable as a national-defense measure to have that clearance effectuated?

Mr. DEWEY. I think that the opportunity to bring those securities together, safeguard them, and have a meeting of minds of the 21 Republics of the Western Hemisphere, would tend to a unity, to a thinking together of these States, and a harmony that might carry us forward a great deal economically.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I hope when the gentleman's amendment is offered that we will have time to discuss it fully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, and ask him whether he has asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. DEWEY. They have been revised and extended in the issue of January 24.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman has no objection I will ask unanimous consent that he have the right to extend his remarks at this time and place in the RECORD the value of those railroads, insurance companies, and other industrial securities he has in mind in the other American republics.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that permission.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also, I should think that the other American republics would be extremely grateful for this suggestion of the gentleman. It seems to me it would be tremendously to their own protection as well as to our protection in the Western Hemisphere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I will insert the statement I made to the Foreign Affairs Committee, embodying data referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, NINTH DISTRICT, ILLINOIS, ON H. R. 1776

Ladies and gentlemen of the Committee on Foreign Affairs: I appreciate this opportunity to present for the record this brief statement on H. R. 1776. Your committee has had before it many distinguished people qualified to speak on the various questions of foreign policy, defense policy, and economic policy involved in this proposed legislation. They have doubtless made it clear that the bill, as it now stands, is defective in a number of respects. I shall, however, confine this statement solely to two defects in the bill which are immediately apparent and concerning which I wrote your distinguished chairman under date of January 13.

I would be pleased if your committee would permit me to insert this letter at the end of this statement. It embodies two specific amendments I respectfully suggest to your committee. In making this statement I merely seek to emphasize what I have already said in my letter of the 13th.

In the first place, the bill makes no provision for an accountability to the Congress of the transfers or sales made under the powers delegated. In the second place, it makes no provision against the possibility that important British assets in this hemisphere may pass into the hands of unfriendly foreign powers in the event of the defeat of Great Britain by the Axis Powers—

The first amendment I have suggested is purely a technical one, suggesting that the Comptroller General of the United States look after the accountability of the material transferred to Great Britain or other countries as permitted by the proposed legislation. It may be that your committee can devise a better means for insuring an accountability, but some effective means there must be. After all, this is a representative government, a republic in form, and a democracy in spirit.

When we, as representatives of the people, are called upon to vest discretionary powers in the Executive, at the very least we should establish some way by which the Congress may know how the delegated powers are exercised. There must be some accounting of what is sold, exchanged, loaned, leased, transferred, or given away. The money and material belong to the people. We are responsible for it, and it behooves us to assume that responsibility.

I respectfully submit that the bill should be amended so that there be some accounting, so that the Congress may at any time learn through a single agency, responsible to the Congress, what is sold, what is exchanged, what is loaned or leased, and what is actually given away as an outright gift.

The second amendment suggested in my letter to the chairman is one of broader importance. It is to this amendment that I am anxious to direct your special attention. It relates to international finance or, more specifically, to British assets in this hemisphere. Having served as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and as financial adviser to the Polish Government, I am perhaps better qualified to address myself to this phase of the proposed legislation than any other.

There has been a great deal of talk about the possibility of the British Fleet falling into the hands of the Axis Powers should any disaster overtake the British Empire. The Secretary of the Navy discussed this possibility in his testimony before your committee, at which time I understand he presented figures on the combined naval strength of the Axis Powers and that of the United States. All of us recognize this danger to our security. We are preparing to meet it by building up the greatest and strongest fleet this country has ever had.

But, as important as this question of the possible transfer of the British Fleet to the Axis Powers in the event of Britain's defeat is to our security, I think we are overlooking a more practical danger. We are overlooking the fact that Great Britain has extensive holdings in this hemisphere, which, in the event of the defeat of Great Britain, will undoubtedly pass into the hands of the Axis Powers. The Axis Powers would have thus obtained the strong foothold in this hemisphere so long sought.

From a superficial research in the Department of Commerce I understand that the equities of British nationals in railroads, public utilities, and national resource ventures in the various countries of the Western Hemisphere, particularly in South and Central America, sum up to many billions of dollars. And, if I am properly informed, Great Britain has been mobilizing the foreign holdings of its nationals for some time past. It is my belief that if the German Government intends to do any grabbing it would grab these equities even before they undertook to get possession of the British Fleet. By this means the German Government would have obtained a foothold in the economic life of many of our neighbors without fighting a war on this side of the Atlantic. This, I think you will agree, represents a real danger to our people, to our peace and security.

To obviate any such possibility and using the Alien Property Custodian as a precedent, I suggest in my proposed amendment the setting up of a custodian or bailee to take over all title of these assets in safekeeping during the period of the war or as long thereafter as the uncertainty of the peace terms might dictate. In this way we will have a control against the unpredictable hazards of war and protect the future of our neighbors as well as the best interests of labor and industry in the United States.

There is no purpose in my mind that these assets shall serve as collateral to our loans or advances. I propose only that we hold them as a custodian, so to speak.

It is reported that the State Department and the Treasury Department have been taking steps preparatory to freezing assets of foreign nations, such as bank deposits, credits, etc., existing in the United States, in order that these holdings may not be improperly used. In some cases these steps have already been taken. But I cannot too strongly emphasize the fact that such procedure is not possible where similar assets are outside of our national jurisdiction even though in this hemisphere.

In a statement before your committee the Secretary of the Treasury presented data regarding the British investments in Latin America. But I do not think his statement brought out the real importance of these investments. In order to show how important they are, both from an economic and military standpoint, I have prepared a memorandum from the official records of the Department of Commerce. I would be pleased if your committee would permit me to insert this memorandum as part of my statement.

In preparing the memorandum I have emphasized the holdings in railroads, because no one can possibly dispute the fact that the railroads are of major importance economically and for military operations. I hope you will examine the data presented in this memorandum with great care, keeping always in mind what the situation will be should these holdings of British nationals become the holdings of the German Government.

Against such a danger we must protect our people and our neighbors. If the Monroe Doctrine is to mean anything at all, we must make certain that the Axis Powers do not, whatever the future may bring, obtain an economic foothold in this hemisphere. I think this possibility, constituting a real danger, can be dealt with by the proper amendment to this bill.

I have suggested a specific amendment for the purpose in my letter of the 13th to the chairman. I earnestly solicit your favorable consideration of it.

Of the total estimate of £1,002,000,000 given there, £451,000,000 were indicated as in railroads. Since railroads alone constitute almost half of total British holdings in Latin America, as estimated by the Secretary, the control of those railroads in the event of unfavorable developments in the world situation appears to be a matter of importance.

In Argentina the Secretary's estimate for British investments in railroads is £263,000,000 nominal value and £52,000,000 approximate market value. Argentina has always been a good market for British goods and one of the reasons is that the British investment in railroads is so heavy. According to a statement issued by the Department of Commerce (Industrial Reference Service No. 8, December 1940, "Railways Equipment Markets in Argentina"), this control amounts to some 65 percent of the total railway mileage of the country.

It might be noted that the estimate for British investments in railroads is slightly over 60 percent of the estimate for total British investments in Argentina.

For Bolivia, the Secretary's statement does not show the estimate for railway investments separately. According to the Stock Exchange Official Yearbook, London, 1939 (p. 456), the Antofagasta & Bolivia Railway Co., Ltd., "directly controls the Bolivia Railway Co." According to the same source, the former railway operates the latter on a 99-year lease from December 31, 1908. Somewhere around half of the total mileage of the country is operated by the Bolivia Railway Co.

In Brazil the Secretary's estimate for British investments in railroads is £38,000,000 nominal and £5,000,000 market value. About one-fourth of the total mileage of the country is controlled by British capital. This includes the strategic line of the Sao Paulo

Railway from Sao Paulo to Santos, which carries much of Brazil's coffee to be exported.

The Secretary's estimate for railway holdings is 20.4 percent of total British investments in Brazil.

In Chile the Secretary's estimate is £20,000,000 nominal and £5,000,000 market value. The chief British investment is in the Antofagasta & Bolivia Railway Co., which, as indicated above, controls the Bolivia Railway Co. The Antofagasta & Bolivia Railway Co. itself is the most important privately owned line in Chile.

The British railway investments are estimated by the Secretary at 19 percent of the total.

In Colombia, it is not believed that British investments in railroads are of any great importance. Possibly 5 percent of the total would be approximately correct. The Secretary did not show separate figures for railway investments in Colombia.

In Costa Rica, the only British line of importance is the Costa Rica Railway Co., which has 188 miles under concession expiring January 1, 1990, when the property reverts to the Costa Rican Government without further payment. The Northern Railway Co. (American controlled) has leased it for the remainder of the concession less the last 2 months. This information appears in the Stock Exchange Official Yearbook, 1939, page 484.

The Secretary estimates British investments in Cuba at £25,000,000 nominal and £1,000,000 market value. The two big railway combinations in Cuba are the United Railways of Habana, which is British controlled, with 1,340 miles owned, and the Consolidated Railroads of Cuba, which is American controlled, with 1,084 miles. Except for the trackage on innumerable sugar properties, these two combinations include the bulk of the railway mileage of the country. Data regarding the two are found in Moody's Railroads, 1939, pages 880-883, and page 1260, respectively.

It may be noted that railway investments comprise 90 percent of the total British investments in Cuba estimated by the Secretary.

In the Dominican Republic there are no British railway interests of importance known.

In Ecuador, the only British interest is in 60 kilometers of line owned in combination with the Government. Since the total kilometers of railroads in the country are over 1,300, British interest is not significant.

In Guatemala no British railway interest of importance is known.

In Haiti no British railway interest is known.

In Honduras no British railway interest is known.

The Secretary estimates British railway investments in Mexico at £90,000,000 nominal and £1,000,000 market value. The British still control the Mexican Railways Co., 431 miles long, the strategic line from Mexico City to Veracruz. (See Stock Exchange Official Yearbook, 1939, p. 506.) Undoubtedly the British have large holdings in securities of railroads now government-controlled.

It may be noted that the railways investment figure in Mexico is 52 percent of the total British investments.

In Nicaragua and Panama no British railway investments are known.

In Paraguay the only railway in the country, the Paraguay Central Railway, is British-owned.

In Peru the Peruvian Corporation has a perpetual concession for 1,053 miles of line it operates. (See Stock Exchange Official Yearbook, 1939, p. 2362.) This is about 40 percent of the total mileage of the country. The Peruvian Corporation is British-controlled.

In El Salvador the Salvador Railway Co., according to the Stock Exchange Official Year-

book, 1939, page 526, has a 100-mile concession running to 1974. The Salvador Railway Co. is British-controlled. During the life of the concession no competitive line can be built between the terminal points.

The Salvador Railway Co.'s lines are estimated at between one-fourth and one-fifth of the total mileage of the country.

In Uruguay the Secretary's estimate for British railway investments is £14,000,000 nominal and £1,000,000 market value. The British control around 80 percent of the main-line mileage and slightly less of the total mileage.

It will be noted that the estimate of £14,000,000 for railway investments is about one-third of the estimate for total British investments in the country.

In Venezuela the Secretary's statement gives an estimate of £3,000,000 nominal and £200,000 market value for British railway investments. According to figures appearing in a release of the Department of Commerce (Industrial Reference Service No. 12, December 1940, "Railway Equipment Markets in Venezuela"), British-controlled railways amount to about 36 percent of the total mileage of railways, tramways, and subsidiary land-transportation lines. Of the steam railways alone, the figures indicate British control of a little over 39 percent of the total.

Railway investments, in the Secretary's statement, are 10 percent of the total British investments in the country.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted I shall attempt to furnish the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] some ground or reason for this bill being before the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, to properly evaluate the purpose and the far-reaching significance of the bill now before us, it is appropriate to consider the historical background, the circumstances, and conditions that make its consideration necessary.

Following the last great World War a number of nations, being anxious to avoid the recurrence of such a disastrous conflict, entered into what is known as the Nine Power Treaty in 1922, and then in 1928 upward of 50 separate and distinct governments, having the same purpose in view, entered into what is known as the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Among the many nations subscribing to this contract or agreement were Japan, Italy, Germany, and the United States. These agreements recognized definite basic rights that belong to each and every nation, and it was understood and agreed in these compacts that such rights would be recognized by each of the contracting powers; and that in case of apparent conflicting interests, it was agreed that such differences should be adjusted through orderly and peaceful deliberation and thereby avoid future armed conflicts.

The verity and good faith of these agreements were adhered to and recognized by all of the contracting parties for a period of 10 years or more, or until 1931, when Japan, the first to ignore or repudiate her agreement with other nations, without notice proceeded to occupy Manchuria in China, and establish therein a system of government under Japanese control. Having been apparently successful in this enterprise, Japan became more ambitious and 3 years later

gave notice to other contracting nations that she, in effect, was repudiating her part in the agreements and was planning to enlarge her Army and increase the construction of her Navy. Japan then lost little or no time in the encroachment upon territory and other possessions of China. She proceeded to wage war without declaring war, and it was soon realized that Japan's purpose was to take complete control of China and all other possessions in the Orient. Japanese leaders began to dream of complete control of the eastern or oriental world, and already were making preparation to destroy or assist in the destruction of all democratic systems of government.

Following the example set by Japan, Italy, in 1935, proceeded to invade and conquer Ethiopia despite the fact that Italy had also entered into the agreements to which I have already referred. This increased power over Ethiopia begat a love for more power in Mussolini, the dictator in Italy, and in 1939 he proceeded to seize Albania in total disregard and in violation of Italy's agreement to the contrary.

Shortly after Mr. Hitler obtained control of Germany in 1933 he began to run true to form generally found in resourceful and ambitious dictator leadership. He soon began to dream dreams in his desire and ambition for more power. He was not long in reaching the conclusion that he could take advantage of the weakened military strength of other nations in Europe following the peace and disarmament agreements previously entered into and could not only obtain complete control of Europe, but with the increased strength and military power obtained as a result thereof, coupled with his increasing strength in South America, he could take possession of the entire Western Hemisphere. Of course his ultimate plans were not disclosed at that time. His first breach of faith with other nations was the reoccupation and fortification of the Rhineland in violation of the Locarno treaty. Then under the pretense of an invitation and urgent demand of the German population in Czechoslovakia and Austria he proceeded to seize and take possession of these countries without regard to Germany's agreements with other nations, and following his action in each instance he gave the assurance to other countries of Europe that he had no desire whatsoever to occupy, obtain, or seize other territory on the continent of Europe, but this oft-repeated statement was violated in each case with increasing evidence of his ultimate goal. It is now well understood by all how he ruthlessly took possession of and divided Poland, and despite almost daily reassuring statements he proceeded to invade and take control of Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, France, and other countries of Europe, and was halted only by the stubborn and determined opposition of Britain upon reaching the English Channel. For the past 6 months the conflict between Germany and Britain has been raging, it having become definite, clear, and certain in the meantime, by the actions and representations of Hitler, that if he succeeds in capturing

Britain there will be nothing to prevent him from taking charge of South America and the Western Hemisphere, including, of course, the entire United States.

Our ambassadors, ministers, and other representatives abroad, without exception so far as I have been able to learn, all say that if Britain is defeated in the present conflict in Europe it is no secret but well understood that the totalitarian governments, Germany, Italy, Japan, and perhaps others, have definitely and clearly planned to destroy once and for all the only remaining democratic system of Government on earth by invading, overrunning, and taking charge of the Western Hemisphere. Such reports have been brought to us from time to time for the past 2 years. At first they were received only as information, but as the conflict in Europe grew and widened with increasing speed and success of the Germans and allied dictators the reports became more frequent and alarming and the situation that confronts this country now is whether we can rely upon our existing military strength to meet the enemy when he comes, or whether we shall make preparations for his arrival, or whether it would be better to marshal part of our military resources and sell, lease, or lend them to Britain to increase her military strength with the hope that she will be able to defeat Mr. Hitler and obviate the possibility of having to engage in a war for the protection of our own Government.

Mr. Chairman, I have hastily and with little detail referred to the actions of Japan, Italy, and Germany within the past decade for the purpose of showing the attitude of the representatives of these three outstanding totalitarian governments, and for the further reason that we may form a reasonably accurate conclusion of their attitude toward the democratic systems of government in other countries and their contemplated actions toward that of our own. We could go further and show from evidence submitted to us that Japan, Italy, and Germany, through their representatives or leaders, have already agreed to combine their forces and proceed as one against this country following the expected downfall of Great Britain.

I may be mistaken—or I may be misled—but this is the situation as I see it. Of course, there are some who do not believe we are in any immediate or remote danger. They say the statements describing the situation abroad cannot be correct, but are greatly overdrawn or magnified. I do not know personally. I have not been there to see and hear what is going on. I have not had an opportunity to see their hands, as it were, or to put my finger into the print of their treacherous nails, or to thrust my hand into the side of their army, but the men and women bringing these reports to us are our accredited representatives and it would be a fearful situation if we cannot rely upon the unanimous representation of these people.

Regardless of how we may feel about the situation we have a bill before us providing that the United States Government shall arrange to sell, lease, or lend

the British Government any military equipment we can spare without jeopardizing our own defense, and I shall attempt to analyze some of the reasons assigned by others why it should not be enacted into law and to submit some reasons justifying its passage.

It may be that our apprehensions as to what will happen have been magnified in some respects, but the fact that at no time has Mr. Hitler offered any protest against our actions as violating any agreement or treaty with his country leads me to believe that the basis for our action in each step taken so far has been well founded and that at no time have we misinterpreted the well-laid plans and unholy designs of these ruthless invaders. If the premises upon which we acted when we passed the Neutrality Act in 1939 had not been true, Mr. Hitler would certainly have offered some kind of formal protest against such action. If the premises upon which we acted when we provided for increasing our Army, Navy, and Air Corps had not been true and well founded, he would certainly have offered some kind of protest against that action. If the premises upon which this bill providing aid to Britain were not correct, he would certainly have offered some kind of protest against this action, and his failure to offer any objections through our State Department, or to offer any protest to any of these actions on the part of our Government is conclusive proof that he is guilty of every charge preferred and, therefore, could not conscientiously offer any protest. He could not come into the court of international relations with clean hands and his failure to offer any formal objections is an admission of guilt and leaves no doubt in my mind as to what we may expect from him, his associates, and conspirators if we fail to make provision for the protection of our own household.

Practically every person who has appeared before any committee of Congress and submitted any testimony with respect to the bill now before us has declared unequivocally and without exception that in view of the pending and threatened danger to our system of government and the privileges enjoyed under it that this Congress should take all necessary steps to aid Britain short of declaring war. The idea seems to be practically unanimous. The one main objection is the procedure to be followed, this objection being that Congress should not give the President any additional authority or power for fear his actions will involve us in war. I can see where definite action on the part of Congress providing aid to Britain may be objected to by some of the belligerent nations and where there may be an excuse for some of them to declare war against us as a result of this action, but surely there could be no additional reason arising on account of the plan or procedure adopted for furnishing such aid. The excuse or reason for any other country declaring war against us for such action would be the same regardless of how or through whom such aid may be directed.

It is impossible to supply Britain with aid of any kind and guarantee this coun-

try will not become involved in war. We cannot prevent other countries from attacking us if they make up their minds to do so regardless of what excuse they may give for their action, and if an attack is made my guess is that this country is not going to sit down or fold its tents like France and surrender without a fight, and if it becomes necessary to fight it will be a fight to a finish. Of course, no one wants war and we will not knowingly do anything to provoke war, but we do not subscribe to the theory of "peace at any price." No one can guarantee there will be no war regardless of what action Congress may take, or whether it takes any action at all. Poland did not take any action to provoke war. Belgium did not take any action that provoked war or invasion, but we all know what happened to them. We do not want it to happen in this country. We all realize the proposal before us is an expensive proposition. We are not certain of the outcome. It may be an experiment, but the proponents of this bill would rather experiment with dollars, yea, many, many dollars, than have to experiment with the lives of our many able-bodied young men.

The real crux of this bill is found in section 3 and the subsection thereunder:

SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any law, the President may, from time to time, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, authorize the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other department or agency of the Government—

(1) To manufacture in arsenals, factories, and shipyards under their jurisdiction, or otherwise procure, any defense article for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States.

(2) To sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of to any such government any defense article.

(3) To test, inspect, prove, repair, outfit, recondition, or otherwise to place in good working order any defense articles for any such government.

(4) To communicate to any such government any defense information, pertaining to any defense article furnished to such government under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(5) To release for export any defense article to any such government.

(b) The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

Practically all of the objectors to the bill emphasize the words "or otherwise dispose of," found in subsection 2, where provision is made for the sale, transfer, exchange, lease, or lend such military equipment as may be utilized "in the interest of national defense," saying that these words give the President the right to actually give away such military equipment as he may desire. That is, they seem to be very much exercised over the idea that Congress may provide equipment to be used in the defense of our country and the President will then give it away without a consideration. The implication is unwarranted and unjusti-

fied because subsection b shows conclusively that there shall be at least some consideration, and it is absurd to think that any President of the United States would violate such a trust reposed in him.

Much has already been said about the danger that would arise from using the Navy to convoy military equipment to Britain. There can be no doubt but what there is danger. The President recognized it when he gave the assurance a few days ago that he is not planning to use convoys in forwarding these supplies. However, if the Congress provides such supplies, it makes little difference with respect to convoys who is given the authority or responsibility of seeing that the equipment is delivered, for the President will still have the power in his own right for convoying ships carrying such supplies.

Opponents of this bill insist that it should place a limitation on the power of the President to use convoys for the purposes mentioned. Congress cannot limit the power of the President in this respect, and the only way to prevent the use of convoys by law is to place a condition in the law providing such supplies by saying that no such supplies are to be furnished except without convoys. This would not be a limitation on the power of the President. It would simply be a conditional aid to Britain. I am not making an argument for the use of convoys, because I think the policy would be dangerous. I am simply calling attention to the futility of the argument made by objectors to this bill when they say it should contain a provision limiting the power of the President to use the Navy in convoying the supplies to Britain. The President already has that power if he wants to exercise it, and Congress cannot take it away from him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. HARE. There is no special reason for giving authority to Mr. Roosevelt to furnish or send aid to Britain other than that he is President of the United States. If it were a mere question of procedure, the authority could be given to a number of other men, but the reason for giving it to Mr. Roosevelt is because he is President of the United States and, as President, he is under a special constitutional grant Commander in Chief of the United States Army and Navy, and as such he already has certain powers which Congress cannot take away from him.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution, says:

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States—

And the Supreme Court declared in *U. S. v. Sweeney* (157 U. S. 281) that—

The objective of this provision is to vest in the President the supreme command over all the military forces, such supreme and undivided command as would be necessary to the prosecution of a successful war.

As far back as 1850 in passing upon this provision of the Constitution in the

case of *Fleming v. Page* (9 How. 603), the Court declared in effect:

As Commander in Chief he is authorized to direct the movements of the land and naval forces placed by law at his command, and to employ them in the manner he may deem most effectual to harass and conquer and subdue the enemy. He may invade the hostile country and subject it to the sovereignty and authority of the United States.

Some would say the President already has the power to involve this country in a war. That is true. He could, under his existing constitutional authority, direct the armed forces in such a way as to give occasion for war at any time, and as long as the Constitution stands he cannot be deprived of this power. The only way Congress can prevent the President today from sending our Army and naval forces anywhere he pleases would be by refusing to furnish the means for maintaining and supporting them. This latter authority, of course, is left entirely in the hands of the Congress. The Constitution provides that Congress alone shall have the right and power to raise and support an army. But when Congress has once provided an army or a navy the constitutional grant of authority to the President at once becomes paramount and he can send them where he pleases and use them as he sees fit so long as they are maintained and supported by Congress.

If you are afraid of the power vested in the President, you should refuse to provide and maintain an army or navy. Yet, in face of the objections offered, the objectors to this bill say we must not only have an army but a two-ocean navy—a navy equal to the combined navies of the totalitarian states of the world. In other words, they prove by their own statements and actions that they are perfectly willing to trust these mighty military forces—the Army and the Navy—in the hands of the President but say in the next breath they are unwilling to clothe him with authority to say when, where, or how a single machine gun, an army tank, or an airplane shall be sent to Britain. The little power given him under this bill is infinitesimal as compared with the power he already has. I can see but one or two reasons for their argument; one is they are not fully advised as to the extent of the constitutional powers of the President, or they are for political or other reasons unwilling to cooperate with Mr. Roosevelt because he happens to be President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, it may be due to my lack of ability to comprehend or understand, but if the Congress makes provision for sending aid to Britain it does not increase the military power of the President by imposing upon him the duty and discretion by which this aid is to be furnished. Without doubt it would impose upon him new duties and additional obligations and enlarge his discretionary powers in the discharge of these

duties, but it would add little or nothing to his existing military powers. The contemplated aid would probably have to be furnished through some military channel, and the President is the natural and logical person through whom it should flow. The opposition seems to resolve itself into political opposition rather than the patriotic reasons assigned. The objectors insist that Congress should retain this authority in its own hands, when we all know it would be impracticable and nigh impossible for Congress to undertake to decide upon every feasible and necessary action in deciding upon the procedure. This would result in lengthy debate and entail what may prove to be suicidal delay. It is conceded by all that time is of the essence, and if this is true why should we cavil and delay on mere formalities? If it is already determined what Congress should do in providing aid to Britain, why not delegate the power to the President and couple it with instructions to proceed at once? To hesitate and delay the matter by unnecessary debate leads only to one conclusion, and that is we are not sincere in what we are saying and that we are really opposed to doing what we say we are willing to do.

The appeasers, the isolationists, the negotiated-peace advocates, the Socialists, Communists, and other opponents of the proposed legislation are expressing their opposition in a number of ways to this bill, but their "ace in the hole" argument is one which appeals to the pride, vanity, and jealousy of Congress when they suggest that Congress should be jealous of its power and not delegate it to the President. I obtain no pleasure in referring to them personally or individually, but the testimony of former President Hoover's Under Secretary of State before the Foreign Affairs Committee a few days ago well illustrates their argument, when he said, in effect:

The passage of the pending bill would make President Roosevelt a dictator over Britain as well as the United States, because through his control of supplies, munitions, and implements of war he would become supreme in all military matters.

He indicated by his statement that the President has no power in military matters unless delegated to him by Congress, which is contrary to fact.

They want to know in advance what the President is going to do with war materials or implements of war before they are willing to give him the right or authority to use or dispose of them. In adopting and ratifying the Constitution more than 150 years ago the people did not stop to inquire of the President as to when and where he was going to send the Army or the Navy before vesting him with the power of direction as Commander in Chief. Certainly he was expected to exercise his best judgment and to be guided in a large measure by the advice of military experts. That is exactly what he would be expected to do with the added power provided for in this bill. All Presidents may have made some mistakes in the exercise of the powers granted, just as Congress has frequently made mistakes in exercising the power granted it, but at no time in history has any President deliberately abused the

power vested in him as Commander in Chief of the Navy and Army. It may prove to be a mistake for Congress to provide any kind of aid or assistance to Britain, but a majority of our people seem to think it is the proper thing to do, even though this is the first time in history it has undertaken to exercise this power.

There must be some added power given to someone if the law is to be administered and it is better to give it to the President so he may coordinate these powers with those already vested in him by constitutional grant than to delegate it to someone with no other authority. I do not know that Congress would have the right to delegate such powers to anyone except the President, and it would certainly be suicidal for Congress to attempt to administer the law itself. There are now many different ideas expressed as to the wisdom of this legislation, for none of us are agreed in all of its details. If Congress should undertake to administer the law you would have 435 different opinions as to what implement of war should have priority, whether it should be airplanes, machine guns, or an army tank; you would have a corresponding number of opinions as to the size of the implement, and if you could ever reach an agreement on either or both of these you would then have each of the 435 Members of Congress insisting that these supplies should be manufactured in his district, and by the time they could reach an agreement on this matter our congressional districts would all be abolished and there would be no need for implements of war and the American people would be subjects of Hitler and his regime.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER.]

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with national defense and with the financial security of the Nation.

We see emblazoned across the country official statements from the administration that all expenditures are to be cut to the bone, aside from national defense. Then we harken back to the independent offices bill with \$125,000,000 more to be used at the discretion of the President. Oh, the President can do many things under that provision. He can use the appropriation for a twice-defeated St. Lawrence Waterway, which would put the \$4.85 Japanese sailors and the \$10 Lascar sailors in direct competition with our own men, to dump farm products right into the lap of our Farm Belt—the products of all the breechclout and peon labor of the world—while our people must buy their own needs in manufactured goods in the highest-cost market in the world. Or the funds could be used to build Passamaquoddy, the Florida Ship Canal, or to start the southwestern counterpart of that great colossus that creeps and crawls and invests the savings of the North in T. V. A. Yes; this T. V. A. was in that bill also, with its 9-inch yardstick, and the Maritime Commission and many socialistic schemes that drain the country of its wealth and compel the further appropriation of billions of dollars.

The T. V. A. defies even the General Accounting Office to audit their books. Slice all this turkey buzzard and then fold it in with funds to care for the victims of war and face a Member of Congress to vote for it or be in the light of voting against the disabled and helpless. And the despairing and dismal admission of the chairman the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that the party in power could do nothing about it; that his party had erred when they won the election of 1932 by promising to cut Government expenditures 25 percent.

There was and is a great scare drive to force the people into line behind this movement for entering the Second World War. The internationalists seem to have done their job almost too well; they are panic-stricken by their own arguments. Contemplate for just a moment what confronts an average intelligent taxpayer. The country is still at peace, but an inefficient, inept, and deceptive administration has created a debt so vast that it is now larger than the tax duplicate of that part of the country west of the Mississippi. It is collecting in Federal taxes about three and one-half times as much as in the fiscal year 1932; collecting at approximately \$18,000,000 per day for the fiscal year 1941, according to the President's budget, and proposes to expend some \$37,000,000 per day in this same year of 1941, and then jumping to \$52,000,000 per day for 1942. All of this without considering the financing of Great Britain, Greece, China, and possibly Russia if the U. S. S. R. should be successfully and diplomatically wooed, to say nothing of the countless millions for corralling and holding the surpluses of competitive production in this and other hemispheres.

For instance, the Cuban Government is said to be negotiating for a loan to buy up 400,000 to 500,000 tons of sugar they are producing without any market in sight, while the sugar producers of Ohio, Michigan, Colorado, Nebraska, and the West, as well as the cane areas, are being cut approximately 20 percent in acreage. Small wonder that our internationally minded Secretary of the Treasury reports sleepless nights and seeks solace in the solitude of an unnamed southwestern ranch! He has told us that the great British Empire is practically bankrupt after 18 months of war and 36 months of an unbalanced budget. He points with alarm to the fact that they must stop fighting if we do not pass H. R. 1776 and step in under their load of \$50,000,000 per day in the prosecution of the great war. Well, if the great British Empire, vastly richer than our own Republic, is going bankrupt after 18 months of such spending and 3 years of an unbalanced budget, where is this Republic going on \$52,000,000 per day and 11 years of unbalanced budgets?

With ordinary expenses of government doubled in 8 years, and an all-embracing bureaucracy crushing the life out of American agriculture and industry, the farmers in my district will find the price of the rising spiral of inflation when they replenish lumber, hardware, fencing, and supplies of all kinds. The rise

from \$2.50 to approximately \$4 in Army shoes will explain what I mean.

The hotels, offices, and corridors of the Capital City creak and groan with the faithful coming in after theirs; no doubt to recover some cash invested in pretty campaign books; the doubling and multiplying costs of the housing of our Army; the delay of months in completion of defense projects; the graft of millions from the men who obtain work on defense projects. All this adds up on the record of bad administration of the past 8 years. It also adds to the crushing load of debt and taxes that fall on the overloaded backs of American taxpayers. It threatens national bankruptcy and it imperils our national defense and thus our national safety.

According to the administration, we are 2 to 3 months from national attack and 2 years from national preparedness. If the first span of time is correct, we are in peril and it is time to quit pampering Sidney Hillman and his C. I. O. and his canceling a contract for ten millions of national-defense material and time to embrace Mr. Ford's offer to make all defense material without any profit at all; time to define our own war aims. What are we trying to do: Nationalize American industry or provide national defense?

It is time also to examine the record of administrative accomplishment and see if we do not need a single head with a single purpose in carrying into effect our national defense. Patriotic Americans will believe Sidney Hillman, David Saposs, and their fellow travelers should have no place in that. No; the picture is not a pretty one—and time passes. Evidently there will be no shortage of black neckties and mosquito netting, but what of the tanks and guns and planes—enough of the unnecessary for 5,000,000 men, but how about the tools men fight with? Small wonder that General Marshall answered the Congressman who inquired "if this bill permitted the President to transfer from our supply of war material to nations he desired to help," with a question of his own, "What supply of war materials?"

Mr. Knudsen made a pretty picture with Deanna Durbin, but we hope our rugged iron master is not too much intrigued with the White House vaudeville. Time passes. It is said "we must buy time to prepare."

I think it is time to remember we are 135,000,000 virile Americans placed by the Great Architect of the universe in the most enviable geographic position in all the world; 3,000 miles of blue water on one side and 6,000 on the other; men of every race and every creed. With 6 percent of the world's people, we have nearly 50 percent of the world's production of the essentials of living and of defense. I like to think of Americans unafraid, jealous of their rights, and ready to maintain them.

Let us prepare our defense, let us do it carefully because we have been through great waste of time and treasure, and national boon-doggling is not a hearty preparation for national defense. Let us have done with this tripe that anything is our first line of defense, except

the indomitable spirit of our Navy, our Army, our air force, and the fortitude and patriotism of the American people. Let us make first things first—guns, tanks, planes, and ships—in our placing of orders. Let us remember that it is time to put an end to grandiose planning; that our national credit is not without limits; that even our magnificent manpower is impotent if we do not provide them something beside schedules and blueprints of dreams of defense.

Let us keep in our own hands these precious liberties and privileges which were won at such great cost by our valiant forebears and entrusted to us by the American electorate. Let us keep this power and exercise it worthily as representatives of a great Republic. Let us refuse to render ourselves impotent by a grant of these powers to any man and thus possibly make adequate defense impossible or a protest worthless. Let us be men, not rubber stamps. Let us have for America the same regard that so many who have enjoyed America's bounty and protection express for lands across the sea. Yes; may there always be an England, and may there also be an America, a great representative Republic with its three coordinate branches of government unimpaired. No powers are inherent in this bill to increase American production. No man should have them nor be invested with them; they are unnecessary, un-American, and dangerous. Guard well the door. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACIEJEWSKI]

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the people of this Nation have become more disturbed over any legislation coming before the House of Representatives in the past century than the measure now before this body for debate, the so-called lend-lease bill, H. R. 1776. Unquestionably, there are some grave and serious implications embodied in the bill as amended and reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

During the past several days my constituents have been writing to me about the lend-lease bill. I have tried to answer all the letters but have come to the conclusion that a broader statement is needed, more definite and longer than can be put in a letter. The communications I have received must necessarily be placed in groups, as follows: Opposing the bill because it might lead us into war; criticizing the measure because they are of the opinion it gives too much power to the Chief Executive, and those who favor its passage.

Because of comments of the press and through other agencies, the people of this Nation have become frightened at the thought the enactment of this bill will eventually lead us into war. Sometimes it is very difficult to judge what the majority of the people want. In my humble opinion, however, there is every sign that the present policy of our Government is supported with as much understanding as any rational person could expect. The American people have made it known that they want aid rushed to England, so that war can be kept from our shores and so that we may have time

to build for ourselves a defense on every front. To those of you who fear that we may be involved in war, let me say that you and I and the vast majority of the American people are absolutely against sending American boys to die on foreign fields. And we know that war is not always tragic but is also oftentimes futile.

The bill has been subjected also to criticism on the ground that it is unconstitutional and not in keeping with our international practices since the foundation of our Government; further, that it gives too much power to the Chief Executive. I think a careful study of the bill and the hearings thereon will convince everyone that this thought is based on a misunderstanding of the purposes of the measure. As a matter of fact, the purposes of the lend-lease bill are to do exactly what the American people want.

The lend-lease bill seeks to insure us against involvement in the wars now taking place in foreign lands by authorizing the President to give material aid to those friendly nations whose continued independent existence is necessary for our vital defense. The bill further authorizes the Chief Executive to manufacture in our Government arsenals and navy yards, as well as in privately owned factories, weapons and war materials for those nations whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States. It also authorizes him to sell, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of weapons and war materials to such countries. Therefore, the bill will materially aid in expediting assistance to England, it will assist in eliminating any friction or confusion in the procurement and production of weapons for ourselves and for the democracies; it places the Chief Executive in a position where he has authority to handle the national-defense program on an efficient and businesslike basis. Further, it places limitations on the broad powers invested in the President.

The other provisions of the measure are primarily administrative and have not been subject to much criticism.

I think, in passing this bill, it is not the intent of the Congress to abdicate its powers as suggested by many of those who are opposed to the measure. In the debate on the bill it is conceded that quite likely new points will be brought out which will call for amendments, and I have every reason to believe that if such improvements are suggested they will be incorporated. Some constructive suggestions have already been offered.

I have tried to give my constituents a clear-cut picture of the purposes of this proposed legislation. I believe with those who favor the bill that it is necessary to properly and effectively safeguard America's future. For the reasons cited I intend to cast my vote in favor of the passage of the lend-lease bill, H. R. 1776. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY].

Mr. DAY. Mr. Chairman, after listening to some of the remarks during the afternoon, I have become convinced that it was well that we reinforced the ceiling of this Chamber to withstand, not any

attack from the dive bombers of Hitler, but the attack on representative government in the very foundation room of its existence.

Granting that this Nation faces a crisis, no emergency is ever a proper foundation for the grant of constitutional power.

Today the Supreme Court of the United States has abdicated its supremacy and independence as one of the three coordinate branches of government. As Members of Congress, then, in considering this bill, we are gathered as a constitutional body in whose keeping reposes the last great stand for upholding the integrity of constitutional power. Please bear with me, then, as I approach the discussion of this bill in the capacity of judges consecrated under your oath of office to the protection and defense of the Constitution of the United States. Shall it live? The answer is in your hands. We cannot, we dare not, escape the responsibility that this fateful hour imposes.

Forsaken by those sworn to uphold it, the Constitution today stands before the bar of this House, and far above the consideration of any other aspect of this bill is your decision whether or not in this beloved United States shall the Constitution die at the hands of the only body ordained by law left to protect it.

Mindful as I am of the history of our Anglo-Saxon people; grateful as we are to the mother country for those cherished ideals of freedom which have grown strong in this new Republic, there are some things that even a mother cannot ask her son to perform. If you can agree with me that we can help Britain without the sacrifice of our sacred honor, then have we not a complete answer to this bill H. R. 1776? If you can agree with me that under our form of government the American Navy belongs to the American people and cannot be transferred, traded, or given away; if you can agree with me that under our written Constitution our hands are tied by the pledges of our honor, irrespective of where our sympathies may be, then you will more readily have patience with what I have to say.

This is not the first time that the American Congress has been tempted to forsake the cause of the Constitution. I can hear again the voice of Daniel Webster, when he said:

But who can reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who can rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty; who can frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with States' rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Congress, the price is too high. We must find some other way.

Our consent to the powers demanded will not make them good if we do not have the power to make the grant. Read me one word in the Constitution of the United States, or any of its interpretations, which has ever sanctioned the abdication of power by Congress to make or declare war, and I will admit that I am in error. The British Parliament could grant these powers, but not the Congress

of the United States, for we have no equivalent in this country of the powers exercised by that Parliament.

Whatever may be the purpose or desire of the President, obviously he can be of no aid to any foreign nation unless Congress grant him the power to give away our own articles of defense and appropriate the money with which to build additional defense articles. We do not have them on hand, save in quantities deemed totally insufficient for our own defense. This places the final determination of the question of foreign policy within the control of the Congress, the keeper of the purse. If we keep our own defense articles, now on hand or on order, for our own use, then any additional appropriations must be for the benefit of some foreign nation.

The Constitution has vested the Congress with specific powers to provide for the common defense and general welfare by way of taxation, to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. If the additional powers be granted to the President, the Congress would clearly be guilty of the abdication of these powers in favor of the President and to have delegated them to him. Both of these steps are clearly unconstitutional.

Conceding that the President has plenary powers over questions of foreign and external policy, in this instance these powers are nugatory without an express grant from the Congress. Thus the status of affairs has shifted. Had the President acted solely within his plenary powers in the exercise of his sole discretion, the question before the Congress would be merely one of ratification and the recognition of something already accomplished, such as occurred on May 13, 1846, when President Polk had actually engaged in the battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de La Palma, and the Congress passed an act ratifying these acts.

Inasmuch as the President has not as yet engaged in actual warfare, he awaits the grant from the Congress to justify his clearly expressed purpose. If this bill be passed by the Congress, no declaration of war will ever be passed, but there would follow an act recognizing a state of war, and the President could well say to the people that there would have been no war, if the Congress had not fortified him to take the steps which led to the war.

Is it not clear, then, that we must approach the consideration of this bill as though it were an act to declare war? The people will hold each and every Member of Congress responsible for his vote in this critical time. How many are ready to vote favorably on a declaration of war, knowing its consequences?

In *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Corp.* (229 U. S. 304, 318) it is held:

It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality.

Conceding this to be true, it is also a fact that there was a division and distribution of the powers of external sovereignty in the written terms and provisions of the Constitution. It is of the greatest significance that from the total sum of external powers there was expressly given to the Congress the power to declare and wage war. Thus, conceding that the powers of the President over our external relations are plenary and exclusive, they are only plenary and exclusive within the categories expressly granted to him by the Constitution. He has no power to declare and wage war. We need not explore how extensive are his powers over external affairs, in the present crisis, because without exercising such powers over our external affairs, he has come to the Congress for express grants of authority.

The report of the majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee, on page 6, states:

This, unquestionably, is the most important single provision of the bill. It authorizes the disposition by this Government, to any nation whose defense is vital to the defense of the United States, of any defense article upon those terms and conditions which the President deems satisfactory. As to defense articles which are not specifically manufactured or procured on behalf of such a foreign government, the disposition can only be made after consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy, or both. This provision, in a manner wholly consistent with our Constitution, gives the flexibility necessary to meet the fast-changing situation in the war abroad in order that our own national-defense interests may be served best. It places this power of negotiation and disposition in the President, the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

They cite the United States against Curtiss-Wright Corporation case as their authority. But they overlook the fact that Congress must act before the negotiations and disposition of the President will be of any aid to the foreign nation. Can there be any doubt that the naked power means nothing if the Congress shall not implement the power with perhaps 40,000,000 American dollars? Then why speak of the President's discretion in matters of purely external affairs?

All must admit that he cannot gain any further powers over our external affairs by any grant from the Congress if the Constitution has not vested in the Congress the power to make such grants. The plain effect of H. R. 1776 is to place the Congress upon record so that the Congress cannot exercise its constitutional powers to declare and wage war. There is no public policy which sanctions the grant of such powers by the Congress.

Weighing all these considerations in their proper light, we find that the President is responsible to the Constitution for such powers as he possesses, and likewise the Congress is responsible to the Constitution for such powers as the Congress possesses. Both the President and the Congress derive their powers from a common source, to wit, the Constitution of the United States. Can there be any doubt, then, that the Congress cannot be called upon to divest itself of the powers which it possesses any more than the President can be deprived of the

powers which he possesses? This is good constitutional law, recognized by more than a century of American practice and procedure.

A fair reading of the provisions of H. R. 1776 forces the conclusion to any open mind that the President realizes that in this bill he can carry the Nation no further into the international war without the sanction of the Congress. He has already carried on his negotiations with foreign nations, he has been advised by our diplomatic representatives in foreign nations, and he has in his own mind determined what course this Nation should pursue. In fact, he has exhausted the exercise of his power over our external relations, no matter how plenary and exclusive they may be. To reach the ultimate goal of his desire, he must have now the grant of further power.

Ordained by the Constitution to declare and wage war, the Congress at this hour is now acting within the sphere of those powers where the Congress is given powers which are plenary and exclusive. We must, then, exercise our own discretion and determine when and how this Nation shall be plunged into the international conflict. In making this decision we act entirely independently of the President, and he has no more right to interfere with or influence our judgment within the sphere of our constitutional powers than we have the right to interfere with the exercise of his judgment within the sphere of his constitutional powers.

This clears the atmosphere, and let no one misapprehend the consequences of our action or underestimate the responsibility which each Member of the Congress owes to the American people.

Section 9 of the bill provides that the President may from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of the act. This is a plain delegation of legislative power and is manifestly unconstitutional. No standard is established and no set of rules or regulations are set up by the Congress to govern the exercise of any of the powers delegated to the President by this bill.

In the leading case of *Panama Refining Co. v. Ryan* (293 U. S. 388, 420) it is said:

The question whether such a delegation of legislative power is permitted by the Constitution is not answered by the argument that it should be assumed that the President has acted, and will act, for what he believes to be the public good. The point is not one of motives but of constitutional authority, for which the best of motives is not a substitute. While the present controversy relates to a delegation to the President, the basic question has a much wider application. If the Congress can make a grant of legislative authority of the sort attempted by section 9 (c), we find nothing in the Constitution which restricts the Congress to the selection of the President as grantee. * * * The Constitution provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives (art. I, sec. 1). And the Congress is empowered "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" its general powers (art. I, sec. 8, par. 18). The Congress manifestly is not permitted to abdicate,

or to transfer to others, the essential legislative functions with which it is thus vested.

Further on in the opinion in this well-considered case we find the following, page 430:

Thus, in every case in which the question has been raised, the Court has recognized that there are limits of delegation which there is no constitutional authority to transcend. We think that section 9 (c) goes beyond those limits. As to the transportation of oil production in excess of State permission, the Congress has declared no policy, has established no standard, has laid down no rule. There is no requirement, no definition of circumstances and conditions in which the transportation is to be allowed or prohibited.

If section 9 (c) were held valid, it would be idle to pretend that anything would be left of limitations upon the power of the Congress to delegate its lawmaking function. The reasoning of the many decisions we have reviewed would be made vacuous and their decisions nugatory. Instead of performing its lawmaking function, the Congress could at will, and as to such subjects as it chose, transfer that function to the President or other officer or to an administrative body. The question is not of intrinsic importance of the particular statute before us, but of the constitutional processes of legislation which are an essential part of our system of government.

This bill is styled "An act to promote the defense of the United States." Surely that is a domestic affair. Without recalling the specific powers vested in the Congress by article I, section 8, of the Constitution, it is safe to say that no one can deny that the Congress is given control of our land and naval forces. This is not a function covering the external affairs of the Nation. It is just as much internal in its scope as the power to regulate interstate commerce. And therefore nothing that is said in *U. S. v. Curtiss Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304) has any bearing.

While it was said in that case that the President may exercise, in the international field, a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved, clearly that case is no authority where there is a clear delegation of power respecting the domestic affairs of the Nation.

It is explained in the report of the majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee that the term "defense article" has such broad meaning that it properly applies to various commodities. We quote from that report, page 2 thereof, as follows:

Section 2 of the bill contains the definition of the words "defense article" and "defense information." It should be noted that the term "defense article" includes not only all arms, munitions, and implements of war, but also other articles or commodities, such as cotton, wheat, and all other agricultural products which may be necessary for defense purposes.

Can anyone deny that the transportation of such articles is not interstate commerce? And a matter of purely internal concern?

If this bill were not unconstitutional on any other ground, the language of section 9—

The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any

of the provisions of this act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this act, through such department, agency, or officer, as he shall direct—

would clearly condemn it as a pure delegation of legislative power which has been declared unconstitutional by all of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States since the foundation of the Government.

Apart from purely constitutional considerations, can any Member of the Congress seriously question that after the passage of this bill, with this section 9 left intact, would there be anything left of the exercise of legislative power by the Congress?

President Roosevelt not so long ago directed the Members of Congress to pass legislation affecting the coal industry no matter whether or not the Members had doubt as to the constitutionality of the legislation. In this instance the passage of legislation is requested where there is no doubt that the legislation is unconstitutional. We are asked to surrender our legislative authority. If we do, there will no longer be a Congress of the United States. Recalling the oath of office which each of us was compelled to take and did take willingly, before we were duly accredited Members of this House, is not the answer to this bill made simple when we stand on the ground of its unconstitutionality?

This bill can be rejected on a common ground that knows no party lines. We can keep our faith with the people who elected us and to those who will come after us, when history shall record that the Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress respected the limitations of the Constitution. And also the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Let me read the historical words of Chief Justice Hughes in rendering the decision of the Court in the *Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States* (295 U. S. 495, 527):

We are told that the provision of the statute authorizing the adoption of codes must be viewed in the light of the grave national crisis with which the Congress was confronted.

Undoubtedly the conditions to which power is addressed are always to be considered when the exercise of power is challenged. Extraordinary conditions may call for extraordinary remedies. But the argument necessarily stops short of an attempt to justify action which lies outside the sphere of constitutional authority.

Extraordinary conditions do not create or enlarge constitutional power.

The Constitution established a National Government with powers deemed to be adequate as they have proved to be both in war and peace but these powers of the National Government are limited by the constitutional grants.

Those who act under these grants are not at liberty to transcend the imposed limits because they believe that more or different power is necessary. Such assertions of extra-constitutional authority were anticipated and precluded by the explicit terms of the tenth amendment, "The powers not delegated by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The Congress is not permitted to abdicate or to transfer to others the essential legislative functions with which it is thus vested. We have repeatedly recognized the necessity

of adapting legislation to complex conditions involving a host of details with which the National Legislature cannot deal directly.

We pointed out in the Panama Co. case that the Constitution has never been regarded as denying to Congress the necessary resources of flexibility and practicality, which will enable it to perform its function in laying down policies and establishing standards, while leaving to selected instrumentalities the making of subordinate rules within prescribed limits and the determination of facts to which the policy as declared by the legislature is to apply.

But we said that the constant recognition of the necessity and validity of such provisions, and the wide range of administrative authority which has been developed by means of them, cannot be allowed to obscure the limitations of the authority to delegate, if our constitutional system is to be maintained.

[Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, if I yield the gentleman 1 minute additional time, will he try to answer a question I should like to ask him?

Mr. DAY. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Did I understand the gentleman to say the bill (H. R. 1776) now under consideration specifically provides that we delegate the right to declare war to the President of the United States? Did the gentleman say that?

Mr. DAY. Yes; it does.

Mr. BLOOM. It does?

Mr. DAY. That is its every intention. The gentleman from New York would not use those exact words in the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Those are the words I wanted the gentleman to say.

Mr. DAY. The gentleman from New York, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, is too astute to have used those words, but when we give the President power taken from us who have provided an army and a navy and say to one man, "You can send this abroad, trade it, or give it away, take it into the war zone, or wherever you want to," I say we have surrendered our power to declare war.

Mr. BLOOM. I may have been mistaken—and if so, I want to be corrected—but I understood the gentleman to say that the bill H. R. 1776 delegates to the President of the United States the power of the Congress to declare war. The gentleman did not mean that, did he?

Mr. DAY. To all intents and purposes that is true; and I agree with the opinion thereon of the Honorable John Bassett Moore, who, as a matter of history, happened to be Assistant Secretary of State while my father was Secretary of State of this Nation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time has been consumed by each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has used 2 hours and 25 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has used 2 hours and 13 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

According to the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under considera-

tion the bill (H. R. 1776) further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] may have permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Elmer H. Boyd.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with reference to two bills, H. R. 970 and H. R. 971, introduced by myself, and to include a recent editorial in respect thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include in connection therewith any information or tables I may have with reference to same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two descriptions on the heading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—one of the past and that of today—sent to me by the Women's Investors in America. I would like an answer from the Joint Committee on Printing as to why the former heading was changed.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could that be done under the present form of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Will the lady restate it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a description or a statement by the Women's Investors in America regarding the heading of the beginning of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today and of preceding years. It expresses regret that the words "the United States" are left out of the present heading and that the cast is smaller.

The SPEAKER. Is that a word description?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a word description. It also has a picture of the shield or the crest of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would be compelled to hold that that request must go to the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if I put in just the description of the heading without the actual heading, would there be any objection?

The SPEAKER. The style and form of the RECORD lies within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Printing, and any request of the kind just propounded by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts would have to go to that committee.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Friday, January 31, 1940, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1437. An act authorizing appropriations for additional shipbuilding and ordnance-manufacturing facilities and equipment for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code by extending the time for certification of national-defense facilities and contracts for amortization purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 4, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

158. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of order dated April 1, 1940, canceling certain charges of the United States existing as debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

159. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting statistical tables containing data in regard to bankruptcy cases pending in the district courts of the United States in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

160. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of credit operations under authority of the acts of June 18, 1934, and June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

161. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a comparative balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1940; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

162. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940; to the Committee on Claims.

163. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

164. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2959. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, to provide for the Federal taxation of future issues of obligations of the United States and its instrumentalities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 15. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 1776) further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1061. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2278. A bill to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended by the act of June 8, 1926, so as to decrease the restriction on the number of enlisted men of the Regular Army who may be detailed as students at educational institutions and other places; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1543. A bill for the relief of Drs. Michel Konne and Pauline Lucia Konne; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2972) granting a pension to Emma Hellwig; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3010. A bill to provide for grants to the States for assistance to needy incapacitated adults; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3011. A bill to authorize an appropriation for an experiment station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3012. A bill to provide a minimum allotment for farm-marketing-quota purposes of five bales of lint cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 3013. A bill to provide for the examination and survey of shore line of Lake Pontchartrain, La., between the Orleans Parish and the Bonnet Carre spillway; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 3014. A bill to accept the cession by the State of Michigan of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Isle Royale National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNS:

H. R. 3015. A bill to provide for Federal cooperation in the construction and reconstruction of air markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3016. A bill to establish a national land policy, and to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PITTINGER:

H. R. 3017. A bill canceling Finland's war debt to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Miss RANKIN of Montana:

H. R. 3018. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain land located within the Fort Missoula Military Reservation, Mont., for certain land owned by the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, of Missoula, Mont.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3019. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives; providing regulation for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same; and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3020. A bill to permit certain officers, employees, and agents of the United States to administer oaths and affirmations in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3021. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGDAHL:

H. R. 3022. A bill to amend title 18, section 563, of the Code of Laws of the United States so as to provide compensation to attorneys assigned to defend a person indicted for capital crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEHRMANN:

H. R. 3023. A bill to enable farmers who are unable to pay emergency seed and feed loans in full when due to work out the amounts due thereon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3024. A bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act entitled "An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska:

H. R. 3025. A bill to reduce Cuban sugar quotas and to increase the sugar quotas of mainland beet and cane; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACIORA:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARNES of Alabama:

H. Res. 90. Resolution for the continuation of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 91. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the Special Committee to Investi-

gate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. Res. 92. Resolution providing for an additional assistant in the disbursing office of the office of the Clerk of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Res. 93. Resolution providing for the salary of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. Res. 94. Resolution requesting the Attorney General to appear before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization for the purpose of testifying with respect to the citizenship of Fritz Kuhn; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. Res. 95. Resolution for the observance of Flag Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Memorial No. 1, dated January 29, 1941, relating to the Reclamation Act and the Case-Wheeler Act (Public, No. 848, 76th Cong.), concerning water rights for supplemental water supply; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Resolution No. 16, dated January 24, 1941, concerning aid to Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 3026. A bill granting an increase of pension to Pete Shelba Hobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOEHNE:

H. R. 3027. A bill granting a pension to Alwilda Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 3028. A bill for the relief of Addison B. Hampel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 3029. A bill for the relief of Elsie T. Bergerson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3030. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3031. A bill for the relief of Alexander W. Grinsel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 3032. A bill for the relief of J. G. Fox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3033. A bill granting a pension to Ella Tate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3034. A bill for the relief of Earle P. Schouten; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3035. A bill for the relief of Allan D. Cameron; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3036. A bill for the relief of Max Delfiner and his wife, Evy (Ewa); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3037. A bill for the relief of Mabel Foote Ramsey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 3038. A bill for the relief of Alice E. Shinnick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of John A. Graber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 3040. A bill for the relief of Kirel Dorozko; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3041. A bill to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to John F. Considine, a former employee of the United States under the Reclamation Service, Department of the Interior, at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3042. A bill for the relief of James J. Orme; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3043. A bill for the relief of Edward Pittwood; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3044. A bill granting an increase of pension to Fanny Brophy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 3045. A bill granting a pension to Ruah L. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3046. A bill granting a pension to Emma Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3047. A bill granting a pension to Nancy V. Mosher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3048. A bill granting a pension to Malisa Maze; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3049. A bill granting a pension to Mary M. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3050. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Mecomber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3051. A bill granting a pension to Annie Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3052. A bill granting a pension to Ella Strutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3053. A bill granting a pension to Virgie M. Plank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3054. A bill granting a pension to Margaret F. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3055. A bill granting a pension to Nancy Jane Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3056. A bill granting a pension to Nan A. Benson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3057. A bill granting a pension to Sarah K. Copeland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3058. A bill granting a pension to Maggie Canter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3059. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3060. A bill granting a pension to Ona Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3061. A bill granting a pension to Katherine Gurney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3062. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ida Nagel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

190. By Mr. ENGEL: Petitions of Mrs. Jessie M. Berry, Mrs. Sadie Mayo, Archie Wilson, Avis Morris, Henrietta Kelly, O. L. Miller, and 196 other residents of Wexford County, Mich., urging Congress to enact legislation which will prohibit the sale of liquor to the armed

forces of this country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

191. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the California Highway Commission, suggesting that an appropriation should be approved by the Congress of the United States for the purpose of aiding the State of California in the expense of building access roads leading to the Army and Navy cantonments located off the main highways in the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

192. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Council of the City of River Rouge, Mich., urging favorable consideration of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

193. Also, resolution of the Council of the Village of Ecorse, Mich., urging favorable consideration of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

194. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the original Racing Pigeon Club, Youngstown, Ohio, urging the enactment of H. R. 1790; to the Committee on Agriculture.

195. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: House Memorial No. 2, enacted by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States, requesting that the proper authorities be urged to employ the utilities and facilities now available at Fort Peck, Mont., in the plan of national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

196. Also, Senate Memorial No. 2, enacted by the Senate of the Twenty-seventh Session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States, requesting that the proper authorities be urged to employ the utilities and facilities now available at Fort Peck, Mont., in the plan of national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

197. Also, House Memorial No. 1, enacted by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States, requesting the enactment of appropriate legislation for the utilization of the power and water resources at the Fort Peck Dam for irrigation development; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

198. Also, Senate Memorial No. 1, enacted by the Senate of the Twenty-seventh Session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States, requesting the enactment of appropriate legislation for the utilization of the power and water resources at the Fort Peck Dam for irrigation and development; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

199. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of the executive committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, at a meeting held in Washington, D. C., November 16, 1940, recommending Federal assistance for purchase of police equipment essential for defense purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

200. By Mr. WELCH: California Senate Joint Resolution No. 5, relating to the baneful effect of the importation of livestock and dressed meats from countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists; to the Committee on Agriculture.

201. Also, California Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, memorializing Congress to provide funds for greater speed in completion of the Central Valley project in aid of the national defense; to the Committee on Rules.

202. Also, California Senate Joint Resolution No. 6, relating to the construction of necessary roads required by the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

203. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Coalition, Washington, D. C., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to H. R. 1776 and similar measures; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.