

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 (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1497) for the relief of the heirs of William H. Peters and Washington Reed, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEITER:

H. R. 3063. A bill for the erection of a public building at Cheektowaga, Erie County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3064. A bill 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; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3065. A bill to amend the act of Congress approved July 14, 1932, entitled "An act to amend an act of Congress approved June 18, 1898, entitled 'An act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia'"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3066. A bill to amend an act to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3067. A bill to amend the act of Congress approved May 3, 1935, entitled "An act to promote public safety on the highways of the District of Columbia by providing for the financial responsibility of owners and operators of motor vehicles for damages caused by motor vehicles on the public highways in the District of Columbia, to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3068. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that all cabs for hire in the District of Columbia be compelled to carry insurance for the protection of passengers, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1938; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3069. A bill granting permanent total-disability rating to veterans suffering service-connected tuberculosis disability if such disease remains active after 2 years' hospitalization; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3070. A bill to aid the several States in making, or for having made, certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 3071. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to manufacturers' and producers' taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3072. A bill amending section 3460 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky:

H. R. 3073. A bill relating to the payment of principal and interest on certain loans

made by the Federal land banks and the Land Bank Commissioner; to the Committee on Agriculture.

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 Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their senate joint memorial No. 2, with reference to democracy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 3074. A bill granting an increase of pension to Georgian D. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3075. A bill granting an increase of pension to Arzilla A. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEHRMANN:

H. R. 3076. A bill for the relief of R. Stern; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 3077. A bill for the relief of the Lebanon Woolen Mills, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3078. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sgt. Alvin C. York as a colonel in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 3079. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEIDINGER:

H. R. 3080. A bill granting a pension to Bertie E. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3081. A bill for the relief of Ervine J. Stenson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3082. A bill for the relief of Mattie E. Baumgarten; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3083. A bill for the relief of Billy H. Quin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 3084. A bill for the relief of Hugh C. Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3085. A bill granting a pension to Lina S. Terrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3086. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Marquis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 3087. A bill for the relief of Ethel Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SACKS:

H. R. 3088. A bill for the relief of Harry Solomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3089. A bill for the relief of Marie B. Neale; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWERT:

H. R. 3090. A bill for the relief of Marian Cichy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. THILL:

H. R. 3091. A bill for the relief of Martin J. Price; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 3092. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of Dr. Joe M. Ferguson; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. James A. Reeves, S. T. D., president, Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Father, creator of the world, redeeming Son, and sanctifying holy spirit, we adore Thee. We acknowledge Thy endless sovereignty. We trust in Thee. "At sundry times and in diverse manners" Thou hast spoken to mankind, particularly through Thy only begotten Son. We thank Thee for this revelation deepening our knowledge of Thee and nurturing our love of Thee.

We cherish Thy utterance. We reverence Thy word as the source of the law that prevails amongst us. In this law we see the unfolding of Thy dear providence, heartening and strengthening us, caring for us in sorrow and in joy.

Let Thy kindly grace brighten our understanding and quicken our love for Thee, so that Thy blessed word may ever safeguard the law whereby we live. Help all men to revere that law. Help them to revere the ways in which it is made. This, too, is Thy gift. It is a holy gift. We are grateful.

Be mindful, O Lord, of all who make the law. Give them light and strength. Be mindful of the institutions that embody it. Keep these safe. Let them endure. Be mindful of all Thy people here and everywhere; they are redeemed by the worshipful blood of Christ, who with Thee and Thy holy spirit abides ever one God. Amen.

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

IDENTIFICATION TO ENTER NAVY DEPARTMENT BUILDING

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Acting Secretary of the Navy:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, January 31, 1941.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Navy Department has just instituted a change in the security system heretofore in use for the protection of the contents of the Department building.

You, of course, agree that, under the circumstances, improvements in that respect were not only desirable but essential.

One of the most obvious features is one requiring identification of visitors; i. e., all persons not regularly employed within the building. It goes without saying that it is my desire that no annoyance of any kind will be caused any Member of the Congress or their representatives when they have occasion to visit the Department. With that object in mind and further for the protection of the employees who are charged with the responsibility of executing the plan, I request that you acquaint all Members of the House of Representatives with the necessity of their identity being made known upon their entry into the Department building. The place established for that purpose is just inside the main entrance, Eighteenth Street and Constitution Avenue.

Every effort will be exerted to keep at a minimum any delay or inconvenience which the formality may cause.

Thanking you for your cooperation, and with the assurances of my highest esteem, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

FORRESTAL,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

CARGO-VESSEL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 77, entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to the United States Maritime Commission for emergency cargo-ship construction, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to explain the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution provides for the construction of 200 emergency cargo vessels by the Maritime Commission and was passed by the House on January 24. The matter was considered on the floor at that time, and I assume is fairly familiar to the membership.

The Senate added several amendments. First, they struck out the language which provided that the Maritime Commission might dispose of the shipbuilding facilities the Government is erecting especially for this program. The Maritime Commission says that so far as it is concerned there is no objection at this time to that language going out. If it is necessary to amend it in the future we can do so.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that all of these facilities are paid for out of funds that have been allotted by the President out of his emergency defense appropriation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. And this language would not apply to those funds.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The allocation of \$36,000,000 the President has made to the Maritime Commission for these facilities is from the contract authorization in his emergency fund and the appropriation to satisfy that contract authority is in another act, so I believe this language would not apply to the \$36,000,000.

The Senate enlarged the provision which the House wrote into the bill on the floor providing that no one should work on this program who advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence; the Senate clarified the House language and added a penalty clause and provides for affidavits which seem to be acceptable.

The Senate also added \$65,000,000 of contractual authorization for the Commission's regular merchant ship program for which there is a Budget estimate now pending. It was put on this joint resolution in the Senate in order that the

Maritime Commission might go forward with its plans to have under contract 200 ships by June 30, 1941, under the long-range program. Of these 200 vessels, 180 have been contracted for to January 20, 1941, at a total cost of \$446,430,000. The total contract authority heretofore granted to the Commission aggregates \$495,000,000. The Commission has left in the total contract authority, therefore, \$48,570,000. Contracts are in process for 20 more vessels at a total cost of \$101,880,000, which would require new authority of \$53,310,000. The difference between this sum and the \$65,000,000 granted consists of \$2,940,000 to provide for additions and adjustments in contracts and \$8,750,000 to provide against the contingency of having two Navy transports costing this sum and contracted for by the Commission at the request of the Navy charged to the Commission's contract allotment for merchant ships.

Another amendment authorizes the Maritime Commission to construct, repair, or equip vessels for any agency of the Government to the extent that such agency has authority by law to do this on its own account, and specifies that such work done for any agency shall not have the effect of diminishing the Commission's contract authority for its own program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. TABER. I think there is nothing in these amendments that should result in controversy.

The second amendment, with reference to a prohibition against the employment of Communists, does not change the language of the House bill, but adds other language which shows how a presumption that they are not Communists may be established by affidavits.

The third provision relates to merchant ships. I understand the Subcommittee on Independent Offices had hearings on this matter of contract authorization and that the subcommittee is unanimous in approving the set-up. It is designed to speed up the merchant-ship construction program. I do not, therefore, believe there should be any controversy on the matter.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman, therefore, has no objection to agreeing to the Senate amendments.

Mr. TABER. I have no objection.

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

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Did we understand the gentleman from Virginia to say that the Senate amendment struck out the language that the Maritime Commission shall have authority to sell these vessels to private individuals?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Just the reverse; they struck out the language which gave them permission to sell, not the vessels but the new facilities they are going to build on which these vessels will be constructed.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman means the shipyards that are being constructed now?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TABER. It seems to me that Congress or somebody ought to keep a pretty good watch on that, because the construction of these facilities will increase the value of a lot of property in some of these States that will be very vital to the welfare of this Nation; and I do not think we should proceed to give that to some State, because they might lobby to get it. We ought to be very careful on that.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman that can be fully protected.

Mr. RICH. In what way?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As pointed out by the gentleman from New York, the funds which are to be used for these facilities were not contained in this bill, but were allotted out of Presidential funds; therefore the language in this bill would be ineffectual even if left in there. If Congress desires to take some action on it, we will have to do it in some substantive way. It was not reached by this language, so that striking out the language does not involve anything now.

Mr. RICH. Are we to presume that the gentleman, one of the most valuable men in the House, will look after this to see that we get legislation which will not permit this Commission to deal with any States or subdivisions to give these shipyards away?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I assure the gentleman we will do the best we can.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 77, with Senate amendments thereto?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, lines 21 and 22, after "otherwise)," insert "and."

Page 2, line 22, strike out ", and sale or other disposition."

Page 3, line 5, strike out all after "laws:" down to and including "violence" in line 10, and 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."

Page 3, line 15, strike out "this act" and insert "section 1 of this joint resolution."

Page 3, line 17, strike out "herein."

Page 3, line 17, after "for" insert "in section 1 of this joint resolution."

Page 4, after line 2, insert:

"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."

Page 4, after line 2, insert:

"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 Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIME OF MEETING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock, and that when it adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Friday at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I am not going to object, because I believe the House wants this additional time for consideration of amendments to this very important bill—I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he can at this time inform the House what the program will be for next week, assuming consideration of this bill will be out of the way by that time?

Mr. McCORMACK. Assuming this bill takes all of Friday, of course it will be my intention to ask unanimous consent to adjourn to Monday. The bill from the Ways and Means Committee is next in order. This is the bill increasing the statutory debt limit.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman expect that bill to be finished Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. There are 3 hours' general debate, and, of course, 1 hour on the rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It will probably go over until Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I was mistaken. There is no rule. There are 3 hours' general debate. I do not know whether it will be finished Monday or not. But it will be finished Monday afternoon or Tuesday. After that there will be the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill. That is the program.

Mr. COOPER. I may say to the distinguished gentleman it is the purpose of the Ways and Means Committee, by agreement of both the majority and mi-

nority members, to finish the bill Monday to increase the debt limit.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have received information that it is desired to finish the bill coming out of the Ways and Means Committee on Monday, and after that the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill will be considered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it expected to take up the balance of the week with that bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of no other business to come up after that next week at the present time; so I assume that debate on that bill will probably be continued for some time.

Mr. FISH. There is no intention on the part of the minority to in any way obstruct or delay consideration of the bill we are now considering, but should it take more than 2 days would we go over until Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. This bill should be disposed of this week, and, unless it is disposed of by Friday, I would feel constrained to have a Saturday session.

Mr. FISH. I understood the gentleman to say he would ask unanimous consent to adjourn over from Friday to Monday. I hope it will be disposed of by Friday night; but if it is not, I suppose you would want to finish it on Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very apparent that, so far as the hearings and debate are concerned, everyone is satisfied, and we want that feeling to continue. If the bill is not disposed of under the 5-minute rule by Friday, we will continue on Saturday.

Mr. RICH. If it is the intention of the House to increase the statutory debt limit from \$49,000,000,000 to \$65,000,000,000 in 1 day, how long will it take the Congress to increase it further?

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I always yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, then, this limitation of debt bill is coming up Monday, and the purpose is to finish it on Monday, which will probably mean that we will run rather late on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I do not know how long the debate will continue under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MICHENER. If it is not finished on Monday, it will be concluded on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my hope, in view of information I have received while engaging in this colloquy, that the bill will be disposed of on Monday.

Mr. MICHENER. Therefore it is important that we be here Monday and Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. For those who are interested in that bill, it is important that they be here.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KEEFE. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the National Youth Administration, frequently the object of bitter attacks by those unfamiliar with its work and the personnel in charge of its activities, is in my judgment making a splendid contribution to the security and welfare of the Nation through its wise sponsorship of a national health training program.

The unprejudiced people of Wisconsin, who for over 40 years have pioneered social and economic reforms now accepted as the law of the land, note with great pleasure the fact that N. Y. A. has recently added to its staff, in Wisconsin engaged in building health, two of the world's outstanding athletes.

I refer specifically to Chuck Fenske, who holds the world's record for 1,000 yards, the world's record for three-quarter mile indoors, and who jointly with Glenn Cunningham holds the world's record for the mile run. Chuck Fenske, always identified heretofore with the University of Wisconsin, holds the national indoor mile championship, having won eight straight meets in the year 1940.

Walter Mehl, an outstanding, nationally known distance runner, graduated from the University of Wisconsin, Department of Education, in June 1940. He holds the American and intercollegiate and Big Ten record for 2 miles, is the national 1940 champion cross-country runner. He holds the national A. A. U. record for 1,500 meters, and recently won indoor events at Boston and New York.

These two young men are outstanding sources of inspiration for the youth not only of Wisconsin but of the Nation, and I am happy to state that they are both now employed by the National Youth Administration in charge of health development under N. Y. A. auspices in the State of Wisconsin.

Wisconsin and the Nation are proud of Chuck Fenske and Walter Mehl, and we are especially pleased to announce to the Congress and the country that in the year 1941 and hereafter these young men in all athletic competition will proudly wear the colors of the National Youth Administration. The hundreds of thousands of young people throughout the country engaged in National Youth Administration health projects will continue to receive great inspiration from the marvelous ability and leadership of these two outstanding athletes.

I congratulate N. Y. A. in its ability to attract to its service such outstanding young Americans. [Applause.]

DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when the majority leader told of the program for next week, not one word was said about the Dies resolution which has been introduced. Every day brings fresh evidence of the urgent need to keep the Dies committee on the job. The thousands of "fifth column" agents in this country are always at work. They have not delayed their subversive activities for 1 minute. The minions of Stalin and Hitler want the Dies committee killed. Lacking the power to kill the committee, they want the maximum delay in authorizing the committee to go ahead with sufficient funds for its investigations. The majority of this House should have acted long ago in the matter of continuing the committee. The "fifth column" alone has been served by the inexcusable delay in this matter.

As a member of the committee, I should like to ask some member on the majority side of the Committee on Rules to tell us when this resolution will be reported and when it will come before the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in response to the statement just made by the gentleman from New Jersey, may I state that I know of no disposition on the part of the Committee on Rules to withhold for any unreasonable length of time reporting the resolution which was introduced a couple of days ago by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] continuing the Dies committee. I believe there is a probability that action will be taken by the committee on Friday of the present week. If this is done, we will come in and ask for immediate consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 11, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and following the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of the Dies committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and, of course, I shall not object, I understand that we are going to have general debate on next Tuesday, anyway, and I suggest that the gentleman get time during general debate.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If I can get time during the general debate, I shall not penalize the House and myself to stay here until 5 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As my second request, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous con-

sent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent editorial by Mr. P. L. Clark, of the Norwich Sun.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a short editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Postmaster General Walker.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I delivered over the radio on the bill H. R. 1776.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Gen. John C. McDonald.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Dr. Marts, president of Bucknell College.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a discussion on How Shall We Finance the Defense? by Mr. Gorham Munson, in his weekly news letter entitled "Men First."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief excerpt from the findings of the Malvern Conference

of the Leaders of the Church of England, which was recently held in Great Britain, presided over by the Archbishop of York.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. 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. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I believe this excerpt, which I shall place in the RECORD from the findings of the leaders of the Church of England, is a document of the most profound significance. In view of the circumstances under which these religious leaders met and in view of their vision of the paramount importance of a deep and profound application of the principles of our religious faith to their problems and the problems of the world, their words are worth reading by every Member of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, in making the statement showing the administration going into the red \$26,925,000,000 in less than 8 years, I also thought of the resolution which is coming up here on Monday next asking us to increase the national debt limit from \$49,000,000,000 to \$65,000,000,000. Where are you going to get the money?

I think we have had the greatest spending spree in the entire history of the World by the New Deal from March 3, 1933, to date, and I do not know how long it is going to take you to reach a debt limit of \$65,000,000,000. I do not believe it is going to be long if you keep on at the rate you are going now. I have asked many times, Where are you going to get the money? Nobody seems to try to answer that question. Nobody on that side seems to care. All you think about is spend, spend, spend, and raise the roof on this debt limit. A crime to future generations. Such inefficiency, such waste, such extravagances I have never seen.

Now, can anybody on the other side of the House tell me when in the world we are ever going to try to cut down expenses and economize? It can be done, if you have a will to do so. Look at the Budget as given by the Budget Bureau for this year and you will see that you are going to have greater expenditures in regular functions of government this year

than last year. Yet you let the people believe they will be less. The greatest debt in the history of the Nation is going to come to the country next year and nothing is being done to cut it down. What are we going to do, Mr. Speaker? I herewith give you the record to date of the Roosevelt administration, the greatest spending record of all the world, not alone of this country:

Roosevelt deficit	
Mar. 4 to June 30, 1933.....	\$892,600,000
1934.....	3,965,991,685
1935.....	3,575,357,963
1936.....	4,763,841,642
1937.....	2,707,347,110
1938.....	1,384,160,931
1939.....	3,542,267,954
1940.....	3,611,056,036
1941 to Jan. 10.....	2,482,601,589

8 years less 54 days.... 26,925,245,920

This means the average for each of the 8 years in the red, \$3,365,655,740.

This means each month of the 8 years in the red, \$280,471,312.

This means each day of the 8 years in the red, including Sundays and holidays, \$9,349,044.

This means each hour of the 8 years in the red, including Sundays and holidays, \$389,543.

This means each minute of the 8 years in the red, including Sundays and holidays, since Mr. Roosevelt became President, \$6,492.

Think of it, every minute since Mr. Roosevelt took office he spent more than the country received by over \$6,000 a minute. That would mean a grand salary for a man with a family for a year.

Where are you going to get the money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Col. Russell L. Maxwell, Administrator of Export Control, before the Export Managers Club of New York on January 21, last.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I should like to reply to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] who evidently has raised the question as to why the Rules Committee has not acted upon the resolution to continue the Dies committee. I reached the floor just as my colleague and fellow member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], was replying that in all likelihood it would be taken up Friday.

For the information of other Members—I am sure that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] is now aware of this—I want to point out that the resolution to extend the life of the Dies committee was introduced on January 6,

and another resolution introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] on February 3, which is just 2 days ago. As all of you know, there are many resolutions now pending before the Rules Committee that were received long before this one.

In the case of these resolutions it happens that I have not received any request for a hearing from the chairman of the Dies committee nor from any of its members. It is true that yesterday a gentleman talked to me, but it was not the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], nor a member of the Dies committee. It was the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], who asked that action be taken on the resolution even before it had reached the committee.

In my opinion legislation now pending before this Congress is far too important to be interrupted by other matters. I have also felt that inasmuch as the Dies committee has not held hearings for several months, and as the chairman is not even in the city, the resolution certainly did not call for early action by the Rules Committee. It has always been the policy of the Rules Committee to have before it the chairman of any committee introducing a resolution, and I certainly hope that when this resolution does come up the engagements outside of Washington of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] will not prevent his being here.

I cannot promise the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] that the resolution will come up on Friday, although it is possible it will come up then. However, it may not come up until Saturday, or possibly Monday. In any event, I want to make my position clear that I feel that any Member desiring to be heard on the matter of the continuance of this committee should be given the opportunity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee later in the day by including certain excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a question. When this bill is passed and becomes a law, what, if anything, are you going to do to get production on that \$46,000,000 order that is with the Allis-Chalmers in Milwaukee, Wis., for war materials that the President wants? What are you going to do to get production on that order?

Mr. BLOOM. I understand the gentleman is asking his question of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, so I would advise him to go over to the Senate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You just pass the buck.

Mr. BLOOM. You asked the chairman of the Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will you open that factory? For 8 days or more Harold Christoffel, a Communist, has prevented somewhere around 7,500 men from working on orders for defense material. Has the majority party the courage to open that factory and get production?

Mr. BLOOM. Your question was addressed to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And it has not been answered?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

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

There was no objection.

CURRENCY EXPANSION

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, answering the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] as to how we are going to balance the Budget, I desire to say that we will never do it on the present price levels or until we either take this gold we have buried in the ground in Kentucky, issue currency against it, or issue currency against the credit of this Government, until we expand that currency to such an extent as to restore commodity prices to their normal level, and in that way restore the Nation's income.

Until that is done we are simply going to continue to go into the red. So far as I am individually concerned, I am for a currency expansion that will raise farm commodity prices to their normal levels, restore the prosperity of the American people, and enable us to balance the Nation's Budget and to meet our other obligations. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by Mr. George B. Sowers on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

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 further 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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 1776, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. At the end of the debate on Tuesday, February 4, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, had consumed 5 hours and 18 minutes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], ranking minority member of the committee, had consumed 5 hours and 58 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman and my fellow Members of the House, I am fully conscious of the fact that I am a new member of this body. I have no desire to become conspicuous, but on the contrary most sincerely desire the very opposite. However, I am fully conscious of the fact that I am the representative of near 300,000 of as good American citizens as the Anglo-Saxon blood affords, as loyal patriots as God has ever graced a democracy with, and that I am the only medium through which their will may be expressed in this branch of Congress. I am further cognizant of the fact that not since the banners of the red, white, and blue have waved over a free people in our democracy has there been before the National Congress a bill of the magnitude in importance of the proposed lend-lease bill that is before this body now. In the present world conflict there are definite signs that when God grants that civilized peoples of the world may breathe the air of peace again, there will be a new world order. In this important hour in our national life when destruction stands on the very threshold of democracy, were I to fail to record in the pages of history of this body my full support of this measure for aid to Britain I would feel cowardice creeping on my soul and that I was an unworthy servant of my people.

If liberty-loving people of democratic faith are to mold this new order and reassure the God-fearing peoples of the world their right to live in peace with the courage of the statesmen of old, then the democracies of the world must prevail against totalitarian advocates in the present European conflict. God forbid that we should ever permit our posterity to become subjected to the terror of an age in which the damnable and maddened theories of government of the Nazi reign. I have said before, and let me repeat, that I had rather see my wife and babies buried and follow by their side than to know that they had to live under the dictatorial powers of Hitler or others of his ideals of government.

Our burden and responsibility is too great to try to laugh it off. We need not

seek to kid ourselves, we cannot do it. It is great to boast of the powers of America to conquer, but please let me remind you that the America you see conquering any of her aggressors in your dreams of optimism, is a United America, one and inseparable in thought, purpose, and action. The life of our democracy is now calling for national unity. The maxims of heroism found throughout the history of this great commonwealth, I remind you, was not wrought in a divided house. The Nazi onslaught against free and representative government was well planned in advance and is a dangerous one. Even though crazed and maddened by their desire to enslave the world, we must not discount either the military genius nor purpose of those at the head of the Nazi regime.

Let me state here that seemingly the opposition to this bill have viewed and are discussing it, as a theory, when in truth and fact it is a problem, and its proponents are facing it as such. There is no one more opposed to the delegation of undue power to any one person than I; as a theory it is destructive, but we are facing a national crisis and emergency which we as a brave people must meet. The time consumed over the passage of this bill stands as full proof of the fact that to administer aid to Britain by the Congress would be a hopeless undertaking. We would revert to the days of Nero and my able colleague the gentleman from New York, HAM FISH, would fiddle while democracy perished. It is imperative that power to act quickly be vested in some individual and certainly our President and national leader is from every analysis the proper individual. By the authority of his office he is by necessity informed in international military questions more fully than the Congress could expect to be. Regardless to your personal like or dislike of Mr. Roosevelt he has proven himself a worthy and courageous leader, and one in whom the populace have utmost confidence. As has been stated from the floor before the grant of this power to the President is not an innovation. Just as great powers have been delegated to several former Presidents since the early life of our democracy.

Before proceeding further let me say that I favor the provisions of this bill and full aid to Britain short of men. I have said before, and say now, the place for American youth is on American soil and not under European soil. I favor the use of American materials instead of American men with the full hope and confidence that with our material aid the totalitarian powers will be crushed without American blood being spilled even on American soil.

With a conquered Europe and strengthened resources, it is credulous to assume, even for a soothing effect on our nervous system, that Germany with Japan as an ally would not seek new fields to conquer in the Western Hemisphere. There is but one answer to the present international status, it is a death struggle between totalitarian and representative forms of government, one must prevail, the other must perish, there is

no middle ground. Shall democracy with all its heritage and glory fade from the world, to leave as a marker of its lamented tomb, bought at the price of the blood of innocent mothers and babes, an enslaved people—my answer is "No."

How simple it is to say that if Hitler conquers Britain he will not secure by such means as are necessary the possessions of its Empire, with all their resources, to conquer what the English mothers and babes suffered to protect.

We as representatives of our people cannot permit ourselves to be soothed into that dreamless sleep that would cause us to trust Hitler or any of his emissaries, by the wild statements of Colonel Lindbergh and others of his school of thought, which, if by us can be considered as in good faith must be considered and accepted as born of ill-advice. We are so often told that we could not be invaded—accept this as true if you may. Let me remind you that England has not been invaded, but its land has been drenched with the tears of helpless women and its air terrorized with screams of horror-stricken babes—her national soul shocked from bottom to top.

Why and on what premise should we assume that we would be spared the fate of other peace-loving democratic people at the hands of a victorious Hitler in all of his mad lust for innocent blood? Power means more to him than God and all of His love. Trust him if you must, and see the soul of man crushed and the liberties of man perish before his ever-increasing fire of hatred and destruction. If it takes my blood and my life to defeat his purposes and program of human slavery, let it go. If it takes aid to Britain, let it go. My heart goes out to Britain—she is fighting the common cause of all the God-fearing, peace-loving people of all the world for that standard of peace, security, and liberty that was bought by the blood of the heroes through the ages. May God give her gallant people continued courage, hope, power, and might to hold the banners of her democracy above the mud, mire, and dust of a lost cause and enslaved people. When you think of death at its worst, it cannot compare with life in an age in which all the heritage of American liberty and tradition lie buried beneath a Nazi flag.

I am young in this body but old in my faith in democracy and in the belief that nothing has ever been gained by bowing a head or a heart to a tyrant. I love peace and hate war, but hold national and personal honor above blood, and before I would appease a monster whose only purpose was to banish love from the earth I would give my blood with a smile.

No tyrant has ever yielded to appeasement, nor will Hitler; he hears only the voice of force and will yield only to its demand.

With the courage of the gallant statesmen who have gone on before and with full faith and prayerful hope that I am right, I shall cast my ballot for the bill that is before this body, H. R. 1776, in the serenest confidence that I have served my people and the cause of love and Christianity well. May God guide us through these trying hours and grant

that no American blood shall be shed in this great conflict. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, the international situation may be likened today to a man struggling in a rapidly moving stream, we on the shore attempting to throw a rope to save him and a bystander responsible for his predicament standing by and saying, "It is all right to throw the rope but don't touch the end." Up to 20 centuries ago and the coming of the Christian era, we had the same philosophy that is trying to be brought back to the world today. I refer to the philosophy of force, the pagan philosophy. The only thing that mattered in those days, according to our histories, was that right could only be submerged by might; that nothing mattered except might; that he who had the might was strong and would prevail. It was not until the coming of the Christian era that we had a change of philosophy, and that new philosophy that we call the Christian philosophy or the democratic philosophy, if you will, has been having its troubles ever since. During the Dark Ages we saw a reversion to the old philosophy of paganism; and coming to a more recent time, the time of Frederick the Great, we saw the glorification of war as his watchword. He builded on the theory of force, and he built well. In later times the Kaiser did likewise, and many of us felt the pressure exerted by that monarch; but at no time in the history of the world of the last 2,000 years, has there been such a threat against the new, the Christian, the democratic philosophy, as there is at the present time. The most terrifying onslaught of all history is on the march today. You may ask me if it is our province to stop that, whether it is our will to stop that, or our ability. I do not know. I do not know how you feel about it, but I am convinced that all we have that makes life worth living is encompassed in that new philosophy of which I speak, and I shall explain what I mean. It is simply the American way. Let us contrast it for a moment with the other way, the totalitarian way.

On our Saturday nights our workingman can go to the boss and get his check. He can convert it into all of the things that he and his family need. He can get that pay check in coin of the realm. He can get it under our free institutions, and spend it for even recreation and the movies—spend it for whatever his heart desires; it is his pay for decent working hours and decent working conditions. On the other hand, contrast with that the situation in Germany. Hitler says to the workingman there, "You work as long as I tell you to work," and it is usually 12 hours a day. He tells them that they must work not 40 hours a week, but 6 or even 7 days a week. And at the end of that time the workingman gets a chit of paper which says, "With this you can get so much food and so much clothing." They even tell him for whom he may work and at what he may work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman will pardon me if I decline to yield. On Sunday morning you and I can go and worship in any church that we desire, but you cannot do that in Germany. Look at the record that Hitler has made with the Lutheran Church, with the Reverend Niemoeller. That reverend gentleman is still in a concentration camp; and then there is the cardinal archbishop of Munich, a Catholic prelate. They still have barbed wire around his mansion, and they still dictate the kind of prayer book out of which one shall pray. If there is ever an election in Germany, I do not know about it; but on last November 5 you and I faced an electorate with no fear in their hearts as to how they might be treated if they did not vote for you or for me. That is the difference that I try to show today—the difference between democracy and totalitarianism; between the new philosophy, the Christian philosophy, and the old pagan philosophy. I do not want to see that prevail in this world. I will go the limit against it.

Now, let us look at the military situation for a moment. I have heard, as you have, that the Monroe Doctrine was created for a certain purpose. I have to disagree with all the purposes I have heard advanced on the floor during this debate. The naval strategists realize that as long as we have had the British Fleet supreme in the Atlantic it has not meant any depredations against our liberties. For over 100 years that fleet in being in the Atlantic has given us an opportunity to go about our business as we saw fit. Why do you suppose we never feared the British Navy, even in times when our Navy was not at all comparable? Simply because Canada lay unprotected on our flank. We could overrun her. England could not have prevented it. We had something with which to combat an aggressive British Fleet. But change the equilibrium in the Atlantic and what have you? You have another nation coming in—over which we have no counteracting power.

When the debate was had on the floor about aid to Finland I first mentioned the advantage, in my opinion, of giving aid to Finland, stopping the Russians where they were, not that I hated Russia, but I did not want to see another power come into the Atlantic, and if they had gone through Finland, Sweden, and Norway could not have stopped them, and they would have been at the North Sea and had access to the North Atlantic. I offered then to give little Finland tanks, even destroyers, if we had to loan them—anything to help keep the equilibrium in the Atlantic. Then later on we saw the Germans come into this theater. They have access to the Atlantic now and you see what a threat it is to us. I understand, although I did not hear the speech of Hitler the other day, that he said, "You had better not send your ships over here because I will sink them." He could not say that after our destroyers got into action in the World War, because he did not have access to the Atlantic. Occasionally a submarine got out, yes; but it was no threat to us. Twenty or more of their submarines were

destroyed and they soon called a halt. Almost 2 months before the armistice was signed German submarines returned to home ports, on the surface, flying the white flag. They could not compete with American destroyers. But now it is different. Now, in the Atlantic, as I say, you have a new power, and that power sits there right athwart the line of communication between us and the democracies if we want to help them. What are you going to do about it?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California 5 additional minutes.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, it is true the British Fleet is still in being, and as long as it is in being it is perhaps possible for her to protect the stream of arms and munitions we send, but I predict if this bill is not passed you will see a negotiated peace, which in no way will curb the onward march of Hitler and the totalitarian nations. [Applause.] But I think this bill is going to be passed. I would like to see fewer amendments even than those placed on this bill by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am thinking of the man struggling in the center of that stream and I would like to see us take hold of the end of the rope and pull him ashore; not just standing by, and when Mr. Hitler says "Do not touch that rope," to quail before his threat.

It can be done in this way. Our hemisphere—the Western Hemisphere—begins at the longitude of zero, Greenwich. Who is he to say that we cannot exercise our rights in that hemisphere? The Atlantic Ocean is our ocean just as much as it is anybody else's ocean. Is someone going to tell us we can go just so far and no farther? By giving power to the President to declare that the combat zone exists no longer west of Ireland we can take our ships that far, and I will guarantee you will have freedom of the seas, when you build up the Navy as you are building today, and neither Mr. Hitler nor anybody else can prevent aid going to the democracies if it is in our will to take those things there. They say it may mean war. My friends, you cannot tell, and I cannot tell, whether the passage of this bill means war or peace. We do not know. But I want to say that it is not in your power, and it is not in mine, to prevent war. I lost all patience with my people when they came to me during the last campaign and said, "Please don't get us into war." I said, "Don't look at me. I am not getting you into war, but there is one man who has the power to do that, and that is Mr. Hitler. Look at him."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I would rather not yield, if the gentleman will pardon me.

Now, that is the situation as I see it. I went through the last war, as did most of you. I hate war. I do not want to see war come to my country again. Sometimes, however, you do not have the power to say whether there will be a war or not; and I think one of those times is now. I believe it is in the hands of the dictator powers—Japan, Mussolini,

and Hitler—to say whether we are going to be dragged into this war or not; and one overt act on their part can cause it. Did you not read the other day where they dropped some bombs on the outskirts of Dublin? Poor little Ireland was not doing anything to cause that. All Mr. Hitler has to do to bring us into his war is to send an aircraft carrier or a merchant ship with a few planes aboard, if he has not any like ours that can cross the ocean, and drop his bombs on New York City; and what are you going to do about it? If he wants to get us into war, he will get us in, and you and I cannot prevent it. This is the situation that I say is fraught with all kinds of danger, and I am not going to quail before a fellow like this because I think there are so many other eventualities that might happen that are worse that I do not think it is worth considering.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I hope the gentleman will pardon me if I do not yield; I have but a minute left.

One other thing I should like to say, and then I am through. We have heard so much discussion on this I am not certain I can bring you any new thoughts, but on this subject of international law, let me say that international law is only a set of rules by which nations can get together after their troubles are over and see how much they owe each other. That is all its effect is, even though some say that international law may prevent our doing some things that are to our interest to do. In the present-day world Hitler, Mussolini, and every other ruler abroad ignores international law and the rules and regulations drawn up in accordance with those general basic principles at the first drop of the hat, at any time it pleases them so to do. Let us not therefore be too circumspect about that ourselves. Let us say, "Here is our hemisphere. We will do as we please in this." And I will go along with my friends for freedom of the seas in all parts of the world when you give us a navy sufficiently large to maintain that freedom of the seas. We are close on that now. When we have it I would refuse to permit Mr. Hitler to say where my ships will go and when. I trust this Congress will make up its mind once and for all time that we will not be dissuaded from that decision by any dictator, and that this way of life we call the American, the Christian, or the democratic way of life, will prove to be so superior in every way to the totalitarian way that our people will cling to it and rather fight than give it up. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Young].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, throughout this debate we have been delighted, regaled, and instructed by expression of views of Members on both sides of the aisle, each of whom has added something tangible in this discussion, and each of whom is sincere and unselfish in the intent to do the utmost for the welfare of our country in this time of its peril. The House of Representatives is a tol-

erant body, a true cross section of the American people. Let us hope that before we finally send this amended bill to the other body there will be a feeling of practical unanimity that we are united behind this bill and that all reasonable objections have been removed.

The national-defense bill, for which I intend to vote, does not change our status as a nonbelligerent. Nor is it a device to get us in war without consent of Congress, as claimed by the gentleman from New York. Nor does it involve the surrender of our war-making powers to one man. We are not at war. In my judgment this is not a war Congress. Only Congress can declare war. President Roosevelt is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. If the President wants war instead of peace he would not have to waste time on Congress. He could order our Navy to Singapore or Gibraltar the same as President William McKinley sent the *Maine* to Havana in 1898; the same as President Woodrow Wilson ordered American sailors and marines to attack Vera Cruz in 1914; 180 Mexicans were slaughtered and 19 Americans were killed and 63 wounded. This was without action of Congress. He could order our warships to escort merchant vessels into the English Channel and clear the sea lanes from Boston to Liverpool. Other Presidents have sent troops into Haiti, Nicaragua, China, and other countries to fight and without any act of Congress. Every American President has always had tremendous powers in the field of foreign relations. The Monroe Doctrine was not an act of Congress. It was the act of an American President who proclaimed this country would fight if any Old World power tried to take any territory in this hemisphere. Americans hold that doctrine as binding and as sacred as any act of Congress.

This debate is one of the most important ever waged in the American Congress. In his fascinating autobiography, *Pilgrim's Way*, Lord Tweedsmuir, Governor General of Canada, before his death a year ago, wrote something strikingly prophetic about the United States. "If America's historic apparatus of government is cranky," he wrote, "she is capable of meeting the instant need of things with brilliant improvisations." This bill to promote the defense of the United States by providing aid to Great Britain—to any country in fact whose defense is vital to our own defense—is precisely for the purpose of meeting the instant need with improvisations. We face unparalleled dangers and unprecedented Congressional action is required to avert them. President Roosevelt frankly stated in his press conference that while he does not crave the powers comprehended in this bill, it is indispensable that someone should have them in order that swift action may be possible. Speed in our aid to Great Britain he maintains is the all-urgent need. Foes of the administration cry "dictatorship," and that this bill gives President Roosevelt power to declare war. These charges are not true.

To those who shout or write "dictatorship" I quote Emil Ludwig, a very great German who loved his fatherland. He said—

Only those who have not lived in unfree air would speak of President Roosevelt as a dictator.

There is nothing in this amended national-defense bill which makes for war or dictatorship. The purpose of the McCormack bill, H. R. 1776, is to enable our Government—not our private bankers—to continue to aid nations whose defense we consider vital to our own defense, even though such nations cannot at the time pay for such supplies in cash. This authority permits of speedier action than could be had after various debates and discussions in both branches of the Congress. If our President wanted war instead of peace, he could involve this Nation in war, and no act of Congress could prevent it.

There are those who claim that Germany, prior to 1916, was traditionally friendly to this Nation, and that Great Britain never offered assistance to the United States. They should study history. In the year 1888 the United States and Germany were at a tension over coaling rights in the Samoan Islands. We had had a treaty for the use of the harbor since 1872, and that was amended in 1884, giving us exclusive rights in the harbor of Pago Pago for a coaling station. The Germans sent three warships and proceeded to take over the islands and denied our vessels the use of the harbor. Congress did not act, but the President immediately sent three warships and they entered the harbor and lined up broadside to the Germans. The American Commander told any of his crew who were German that they could go ashore during the fight. About a third of his men went over the side. This threw the advantage to the Germans, and one morning when the guns were all loaded and things were about to explode, the British cruiser *Calliope* steamed into the harbor and lined up with the American ships broadside to the Germans, cleared for action and the British Commander called the crew to quarters. That stopped at the moment what certainly would have been a war with Germany, and directly afterward an act of God, a terrific hurricane, scattered the warships of the three nations.

At the outbreak of the Spanish-American War the German Kaiser sounded out the British Government on a proposition to assist Spain. This German effort did not meet with success. Then directly after the Battle of Manila Bay, in May 1898, Admiral Dewey awoke one morning to discover that the German Government had reinforced its warships in the bay and Germany had a stronger fleet than his little squadron. Furthermore, the German admiral, Von Diederichs, took a hostile attitude. Admiral Dewey ordered a shell fired across the bow of the German cruiser when the German Admiral insisted upon steaming into a section of Manila Bay barred to his fleet by Admiral Dewey's orders. The American Admiral sent a hurry call for the battleship *Oregon*. Simultaneous with this, Von Diederichs asked the Commander of a small British squadron in Manila Bay what he would do if Germany took a hand in the affair and helped out the Spaniards. The English commander then uttered some very weighty words.

He simply said, "Blood is thicker than water." The battleship *Oregon* completed coaling at Hawaii and left under sealed orders. The day the *Oregon* left Hawaii Von Diederichs and his German Fleet moved out of Manila Bay.

I am unalterably opposed to sending American boys to fight on European battlefields. What is the future of America if Hitler wins? What of the future if we stop our aid to Great Britain, or delay? If Hitler reduces Europe and England to slavery and dominates the ocean lanes and the commerce of the world, what hope is there for the American way of life, for our peace, and for the maintenance of prosperity and contentment? Today thousands and thousands of children are marching to the schoolhouses of this land. Their liberty, their supremacy, and their happy and peaceful future are sweeter to us than the fragrance of the sweetest flowers. What hope is there for their future if we stand aside now and permit the lights of democracy to go out in Europe? My boy is 18. He will surely serve in this war if there should be a war. Yet what hope is there for him 10 years from now, or for his children 20 years from now, if we fail to send planes, munitions, guns, food, supplies to Great Britain and China, who are fighting valiantly against the evil forces that would crush democracy in our time? No one can positively know what road we should take to maintain peace and preserve democracy in America. My choice is to support President Roosevelt, who said:

I have one supreme determination to keep war away from the Western Hemisphere for all time. It is for peace I have labored, and it is for peace I shall labor all the days of my life.

Will the dictators in their arrogance bring the war to us the same as they brought it to Poland, Holland, Belgium, Norway, and Greece? We are a peace-loving people, but certainly no people on earth loved peace more than the Norwegians and the Dutch. Norway had not waged war in 102 years. Holland had not been involved in any war in 147 years. They did not want war. Hitler took the war to them.

National defense is not a political issue—it is a national necessity. Nevertheless, the most compelling issue in the recent campaign from a national standpoint was that of foreign policy. Notwithstanding the highly patriotic position taken by Mr. Willkie, the rejection of President Roosevelt would have been interpreted by dictators as a repudiation of American foreign policy. The overwhelming reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress is a clear mandate for the continuance of the forthright and unswerving foreign policy of President Roosevelt and our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, for the maintenance of a two-ocean navy, our first line of defense, as the mightiest in the world, and for the unflinching defense of the entire Western Hemisphere from all threats of dictatorship aggression. I will uphold the hands of our President in the maintenance of the integrity of our institutions and help write into history, not of war, but of humble people, their life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

LXXXVII—37

I am much opposed to using American warships to convoy British merchant vessels, and I want all Americans to be compelled to remain out of European war zones. Nevertheless, every President from George Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt has had or has exercised authority—and the Constitution gives the authority to the Executive—that might precipitate war regardless of the act or wish of the Congress. Obviously, the purpose of this bill is to accomplish the more efficient use of our resources to achieve national defense without war. As Congressman at large from Ohio—representative of nearly 7,000,000 constituents—in this time of grave danger to our Republic, to our security, and to our way of life, I am determined to do my utmost to keep war 3,000 miles distant from our shores. Let us strengthen, not weaken, the hands of the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy so that no dictators will dare attack us.

House Resolution 1776 bears a prophetic number. H. R. 1776 is a virtual declaration of independence through Great Britain from the dictator powers.

This is our hour of decision. Some folks who now cry dictator, if they had their way, might experience Hitler as a dictator. Delay is dangerous. Hitler fears the industrial strength of America added to that of Great Britain. This is an emergency that calls for the utmost speed. The crisis confronting this Nation is more menacing than that faced by the North following Bull Run and before Gettysburg. In fact, had the South won the War between the States—we in Ohio refer to it as the Civil War—there would have been two American democracies instead of the United States; but if Hitler triumphs and controls the Atlantic, our free institutions are face to face with the destructive forces of autocracy. There might be no democracy. Our way of life—our standard of living for which our forefathers fought and builded—will be torn down. Great Britain is trusting Winston Churchill. We in America must place our trust in Franklin D. Roosevelt. The industrial force and strength of America behind the manpower of Great Britain will enable Britain to stave off destruction and disintegration without the loss of an American soldier. The British Navy plus American bombers manned by the Royal Air Force will enable Great Britain to continue its naval blockade, and in the end launch an air offensive over Germany and the hollow shell of nazi-ism will collapse. Then it is for American leadership to point the way—to chart the course—to help build the road through the jungles of Old World hates and desires for political aggrandizement—to a just and lasting peace in this desperate, war-weary world. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I am as keen in my desire to assist Great Britain and the other victims of aggression at the hands of the Axis Powers as any man on this floor. And while I am none too happy over the necessity for the enactment of such legislation as that now under consideration, I am reluctantly driven to the conclusion that in going along with this legislation I am accepting the lesser of the two evils offered—the necessity for aiding Great Britain with the risk of becoming involved in the war which that course involves, or accepting the other alternative of running the risk of allowing Great Britain to be defeated, thereby leaving America alone to withstand the onslaught of the totalitarian powers.

For more than a year the United States has been successful in its determination to prevent being drawn into the maelstrom of World War No. 2. The fact that it has been enabled to stay out of this war is attributable to the fact that on November 4, 1939, the Congress of the United States passed the so-called Neutrality Act, which provided that American ships should not enter the combat zones. I am convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt—and you will agree with me—that had it not been for the fact that Congress in its wisdom saw fit to pass this law, we would have been in this war long before now. You and I know, in the light of past experiences and with the knowledge of the temper of the American people, that had our ships been allowed to freely enter these danger zones, innumerable American ships would have been sunk by the Axis Powers and America today would be in the war. Lesser nations have been content in this and in previous wars to permit the sinking of their ships with the attendant loss of the lives of their nationals and the dipping of their flags into the sea; but the people of America—proud of their heritage, conscious of their vast resources, and resplendent in the knowledge of past achievements—are unwilling to withstand the shock to their national pride of permitting the sinking of American ships and the loss of American lives by a foreign belligerent. How long do you think a proud American people would tolerate the repeated glaring headlines which would appear in the press daily advising an inflamed public of the loss of American ships and American lives?

Mr. Chairman, with this in mind, I have endeavored by discussion with members of the Foreign Affairs Committee from the inception of this legislation to write into it a provision that the materials of war which this legislation proposes to give Great Britain should not be delivered in American bottoms. I think such a provision should have been written into the bill in the committee. Failing in that, I will offer at the appropriate time such an amendment for the consideration of the House. The amendment which I propose to offer is as follows:

Page 4, after line 5, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"(e) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or permit any of the defense articles herein provided for to be transported to belligerents in American vessels."

In the consideration of this amendment, no doubt, we will meet with the argument by those in charge of this legislation, which they have heretofore advanced, that there is no necessity for such an amendment. That the bill does not specifically authorize the transportation of such materials in American bottoms. Our answer to that argument is that, if there is no such authority, either specifically set out or implied, the amendment can do no harm. However, I might point out, the legislation is so broad in its scope, its powers delegated are so numerous—both specifically and by implication—that there is grave doubt whether or not such power is conveyed in the bill. Again I would like to say that this amendment is in line, and on all fours with, the amendment adopted by the committee with reference to the conveying of ships by our war vessels. I am advised that the committee, in the consideration of this bill, took the position that they, no doubt, will take here, that there was no power either suggested or implied with reference to the conveying of ships written into the bill. And yet the committee saw fit to adopt the so-called conveying amendment.

Frankly I think that the committee should accept this amendment. They argue that it is not the purpose of this legislation to convey these articles in American vessels. Then, if that be true, what harm could there be in its adoption? Moreover, the committee, no doubt, will argue that this proposed legislation does not repeal the Neutrality Act, which prohibits our ships from going into combat zones. My reply to that argument is that the multitude of American citizens who are apprehensive of this bill and its broad powers will have their fears allayed by an affirmative reaffirmation and redeclaration of American foreign policy as set out in the neutrality law prohibiting American ships from entering the combat zones.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has made a most excellent statement. I trust he will offer the amendment he has referred to. If he will offer it, I have the confidence to believe there will be enough Members to follow him to adopt it by an overwhelming majority. If the committee sponsoring the bill does not accept the amendment, it ought to.

Mr. COLMER. I agree with the gentleman that the committee should accept the amendment. I tried to get them to agree to it, but, so far, my efforts have been unavailing.

If such an amendment is adopted—I do not care whether it is in the particular verbiage I have proposed—but I think the adoption of such an amendment would be the most constructive thing we could do. I have no pride of authorship or verbiage in the matter so long as the principle is embodied.

And let me say in this connection that I propose, if I do not have the opportunity to offer this amendment, to vote for

such an amendment, whether it comes from this side of the aisle or from that side of the aisle. [Applause.] And I want to say in furtherance of that that I took occasion some several days ago to criticize—well, that is a little strong perhaps—but I did take occasion to rise on this floor and make some remarks about the partisan attitude that was being developed in the House on this legislation. I am happy to see as this debate progresses that less and less partisanship is being shown and a finer spirit of patriotism is being evidenced.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the full significance of the traditional method of legislating by committees and the full import of our traditional adherence to recommendations of departments and bureaus who sponsor the legislation which comes before the Congress. But I would remind you that in the final analysis it is to the Congress and not to the departments and bureaus, or even the President himself, that the people of America look. And it is the Congress of the United States which the people of the country hold responsible for the legislation enacted. Now I appeal to you as sovereign representatives of the American people in this hour of gravity and peril to the young Republic. I appeal to your sense of responsibility. I appeal to your patriotism. I appeal to your initiative and your spirit of independence. Is there anything sacred about a bill which is reported from a committee? Shall we surrender in toto our responsibility simply because a department of the Government, regardless of how much respect we may have for that department, has said to a committee of the House that the language of the proposed legislation shall be just as it was handed to the committee, and beyond that we should go no further? Let me put it this way. Suppose the State Department had said to the Committee on Foreign Affairs that they thought such a provision should be in the bill and had put it there. Can you conceive for one moment of such language being stricken from the bill? Or again, had the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is chairman, written this very provision into the bill when it was brought to you here on the floor of the House, can you imagine that it would have been stricken? Or, finally, suppose the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] were now to arise—as I think he should—and say that the committee accepts this amendment, do you think there would be any objection from this House? Now let's just use a little plain horse sense about this matter. Are we, the 435 Representatives of one hundred and thirty-odd million American citizens, to surrender completely to a department, to a committee, or even to one man—the distinguished chairman of the committee—our right to legislate on this important subject? I repeat the query: Is there any sacrilege in our adopting an amendment to this bill to which the only objection raised is that it is unnecessary? Who knows whether it is necessary or not?

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am compelled to yield to the distinguished gentleman under the circumstances.

Mr. FISH. I read in the newspapers a day or so ago that a spokesman for the White House said there will be no amendments in the House, that there were enough votes to pass the bill unamended, but they would make concessions in the Senate. Does not the gentleman think it is the duty of the House to legislate itself?

Mr. COLMER. Of course, I am not advised about the first statement the gentleman makes. As to his last statement, it is self-evident. It is the duty of this House to perform its own legislative function, and simply because this particular piece of legislation has been dumped into the lap of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is no reason why it should be adopted in that particular form.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Is there anything in this bill that gives the President the right to do anything that the gentleman's amendment applies for? Does not the Neutrality Act at the present time provide for just what your amendment states?

Mr. COLMER. Does the gentleman direct that inquiry to me?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. I wonder if the gentleman would think I was facetious or presumptuous if I answered that by directing an inquiry to him.

Mr. BLOOM. I would be very glad to try to answer it.

Mr. COLMER. Immediately preceding the point where I propose to offer this amendment is another amendment which states in almost identical language that "Nothing in this act shall be construed to give power to convoy vessels." Carrying this matter further, may I ask the gentleman if there is anything in the legislation that gives the power to convoy vessels?

Mr. BLOOM. I will answer the gentleman in this way. There has been so much talk about that matter that the committee thought it would put that in there just to allay fear; but there is nothing in this act, and there is no reason for an amendment, which grants power of that sort in there, and the Neutrality Act specifically provides for that. In my speech of Monday I covered the question that the gentleman raises.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman admits then that there is nothing in the legislation that would authorize the conveying of ships and that that was put in there to allay fears and to reaffirm and to redeclare the policy of this country with reference to that particular item. Is that right?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Then would the gentleman have any objection to a reaffirmation and a redeclaration of the foreign policy as set out in the Neutrality Act which is on all fours and in line with the gentleman's statement on this question of

keeping our ships out of the combat zones?

Mr. BLOOM. We can write a bill of "don'ts" if that is what the gentleman wants to do. There are certain rights given to the President as Commander in Chief under the Constitution. Do you want to put in here that we give him or grant him these rights over again? You can go very far on that. You could say that this does not give the President the power to do this or that, and we could go on down and enumerate a hundred different things, but please remember the Constitution is written practically the same way as stated in there.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken up quite a bit of the gentleman's time and I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I make the inquiry of the chairman of the committee sponsoring this bill whether he objects to the amendment to which the gentleman makes reference and which he says he is going to offer to the committee? May I say to the gentleman, further, that he has stated to the House and to the country that this is not a war bill, that this is a peace measure?

Mr. BLOOM. That is right, except I did not say it was a peace measure, it is a defense measure.

Mr. COX. All right. It has also been stated that the conveying of ships or the transportation of equipment in American vessels would certainly get this country into war. The gentleman's amendment is intended to prevent the doing of those things which the gentleman and his colleagues say may be provocative of war. In view of that statement, and in view of the position the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has taken, is he opposed to the amendment that the gentleman from Mississippi will offer?

Mr. BLOOM. I will answer that in this way: The committee yesterday, today, and tomorrow morning has met and will meet to consider all suggestions and all amendments that are offered. I will be very glad to take the gentleman's amendment, present it to the committee, and if the committee should decide to agree to the gentleman's amendment or to act upon it, that is all right with me.

Mr. COLMER. I think that is a very fine and fair statement from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] meant by his last statement that the majority members were called together. There has been no call of the minority members.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from New York is making quite a few statements here. Naturally, the gentleman knew that I referred to the majority members of the committee.

Mr. COLMER. May I say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I assume from what has been said here that he will have the cooperation of

the minority members in the adoption of such an amendment.

Mr. FISH. We hope that this is a non-partisan bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. It was impossible to hear what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said when he was on the floor a moment ago. Possibly he covered the same ground. In answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] who says there is no necessity for the amendment to which the gentleman from Mississippi has referred, may I call attention to the fact that that is correct as far as the law today is concerned, but if this lend-lease bill becomes a law, that part of the Neutrality Act which is in existence today will be suspended or waived in the discretion of the President.

Mr. BLOOM. No; not at all.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that such an amendment written into this bill would be the greatest safeguard against this country becoming involved in war of anything that we could do. Let me remind you again that the one thing that has kept this country out of war to this date has been the keeping of our ships out of the combat zone. And I now make so bold as to predict that the day we allow our ships to go into these zones that day America actively and overtly enters the war. Aside from our desire to prevent the sacrifice in blood and money of such a war, the tragedy lies in the fact that America is not prepared for war. It seems to me that the greatest task that lies immediately ahead is a diplomatic one. We should see to it that America should stay out of this war at least until it is prepared to fight. God permit that we may stay out entirely. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I cannot find myself in agreement with this bill in its present form. It seems to me that in order to correctly approach the question involved in this bill we must start with the beginning of the opening day of this session of Congress. It was on that particular day that I took my oath of office as a member of this body, and in that oath I was bound 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."

I assure you that it shall constantly be my endeavor to keep inviolate both the spirit and the wording of that oath. I have been impressed by the debate on both sides of this great question these last several days. I had hoped that on a matter so important as this, we would find ourselves in spirit at least in unity.

I would regard this as an important and forward step both for the welfare of this country and for the countries this bill is designed to assist. The wording

of this bill states in understandable language that its intention is "to further promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes."

I have been impressed with the unity of purpose of all who have spoken on this bill insofar as their desire to aid Great Britain is concerned. I, too, share this view, and I am glad to find that on this particular point there is general agreement.

It seems to me that we must for a moment briefly analyze what is transpiring in the world that brings to us what the administration seems to feel is the need for this bill. I am inclined to think that there is going on today a great struggle that can be called a revolution of principles of government. That revolution is being led by the German chancellor and his associates. It is, in fact, a contest between the totalitarian types of government now so general in Europe, and for which the German chancellor stands as the speaker, against the democracies or the democratic plan of life, of which our American system is one.

There are many in this land who look with suspicion upon England. I am reasonably familiar with the history of the long span of national existence of the British Empire. I recognize that a nation with a history so long, that has played so important a part in the affairs of Europe, will by the very nature of things be adjudged guilty before the world of many mistakes. It is not my purpose here to attempt to defend the errors of England and her empire, and I am willing to include in that catalog another important event known as 1776. But it is my profound belief that the German Chancellor has committed more far-reaching crimes against the free peoples of Europe in the period of the last 12 months than was done by the British Government over a period of a thousand years.

So I, too, join with the others in a sincere desire to give every possible assistance to Great Britain as she fights valiantly today with her back against the wall.

The German Chancellor has publicly proclaimed his intentions, which are, in effect, to create a new world order, and we are left to assume by his remarks that he will mark the trestleboard as to the new kind of world order in which the nations of the world must live. Surely few Americans who hear these remarks and observe this revolution in government can fail to show an ever-increasing sympathy toward the democracies.

We have the word of the administration that the United States is already giving Britain all the aid possible to give without impairing our own national preparation. The passage of this bill, therefore, will not in itself either increase or speed up that aid; first, because such aid is already being extended to the limit of our capacity to produce; and, second, because such aid will no doubt continue to be extended whether we pass this bill or not. It seems to me, therefore, that the crux of this situation is not, as the administration supporters would have you believe, the matter of the

aid to Great Britain. We can give all aid to Great Britain without the passage of this bill, by simply passing a measure extending to her and other democracies such gifts, loans, and credits as this Congress deems essential.

So the real point at issue is not the question, in my mind, of whether we can extend greater aid to England. It seems to me the people of the country are overwhelmingly in favor of extending such aid. The real issue raised by this bill is whether or not we, as Members of Congress, are going to grant these vast and unrestricted powers to the President. Are we ready to abdicate our constitutional authority, which each of us assumed when we took our oath of office, Republicans and Democrats alike, and entrust the lives of all the people of this Nation to the judgment and wisdom of one man? Are we, ladies and gentlemen of this Congress, elected representatives of the people, going to surrender these rights which are vested in us by the Constitution which we have sworn to uphold? That, to me, is the issue that must be met as we meet to debate and discuss this bill known as 1776.

In my honest judgment, much as I desire to continue our material aid to Great Britain, and much as I desire to see Great Britain stop the German Chancellor in his march of destruction, I feel that there rests upon our shoulders a correspondingly greater responsibility, and that, the preservation of the Constitution of the United States. The passage, therefore, of this bill would, in my humble judgment, be an act of abdication by the Congress and the surrender of constitutional prerogative to the Chief Executive. Conduct of the foreign policy of the United States is vested in the President and the Department of State, but the founding fathers imposed upon this executive power two very important checks: Treaties with foreign governments require the ratification of the Senate, and the Congress alone was given the power to declare war. In effect, this bill sets aside these two safeguards. It would authorize the President to enter into agreements with foreign governments, wider in scope than even treaties, without seeking the advice and consent of the Senate as provided by our Constitution. It would authorize the President to engage the armed forces of the United States in undeclared wars at his own discretion without permitting the Congress to pass upon this most vital of all the issues; and thus I find myself, as I study this bill, drawn between two forces; a profound desire to assist England, and even more do I desire to preserve the democracies of our own United States.

I hold for the President a high regard, and an equally high regard for his office. I recognize that in our America we abide by a majority rule. I recognize that the President was elected by a majority vote. He is my President, and he is your President. It is our duty to support him as the President, but likewise it is our duty 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."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a mandate from the voters of the Twentieth Congressional District of Ohio, whom I have the privilege of representing in this distinguished body, to vote against this vicious war-involving measure known as H. R. 1776—God save the mark. What an ironic gesture to identify the lend-lease, give-away bill with 1776. Our own American Revolution is associated with the spirit of 1776, which year brought forth our immortal Declaration of Independence.

In the congressional election of 1940 I presented my candidacy for reelection solely on the basis of no war and no war involvements. Democrats, Republicans, and Independents rallied to my support and elected me by a majority of 44,000, with full knowledge of my consistent record during the past few years in opposing every step bringing us nearer to war. My constituents had full knowledge that every metropolitan newspaper in my district who were daily urging the country to become engaged in the blood business of Europe fought my reelection.

I vigorously denounced the lifting of the arms embargo, permitting the sale of war supplies to belligerent nations on a cash-and-carry basis. I protested this measure as a violation of our neutrality law and a step that would only serve to prolong the war and ultimately hasten our entrance into the conflict.

I strongly opposed the policy of peacetime conscription of manpower and characterized that measure in debate as the very negation of democracy. The hullabaloo raised by the advocates of peacetime conscription about a foreign power invading our shores within 60 or 90 days has since subsided, and the 60 days passed with no invasion, as did the 90 days. The opponents of the peacetime conscription law have been consistent in their protest that a voluntary plan of enlistment with adequate pay would produce an army of manpower sufficient to repel any invading force that sought to invade in a military way the United States of America.

Recent events appear to justify the prediction of us who warned that a peacetime conscripted army would soon be used as an expeditionary force to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for Great Britain and once more "save the world for democracy."

We now predict that the lend-lease, give-away measure would invest in the Chief Executive the power to involve us in actual participation in the war. Never in the history of this Republic, nor in the history of any democracy, even in the history of Great Britain itself, has any legislative body, be it a congress or a parliament, attempted to delegate in peace or wartime such tremendous powers as this measure seeks to invest in one individual. I care not how sincere or patriotic any President of the United States may be, such power must be kept within the Congress. We are actually in the war once this bill is passed.

The authority to use our ships to convey vessels carrying munitions and war supplies through the actual war zones is bound to bring an attack upon our naval vessels by the powers now at war with Great Britain.

The authority to open our shipyards, docks, and naval bases for the repairing of warships belonging to Great Britain brings the war actually to our very door in Brooklyn, Boston, Norfolk, and every other naval base that may be opened for such a convenience to a belligerent power.

The authority to lend or lease any and all of our vessels, air bombers, and armaments to any nation whose defense the Executive deems necessary to the defense of the United States makes us the banker and the policeman of the entire world. The incidents that will flow from the administration of such power will undoubtedly force our American youth to any portion of the globe where we by our own belligerent acts, with chips on our shoulders, will impose our will and our philosophy, be it for good or evil, upon other nations.

One could not expect to constantly and without provocation punch Joe Louis, the champion of the world, without the pugilistic Mr. Louis returning a blow in kind. The analogy is perfect.

As a free people we despise the pagan philosophy of the totalitarian form of government, and we despise—at least, should despise—the selfish imperialistic philosophy of Great Britain, who controls three-fourths of the world and nearly one-half of the world's population. Our money, our blood saved Britain in the last World War and made possible her security as a world power. For that we received from the same officials, who are now begging us to once more save imperial Britain, the contemptible designation "Uncle Shylock," because we dared to remind our former ally of the huge war debt due this country.

Before we pass this bill we may well ponder over the statement of Ambassador Joseph Kennedy, that "democracy is dead in Great Britain." We are told that our first line of defense is the English Channel. We may well inquire just what sort of government or democracy we are about to save, if we do become involved in the war. Behind the chalk cliffs of Dover will there be a national socialistic state, a Fascist regime, or the time-honored imperialism we have observed since Britain became the mighty empire that she is today?

Before we once more come to the aid of a tottering empire, may we not make bold to ask if you are the last bulwark of democracy the proponents say you are, that the newspapers say you are, and that your statesmen claim you are? What are your war aims? Will you continue to keep in subjection 400,000,000 human beings in India, who are clamoring for independence? Will you continue to keep in subjection embattled Dutch farmers—the gallant Boers of South Africa? Will you continue to encourage a dual form of government in Ireland, fostered and kept alive by religious bigotry and the mighty hand of your military strength? Will you continue, as Mr. Winston Churchill said recently, not

to relinquish 1 inch of your far-flung empire? These are questions some of us would like to ask before we take the fatal step in once again going to your aid. May we ask the further question, if you are a democracy, when did you become one in the fullest meaning of the term? Would you want the world to forget that only 20 years ago, under the leadership of your statesman, Lloyd George, you combed the slum sections of London and other English cities to pick up the worst types of humanity, paid for with your bounty and designated as the "black and tans," whom you sent into Ireland to plunder, rape, and destroy a peaceful, religious people whose only crime was to appeal to Your Majesty's Government for that God-given freedom which you now so valiantly boast you desire to secure for the world? Will you explain why, despite the fact you had a mandate to protect the Czechoslovak Republic and Poland, you permitted these countries to be conquered without lifting a finger to assist? The Czechoslovak Republic, France, Poland, and the other countries were in a true sense democracies, compared to your boasted democracy, and you stood by while they fell, contributing only a shower of paper pamphlets on Berlin from your boasted military bombers. All of this we in the United States know full well, and with tragic implication, hence we ought to know what democratic form of government you are fighting to preserve in Europe—the Europe of today.

We can and do sympathize with the poor people of England, and I dare say the poor people of Germany, who are not responsible for this war and who at night crawl into the bowels of the earth for shelter from aerial bombardments. The ruling class of Great Britain and France made possible Hitler's ascendancy and enabled him to build up the mighty military machine he is reputed to control today. Thank God, so far as it is known the United States had no part in the creation of a Hitler any more than we had to do with the creation of a Mussolini, or a Stalin, or in other days a Napoleon. There is no obligation on our part to destroy these dictators. The history of Napoleon presents a striking example of what happened to a dictator who sought to impress his will upon the people of the world. Left alone, they will destroy each other. Whether we will it or not, our actual participation in the blood business of Europe spells the doom of our democracy and paves the way for what most students of the situation predict a rise in communism throughout the world.

I am not a pacifist in any sense, but I believe like Col. Charles Lindbergh that the good offices of the United States, together with the other neutral powers and the head of Christendom, Pope Pius XII, should exercise every influence in the interest of a negotiated peace before the world is thrown into shambles.

Since my membership in this House I have supported approximately a billion dollars each year for national defense. I am wholeheartedly in favor of our present defense policy, the building of a two-ocean Navy, and the strong increase in

the military sphere of our national defense, and to make the United States the greatest power on earth in the field of aviation. To that end I subscribe to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. While I did not support the measure to subsidize the South American republics with a loan of \$500,000,000 through the Import-Export Bank, believing as I do that you cannot buy goodwill, and that the chief industry of most of the dictator countries in South America is revolution, nevertheless I am in favor of more cordial relations with our Latin neighbors to the south and with our Canadian neighbors to the north.

This measure is for the purpose of giving all possible aid to Great Britain, even though the name of that world power does not appear in the text of the bill. Great Britain is crying out for ships and more ships. Her next cry will be for men and more men. She has hundreds of ships now engaged in ocean traffic in the Orient, in African trade, and in the Atlantic, that she could very well put into service. But because of her selfish interests and fearful she may lose some small portion of the world trade she dominates she calls upon generous Uncle Sam to provide the ships for her war purpose and invite the loss we will have to assume while she minimizes her loss by carefully keeping her mercantile fleet away from the scene of conflict.

I believe when this conflict is over we shall have to sit around the table with the nation or nations who emerges as victor to discuss our economic and industrial problems. In the meantime it is my conviction that our forces should be kept intact and not weakened while we are engaged in the defense program, which is a program, we have been told, for the defense of the United States and the Western Hemisphere.

I honor the charge of the warmongers designating public officials like me and my colleagues, who place the interest of the United States first above every other nation on earth, as appeasers, pacifists, and what not and reaffirm we have no second choice, America comes first.

During the last World War certain Members of Congress who voted against our entering the war were threatened with physical violence and in some cases personally attacked. Time is a great healer. Every Member of Congress who voted against the war measure that brought us into the last war has been vindicated, and their action acclaimed by representatives of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other organizations made up of men who went over the seas to bare their breasts for what they thought was a sacred cause. I firmly believe it will be the same with those of us who are against war involvement. Unjust criticism we expect to meet. Selfish interests who expect to profit by war will assail us at every turn.

Speaking for myself alone, I have registered a solemn vow that I would never under any circumstance vote for the shedding of a drop of blood of one American boy in this war business unless our beloved country was the victim of an attack by an invader. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, to cast my vote against this

measure, and to keep the record straight of consistently defending the land of my birth by trying to prevent the destruction of our manhood, the disunion of our people, and the collapse of our democracy by a man-made war.

One of the major causes of our participation in the last World War was the loans to warring nations by the international banking firm of J. Pierpont Morgan and others. Graciously we declared a moratorium on the war debts in December 1931. Not one red cent has been paid on these obligations save the token payments made by gallant Finland.

I venture to predict that this terrible holocaust in Europe was brought about by the same international bankers, who are now receiving hundreds of millions of dollars per year on their private loans, while Uncle Sam, figuratively speaking, plays the role of the beggar with the tin cup, shunned and cursed by the prosperous banker as he passes by.

It is significant that J. Pierpont Morgan does not appear on the front pages during these strenuous days. He is reputed to have reorganized his international banking concern and that the spearhead for the negotiation of loans with foreign powers is the junior partner, Thomas Lamont, one of the most vociferous war mongers of the Nation.

Lest we forget, it was Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan who happened to be in Europe negotiating with the powers that be when this terrible war struck the Continent in September 1939; and if we remember, it was the same Mr. Morgan, the international banker, who helped arrange for the visit of the King and Queen to the United States in June 1939. His picture appeared in every newspaper in the country when he attended the garden party at the British Embassy in honor of Their Majesties when they visited this Nation's Capital.

Our country with one-third of its population ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed should be more concerned with its domestic affairs than involvement in a quarrel which is not of our making. Our 10,000,000 unemployed are now the forgotten men of the administration. Our W. P. A. workers and our bread lines are now things of the past. Vicious cuts in the appropriations to sustain agencies of the Government for the protection of the unemployed and those on relief are now under consideration. Everything is relegated to the popular slogan of national defense. While it is true that this tremendous program may absorb many skilled workers who are now on W. P. A. and relief, every Member of Congress knows that in his respective district there are hundreds, aye thousands, of unskilled men and women who will never be able to receive steady and gainful employment in their lives under our present economic system.

Because I do not want to see the total collapse of the one remaining democracy in the world, save the Swiss Republic, with every force at my command I register my protest as an American citizen and as a Representative in Congress privileged to speak for hundreds of thousands of inarticulate citizens.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, there are a good many things in both domestic and foreign affairs that should give us some pause these days. One of the things I have been wondering about is just what sort of a democracy we are going to be fighting for or are helping others to fight for. The Malvern resolution, which my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] has obtained unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, according to Time magazine, the issue of January 20, was virtually unanimously sponsored by the Archbishop of York, 23 of the Church of England's 98 bishops, including top-ranking London and Durham, 14 deans, and a total of some 200 other churchmen. The article in Time magazine states that this resolution calls for the unification of Europe in a cooperative commonwealth, communal ownership of the means of production, all of which spells communism to me; and on the negative side it condemned the profit motive, which I understand to be the mainspring of capitalism.

The article further stated:

Profit system condemned: Christian doctrine must insist that production exists for consumption. * * * To a large extent, production is carried on not to supply the consumer with goods but to bring profits to the producer. * * *

Further:

The monetary system must be so administered that what the community can produce is made available to the members of the community, the satisfaction of human needs being accepted as the only true end of production.

I recognize that the gentleman from California is interested in the monetary feature, but I should like to know whether a cooperative commonwealth of Europe and the communal ownership of the means of production, which sounds like communism to me, are the things we are asked to help defend in Britain today? [Applause.]

The gentleman from California [Mr. Izac] spoke a few moments ago of the "Christian democratic philosophy" if I quote him correctly. He did not refer to the Malvern resolution directly. Just what is this Christian democratic philosophy? Is it the philosophy of communism dressed up in Christianity? Is it the philosophy of the communal ownership of the means of production? Is this the philosophy of democracy? It is high time we learn just what it is that is proposed in "ordering the new society."

Not long ago I heard Sir Walter Citrine, secretary of the British Trades Union Council, address a Washington meeting of the American Federation of Labor and say that British labor leaders had come to the conclusion that socialism and communism meant slavery to labor and the loss of all the rights labor has so long fought to establish. He said that capitalism was the only system that men could live under and be free. We all know that capitalism is the foundation of democracy—not communism.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The article from Time magazine follows:

[From Time magazine for January 20, 1941]

RELIGION

FOR A NEW SOCIETY

Church of England liberals moved boldly last week to seize for the church leadership in "ordering the new society" which they found "quite evidently emerging" from the war.

To that end they stole a march on the government with a program of post-war aims which, coming from any group, would be startling. Coming from the traditionally complacent and conservative established church it was little short of revolutionary. It called for unification of Europe in a cooperative commonwealth, communal ownership of the means of production, more religion and less liturgy. On the negative side it condemned the profit motive and the church's own financial dependence on ancient perquisites and levies.

Virtually unanimous sponsors of this program are the Archbishop of York, 23 of the church's 98 bishops (including top-ranking London and Durham), 14 deans, and a total of some 200 other churchmen. All of them seemingly remembered that the great ages of Christianity have come when the church took the lead in historic movements, which were as much economic and social as religious, like the Crusades and the Reformation. All of them were determined that the church should assume just such a leadership in post-war reconstruction. And all of them were determined that that leadership should come from the Liberal rather than the Conservative wing.

With greatcoats wrapped around them, they gathered day after day in the paralyzing cold of unheated Malvern College to hear speaker after speaker denounce present-day failure to identify Christianity with any great cause except "nosing out fornication." And then without a single dissenting voice they adopted a resolution presented by the archbishop himself. Chief planks:

Union then: "After the war our aim must be the unification of Europe as a cooperative commonwealth."

Commerce and conservation: "In international trade a genuine interchange of materially needed commodities must take the place of a struggle for so-called favorable balance. * * * We must recover reverence for the earth and its resources, treating it no longer as a reservoir of potential wealth to be exploited, but as a storehouse of divine bounty on which we utterly depend."

Profit system condemned: "Christian doctrine must insist that production exists for consumption. * * * To a large extent production is carried on not to supply the consumer with goods but to bring profits to the producer. * * * This method * * * which tends to treat human work and human satisfaction alike as a means to a false end—namely, monetary gain—becomes the source of unemployment at home and dangerous competition for markets abroad. * * * The monetary system must be so administered that what the community can produce is made available to the members of the community, the satisfaction of human needs being accepted as the only true end of production."

Labor: "The true status of man, independent of economic progress, must find expression in the managerial framework of industry; the rights of labor must be recognized as in principle equal to those of capital in the control of industry, whatever the means by which this transformation is effected."

To this unanimous resolution the conference added "by a very large majority" a still more sweeping amendment proposed by Liberal Member of Parliament Sir Richard

Thomas Acland, which stirred up the only major controversy in the 4-day conference. This amendment asserted that "the ownership of the great resources of our community * * * [by] private individuals is a stumbling block. * * * The time has come, therefore, for Christians to proclaim the need for seeking some form of society in which this stumbling block will be removed."

Hardly less revolutionary than the church's program for society was its program for reforming itself:

Church's function: The church has the duty and the right to speak not only to its members but to the world concerning the true principles of human life. * * * The church as we know it does not. * * * We therefore urge that enterprises be initiated whereby that life can be made manifest.

Church militant: Christian people should take the fullest possible share in public life, both in Parliament, in municipal councils, in trade unions, and all other bodies affecting the public welfare.

Church finances: Christians, clergy and laity alike, cannot take part in this work unless they are prepared to advocate complete reorganization of the internal financial life of the church.

Form of worship: This must be so directed and conducted that its relevance to life and to men's actual needs is evident. * * * Our traditional forms of matins and evensong, presupposing as they do acceptance of the tradition of the church and unfailing regularity of use, are largely unsuitable. They must in most places be supplemented by services of another type, whether liturgical or not, designed to bring before un instructed people the truth concerning God.

Concrete Christian service: "The whole congregation habitually worshipping together should regularly meet to plan and carry out some common enterprise for the general good. If there are social evils in a locality, such as bad housing or malnutrition, let them consider how evil can be remedied. * * * In other places let "cells" be formed upon the basis of common prayer, study, and service."

A far cry is all this from the class consciousness of the Church of England (and United States Episcopal) catechism: "My duty * * * is * * * to order myself lowly and reverently to all my betters * * * and to do my duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me." But World War No. 2 has merely speeded the shift from the old-time hunting-parson philosophy. Forerunners of the change were the Bishop of Ely's effort in 1939 to turn his palace into an old folk's home ("we keep too many gardeners to grow too many vegetables to feed too many servants to make too many beds"); the 1937 move by a group of bishops and clergy to give up the mining royalties of the poverty-stricken northeast of England which went to the church, because otherwise it "cannot hope to evangelize successfully a body of men (miners) who are strongly prejudiced against the sources of its supply."

If the Malvern resolutions were revolutionary, the speeches which spurred the conference to their acceptance were no less so. Seldom has the church called sinners to repentance with such bitter jeremiads as those by which 10 lay speakers called the church itself to repentance. Gloomed Critic-Philosopher John Middleton Murry: "The church has no relevant pattern of goodness to set before contemporary man. * * * Regarding unemployment has the church done any other than acquiesce in the appalling solution which is the only one secular society has found, namely, preparation for war? * * * The church fails in leadership because it shows no signs of having known despair; no evidence of having been terrified by its own impotence."

Poet Thomas Stearns Eliot attacked the church in wasteland accents for letting Christian principle vanish from education.

Sir Richard Acland was fiercer: "For over 150 years you have neglected your duty * * * because of sheer funk. * * * The whole structure of society * * * is, from the Christian point of view, rotten and must permanently frustrate your efforts to create for the individual the possibility of a Christian life. * * * This has given Hitler the opportunity for saying 'To hell with the whole order.' * * * He said this, and from despairing humanity he wrung forth a tremendous and dynamic response. * * * In order to save humanity from the horror of * * * nazi-ism, we must find a way of living superior, not merely to nazi-ism, but to that which we ourselves knew before. * * * We are unprepared for this. * * * You must be prepared to offend people who are determined to preserve the existing order. * * * I beg of you now to proclaim the new society openly. * * * So only will you save yourselves and us."

Novelist Dorothy Leigh Sayers ("Lord Peter Wimsey") was even more vitriolic. "Suppose," said she, "that during the last century the churches had * * * denounced cheating with a quarter of the vehemence with which they denounced legalized adultery [i. e., divorce and remarriage]. But one was easy and the other was not. * * * To upset legalized cheating, the church must tackle the Government in its very stronghold; while to cope with intellectual corruption she will have to affront all those who exploit it—the politician, the press, and the more influential part of her own congregations. Therefore, she will acquiesce in a definition of morality so one-sided that it has deformed the very meaning of the word to sexual offenses. And yet, if every man living were to sleep in his neighbor's bed, it could not bring the world so near shipwreck as that pride, that avarice and that intellectual sloth which the church has forgotten to write in the tale of its capital sins."

No small part of the significance of the conference was that its convener and chairman was the Church of England's second ranking prelate and its real intellectual and spiritual leader—stout, brisk, erudite, 59-year-old Dr. William Temple, Archbishop of York. Son of an Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple was an Oxford don of philosophy at 23, a headmaster at 29, a bishop at 39, an archbishop at 47. A famed theologian and an ardent exponent of the ecumenical (inter-church) movement, he is likely to be first president of the still-organizing World Council of Churches. Said he at the conference:

"The war is not to be regarded as an isolated evil detached from the general condition of western civilization. * * * It is one symptom of widespread disease and maladjustment, resulting from the loss of conviction concerning the reality and character of God. * * * [We need] a new order of society—a new integration of religion, morals, politics, and economics. * * * It is the business of Lambeth [the palace of the Archbishop of Canterbury] to remind Westminster [the Houses of Parliament] of its responsibility to God."

Conspicuously absent from the Malvern Conference was the suave, sail-trimming Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Reverend and Right Honorable Cosmo Gordon Lang, evictor of Edward VIII, now 76 years old, whom William Temple may eventually succeed as primate of all England.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, it has not been my custom during the 8 years I have been in Congress to frequently engage in debate upon or discuss many of the measures coming before this body for

consideration. I have always entertained the opinion that this representative body of intelligent men, having every facility furnished to them to enable them to examine every possible suggested piece of legislation, would be able to make up their minds and vote their own convictions upon legislation without any aid from me.

Today I am taking the floor, however, for two reasons: First, the measure before us is one that I consider, and I believe it is considered by a majority of the House, a matter of greatest importance; and, second, since the preparation of this bill there has been much misrepresentation with respect to it. The misrepresentation includes various and sundry statements with reference to what the bill contains and what its effect will be. We have heard it said that the passage of this bill will enable the President to lead us directly to war; that the authority granted him by this bill to repair and allow the warships of belligerent governments to be repaired in our ports and in our navy yards would be contrary to international law and would cause us to enter the conflict. It has been said that this bill would enable the President to spend large sums of money; in fact, it would enable him to bankrupt the Government of the United States. It has been said there is no limitation to this bill, even though an amendment has been written into it providing a limitation. It has been said that the President, during the 2½-year period this bill is in force, would be able to engage in great undertakings and involve the United States Government in contracts which would neither be completed, finished, adjusted, nor executed for many years.

I want to use this occasion not to take up the bill in all of its phases and analyze it point by point and clause by clause, because that has been ably done by speakers who preceded me, but if I can relieve the minds of some of the Members who have misapprehensions with respect to the effect of this bill; and if by what I say today I am able to lead one Member out through the maze of doubt that has been thrown around the meaning and effect of this measure, then I will have served some good purpose.

Mr. Chairman, for 150 years, or ever since the foundation of our Government, this Nation and its people have lived under a constitutional government, free, happy, and contented. During that time we have blazed a way for the nations of the world. We have been the one great democracy and our example has been, until some years ago, followed by many of the nations of the earth. But today we find ourselves faced with a grave danger, a grave situation, not of our making.

Three of the great powers of the world have combined together for their own purpose and that announced purpose is the creation of a new order, not alone in Europe, or in Asia, not in any one continent, but a new order throughout the entire world. In view of that, can anyone assert that the United States is not interested in the new order proposed to be created and established in the world, not with the consent of the peoples which it

would affect, but established in the world by force of arms?

As I talk to you today that new order is being instituted and has been instituted in many nations that just a few short months ago were free and almost as democratic as our own. That order does not seek alone to change government, it does not seek alone to modify the methods of government, but its aim is to change every human relation. The dictators and those who are putting into existence the so-called new order propose to enter the individual homes of the world and there destroy every domestic tie, deaden every tender sentiment between parent and child, and eradicate every sense of loyalty binding together the members of the household. It means to regulate the relationship between man and man, destroy the friendship between individuals, and sever the ties that bind them together, whether they be business or social. This new order seeks to take away from men every initiative and to make each individual a mere unit, with no personal liberty or personal initiative and with no obligation of loyalty except to a state. Not only that, but as referred to by my distinguished friend from California, it destroys the most sacred and precious thing that mankind has, the right to worship a God of his own choice in a manner of his own selection.

In the past, under the most tyrannical governments in the world, as for example, the land of the Czars, the serfs, the most downtrodden people on earth, up to recent years had little churches at the crossroads out upon the barren, wind-swept spaces of Russia where after long hard days of labor they could kneel down and worship the God of their fathers and draw hope and comfort from the religion of the Lord, Jesus Christ. That privilege has been taken away from them and the same privilege and right is being rapidly destroyed in each of the totalitarian countries. Today in some of those countries God has been outlawed. With that same danger we are now threatened. When I say we are threatened, I speak advisedly.

We had witnesses in our hearings who testified that this country was in no danger of invasion from Germany. I call your attention to the fact that one of the chief witnesses who gave testimony to that effect was Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, who testified that only 10,000 airplanes would be necessary to fully protect this country from any invasion by a foreign government. But upon being questioned, Colonel Lindbergh admitted that there are only 1,800 miles of distance between the eastern coast of South America and the western shores of Africa.

He advised most earnestly that we at once acquire bases in South America on its east coast and establish air fields and army bases. For what purpose? There can be but one answer. We must establish bases in South America for the purpose of repelling an invasion which, according to this same witness, could not happen.

It has been shown by the history of Europe that certain unfortunate nations over there did not fear invasion, either. They were neutral; they endeavored to

remain neutral. More than that, they leaned over backward to be friendly with the totalitarian powers. But were their rights respected? One morning they were free, and the next morning they awakened to find that they were under the control of an alien power and no longer had any rights which that alien power was even expected to respect.

The only barrier that stands today between this country of ours and the threatened danger of the three totalitarian powers is the British Empire. Much has already been said on the floor of the House about the gallant stand being made by Great Britain against the forces of aggression. It will serve no useful purpose for me to add my praise to that which has already been given. The courage of the British soldier and sailor and the morale of the British people are beyond all praise. Whether Britain goes down in defeat or whether victory perches upon her banners, she will have written a glorious chapter in the world's history, a chapter emblazoned in letters of living light which will forever shine as a beacon for the guidance of generations yet unborn.

To my mind there is no necessity for us to argue today the question of whether or not we should aid England. That question has long been settled in the minds of the American people. That is today the fixed and determined policy of America and that policy is approved even by the greater majority of the opponents of the measure now under consideration. As a matter of fact, upon this question alone there is no difference of opinion between the gentlemen to my left and my colleagues to the right. The controversy is as to method alone. In other words, we are practically agreed upon the policy that it is to the best interests of the United States to give aid to Great Britain, and it is an assured fact that the greater majority of the American people today are in favor of our supplying this aid to the fullest extent short of war.

The question may well be asked "Upon what grounds do both the proponents and the opponents of this bill base their belief that it is to our interest to give aid to the British Empire in its fight against the aggressor nations?" It is quite evident that we all have the same reason, to wit: That the defense of Great Britain is essential to the defense of the United States. However friendly any of us may be toward the British, whatever our ties may be with the British people, none of us would advocate devoting the resources of this country to the aid of the British Empire did we not believe or were we not firmly convinced that the fall of that empire would place our own country in grave danger.

We hear it frequently said that Great Britain is fighting our fight. In a certain sense this is true, but in a more realistic sense it is not true. Great Britain is fighting her own fight. She is fighting for her possessions, for her trade, for her homes, and for her very existence as a nation. She does not have as an objective any interest of America, and not even Great Britain's warmest friend or strongest supporter in this country can conscientiously claim

that this was one of her objectives. On the other hand, however, and in another sense, England is today actually fighting our battle for upon her success, upon her continued national existence, depends our safety. To put it more bluntly, should England lay down her arms in defeat our security would demand that we pick them up. If the torch should fall from England's hand, it must be caught and carried by us.

As I have already said, it seems to me that the only controversy there is today between the opponents of this bill and its proponents is the question as to the best method to be adopted by this country to aid the British in their fight. In the bill now under consideration we are proposing a method to render this aid which, after long consideration, we deem to be sound and efficient. It was early recognized by the committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, that no method could be proposed which would not meet with objection from some quarter. The bill before us was neither hastily drawn nor ill considered. Every provision in it was written with studied care and the whole was designed to best carry out the intended purpose of rendering the greatest aid to Britain at the earliest possible moment.

I shall not attempt to make an analysis of this measure section by section, for that has been done many times, not only during the extensive hearings upon the bill, and in the report of the committee, but also by able speakers who have preceded me upon this floor. It is my purpose in the brief time allotted to me to take up and discuss one by one some of the objections and criticisms of the bill made by its opponents.

Early in this debate the statement was made and is still being made that this bill had been the subject of more misrepresentations than had any other measure ever considered by Congress. I agree with that statement, but I insist that these misrepresentations have been made not by the proponents of the measure but by those in bitter opposition to it. It has been labeled a dictator bill and a war measure. It has been represented as conferring upon the President of the United States not only vast additional powers but dictatorial powers to an extent only to be conjured in the vivid imagination of someone in violent opposition to it and careless of the methods used to defeat it; it has been represented as a measure prepared and intended for the sole purpose of dragging this country into war; it has been represented as a measure the passage of which could have no effect other than to at once precipitate this country immediately into the armed conflict now raging in Europe and to compel the sending of American soldiers to battlefields in foreign lands. These are the misrepresentations to which I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] referred in his address to this body, and these are the misrepresentations which are without any foundation in truth.

One of the original criticisms of the pending measure was that it authorized the President to direct the convoy of ships carrying materials to the nations

for whom they are intended. If any of you were present at the hearings, you probably recall that Mr. Castle, a former Under Secretary of State, testified at the hearings and without any hesitancy at once said, "Oh, yes, this bill authorizes the President to establish convoys and send the naval vessels of this country to convoy shipments to the old country." Upon being required, however, to point out the section of the bill that contains that requirement, he was unable to do so, as is anyone within the sound of my voice or anyone else who has ever read the bill. There is not a single clause or provision in there that authorizes any convoy of these ships, by the orders of the President or anyone else.

To meet the objections, however, that were raised with reference to this proposition, and, as lawyers would say, out of an excess of caution, we have inserted an amendment in the bill which directly and explicitly states that nothing in this bill shall be construed to authorize the convoy of ships.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. The question of whether or not the President himself can direct a convoy of these ships is another question. I say to you, and I think I say it advisedly, that a provision in this bill directly forbidding the convoy of vessels would not be constitutional.

Under the Constitution the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. This is not an honorary position unaccompanied by authority, but it carries with it all the powers implied by the title. Who can say what the President may or may not do as such commander in chief? It is my considered opinion that in his discretion and under his constitutional authority he already has the power to order convoys for vessels bound to any part of the world. If that is true, this power of the President can neither be revoked or limited by congressional action.

History records many instances of the exercise by our Presidents of their constitutional power over the Navy. Jefferson sent our fleet against the pirates of Tripoli; McKinley sent our fleet, as well as troops to fight the Boxers in China; Theodore Roosevelt sent the Atlantic Fleet around the world, and other Presidents have sent units of the fleet to remote corners of the earth upon various missions and without any express or implied congressional authority. Even our good friend, Col. Charles Lindbergh, as was right and proper, was, by order of a President, "convoyed" home from France by an American warship on the occasion of his greatest exploit. It would, therefore, seem to be elementary that the President is already vested by the Constitution with the power to order convoys and that the only possible way of divesting him of this power would be by constitutional amendment. We certainly cannot do it by this bill.

I am personally opposed to the convoying at this time of British, American, or any other vessels by the American Navy. I firmly believe that should we undertake the convoying of vessels, such action

would invite attack and inevitably lead us into war. I would vote against any proposal to establish at this time and under present conditions a convoy system. At the same time, I am just as firmly convinced that the Neutrality Act, insofar as Congress has the authority to do so, meets the situation. It forbids American vessels from going into combat zones, and it is certainly apparent that ships cannot be convoyed where they cannot go. To enact legislation upon this question more stringent and far reaching than the Neutrality Act would, in my opinion, be going beyond the jurisdiction of Congress.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, said the conveying of ships would be an act of war?

Mr. KEE. I believe myself it would be an act of war. I would vote against the conveying of ships if that question should come before us at this moment and under present conditions, but this bill does not authorize any conveying and does not say anything about it.

Mr. FISH. But this bill surrenders a great many of the powers of the Congress to the Executive. In my opinion, it surrenders some of our great constitutional powers to the President.

Mr. KEE. In my opinion, it surrenders very few.

Mr. FISH. If we do that and surrender our powers to the Executive, why should not the Executive be willing to surrender some of his power and accept an amendment of that kind, if it is the will of the Congress and the American people?

Mr. KEE. The President himself is just the same as any other individual. He cannot violate the Constitution. He can neither surrender any right under the Constitution nor abdicate his powers, and if the Constitution gives him a power he would have the right to exercise that power.

Mr. FISH. But we in this bill are surrendering much power. We permit the President to give away any part of the Navy.

Mr. KEE. And the gentleman thinks that there ought to be a trade between us and the President?

Mr. FISH. What is sauce to the goose is sauce for the gander.

Mr. KEE. I am sorry, but I cannot yield any further.

One of the criticisms of the bill early voiced by its opponents was the fact that no time limit was fixed for its expiration. Your committee recognized that there were grounds for this criticism, and in consideration of this fact the bill comes to you with an amendment definitely providing for its termination on June 30, 1943. Now we find that this concession is unsatisfactory to the objectors and a new criticism is offered to this provision. The claim is made that the provision is in fact no time limit because, they say, that during the period the bill is in force and effect the President of the United States can make and enter into agree-

ments which will not be completed at the termination of the time limit. The fact that the President can make contracts which will not be executed until after the legislation is no longer in force is true, but that fact is not properly the subject of criticism. A contract as to the time for its execution is always governed by its own terms and not by the law under which it is made. It would indeed be a foolish and futile thing for Congress to do to pass an act giving a power of attorney to the President to make contracts for and on behalf of the United States and by the same act fix a definite time limit for the execution of all contracts made under the power. The time limit of something over 2 years, fixed as the lifetime of this measure, emphatically designates the date on which the powers conferred herein upon the President expire and after which they can no longer be exercised. To say, however, that a contract made by the President prior to the expiration of his authority must also end with the date his authority expires would simply mean an inhibition against the President entering into any contracts other than those that must necessarily be executed within the shortest possible space of time; it would mean that on the expiration of the President's power no uncompleted contract could be completed, no uncompleted settlements could be settled, no undelivered goods or materials agreed to be delivered could be delivered, and no unfinished job could be finished. It certainly seems to me that to any man of the slightest experience in the business world the absolute futility, not to say injustice, of inserting a clause in this measure, which in effect absolutely forbids the completion of a valid and subsisting contract, should be at once apparent. Any individual who has ever found it necessary to give a power of attorney or to transact business with one holding a power of attorney will at once recognize that such a power would be absolutely useless should it contain a provision to the effect that contracts made thereunder might not be executed after the termination of the power.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEE. Under a limitation a half-completed battleship would remain on the ways, an undelivered consignment of commodities would stay on the docks, an unfinished fleet of torpedo boats would remain uncompleted, unpaid bills could not be liquidated, and there could be no settlement or final adjustment of the entire program. The common-sense and businesslike method is to have each contract made under the power granted in the bill to contain a provision for its termination, either at a fixed date or when and if a change in the situation justifies its termination. I personally am confident that such a limitation will be written in every contract made under this act.

Another amendment insisted upon by the critics of the bill and which has been incorporated for the purpose of relieving any undue misapprehension is the provision requiring that, before the disposing

of certain materials as defined in the measure, the President shall consult with the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations. This amendment is a mandatory clause and compels the President to do that which, without compulsion, the evidence before the committee showed he has always heretofore done. The critics, however, would go further and have this clause amended in order to specifically require the President not only to have such consultation but also, before taking any action, to secure from the Chief of Naval Operations or the Chief of Staff of the Army, or both, a certificate to the effect that the materials to be disposed of were not required by the American Army or Navy.

To demonstrate the unsoundness of this latter proposal, it is only necessary to point out the fact that both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff of the Army are subordinates of the President. He is the Commander in Chief of both the Army and Navy and the officers referred to are both subject to his orders and direction. He has the power to remove them at his discretion and for cause. It must appeal to any thoughtful mind that it is nothing short of ridiculous to impose upon a commander the requirement that he secure the consent of a subordinate to any proposed action. It would be just as reasonable to impose upon the manager and owner of a mercantile establishment the requirement that he secure the consent of his bookkeeper as a condition precedent to his purchase or sale of a bill of goods.

In addition to the above argument against the clause under discussion, I can also authoritatively state that the committee had before it conclusive evidence that the necessity of making certificates of the character named—a requirement heretofore imposed—has not only been unsatisfactory to all parties concerned, including the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations, but has from time to time been the direct cause of chaos and confusion in the departments, with resultant trouble and delays.

I would like to discuss, if I have sufficient time, section 3 of this bill, which is claimed to give the President so many extraordinary powers. I want briefly, however, to discuss before I close one other point, and that is the question raised with reference to the limit of expenditures that can be made under this bill. Everyone is agreed that this bill is not an appropriation bill; it is a bill of authorization. It authorizes merely the appropriation of what money may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act; and the appropriation to be made is a future thing to be done by the Congress and is in the control of the Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I only have a few minutes and cannot yield.

There may be an amendment offered on the floor providing for a limitation of the appropriation authorized by the bill. It is said that such an amendment will

limit the appropriation to \$2,000,000. This bill, as all knows, does not appropriate a single dollar to carry out its purposes. Therefore the matter of the amount to be expended for such purposes is left entirely in the control of Congress. The bill is an authorization only. Before a single dollar can be expended it will be necessary for the President to come to Congress for an actual appropriation of such amount as he may deem necessary. The amount to be expended will, therefore, be for the determination of Congress alone. I know that it is said that under this bill the President can engage in undertakings and can incur obligations which will necessitate an appropriation by Congress to liquidate them. This is not true. There is a constitutional inhibition against incurring such obligations, and the President as well as all others are bound by this constitutional provision. Where, therefore, is the necessity of putting a ceiling upon a mere authorization? If we were authorizing the construction of a Federal building, or the building of a flood-control dam, it would be perfectly feasible, through the estimates of construction engineers, to stipulate a maximum authorization. In the instant case, however, it is not possible to compute in advance the expenditures that may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act—purposes involving the defense of one and perhaps more great nations. As the bill stands, Congress will hold the purse strings and will be absolutely able to control and fix the amount of the necessary appropriation. In this authorization there is no place for a limiting amendment.

The claim that the President might or could under the terms of this act give aid to aggressor nations is equal in absurdity with the idea that the President would give away the American Navy. The bill authorizes aid only to nations whose defense is vital to the defense of this country, and there is no aggressor nation on the face of God's earth whose defense would be considered by the President as vital to our security.

Objection has been made to the authority granted in the pending measure for the repair of belligerent vessels in American harbors or shipyards. In my opinion this action by us could not possibly plunge us into war any quicker than would acts we have already committed. Under existing conditions Adolf Hitler is the last man on earth who wants war with the United States. If war with us would be to his interest we would have had it a long time since. It cannot be disputed that we have already committed many unneutral acts or acts which could be labeled as unneutral under international law. Today, however, international law is practically nonexistent.

Germany, Italy, and Japan have time after time violated or entirely disregarded every provision in international law inconsistent with their national interests. Treaty after treaty, solemnly made and signed by these countries and presumed to be valid, binding and subsisting contracts have been consistently violated or repudiated by each of the Axis Powers. Their solemn promises, their pledged

faith, their national honor have all been thrown to the winds in every case where it served their interests to do so. When and if Hitler wants war with the United States it will be unnecessary for us to give him an excuse. He himself will find a reason. In any event, even under international law as once observed, it is allowable for ships of a belligerent nation to be repaired and made seaworthy in our harbors, even though it requires a period of more than 24 hours to make such repairs. Therefore, the clause in this bill authorizing the repair of ships in American shipyards or harbors may be justified even under international law.

I have already explained that the words "notwithstanding any other law," contained in section 3 of the act does not repeal a single existing statute. This fact is clearly explained in the report of the committee bringing this bill to the floor of the House. The Neutrality Act and the Johnson Act are in nowise repealed or modified by this bill. The quoted phrase merely means that, during the life of this measure, any provision of another statute which may be in conflict with the provisions of this bill, is suspended for that period only. In all other respects all laws continue in full force and the suspended provisions are restored upon the expiration of this act.

It has been well said that the heart of the bill under consideration is section 3. It is also true that the bulk of the criticism against the bill is directed at this section. That criticism can be boiled down to one premise upon which all of the objections of the opponents of the bill are based, to wit: That Congress is giving too much power to the President. Section 3 has been repeatedly explained and analyzed. It is not complicated, neither is it vague nor indefinite. Its meaning can be expressed in a few simple sentences. It simply means and says that notwithstanding the provisions of any existing law to the contrary the President may, if he deems it in the interest of the defense of our country, authorize our Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy to manufacture in plants under their jurisdiction, or otherwise procure, articles deemed necessary to the defense of any nation whose defense is vital to the defense of our country, and to put such articles into the possession of the country to be defended; it further authorizes the placing of such defense articles into workable condition, the communication to the government receiving them, of information upon how to use them, and the release of such articles for transportation to the government to which they are furnished.

We have heard it repeatedly asserted by the opponents of the bill that under this section 3, read in connection with other sections of the measure, the President could do strange and wonderful things to the grave danger and injury of our country. We have been told that he could, and great fear has been expressed that he would, give away the entire Navy of the United States; that he could bankrupt the Nation by making large expenditures of money without any further authority from Congress; that under these provisions he could give aid to aggressor na-

tions; that by permitting the repair in American harbors or American plants of vessels belonging to belligerent nations he would immediately plunge this country into war; that the words "notwithstanding any other law" necessarily repealed many vital statutes of this country; that under section 3 the President could order the transportation of war materials to foreign countries in American ships; that the authority granted by the bill to the President was so broad in its scope that it meant the entire surrender by Congress of its every prerogative.

The idea that the President might give away the Navy of the United States was, no doubt, born of ill-will or hatred of our great Executive; was carefully nurtured in the hope that it would grow into a great fear in the minds of the American people and undermine their confidence in the man who for 8 years has directed the affairs of the Nation without the commission of a single act in betrayal of that confidence. Paragraph 2 of section 3 gives the President the power to authorize our Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy "to sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of to any such government any defense article." The delegation of that power to the President is for the sole purpose of national defense—the protection of our country by aiding in the defense of any country whose security is vital to our defense. No other reason would justify our parting with a single boat or a single gun. But when and if we are assured that our national security, our very national existence as a free people, depends upon the successful defense of another nation, we would then be traitors to our country should we niggardly withhold that which we possess of what that nation may require. If we are going to lend our aid at all, it must be limited only by how much we have of what is required to protect and save the nation whose defense is vital to our own. It is for this reason that the broad power is given. Anything less would be futile and useless. The talk about the President of this great nation giving away the American Navy is childish and absurd. Not a single witness of the opposition appearing before our committee at the hearings would admit any fear of such action, and no one can tell me that any such fear is in the mind of any Member of this Congress.

Like my friend the gentleman from South Carolina, who most ably discussed this measure on yesterday, I frankly say that I do not know whether this bill, if enacted, will keep us out of war or not. I echo his prayer that it may. I do know that it is our duty as Representatives of the American people to devote our minds, our hearts, and our every energy to the task of defending this, the last and greatest of the world's democracies, from the danger which threatens us and to the preservation for our children and our children's children of that liberty and freedom which was our priceless heritage. It is our duty at this time of grave danger to lay aside the petty things of everyday life, to forget party affiliation, to overlook personal disagreements, and to unite as one man in our effort to find and pursue

the best method to accomplish the purpose that is in all of our minds. I am of the firm and unalterable conviction that the passage of this act is the best means we could adopt for our present defense. As time passes other measures may be necessary, but for the moment this is the action that we should take, and I trust that we will take it. Let us pass this bill and look forward to the future not only with hope but with faith in the ultimate triumph of a righteous cause.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, after listening for the past 2 days to the speeches and remarks that have been made on the so-called lease-lend bill, No. 1776, and after reading and listening to the testimony and statements of the various witnesses, given before the Foreign Relations Committee, I would like to make a few remarks on this matter.

We have heard a great deal about the importance of this bill to our country. The danger and the safety of this country have been greatly stressed by both the proponents and the opponents of this bill. Unfortunately, due to the conditions over which we certainly had no control, and in which we had no voice nor vote, I believe this situation is fraught with great danger. I think this danger is evident in two ways. First, as it affects our national defense and safety.

Second, the danger as it affects our American form of government as we have known it, and the changes in the functioning of this Government that might occur as a result of the passage of this bill.

Much has been said on both sides by those who are for and those who are against. The peculiar thing about this whole bill is that much that has been said on both sides is true, and I believe that my colleagues who have made these statements are certainly conscientious and patriotic, but present the side as it particularly occurs to them respectively.

The fact that there is such a difference of opinion by such conscientious and patriotic men does indicate that the bill is defective and is certainly open to many different interpretations. Unfortunately, every one of these interpretations is extremely important to the safety and welfare of this Nation, either from the standpoint of our own national defense, or from the standpoint of the change it may make in the American form of government.

So far as I am concerned—and many others on both sides of this House feel the same way that I do—my opinion is this: That this country has already gone so far in this matter that they cannot turn back, and it is not a matter of a free choice, but now becomes a matter of making a choice against our will, with the hope that we will be guided in our judgment to do the very best we can for the country, considering all sides of the question. Many of the things that put us in this position were done over our heads, against our wishes, against our voices,

and against our votes. There is no use to dwell on why these things were done, but we must actually meet the conditions as they are and face them. Therefore, I say that we are not free in our choice and we have perhaps gone so far that we cannot now turn back. Summed up, the things we would like to do are these:

First. We must do the thing that will protect America first, above everybody else's interest.

Second. In order now to protect America we must give the British aid.

Third. We should not abdicate as Congressmen and change the American form of government.

Fourth. We would like to keep this country out of war.

How we can do these things and still keep this country out of war depends upon the handling of the whole matter by our administration itself. After all, the conduct of foreign relations is vested in the administration, and when the administration seeks this power it certainly does take the responsibility that goes with it, as well as the accountability to the whole Nation for its ultimate action. The administration was elected upon a platform pledging to keep us out of war, and now that this is beyond our control, with particular reference to foreign relations, it is up to them to make good.

Very frankly, I do not like this bill, although I may have to vote for it. I am sorry to see this kind of a bill presented in this form on this floor. I feel that a better bill could have been drawn which could have been much simpler and much more understandable and subject to only one interpretation. I feel that the objectives could have been accomplished, first, by presenting a single bill to aid England, without incorporating therein this tremendous grant of power to the administrative side of government, and still accomplish its purposes.

Stress has been laid upon the speed with which Congress acts, and much comment has been made about speed of action. I submit the actions of Congress itself as evidence that it can act speedily when bills that have only one meaning are presented to it. It has voted billions of dollars when it came to a question of national defense. We have put these bills through in one day and in some instances in less than a day. Therefore, I again say that if a single bill is presented to this House in proper form this House can and does make speed. I offer the above as evidence that it was unnecessary to place before this House this double-barreled bill.

Many of my friends on both sides of this House and myself would like to vote on these issues separately. There is no doubt but that nearly every Member of this House would vote to aid the British, and do it quickly.

There is no doubt that these same Members, including myself, would vote down this Presidential power. If we were permitted to do that, we would then be having a free choice in this matter and vote freely.

As against this, we have not a free choice to vote on this bill in its present form. I say to you that we are being de-

nied free choice as Congressmen to vote as we would like. Expressed in other words, it simply means that we are disenfranchised to a certain degree. My proof of this statement is that, if we vote "yes" on this bill in its present form, we would accomplish the thing that we would like to do, namely, give aid to the British, but at the same time this "yes" vote would automatically give away powers of the Congress that we do not want to give away, and if we had a free choice, we would not give them away.

If we vote "No," we accomplish one of the things that we want to do, namely, not give away the powers of Congress, but by that same vote we automatically deny that aid that all of us want to give to Britain. What the amendments may be in their final form none of us now knows, but I ask this Congress to amend this bill in such a way that it will give aid to the British and modify or cut out that part which would change the American form of government.

The thing every one of us here is going to be faced with in the last analysis is a vote on this bill. Facing the facts as they will be, we will then be confronted with a "Yes" or "No" vote.

Many of us will probably vote for this bill, but will do it reluctantly, feeling that we have gone so far out already, and feeling further that we are more or less gambling and will have to choose the lesser evil or the lesser gamble, namely, the safety and welfare of this country from a standpoint of national defense, as against the loss of certain congressional powers, and in voting this way I feel that if we come through this whole situation, we can again regain those powers of Congress and regain our American form of government, where we could not do so if the country was lost.

Therefore I again ask the Members of this House to look carefully at each amendment and to carry these amendments that would modify the Presidential powers and give us the greatest protection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this lend-lease bill is the most important piece of legislation that the Congress of the United States has been asked to consider in the past 160 years of our existence as a free Nation. There is not one of us who is not alert to the situation and who has not spent hours analyzing this bill, as well as all testimony presented at the hearings. Frankly, gentlemen, we have all lost sleep over this important measure.

It is common knowledge that prior to my election to Congress I was active in veteran circles throughout the United States, and that during such activity I constantly stressed the need of an adequate national defense, the preservation of our American form of government, and, above all, the keeping of America out of another futile World War.

Since coming to Congress I have continued my efforts in support of those views, believing them to represent a gospel of real Americanism. While I do not pretend to speak for organized veterans, the right to employ the knowledge and experience gained from firsthand observations during my veteran activities should not be denied me.

I am not content to accept at all times the philosophy of those who would have us as a nation police other portions of the globe; nor do I wholeheartedly subscribe to isolation theories in their entirety. There may be occasions when both these different schools of thought have merit to their contentions. What I have honestly tried to do is to utilize the good points of both isolationists and interventionists, thereby promoting the best interest of America in acquiring an adequate national defense, preserving our form of government, and keeping America out of futile Old World struggles.

An analysis of my voting record in Congress will indicate that I have zealously followed my honest convictions. Gentlemen, to chart such a course and remain true to it has been difficult in the face of a wave of organized propaganda the like of which the world has never witnessed.

At this point I want it understood that I join the overwhelming majority of the American people in approving all possible aid to the valiant sons of the British Empire. Moreover, I sincerely pray that the courageous English people will emerge victors in resisting the iron hand of Hitler. Like the vast majority of the American people, I do not favor stripping our own defenses of needed military supplies so essential to our own national security.

Unfortunately, this bill before us has been labeled as a measure "to aid Great Britain." Nothing could be further from the truth. The bill grants nothing to Great Britain directly. Britain is not named in the bill. Every grant made by the bill is a grant, not to Great Britain or any other nation but to the President of the United States. In reality, stripped of its camouflage, it proposes to have Congress delegate its constitutional powers to our Chief Executive under the guise of helping any warring nation designated by our President.

There is no doubt in my mind that those who designed this bill have employed clever partisan strategy, hoping that in using the slogan "to aid Great Britain" we will yield our constitutional powers as representatives of the American people to attain such an objective. The sponsors of this legislation bluntly ask us to accept this measure and abdicate our powers or take the consequences of being labeled as opposed to aiding Great Britain. Since aid to Great Britain is the paramount issue, why does the administration refrain from advocating direct aid to Great Britain?

We all know that Great Britain is not directly mentioned in this bill. Furthermore, a bill for a specified sum of money as aid to Great Britain will have my hearty support, and I am certain will be overwhelmingly approved by the great majority of Congress.

My brief summary of the so-called lend-lease bill indicates that we are placing our own national defense in absolute jeopardy by giving the President power to direct the heads of the Army and Navy to sell, transfer, exchange, lease, or otherwise dispose of any defense article to any country the President deems vital to the defense of the United States after consulting with the Chief of Staff of the United States Army and the Chief of Naval Operations, or both.

Let us concentrate for a few moments on the picture before us. Here we have the Chief of Staff of the United States Army and the Chief of Naval Operations, both military appointees, conferring with their appointer, the President, who is also their Commander in Chief. It is a basic law of military life that a good soldier follows the advice of his superior officer, or he is returned to the ranks; or, in the case of generals or admirals, being offered the gracious consideration of asking for retirement. In a few words, it is possible to be asked to concur in the recommendations, or else be replaced. The fate of former Secretary of War Woodring remains as a grim warning of the futility of opposing seasoned politicians.

Christian charity prompts me to refrain from saying that President Roosevelt would discard the measured judgment of General Marshall or Admiral Stark; but then let it be remembered that we are all human and susceptible to our emotions.

In all seriousness, gentlemen, this so-called provision for consultation by the President is empty and meaningless. In reality we are taking our whole national defense and its many component parts out of the hands of Congress and military experts and placing it in the hands of an astute politician.

Do you realize that from basic industries related to national defense, such as cotton, wheat, steel, and so forth, that the President may literally take the clothes off your back, so wide is the authority conferred under this bill?

In line with this thought, efforts were made to ridicule the oft-repeated statement that the President could give our Navy away. Any controversy over the truth of such a statement was definitely settled when Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, the administration's spokesman, testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 16, 1941, declared in answer to this question:

This bill permits the President to give away all or any part of our Navy, doesn't it?

Well—

Mr. Stimson replied—

it permits him to transfer it on considerations that he thinks concern our defense. I can foresee conditions that might make it desirable that the Navy be transferred. A situation might arise where it would be to our advantage to do so.

There, gentlemen, in Secretary Stimson's own words you have an authoritative interpretation of what can really happen under this bill. We all recall that a few months ago the President had to call off a deal which involved a number of modern torpedo boats because

Congress called to his attention the violation of an existing law, and the Attorney General concurred in the opinion of Congress.

Such action as giving away necessary critical equipment that is vital to our own national defense is directly opposed to our preparedness program and my idea of building an adequate national defense. While I do not say the President will again indulge in such attempts, nevertheless the authority is there in unmistakable language this time and requires no scholarly opinion of the Attorney General.

The same rule of conduct can be applied to our Army, and no one will be able to question the motive or act itself. Here is where the issue of an adequate national defense asserts itself.

Gen. George C. Marshall, in the American Legion Monthly for January 1941, says:

The surest road to peace today—indeed, the only road—is for us to become so strong that no one will dare attack us.

If we are to follow the sage advice of America's No. 1 military man, let us, in the name of common sense, not fall into the grave error of placing such discretion in the hands of one lone individual. We cannot afford to gamble with our national security when in the words of our own military leaders, as quoted by Gen. Hugh Johnson in his news column of January 30, General Marshall is authority for the following statement:

We could not transfer to Great Britain surplus stores of Army equipment. Stores? We have no stores. It will be a happy day when we can speak about stores of Army equipment.

We have a need for all modern equipment delivered us.

Supporting General Marshall's position, according to the Washington Times-Herald of January 17, 1941, Assistant Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson stated:

At present the Army does not have sufficient modern weapons to outfit completely an army corps of three of its streamlined divisions, or a total of less than 40,000 men.

Last week the Washington Times-Herald related that—

Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee were startled by testimony concerning the deplorable state of the Nation's air defenses which was elicited from Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson.

Stimson's evidence was given at a secret session of the committee after he had pleaded for permission not to be asked questions concerning the Army's air strength at an open hearing, according to the Times-Herald.

Under close questioning Secretary Stimson revealed that not a single combat plane in the Army fulfilled all the requirements of modern air fighting in Europe. He further disclosed, of approximately 2,800 combat planes produced in the United States last year, that about 400 were kept here for the Army and Navy. The Army now has about 650 combat planes—bombers and pursuit type—of all ages, Stimson told the committee.

Added to Secretary Stimson's shocking revelations of the true condition of our national defense, we have the following pointed remarks of Ambassador Joseph Kennedy uttered December 14:

As it stands today our production for defense is nowhere near adequate for the protection of our own situation, let alone aid Britain. While our own defenses are weak, we are limited as to what we can do for Britain, even though we want to. Therefore our first obligation is to speed up defense with all our might. It would be suicidal for our country to get into war in our present state of unpreparedness.

Thus spoke our Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, and whether or not you agree with Marshall, Stimson, or Kennedy you must admit that someone in stripping this Nation of needed military supplies has been gambling with our own national defense and the security of the American people.

As a nation we should be thankful that no overt act occurred during this period of unpreparedness that would force us into war. I make these observations fully aware of the great efforts being made by the Army, Navy, and private manufacturers in building up our national defense.

Yet, on the other hand, we must recognize that we are asked in this so-called lend-lease bill to give one man the power to hold the destiny of this great Nation in the palm of his hand.

Congress, in being asked to surrender its constitutional powers to the President by relaxing its vigilance over national defense, is in the same breath being asked to abandon its position as the watchdog of the Treasury, in section 6 of this so-called lend-lease bill, which in simple language provides that the President may spend Federal Government money in any way beneficial to our defense as the President sees fit and in any amounts.

By this section of the lend-lease bill the President is given authority to obligate this country in underwriting a great portion of the cost of the present war for Russia, Japan, China, Greece, Great Britain, and the countries of the Western Hemisphere, and many others. It is noteworthy that the daily cost of the war to Great Britain alone is \$48,000,000.

It must be kept in mind that the money President Roosevelt can spend in purchasing articles of defense is not confined to this country. Under section 8 of this bill he can purchase or otherwise acquire arms or implements of war produced within the jurisdiction of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States.

In doing so the industries of Canada, China, Greece, England, and Russia stand to profit by either being revitalized or expanded with American taxpayers' money.

When the war clouds lift and peace is restored we will have developed our foreign competition and lie prostrate, the victim of national bankruptcy.

Little or no attention has been given to the provisions of this bill which permits the President to authorize the testing, repairing, reconditioning, or otherwise to place in good working order any defense article for any country whose defense the

President deems vital to the defense of the United States. In other words, this simply means our navy yards and arsenals will become repair shops for favored warring nations.

Such a violation of neutrality can only have one result—the plunging of this Nation into another World War. It is my honest opinion that unless this bill is radically changed we are not only jeopardizing our national defense but we will be actually at war, which will demand as a sacrifice that we surrender the American way of life.

A thorough canvass of my congressional district reveals that the majority join me in favoring all possible aid to Great Britain without stripping our own national defense and, above all, without yielding our form of government by becoming involved in World War No. 2.

And let none of us be so smug as to utter, "It can't happen here." This lend-lease bill contains 872 words and is similar to the vehicle upon which Hitler rode into power when he deftly began to translate the meaning of the German Constitution so as to further his own political aims.

It is interesting to study the following laws enacted by the German Reichstag on March 23, 1933.

The Reichstag has enacted the following law which, with the consent of the Reichsrat, and in view of the determination that the requirements for laws changing the constitution have been complied with, is hereby promulgated:

ARTICLE 1. National laws can be enacted by the national cabinet as well as in accordance with the procedure established in the constitution. * * *

ART. 2. The national laws enacted by the national cabinet may deviate from the constitution insofar as they do not affect the position of the Reichstag and the Reichsrat as such. The powers of the Reich President remain untouched.

ART. 3. The national laws enacted by the national cabinet are prepared by the chancellor and proclaimed in the Reichsgesetzblatt. They take effect, unless otherwise specified, upon the day following their publication. * * *

ART. 4. Treaties of the Reich with foreign states which relate to matters of national legislation do not require the consent of the bodies participating in legislation. The national cabinet issues the necessary provisions for the execution of these treaties.

ART. 5. This law becomes effective on the day of its publication. It becomes invalid on April 1, 1937; it further becomes invalid if the present national cabinet is replaced by another.

The above laws established Hitler as a dictator and abolished the usefulness of the German Constitution insofar as it affected the rights of the German people to carve out their own existence.

Mr. Chairman, when you start tinkering with a Constitution such as ours you are shaking the mighty foundation of this great Republic. As a Member of this House elected to represent over 300,000 of my fellow Americans, I took an oath to uphold the Constitution of these United States, and to vote for this lend-lease bill in its present form I would be violating my oath of office. Likewise, I would be false to the ideals that have motivated my actions the past years in advocating an adequate national defense,

preservation of the American form of government, and keeping America out of war.

I repeat again, I am asked to yield my constitutional power as a Representative in Congress on the flimsy excuse that it is aid to our heroic English neighbors.

Mark you! I am for all possible aid to Great Britain and will sit here 24 hours a day to legislate appropriations necessary to aid in repelling the forces of Hitlerism.

I resent being asked to surrender my congressional powers by supporting a cleverly disguised legislative measure whose slogan "aid to Great Britain" is not only a misnomer but an insult to my intelligence and a fraud upon the

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield now 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege, thanks to the courtesy of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to have heard practically all of the testimony before that committee during the past 2 or 3 weeks. I think I have read all of the correspondence which has come to me on this subject for and against the bill, and I have heard a great many of the radio talks and read most of the columnists. It would be presuming for me to think that I could offer any new thoughts on this subject, even though the debate itself has consumed but a few days. I wish, however, to make myself perfectly clear, for the information of any of those whom I have the honor to represent who may be interested. I think it safe to say that 90 percent of all of the people in this country today are against our entry into the war. Considering that proportion, I am led to believe that you could not find 40 Members of the House, or a 10-percent representation of all of the people, who would be for a declaration of war. I think it is also generally agreed that there are probably 75 percent of the people today who come within the general classification of wanting to help England short of war. Of that 75 percent, however, there are in my opinion a great many people who have not thought this thing through. Of this group, short of war provides the debatable ground. I feel that if this group knew that any sort of aid to England short of war would mean the eventual use of American troops, or that such aid might mean involvement in war, then the percentage of people who would favor help to England short of war would drop from 75 to about 45 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those who share the great apprehension of the dire consequences to this country in the event that the British Isles go under. I also believe this—and I think a great many Members of Congress would admit it to be true—that if all of the things we hear today in the way of alarming possibilities and threatening conditions to this country are true, and I am thinking now also of what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] said yesterday about public opinion and the fact that

he made up his mind 2 months before public opinion had crystallized on this matter; if the value of our taking a position as a nation means anything, and if the morale referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] means anything, and if we really take that attitude, provided the conditions are as acute as some today consider them—then we ought not to be discussing this question today, but we should be considering the matter of a declaration of war.

It all boils down, in the last analysis, to one consideration; and each Member of Congress, regardless of public opinion, regardless of party and of what the effect may be on his own future success, will have to reason the thing out on the basis of his own convictions. Is this our war or is it not our war? If it is our war and we feel that we should go into it to defeat Hitler for our own sake, then we should declare war now. If it is not our war, and I do not think it is, we are not going to have a declaration of war, for it is evident that the people are against our entering the war, because that is reflected here now in the opinions of the Representatives in Congress.

On the other hand, we wish to help England, for hereditary or other reasons, beyond what we are now doing, so we have a bill before us that was conceived very hurriedly and in the drafting of which the minority leadership of the House and of the committee were given little or no consideration. Personally, I am in favor of helping England, and I will vote for this bill providing additional and perfectly reasonable amendments, which have been suggested, are adopted. I wish to address myself now principally to the controlling gentlemen of the majority on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the majority leader, and also the Speaker of the House. This matter could have been worked out by another method along more moderate lines than those provided for in the original bill. The President of the United States, by his own recent approval, has indicated that the original bill was extreme in his willingness to accept four amendments thereto. The bill as it is now does not represent enlightened and considered thought on our real responsibilities of the moment. I venture the opinion that there will be changes made in the Senate if they are not made here tomorrow or before we vote upon it. The real vote on this bill will be when it comes back from the Senate after conference. Referring to the bill, it has seemed to me that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is a very reasonable man, and I think he has a conception of our foreign relations equal to that of any man on the majority side. His record proves that. He has been particularly reasonable on all measures in the last few years affecting the welfare of this country. He has made some very pertinent and considered suggestions for amendments. These would go a long way to satisfy the doubtful and, to my mind, would strengthen the bill. If we are going to have unity, there must be consideration of the best opinions on both sides of the aisle, and I think it would

reflect more unity in this country if the vote for this bill in the end is a vote by a large majority rather than the question of limitations or no limitations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to leave just one thought with you: Why not some limitation on the expenditure of funds? We are charged with the responsibility of voting those funds, and we should fix the limitations on this measure. The gentleman who just preceded me spoke of the impracticability of limiting future contractual obligations beyond the date covered by this act, but they can all be figured out in dollars and included under the lump-sum limitation when the time comes. I do not care whether it is two billion or three billion or even four billion, but it is a reasonable amendment, and I venture to say to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee on the majority side that the biggest proportion of the membership on the Democratic side would be very glad to see such an amendment adopted. Who will guide you? I think it would be reasonable and smart for the President of the United States to go along with it, if he, too, wants unity. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, in my consideration of H. R. 1776 I have been entirely free from any fear that it is within the range of possibility that the United States of America can be invaded by any single nation or combination of nations in Europe, or Asia, or both. I am not one of those who holds such a poor opinion of the fighting qualities of the American as to tremble with fear over the possibility that the war in Europe may end in a way that is neither pleasing nor satisfactory to us. Neither am I one of those Americans who believes that the navy of a foreign country is our first line of defense. The first line of defense for America is 132,000,000 free men, women, and children, and so long as we remain free and fully protected there will be no danger of invasion.

I cannot bring myself to believe that a people who in 150 years transformed a wilderness empire into the greatest and mightiest nation in all the history of the world have so deteriorated that they are incapable of protecting their firesides under all conditions and against all odds. It may be charged that that feeling of security is due in a measure to the interior location of the great State which I have the honor to represent in part, but I will not concede that, because those Americans who live in the coastal zones of the country are just as independent and self-reliant, just as ready to rely upon themselves as are their kinsfolk in the interior.

There are few left in this and in the other body of those who served in the World War Congress 24 years ago. They must be impressed, as I have been, with the fact that we are now being subjected to the same waving of flags, the same beating of breasts, the same roll of the

tom toms that blitzkrieged us into the World War nearly 24 years ago. The only difference that I can discern is that today a comparatively new instrumentality—the radio—is freely being made use of by both sides.

There is another difference in the two campaigns to embroil America in the war. Twenty-five years ago the anger of our people was raised to a fighting pitch by cleverly concocted stories of unspeakable atrocities that we found, after the war was over, to have been a tissue of lies invented and disseminated by the most expert propaganda organization in all the world—the British Foreign Office.

Now we know that our expedition to Europe in 1917-18 was a tragic mistake. That war marked the closing chapter of the America that we had known and under which all had greatly prospered. It ushered in a new era of wasteful spending and an ever-increasing tax load that will sit upon the shoulders of unborn generations like the old man of the sea.

When we went into that war our national debt was about \$1,000,000,000. During our excursion to Europe we spent about \$36,000,000,000, or let me put it this way—\$36 for every minute since the dawn of the Christian era. And it is estimated that before the last obligation of that war has been paid its total cost will be in excess of \$100,000,000,000.

Now we are getting all set to repeat that folly. It seems that we did not learn much of anything from our former European experience. Twenty-five years ago we were told that it was necessary for us to go over there to make the world safe for democracy. When the war was over there was not a single dictator left in Europe. The Czar and the Kaiser had been driven from their thrones; Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin had not been heard of; new and free nations were created—Poland, Finland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia—all of them democracies—came off the ways and were launched on the sea of democracy. Alas, the good that was wrought soon disappeared, like the snows of yesterday. Germany, Italy, and Russia are today dictatorships, and in all Europe only two real democracies survive—Finland and Switzerland. So much for what we accomplished then.

Now we are again being urged to go over to Europe on the plea that Britain, who, they tell us, is our first line of defense, is being seriously threatened, and we are further told that, if she goes under, we will be next. They are not trying the old atrocity stories on us this trip. Oh, no! We may bite on the same substance twice, but it must be dished up in a different form. Twenty-five years ago they played upon our hates and passions. Today they play upon our fears.

I do not believe that there is a single military authority in all the land who will seriously claim that this country is in danger of invasion; neither do I believe that there is serious danger to South America from that source. If Germany finds it difficult to cross 20 miles of water, how can she or any other country hope to successfully invade countries separated by 3,000 miles of water? Any invasion of Latin America must be purely eco-

conomic and will be due to the ability of competing nations to undersell us. We cannot expect to gain and hold economic supremacy in South America because a majority of the countries down there produce products that compete with American products. Aside from coffee, manganese, some tin and rubber, practically everything produced in South America is of a competitive character. The countries of South America must buy where they sell.

Is there anyone within the sound of my voice who is so fatuous, so naive, as to believe that we can ever hope to establish real reciprocal relations with Argentina? That country produces cattle, sheep, swine, corn, wheat, and, I believe, some cotton. Is there one of the products I have just named that we would be willing to let come into this country under a reciprocal arrangement? Argentina must and will do business with the countries that buy her products. The same is true of Uruguay and, in a measure, of Brazil and Paraguay. We may loan them money until we have pauperized ourselves, but it will not—it cannot—change the picture.

My countrymen, I appeal to you to be practical in this matter. Do you realize that if we go through with the ambitious lend-lease program that the administration has mapped out it may result in raising the national debt to as much as eighty or one hundred billion dollars, and that would be about one-third of all our wealth of every kind and description?

Less than 8 months ago we raised the limit for our national debt from \$45,000,000,000 to \$49,000,000,000. Only the other day the Ways and Means Committee reported out a bill to further increase the national-debt limit from \$49,000,000,000 to \$65,000,000,000, and we were told that this is necessary if the Federal Treasury is to meet the Nation's obligations in May. We were told by responsible representatives of the Treasury that it is imperative that this increase be voted at an early date. Indeed, the Secretary of the Treasury told the committee that the Government's financial condition is such as to cause him many sleepless nights and yet you are giving serious consideration, and will probably give approval to a proposal to give the President a blank check in spending. With all due respect to the great office of Chief Magistrate of the United States, I ask you if it is safe to grant that extraordinary and unheard of power to any human being? And I ask that question in all sincerity and in all charity.

On March 23, 1933, Hitler promised the German people that he would surrender to them in 1937 the extraordinary powers conferred upon him by the Reichstag, but he has never done so; neither can I recall any of the great powers heretofore conferred upon Mr. Roosevelt being surrendered by him. My friends, we are playing with fire.

In the 8 years that Mr. Roosevelt has been President he has increased the national debt from \$22,500,000,000 to about \$43,000,000,000 and the Budget Bureau estimates that the public debt will attain the stupendous sum of \$58,367,000,000 in 1942. And all this, notwithstanding that

the net revenue of the Government increased from \$2,080,000,000 in 1933, to \$5,387,000,000 in 1940. These are figures that can hardly be grasped by astronomers who spend their lives computing the mileage between the various heavenly bodies.

My friends, you are proposing to embark upon a program of spending that will sell unborn generations of Americans into lifetime bondage of debt. You are proposing to so increase the national debt that the living level of the American people will be reduced to that of pauperized Europe. It is all very well to get up here and beat your breast and talk about the great man in the White House; that he will not usurp or abuse any power given him, but it is not so long ago that we elected another President on the plea that he would keep us out of war. It may be that Mr. Roosevelt is sincere when he says that he does not want to get into this war, but when I see someone walking around with a chip on his shoulder, as he has been doing for the past several years, it is a pretty good sign that that someone is looking for trouble.

To you newer Members who feel that you must blindly follow the President I would suggest that you study the congressional election returns for 1918 and reflect upon the habit history has of repeating itself. To you older Members who say you believe that the future welfare of America demands that we again mix in European power politics, let me urge that you be your age. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, we are now debating for the third day H. R. 1776, known as the lend-lease bill. This debate has brought out an honest difference of opinion as to what is the best course for our Nation to follow. There are those who contend that the pending bill must be enacted into law immediately if we are to maintain our democracy. There is an equally sincere group who contend that its enactment means the end of our democracy and our entry into the present European war. Patriotism is not a partisan issue. We are facing the most critical period in our history. Sincere and honest debate of this problem must be had in order to clarify, if possible, our best future course for our country.

Our Nation is in danger of being carried into a war by propaganda and emotion. Our sympathies are so strong for the Allies that it is hard to approach this subject on its merits. We are not neutral in our thinking or our actions. My sympathies are all for those people who are fighting to protect their country, their homes, and their liberty against cruel, despotic rulers. Our Nation must make a vital decision—a decision that may forever destroy our democracy. The pending bill does more than furnish aid to England. In fact, testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee assures us that this legislation cannot be of any assistance to that country for many months. That being the case, I would like to ask why all the haste in securing its enactment. I do not impugn the motives of anyone who favors this legislation, but I

do believe the American people should be taken into the confidence of those who are sponsoring this legislation.

They are asking now:

Is it necessary for this Nation to adopt a policy that approaches dangerously near to a dictatorship in order to oppose dictatorships in foreign lands?

Why should Congress, composed of Senators and Representatives elected by the people, give the power to one man, without restriction, to declare war, to raise and support armies, to maintain a navy, and to spend the taxpayers' money?

Why not follow the course laid down by the Constitution and have Congress openly declare war rather than give the President powers which may ultimately drag this Nation into war?

Since Congress is now in session, and will no doubt be in continuous session for this year, willing to meet any emergency, why abdicate its constitutional responsibilities?

Is this legislation necessary to aid Great Britain, or can more aid be extended by other methods?

These are fair questions. They are vital questions, and the American people are entitled to an answer. It is the American people who will have to pay the bills incurred by this legislation. They will have to die on foreign soil and possibly on the battlefields of every continent if we are to police the entire world. For years our Nation has followed the advice of Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson when they urged us to keep out of foreign entanglements. That tradition or that foreign policy has enabled us to make the most remarkable progress in history. We, by our example of peace and progress, have not only preserved our democracy, but we have been an example, a shining light, to the people of all nations.

Surely we have not forgotten that 24 years ago we ventured into a European war to make the world safe for democracy. That war resulted in an unjust Versailles Treaty which insured another war. It resulted in the destruction of democratic government on the Continent of Europe and replaced it with communism in Russia, nazi-ism in Germany, and fascism in Italy. Are we not in danger of losing our own democracy if we become embroiled in the present European conflict? The last war cost us casualties of more than 500,000 American men and the loss of more than \$30,000,000,000, which resulted in war debts, depression, financial and economic destruction. The American people have not yet recovered from the suffering and misery of that war. Our aim must be to preserve our democracy in order to perpetuate the last stronghold of liberty on this continent and in the world.

The American people are opposed to war; they are opposed to sending their sons to fight a war 3,000 miles from our shores; they are opposed to foreign entanglements, alliances, and power politics; they are going to hold their Representatives in Congress to a strict accountability. This bill, if enacted into law, takes us one step closer to actual belligerency. No one believes that we can furnish war materials, airplanes, convoy merchant ships, repair belligerent

ships in our harbors, and use our economic weapons without sooner or later sending our men into actual battle.

This bill transfers the powers of Congress to the President, and by so doing we evade our responsibility. That is not democracy. To continue our democracy, we must guard zealously every right granted us under the Constitution. It is easy to relinquish these powers, but it is another and serious matter to regain them. America has a great future, but that future lies in the power of the people. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, with the danger that confronts us, with the known knowledge of the viciousness and ruthlessness of the destructive forces that exist in the world today, with their known objectives of the destruction of democratic processes of government, and of our civilization, it is apparent to all that our country is justified in and should take action at this time to defend our people and our institutions by preventing the present conflict later coming to our shores.

The present bill is a peace measure for our people. It is based on the necessity of our own self-defense, and our country has a right—and it is our duty to do so when danger exists—to provide for our self-defense, international law to the contrary notwithstanding. The real warmongers are those who oppose action, and in their blind opposition are attempting to divide our people. This is no time for division. This is the time for unity. Division at this time will result in harm. It might result in destruction. If the opposition succeeds in preventing the passage of this bill or amends it so that for all practical purposes it is useless or meaningless, and if Britain, Greece, and China are defeated, do they, such persons, for a moment think that we will be left unmoled? Do you think so? What do you think Nazi Germany and Army-controlled Japan will do to the United States in the case of an Axis victory? Do you think they will let us alone?

An economic attack, such as they can and will wage against us in the first instance, closing the world's markets to all American products that can be obtained elsewhere, and the flooding of our markets with the products of their forced labor of itself would have a serious, if not fatal effect upon our economic, social, and political life. Do you think that those countries, the Axis Powers, are going to permit us to continue on our even way? Every person in his own mind and heart feels and knows that a victorious Axis will demand their tribute of us in some way, and unlike the crude method of the pirates of the Barbary coast of old, they will exact tribute in a brutal, vicious, ruthless, modern manner.

Having that picture in mind, the question for us to decide is whether we are going to close our eyes to the plain facts or if we will view the existing world

situation and the apparent dangers that confront us from a practical and realistic manner, and take such steps, short of war, that the present conditions justify and warrant, in fact demand.

One thing is certain, inaction now is an open invitation to an attack later on, either from an economic or a military angle or through a combination of both. It is not alone a question of where our sympathies lie but is a question of cold, calm, practical, and realistic judgment as to what course, in the light of the existing dangers, we should take in the best interests of our country. One thing is certain, inaction and indecision will be injurious and harmful. This is the time for quick and correct judgment, devoid of our likes or dislikes, with unity of action along a course that is certain and definite, having foremost in mind the best interests of our country, and then to have the courage and the determination to carry that judgment quickly into effect.

Is there any Member of this body, or any American, who thinks that a defeated Britain, China, or Greece means an untouched America later on? Any person taking that position would properly be indicted as being blind to the existing dangers, to their conscience, and to the truth.

Suppose, in the papers of tomorrow or later on, the people of America should read of the defeat of Britain, what do you suppose will be their feelings? Will it be one of calmness, of safety and security, or will it be one of alarm, one with the feeling of fear, of impending danger? Would not their feelings be properly summed in the words "we are next"? That is the reason why this is a defense measure and a peace measure, so that "we will not be next."

It is amazing to me how many people think in terms of keeping our country out of war. Every one of us by nature and at heart is a pacifist. I do not want to resort to violence. In my contacts with my fellowman as a youngster and growing up I ran away from danger until some greater danger compelled me to enter into conflict, into battle with some of the youngsters with whom I grew up. That is my feeling today. It is the natural feeling of all persons. We do not want trouble. We do not want war. Our inclination is to run away, to do everything we can to avert it. But sometimes the law of self-preservation stares us in the face as individuals and the same law of preservation at times stares a nation in the face. In the face of a greater danger—destruction in all probability—we are compelled then to react in a contrary direction to what our natural instincts prompt us to do. That is why there are two aspects involved, one of which is to keep our country out of war—that is the easiest thing we have to do. All we have to do is do nothing, but if we do nothing, does your judgment tell you that we are keeping war from our shores later? In order to keep our country out of war, as I see it, in the face of the imminent danger that confronts us, to prevent that danger from becoming actual we have to

take affirmative steps of some kind to prevent the war later coming to our shores.

The purposes of the pending bill is to keep our country out of war and to keep war from coming to our shores later on. That can only be done by preventing an Axis victory. It is unfortunate that the present world situation exists that requires us to consider legislation of this kind. That condition was not brought about by us, but it exists just the same. We are confronted with a condition, not a theory. Most of the arguments of those who oppose ignore the indisputable fact that a condition exists in the world today that menaces our future safety and existence. It is here, and, much as we dislike to, we must meet it. The law of self-preservation applies to nations just the same as it applies to individuals. When danger confronts an individual he must form a quick judgment, and he must act accordingly, and with courageous certainty. The same applies to nations. In this case it is our country. Indecision and inaction in the face of danger is fatal to a nation, just the same as it is to an individual. The mere fact that we are a powerful and wealthy nation does not make us an exception to the necessities of self-preservation when danger confronts us. We, as a matter of fact, alone in the world, as we will be, will be attractive prey for the destructive hunters.

Everyone agrees that imminent danger confronts us now. Is it for our best interests to remain idle, to hesitate, to react to fear, or is it for our best interests to act while we have friends remaining, before it is too late? The answer to this and other similar questions is clear to me. Now is the time we should and must act if we want to prevent the "imminent danger" that confronts us from becoming an actual danger. This is not time for splitting of hairs on the part of those who realize the dangers of the present situation, and the necessity for action. It will be useless for us to offer alibis later on for the inaction and indecision of today.

In the face of the danger that confronts us, I beg of you, those who realize the situation, to let all minor differences of opinion as to some provisions of this bill—some differences of opinion as to details; all feelings, personal, political, or otherwise, to disappear or be laid aside during the period of the present crisis. We have too much at stake to allow such feelings or differences of opinion as to details, divide us in this hour of danger.

We of this generation of Americans have inherited a great trust from the past. It is our duty as Americans to preserve in our generation our institutions of government. We have received our great heritage from past generations with the unwritten mandate, the duty to preserve and to pass on. We are a generation living in the face of grave danger to our country. We will be judged by our children and their descendants by the results we obtain.

We cannot view this serious situation from the angle of hind thought, and leg-

islate accordingly. We all wish that we could. Looking ahead, as we must, and in the light of existing conditions, we must now determine the course of action necessary to perform our trust, the preservation of the Union and of democratic processes of government. The future will appraise us by what we do now. Past generations of Americans, those that underwent days of trial and danger, have kept their trust. Will we? On what you and I of this Congress do now will depend the answer to that question.

Are we going to be recorded in history as a generation of Americans that failed? Unity, judgment, courage, and action as Americans, is the road that we must take to be recorded as a generation that succeeded. Inaction, indecision, is the road to failure.

For myself, my duty is clear, and that duty I will perform as my conscience convincingly dictates to me. I am more concerned with the preservation and the future of my country than I am with the preservation or future of my political life.

I wonder if those who vote against this bill will be able to convince their people or Americans everywhere that they voted right if Hitler wins and overt acts are directed toward our country? I wonder if they will then be able to satisfy their people, yes, themselves, if, in splitting hairs over some of the provisions of this bill, they vote against it. I would not want to have it on my conscience that in this hour of danger to my country that I split hairs or that I blew hot and cold at the same time, or that I tried to play both ends against the middle, on this bill. I have no difficulty in wondering what will be the opinion of the American people against those who voted against legislation, if Hitler and his international group of pagan bandits win, and our country is next on the list.

The opponents advance all kinds of arguments in an effort to justify their position. To one who takes the position that under no conditions should the Congress pass legislation of this kind, much as I disagree with such persons, I respect their views and their honesty. Such a person takes a clear and definite position. They are outright and unadulterated isolationists. There are some such persons in this country. Such persons will have to later assume their full responsibility and blame if, due to serious amendment of this bill, or due to unnecessary delay, actual danger comes to our country. If actual danger is averted, it will not be due to any cooperation on their part.

There are others who, realizing the danger, feel that something should be done in an effort to avert its actual arrival to our people who oppose for various minor reasons. I urge them to stop, look, and listen and not to play with fire but to unite in certain and definite action as contemplated by the provisions of the pending bill.

During the course of the hearings and the debate, we have heard with frequency the charge of dictatorship. We have been hearing the same argument for the past 8 years, on every important piece of legislation that Congress has considered.

It is about time that the opponents of this measure coin out of the English language another word or slogan in an effort to excite the fears of the people. We heard that cry made against the securities and exchange bill, the wage-and-hours law, the National Labor Relations Board legislation, the monetary legislation, the reorganization bill, the repeal of the embargo, and other legislation. I remember well the furore created when the reorganization bill was pending in Congress only a few years ago. The fears of hundreds of thousands of fine persons were played upon. The charge resounded throughout the country that the passage of the reorganization bill meant dictatorship.

We all remember well that legislative battle. The bill passed. It is now no longer a law, its operation expiring on January 20, 1941. Where is the dictatorship that the opponents assured was coming?

The same old attempt is now being made to divide our people by playing upon their fears by the making of statements that are unwarranted. There is too much involved in the future of our country to resort to such specious arguments engendering fear for the purpose of dividing the unity of our people.

To listen to this argument, one would think that delegation of power in itself is dictatorial. One of the first bills passed by the first Congress in the easier and more simple economic system that existed than today, was a bill delegating certain powers to the executive branch of our Government. Practically every important bill that any Congress has ever passed, or will pass in the future, carries with it delegations of power, necessary to make the law effective. Congress cannot legislate on every detail that confronts or relates to the operation of our Government. Democratic processes must serve its people just the same as any other government, and in order to serve it must work. The greater the emergency, the greater the danger, the more necessity exists for the delegation of powers during an emergency. And, lest we forget, this bill delegates the powers therein contained to whom? To the President of the United States, an elective official, not an appointive one, in the face of danger, under the Constitution, our Commander in Chief, and the only elective executive whose constituency is the whole country, and all of our people. If I have a choice of electing between delegating powers to an elective or an appointive official, I prefer to delegate them to an elective official. And this opinion is no reflection upon appointive officials.

We have the fact that in this bill 95 percent of the money necessary to carry it into operation must later be appropriated by the Congress. The power to appropriate carries with it the power not to appropriate. The power to appropriate carries with it the power to appropriate as requested or recommended in whole or in part, or to appropriate with limitation. Therefore, under this bill we have reserved to ourselves, by the fact that the President must recommend to the Congress the appropriations neces-

sary to carry it out, jurisdiction over at least 95 percent of the operations of the bill.

On this question "dictatorship" advanced by opponents of this measure, let us remember the last time that our country faced a danger that threatened its continued existence. That was during the Civil War. The men who fought on both sides of that conflict fought honorably and for the principles they believed in at that time. As we look back, we all realize that a divided Nation would have been harmful to both sides. In those days the immortal Lincoln, the saviour of the Union, was also charged by his opponents—and they were from the North, not from the South—with being a "dictator," and as "a destroyer of the Constitution." Thomas Jefferson, of immortal fame, was bitterly attacked in his day as "a violator of the Constitution" for making the Louisiana Purchase. Even the Father of the Country, George Washington, who will always be foremost in the minds of Americans, was accused in his day of wanting to perpetuate himself in office by establishing a monarchy, with himself as the king. Every strong President has met the charge of wanting to be a dictator by his opponents and enemies. Every strong President will. There is absolutely no justification for such a charge being made against this bill. To the contrary, it might well be advanced that the enactment into law of the pending bill will prevent an alien ideology, and a foreign dictatorship being imposed upon us.

The argument has also been advanced that this bill will lead us into war. I cannot agree with that view. It is my opinion that this bill is the safest course that we can take to keep us out of war and to lessen the chances of war coming to our shores later on.

No matter what course we take, inaction or action as proposed in the pending bill, certain risks are involved. The question in this respect is whether by inaction we take a greater risk than we will take by proper judgment and action that we deem necessary for our welfare. The conscience of each individual American must answer that question. In connection with this, there is one question that I cannot escape asking myself, and which I must answer, and upon my answer depends my course of action. Will an Axis victory be followed by an economic or military attack upon my country?

To me there is only one answer. It is my firm opinion that in the event of an Axis victory, which will mean that all of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia—the whole world outside of the Western Hemisphere—will be conquered, controlled, or dominated by the Axis Powers, and that of the once numerous democracies of the world, our country will be alone. The countries of Central and South America, having their own problems and cultural associations, will be affected, and in all probability compelled, of necessity if not otherwise, to wean away from the United States. The "squeeze play" of Germany, Italy, and Japan will then be ready for operation. That pact, as we all know, constitutes a

direct threat to the United States. That was its purpose. Japan will in all probability only move when that country thinks it can do so with safety and with chances of success, and that will undoubtedly happen if Britain is defeated. Is it a reasonable probability to draw that we will be left alone in the event of an Axis victory?

In all probability inaction now is the road to tribute first and war later. In any event it is the road to adversity and troublesome days for our country.

Respecting as I do the views of those on this question, that inaction now is the best course to pursue, I cannot escape the conclusion that action now is vitally necessary and that prompt aid to those countries now or in the future, while the present emergency exists, who are resisting the attack of the totalitarian aggressors is essential to our national defense. I recognize and appreciate the fears of those who feel that the passage of this bill will result in a declaration of war by Hitler and his allies. My answer to that is, much as they dislike to see this bill pass, that prior to the defeat of Britain they will not dare declare war. To do so means that by their own act—not ours—they will bring into operation the full force and power of our Government and of our great resources, and they do not want that to happen.

One might say, "If we do nothing we will be left alone in case of an Axis victory." My answer to that is that if we did everything that Hitler wanted us to do, short of establishing a Nazi-controlled form of government, that he and his partners would not leave us alone. One thing is certain, a defeated Hitler, or a Germany that does not win, means a secure America from future attack of any kind.

There are some who advance the cry that this bill will lead us into war who made the same cry when the bill repealing the embargo was passed. That was well over 1 year ago. They predicted that its passage would result in our entry into the war within 60 or 90 days. They were wrong then. They make the same cry now.

There are some who are trying to impugn the motives of President Roosevelt. He has been the subject of that attack for the past 8 years. When we hear some of the charges made, I sometimes wonder if those who make them realize that every elective official, from President down to the smallest office, is elected by the people, and for a time certain, and that the people are well aware of that fact.

I deplore such attacks upon any President. I may disagree with a President of our country, as I have, but I will never impugn his motives, no matter who he may be, and I will never doubt his patriotism and his love of our country.

Some have even gone to the extent of charging that the President recommended this bill in order to bring us into war. That is a statement that is unwarranted, unfounded, and in complete disregard of the truth. A declaration of war is an act of Congress. Only Congress can declare war. But, they say, a President can create an incident that will result in war. To charge any President with that

purpose goes far beyond the limits of decency. However, every President in the history of our country, and under the constitutional powers conferred upon him, could do that if he wanted to. If President Roosevelt wanted to create such an incident, the last thing he would do would be to seek the passage of the pending bill. Under the broad powers conferred upon the President under the Constitution, he or any other President could create an incident which some other country could consider an act of war. But, instead, President Roosevelt recommends this bill, showing his intention and determination to take such steps as he deems necessary for our defense—necessary for the preservation of our institutions, and essential to the keeping of our people out of this war, and by keeping war away from our shores in the future.

In taking the proposed steps, in addition to taking a course of action that present world conditions require in our own defense, by the passage of this bill we will also render a greater service to mankind. The present war is not one of mere conquest alone. The "new order" of Hitler and his allies have clearly evidenced a determination to destroy the civilization of which we are a part, and which we believe in, a civilization that recognizes the omnipotence of God, and which has its origin in "love of God, and love of neighbor." The new ideology has its origin in the theory of the supremacy of man and its accompanying element of hate. It is purely paganistic. Not content with its acceptance by the people of those countries that voluntarily want such a paganistic form of government, its leaders are attempting, and determined, if possible, to impose their will upon the peoples of all nations of the world.

The minority report is an interesting report in many respects. In it those that signed the same say they recognize the danger to our country * * * that action is necessary at this time. They admit the grave danger to our country. Their eyes are open, so they say, by the very report they have made. And yet, with the admission of grave danger, they hesitate, and propose a bill that practically everyone knows, if enacted, would be meaningless and ineffective. They recommend the passage of legislation that our military and naval advisers have stated would be a mere gesture * * * wholly inadequate. They undertake to substitute their views for the views and the opinions of men who are giving their whole lives to the national defense of our country.

The Washington Star of last Sunday in an editorial stated in relation to the minority report:

In effect, they recognize the importance to us of a British victory by advocating aid to Britain, but they are not willing to sanction that degree of assistance which, in the judgment of our own military experts, is essential to prevent a Nazi victory.

The minority report also stresses, as an objection, the proposition that under the bill—

We surrender our democratic way of life now for fear of a future threat to our democratic way of life.

They say—

Fear of a future threat.

Everyone with an appreciation of danger knows that the danger is imminent, not from within, but from without. To sit idly by and by our inaction permit the vicious forces of destruction to develop a situation where they can, as they will, attack us later on, would be recreant to our duty * * * recreant to the trust we have inherited from the past, recreant to our responsibilities of the present, and recreant to the obligations that we owe future generations to transmit to them the democratic institutions of government we possess and which we inherited.

In conclusion, practically everyone agrees on the necessity for action. I respect the views of those who honestly disagree with me. There are those who say nothing should be done at all, but a great majority of us realize the imminent danger. A great majority of the American people realize something must be done; realize that we are justified in taking steps to preserve ourselves against the threat that is apparent. Everyone realizes that if Britain is defeated that America is next in some way. We have seen other countries, through their inaction, take a course of action that later resulted in their destruction. The mere fact that we are powerful and wealthy is not sufficient. We will be alone in the world. An economic attack, properly waged, might of itself have a serious effect upon our institutions of government.

Suppose, for example, and it is a probability, the chief products of the forced labor of Nazi-controlled Europe and the Japan Army-controlled Asia were to be shipped into the United States, with the world markets closed to those goods that are produced in the United States now and which can be obtained elsewhere. Our country would then be faced with the proposition of building a tariff wall around itself that would make us as self-contained as possible. Then Mr. Hitler and his allies would say to the United States: "We consider that an offensive act." If we were alone in the world, I do not care who made up the Congress, we would think twice, being alone in the world as we would be, if Britain and China were defeated, but particularly if Britain were defeated—being alone in the world as we would be, I doubt very much if we would undertake to create a barrier against the imports from Nazi Germany and army-controlled Japan. The result would be that millions of Americans would be thrown out of work and there would be all the economic distress that would flow therefrom. Military attack is not necessary, in the first place. Economic attack, in my opinion, will be the first step, and the economic attack will have serious if not vital consequences to our country, even though we are a powerful nation.

Inaction means injury and harm. Action along the lines outlined in this bill is consistent with international law, because self-defense transcends international law. We have got to do something; we should do something. This bill proposes the journey we can properly take at this time. It is a bill we should enact into law for the preservation of the

institutions of government we have inherited and which we as Americans of this generation and Members of this Congress with full responsibility must preserve for future generations of America. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has consumed 38 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to ask a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the majority leader has made a characteristically forceful and thoughtful speech.

Referring to his statement with respect to the control of Congress over the situation through control of appropriations, and referring to the discussion which the majority leader and I had on the subject some days ago, I should like to ask the gentleman if he means to say that Congress will have control over this situation? Because there will be no transfers of defense articles except those that are to be provided by future appropriations and that there will be no transfers of existing defense articles and those already on order?

Mr. McCORMACK. My answer to the gentleman is that under this bill Congress in its practical operation reserves to itself through power to appropriate, 95 percent jurisdiction over the bill. By this, I mean we have got to appropriate money to carry out approximately 95 percent of the provisions of the bill.

In my opinion the President would not take any substantial amount of the moneys we have appropriated for the regular departments of the Government, the War Department and the Navy Department, to use to carry out the purposes of this bill. After an appropriation is made for this bill I can see where out of appropriations made to the War Department and the Navy Department for the purchase, say, of airplanes, and they are already under construction, that these airplanes might be transferred for use under the provisions of this bill; but from the amount provided by Congress for the carrying out of this bill sums would be transferred that would fill up the gap in the regular appropriations of the War and Navy Departments.

I cannot visualize for a minute any President utilizing large sums of money out of regular appropriations that Congress has made.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If 95 percent of this is to come from future appropriations, will the material be there in time?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I have on my list the names of 30 Members who want to be heard on this bill this evening. So far I have yielded to but 3 Members. If the other 27 wish to be heard, I believe the House will have to stay in session until about midnight. I thought I should make this announcement now.

So far as appropriations are concerned, I believe this bill authorizes the President to go ahead and spend enormous sums of money, whether it is \$20,000,000,000 or

\$50,000,000,000; and the moral responsibility rests upon the Congress which gives him this authority to appropriate the money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] such time as he may desire.

FLOOD OF ORATORY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been such a flood of oratory on the floor that one hesitates to take a chance and walk down into the well without a life preserver. There has been too much talk in view of the exigency and the emergency that confronts us. We are at and in war, all but the shooting. Do not forget it.

The lend-lease bill undertakes to make the defense purchasing units of this country function for both America and Great Britain.

ECONOMIC ALLY

The bill undertakes to make us an economic ally of Britain in war. No fooling. We are still dreaming of a peace that does not obtain. We have all the alibis in the world from prejudice to President to obstruct our saving ourselves. No man has more zealously, persistently, or pertinaciously opposed the policies of the New Deal than have I. But I do not propose to sacrifice myself or my convictions to make a partisan Roman holiday when the time comes, as now it has come, for me to make a decision for or against my country. I am for America first; and therefore for all aid to Britain, short of war, now. As Alf Landon once said, "partisanship ceases at the seashore."

LIMITATION OF POWER OF PURSE AND LIMITATION OF TIME OF GRANT

Circumscribed and limited by the retention of the power of the purse in Congress and a limitation on the time within which the delegation of extraordinary authority to the Commander in Chief is prescribed, and with further amendments included to satisfy a public state of mind, which further amendments, though perhaps not necessary, are expedient in such an emergency in order to conduce to unity, the bill is not half so bad as some would have you think. I do not like to have to vote for it, I admit. I think a bill could be drafted better to my liking. However, I have a choice—vote for it or vote against it.

If the bill were to be amended as has been suggested, I could vote for it without reservation as a bill "to promote the defense of the United States," which, in my judgment, if amended, by its terms does not suggest or accomplish the abdication of Congress or the surrender by it of its prerogatives. I would have no question as to my duty under my oath. So others feel.

SHORT-SIGHTED POLICY

How we may be forced to vote by the short-sighted policy of those who prefer to dominate rather than cooperate is yet to be determined. The responsibility is theirs, not mine. I am for united action against a common foe and for aid to Britain as a defense for America; and since it involves every citizen, I think the wishes of a large portion of the people to be assured with respect to certain matters

involved in this bill are entitled to and demand respectful consideration.

I do not agree, in entirety, with the interpretation assumed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in its majority report involving the construction of the language "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law," which appears in section 3 of the bill.

If time permitted, I think we might have an interesting discussion which, after it was all over, like the dictum of the Court, would get us nowhere. However, the committee, right or wrong, has clearly, definitely, and positively stated that the bill as drawn, with the language referred to included, means just what they say it means; that its purpose and intent is exactly that which they declare it to be in their report, unequivocally and beyond all question of doubt.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE LAW

Now, the committee has designedly been very careful to take these definite steps in making its report in order to make it impossible for anybody, anytime, anywhere, to misunderstand, misconstrue, or incorrectly interpret the meaning, purpose, or intent of the act.

Those familiar with and skilled in the rules and methods employed in the interpretation and construction of laws realize that a committee of Congress is charged with the responsibility of investigating the necessity for the act concerning which it is its duty to report. Further, it is understood that a committee report is not conclusive in itself; yet as the report is made as a duty, and it is done in the execution of a duty, it has been repeatedly held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the measure that the committee recommends has the purpose that the committee declares it to have, and that it will accomplish the purpose as it is declared so to do by the committee.

THE LIMITATIONS

So it is well enough for those who are in doubt with respect to what limitations, if any, the language referred to has or carries to remember the full force and effect of committee reports, and that such a report must be read and studied and will control the actions had and to be taken by all parties in interest as to the question of what is exactly meant by the act, how it must and shall be construed and interpreted, and how they shall proceed in the administration of the act, if and when enacted.

I admit that the report of the committee as made has disposed of certain objections which I had to the bill in its original form. I still do not like the bill unless further amended.

Why we in the House of Representatives consistently permit ourselves to be wagged like the tail of a dog is beyond my comprehension. We know perfectly well that this bill is going to pass. Why not pass it in such form as that in which we have a right to assume it will come back to us? Why not, in addition to the amendments already proposed, forestall objections and relieve the public mind by further amending the bill to provide:

NECESSARY AMENDMENTS

First. A top limitation on the sum authorized to be appropriated for the program.

Second. A limit, expressed in dollars, on the amount of contract authorizations or future commitments the President might make under the terms of the bill.

Third. A definitive, specific, unqualified time limitation on powers granted. Such amendments, while it may be contended that they are not absolutely necessary and that impliedly what they attempt to effect is already in the bill, or in the proposed amendments, would, nevertheless, satisfy the demands which are being made upon many Members of Congress under no circumstances to vote for the bill unless such provisions are definitely and specifically included within the clear language of the act as written. And in the bill they do not detract from its force or effect, but simply define both.

If these several amendments to which I have referred are adopted, I can vote for the bill. I know several others who now oppose it, whose substantial and reasonable objections to it would be dissipated almost completely by such action as I contemplate ought to be taken.

AMEND THE BILL HERE

Why not amend the bill here and now instead of sending it along, incomplete and imperfect; having it sent to a conference; having a conference report; and eventually adopting the report of the conference committee?

Why do we not assert ourselves as representatives of the people, stand up and protect our rights and prerogatives, complete our job now, instead of cheapening our effort by leaving something for trading purposes to be used in another body of this legislative branch of government? That, as I see it, is the test of our patriotism and of our courage and of our desire to unify the country back of this measure.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of having this time extended to me, and it shall be my purpose to speak briefly.

The day following the introduction of this bill in Congress I made a speech against it. Section 3 of this bill, which gives to the President such tremendous powers, so shocked me that I felt I should record my sentiments while the conviction in my heart was so strong that the bill should be defeated. I had no doubt as to what I should do, and I am still of that opinion.

I listened to the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, before which men of great prominence testified. Four or five members of the President's Cabinet testified. Naturally they supported the bill that would give to them and the President these tremendous powers. Few dictators will admit that they are dictators, and few people will admit that they have too much power. Mr. Lindbergh also testified before that committee, as did Norman Thomas and many other men whose influence rates high with the American people. None of that testimony convinced me that my first impressions of this bill were wrong. Rather they strengthened that conviction. I would

have the House understand, however, that those hearings were pitched to a very high plane and that the testimony of those who appeared before that committee proved again that they were men and women of great capacity.

The debates on this bill in this House are now running well into the third day. These debates have been sincere and illuminating. Men and women from all parts of the United States, representing all sections of the country, have stood up and given us their views and their reasons for the position which they expect to take when this bill comes up for final vote. I have no quarrel with any of them. Those who agree with my point of view encourage me in my belief, and those who disagree with me when they give their reasons prove to me more completely that this bill is fraught with great possibilities and great danger.

I want to compliment those who prepared the report made by the majority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I wish to especially compliment those who prepared the minority report. The majority report is not an aggressive report, but on the contrary it is in its nature conciliatory even unto being apologetic. On the other hand, the minority report takes the position that the bill gives the President unlimited, unprecedented, and unpredictable powers and maintains that it is violating all the principles of international law. It especially stresses the fact that under the bill the President may give away our Navy, our airplanes, our arms, and our war secrets.

If I have time, I shall revert again in this discussion to this minority report.

While it is fresh in my mind, I wish to discuss with you briefly the prepared address delivered by the majority floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. Because of his position he is assumed to speak for the administration and especially for his party. In his speech he takes the position that Great Britain is our first line of defense. Some members of his party have in the past taken the position that the Rhine was our first line of defense. If the Rhine is our first line of defense or if Britain is our first line of defense, then it would seem that this must be our war. While I sympathize with Britain and while I abhor the atrocities practiced by Hitler and his followers, I still think that the United States of America, with her great resources and with her great Navy and with 132,000,000 people, does not need to permit this trouble in Europe to fix her first line of defense.

I much prefer to believe that our first line of defense is any place where anybody infringes upon our liberties in such a way as to become a menace to the general welfare of our people. I do not believe that we should take offense at any and all trivial insults that might be accorded to our citizens that might be in distant lands, but any studied and serious infringement upon our national activities, wherever that infringement is done, is where our first line of defense should be. Primarily the first line of defense is in the patriotism of our executive officers, especially the Chief of Staff of the Army and our Chief Naval Officer and the Sec-

retary of State. I repeat that we should not permit a quarrel or war between foreign nations to be considered, so long as we are unmolested, to be such an invasion of our liberties and such an insult to our national memories as to fix our line of defense. We fixed it for ourselves in the Revolutionary War and we maintained it successfully. We fixed it for ourselves in the War of 1812, when we maintained our claim that the seas should be free. We have maintained it ever since, and I think that we are as well able to maintain it today as we ever have been.

From the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] I have been strengthened in my belief that there is something in connection with this bill that has not yet been brought out. At first we were given to understand that this bill was drafted as the free handiwork of the Congress. That is not true. This bill has been cautiously and clandestinely put together. Ostensibly the physical drafting of it was done by a group of Congressmen, but its genius was in the heart and mind of someone aside from the active membership of Congress. Its genius comes from those who want the United States of America involved in this world conflict. There are powerful influences in the United States of America that would not stop in their determination to involve us in war, regardless of how dire the consequences might be. The cry of American mothers against another war that would rob them of their sons is not heard by this group. The prospect of the loss of lives and the loss of property and the bankruptcy of the Nation do not deter this group. They want Hitler destroyed for a different reason than what most of us have for his destruction. That this bill had all been thought out is proven by the President's message to Congress delivered on the 6th of January, which was several days after the bill was introduced. In this message he said that he would be compelled to ask Congress for money and materials that he might transfer them to the belligerents in this war. Through all these debates and through all these hearings I have been seeking to locate the real genius of this bill. Can it be in the insatiable ambition of the President to want to have a hand in the domination of the world? Can it be in moneyed influences against whom Hitler has committed some special act which they resent? Or can it be as the result of fear of world domination from Hitler and his followers? I must confess that I do not know the answer, but I have a strong conviction that, as I have already stated, this bill has behind it and back of it some motives the purposes of which have not yet been disclosed. The tenacity with which the President and his group have refused important amendments is proof that they think this bill must be passed without any curtailment of the tremendous powers which it gives to the President. There are some who think that the President wants this bill so that he may then be able to take from Great Britain, or at least to share with Great Britain, the active management of the war. If the President could, under threat of withholding money and supplies, demand that the war be carried on

along certain lines, he would be in a position to have his demands recognized. If he assumes a position of collaboration and cogeneralship with the war leaders of Great Britain, we are then actively in the war.

Before I leave the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] let me take issue with him where he says that 90 percent of all the President's activities under this bill will be directly controlled by the Appropriations Committee of the House. If the President can give away our Navy which is already built he will be disposing of many millions of dollars without consulting the Appropriations Committee, then he can give away about thirteen billions of value that is now being constructed from last year's appropriation, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was badly mistaken in his percentage. I must not continue further in this vein for I want to discuss with you for a few minutes a great speech delivered yesterday by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. Because of his candor and his honesty in the presentation of his arguments, he always commands a large and attentive audience in this House when he speaks. Yesterday he was at his best. I shall not have time to go into detail in an attempt to answer his argument but I wish to make some comments with reference to what I considered was the heart of his speech.

He stressed the Executive powers of the President. He made it appear that there was something almost sacred in connection with the executive powers of the President. He admonished us that Congress and no one else had any authority to curtail these executive powers. He cited the action of Thomas Jefferson in negotiating the purchase of what is known in history as the Louisiana Purchase. He cited in support of his argument the powers exercised by President Lincoln in calling out volunteers without the action of Congress.

I would most humbly call the attention of the House to this proposition—that if the House should be careful of its invasion of the executive powers of the President, likewise would it not be the duty of the President to be careful of his invasion of the powers of the House? If the executive powers of the President are such that he could not surrender them and no one could infringe upon them is it not more important to the people whose direct representative is the Congress that the President or no one else should invade the prerogatives of Congress and thereby invade the rights of the people.

Let us go back to the Constitution, the source of all authority, and from it compare the powers of the Executive and the powers of Congress as they apply to war. I would ask you to consider with me carefully for a moment that when the Louisiana Purchase was effected we were not at war, and no war was imminent, and that it was not a matter that would be in any way affected by war. It was simply the purchase of a large acreage of land. Jefferson had a chance to make the deal and he took the prelimi-

nary steps toward making it. The deal had to be ratified in the proper legal way. The whole deal up to the payment of the money was not handled by Jefferson. He only negotiated it. Likewise, in the case of Mr. Lincoln with his volunteers. The Civil War was not considered as a war. There was no formal declaration of war. It was considered as a civil insurrection or is sometimes called a civil rebellion. The President acted immediately as he had a right to do as Commander in Chief of the Army to take such steps as were necessary to prevent those who first precipitated the civil rebellion from continuing in their course. They had fired on Fort Sumpter and gave every indication that they intended to persist in their course. The whole Nation had been stirred for many years with the question of slavery and the action of those who participated in the firing on Fort Sumpter was not the action of a mob of hoodlums or lawbreakers but it was the action of a group of determined people who felt keenly on a great subject. Lincoln was always careful not to have the world consider our War between the States as a war in the full acceptance of the term in international law. He considered that he was the President of all the States even when some of them were in open rebellion.

All that the Constitution says about executive powers is contained in the first sentence of article II, which says:

The executive powers shall be vested in the President of the United States of America.

Further it says that the President shall "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." All this means is that the President shall carry into execution the laws that the Congress passes. The constitutional provision with reference to the powers of the Congress are numerous and I shall not cite them here, but we should confine our words in this discussion to what the Constitution says with reference to war. The Constitution makes the President of the United States the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. It does not give him any powers in war until the Congress has declared that a state of war exists. The Constitution prescribes specifically that it is the exclusive province of Congress to declare war and to raise and support armies. And it further provides that even the Congress cannot appropriate money for that purpose for a longer period than 2 years. In other words, the Constitution itself gives to that branch of the Government nearest to the people the right to declare war. Consequently there can be in this bill no attempt to invade the rights of the Executive, but this bill is an example of the terrific desire of executives all over the world to grab to themselves dictatorial powers.

I repeat, therefore, that Mr. WADSWORTH's great speech, in all due respect to his ability and his well-recognized patriotism and candor, is not well grounded, for this bill surely amounts to a surrender by the Congress of the United States of its power to declare war and to raise armies. If this bill is passed and the President proceeds under it to sell to Great Britain or to China or to Greece a number of our battleships that

surely would be construed by Germany as a warlike act. If in addition he should transform the United States, as he says he will do, into an arsenal from which England and Greece can draw their supplies in unlimited quantities without let or hindrance or without price then, of course, we will be in the war. If he cannot do this except by the authority of this bill then, of course, those who vote for this bill will in effect be declaring war.

I voted against the repeal of the Neutrality Act and I voted for the Vorys amendment in 1939. But the majority of the House and Senate repealed the neutrality laws and the President has been operating since that time under the law in its present form. Of course, after Congress had passed the law and the President had signed it, it would not become me or anyone else who voted against the law to sulk in our tents and to refuse to support the President in his actions. I am for the President of the United States regardless of who he is and almost regardless of what he does as against any ruler anywhere in the world. I feel that the President has for years indicated that he has a chip on his shoulder and has been too anxious to speak and give expression to his personal views as though those were the views of the Nation. This bill will give him more power of this kind. If he takes an active interest in the management of the World War or if he permits our battleships to do warlike duty in behalf of one of the belligerents or if he permits our battleships to do convoy duty, there is no question but that sooner or later we will find ourselves in the midst of this conflict.

Just today, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, admitted that the amendment which his committee has agreed to accept to the effect that nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the President to send naval vessels as convoys is an innocuous amendment and has no force and will have no effect. In other words he knows that the American people are unalterably opposed to the President having the right to send our battleships as convoys. Yet he says that this amendment, which will be adopted tomorrow, is nothing but a sop to the American people. The report of the minority members of this committee, which we have before us, makes it clear that this amendment which the majority offer as a sedative will not prevent the President from sending convoys.

A very strange situation has developed in these debates with reference to this proposition. The original bill carried no provision with reference to convoys except the general provision that the President would do almost what he pleased with American war materials. This might have meant that when the bill provided that the President could "sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of" any war materials that the President could convoy these goods and deliver them to the belligerent nation wherever he deemed best. If this language does have this meaning, then the

proposed amendment should have great effect. Therefore, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] maintains that the bill does not give the President any right to convoy, why should his group offer an amendment? And again, if the minority membership of the committee maintains that the amendment is of no effect, and that the President may use the battleships as convoys regardless of the passage of this bill, then we should look into the matter to see how this could be done. Let me repeat, how can the Republican membership of a committee claim that the President can use battleships as convoys if this bill does not give him the power, and if the amendment does not have anything to do with it? This is one proposition that has not been discussed as yet. What they mean is that the President may, if he cares to exceed his authority as Commander in Chief of the Navy, decide in his own mind that in order for a certain shipment to reach its proper destination it should be accompanied by an American battleship, and he therefore might order a battleship to proceed as a convoy to that vessel. This brings up the question of what power has the President, as Commander in Chief of the Navy, over the battleships of the Navy. He cannot sell one of them under the present law, but after this bill is passed he may, by the express language of the bill, sell one of them. If he can sell one, he can sell them all. The bill also provides that he may "otherwise dispose of" them. That might mean that he might give away any or all of the American Navy. The President answers this fear with the statement that a cow might also jump over the moon, which is highly improbable, or that he might stand on his head in Pennsylvania Avenue, which is also extremely improbable. These facetious illustrations do not answer or satisfy the grave fears which the American people have. Just recently the President did practically give away 50 American destroyers, clearly contrary to law, and one of the principal purposes of this bill is to change the law so that he might give away the next 50 in accordance with law. As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the President can order the Navy to the protection of American interests any place and any time when the rights of America or its citizens are abused. But he cannot lawfully order the Navy to deliver munitions to belligerents in a war in which we are not parties. I have no doubt he will do so. When he does we cannot blame Hitler if he sinks the ships.

Mr. Chairman, let me quote in a few words the heart of this bill and with that I think I shall have stated sufficient reasons why any Congressman should be careful of his vote.

This is the language:

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 manufacture in (American) arsenals * * * any defense articles, to sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of * * * any defense article.

As I have already stated my sympathies are entirely with Great Britain.

The President has gone farther than I thought originally he should go but since he has gone, we must stand by him in what he has done. Already Great Britain has been getting practically all the war material that we have been able to produce in our country. There is no disposition on my part to curtail this program. I think that those in charge of our defense program, although under terrible handicap, have attempted to do a good job. I think that within a few months our production will be a marvel to the world. I hope it comes in time to do Great Britain much good. In spite of all this, I still maintain that our Government is a government of law and not of men and that heretofore we have waged wars by cooperation between the legislative and executive departments and that it is not now necessary for the legislative department to capitulate and surrender its constitutional prerogatives to the Executive. I think he is asking for more power than any other President ever asked for and I think his request should be denied.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that whatever I might say concerning the pending legislation, H. R. 1776, will have little or no effect on the final vote. It is my desire, however, to go on record as being emphatically opposed to it. I am convinced that its passage in its present form—and it is obvious that it will not be improved—would effectuate a virtual adjournment of Congress insofar as the present world conditions are concerned, because it will delegate to one man all the powers of the Congress in regard thereto.

I am unalterably opposed to any legislation that will further divest the Congress of its powers. In my opinion, we have already surrendered too many of them, and experience has proven that it is impossible to recover them once we have delegated them to the present occupant of the White House. With Congress continually in session, as it will be during the present European crisis, the conveying of so much authority to one man, as is provided in this bill, is as unwise as it is unnecessary.

There is no question but that there are enough votes in the House of Representatives to pass this bill. I hope, however, that before it is passed it will be so amended that it will not give any one man the uncurbed and uncounseled power to spend the wealth and the property of this country to finance a war that is not of our making. I hope, too, that this bill will be so amended that it will positively prohibit convoy of shipping in war zones and to provide for tangible collateral or security for such loans as are contemplated through the transfer to the United States of British possessions in this hemisphere.

I do not oppose aid to Great Britain but it seems to me to be unwise, yes, plain ridiculous for the United States to advance moneys, munitions, and materials of war while our own defenses are known to be so woefully lacking in this same defense equipment. Our best military and

naval experts cannot, and will not, deny that our fighting forces would be unable to carry on a war of 3 weeks' duration with the materials and the munitions now on hand.

The Chief of Staff of our Army, Gen. George C. Marshal, only recently testified during the hearings on this legislation that—

We have no stores * * * It will be a happy day when we can speak of stores of Army equipment. * * * We have need for all modern equipment delivered to us.

I say, Mr. Chairman, let us go all the way on national defense, but let us be done with playing the role of Santa Claus to the entire world. I believe I am as good an American as any Member of this Congress, but I cannot help feel that this is not our war. Even William Allen White has made that same statement. We were not consulted about this war, so why should we be expected to pay for it? And permit me to add right here, I do not subscribe to the contention of proponents of this bill that the British Navy is our first line of defense; that Great Britain is fighting our battle. That is bosh. If that were true, we had best accept a dominion status and be done with it. I am one Member of Congress who believes that our own Navy and our own Army are our first lines of defense, and I believe that they should be properly and adequately equipped before sending all of our equipment and munitions to a foreign nation which, down through history, has never been too friendly.

Certainly my sympathies are with Great Britain in this war. I want no part of Hitler nor Hitlerism. But I cannot forget the disparaging remarks that were made by high British officials concerning the help we gave in the last World War, and the cries of "Uncle Shylock" when we asked Great Britain to settle her war debts. It seems to me that England's attitude regarding her debts should be a sufficient lesson to us. We would be fools to be burned in the same place the second time.

Almost a quarter of a century has passed since the World War and during those years England has persisted in her refusal to pay her debt to us. In fact, she has led all other debtor nations in their refusal to pay. In the meantime, however, England has been able to accumulate enough reserve capital to begin another gigantic war which we are now expected to finish for her either financially, or with men and materials, or all three. In other words, we are again to become Uncle Sap rather than Uncle Sam.

I say that instead of financing a world war every quarter of a century—wars from which we get nothing but dislike and hatred from those whom we defend and befriend, let alone those whom we antagonize—let us spend our money in preparing our own armed forces so that there can be no question in the future as to who is protecting who, and why. [Applause.] Let us do this before we lease, lend, or give anything to anyone. If we will do that, we will have no worry about any European-promoted wars, economically or otherwise. Under

the program we have followed during the past 12 months our own military and naval forces have been stripped while we have furnished Great Britain with war planes, guns, ammunition, and other materials. England is getting practically everything we produce. It seems to me that it is high time that we equip our own forces and end for all time the contention that Great Britain is fighting our battles. If we equip our own forces we will be well able to take care of ourselves. But what will we do if England fails and our fighting forces are found lacking in equipment?

While, as General Marshall has testified, "we need all the modern equipment delivered to us", in the first 11 months of 1940, we have shipped to Great Britain more than 3,300 war planes, 92,585 pistols and revolvers, 29,000 shotguns, 932,639 Army rifles, 143,059 machine guns and heavy ordnance guns and carriages, 29,485,632 1-pound armor-piercing shells, and other equipment. During the month of November last there were manufactured in this country 356 war planes, of which 350 were exported to Great Britain. This in spite of the fact that the airplane factories of this country have been placed upon a strict war-plane production program while the airplane factories of Great Britain are still manufacturing commercial airplanes. Only recently in Great Britain, workmen of munitions factories created a debate in the House of Commons by threatening to strike because the munitions they were manufacturing were being shipped to Japan.

Besides war material, the United States has furnished Great Britain with raw materials and other essential items including 2,725,583 tons of scrap iron and 739,169,682 tons of copper. These figures have been taken from the Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States and further show that during the first 11 months of 1940 there was exported \$217,788,776 worth of power-driven metal-working machinery. Steam engines, airplane motors, locomotives, machine tools of every description and character, including engine and turret lathes, milling machines are going out of the United States in a steady stream today despite the fact that industrialists say that lack of this equipment is causing one of the greatest bottlenecks in our defense program. Many of these machines are going to Great Britain while others are going to Japan and Russia and other countries subjugated by Hitler. The British are already complaining that the war materials we have sent to Russia are finding their way into Germany.

In view of the amount of aid we are already giving, only a portion of which I have enumerated here, this so-called lease-lend bill, in my opinion, is unnecessary. It seems to me, as I have said before, ridiculous for us to pass such a measure while Canada, a member of the British Commonwealth of nations, does not have such a law. While many Americans are protesting that England should not be made to convert her investments in this country into dollars with which to buy our armaments, Canada is selling her armaments to her mother country on exactly that basis. Why should we adopt

a policy that Dominion of Canada has not yet adopted?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that what ought to be accomplished to aid Great Britain could be accomplished without Congress passing this legislation and thereby relinquishing its powers insofar as the present world problems are concerned. I think a mere glance in our history books will indicate that many more democracies have been destroyed by the abdication of legislative bodies than by invasion. I think the great need in the United States today is a strong, virile Congress.

I am certain that the majority of the taxpayers of the Third District of Michigan, who have honored me with a seat in this Congress, do not want me to support such legislation as this. I do not believe they want me to vote for a bill that so lavishly and so foolishly throws away their money and jeopardizes their own economic safety. My people want a sane and substantial government, an honest and adequate national defense, but they want no part of this European mess. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] 15 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I trust that I can speak out of a mind this afternoon that is clear and calm; but I must confess that I speak from a heart that is heavy and troubled and from a soul that is sick. Ever since World War No. 1 ended, in which we fought to make the world safe for democracy and to end all wars, we have witnessed war going on in practically every continent of this earth. It has been my opportunity to have witnessed, first-hand, the slow, gradual, and certain death of democracy in most of the countries of the Old World. I saw it die in Germany, I saw it extinguished in Russia, I saw it perish in Italy, I saw it end in France, I saw it finally surrendered in Britain, and for the last 8 years I have witnessed the insidious assaults upon it here at home, which is the last stronghold and the only citadel where democracy is found on the face of the earth today. I am not so sure that it can long survive here, because in the measure before us we propose the very thing we detest. We embrace the thing we abhor. We ignobly confess failure of the democratic processes and propose to turn over to one man a constitutional prerogative of the Congress of the United States to this man who, after taking the same oath that you and I have taken to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution, has demanded that we pass legislation, whether it be constitutional or not. No doubt this will give comfort to all dictators. When the highest tribunal of our land threw many measures out of the window as unconstitutional, he deliberately attempted to undermine and destroy the independence and integrity of that free judiciary by packing it with stooges.

When he was opposed in that nefarious scheme, he deliberately invaded the sovereign States in an attempt to purge men who dared stand and vote their conscientious convictions. [Applause.] He has defied the third-term tradition and has

taken huge funds, running into billions of dollars, voted by the Congress of the United States, to perpetuate himself in power indefinitely. He has asked, and has been granted, the power, never exercised before in peacetime by any of his predecessors, to conscript human life; and now, the last straw that breaks the camel's back, is, in my opinion, the most dangerous proposal that has ever been offered to the Members of this body in this bill that is hypocritically and ironically numbered 1776.

Oh, what a travesty on justice, what an insult to our national pride and honor. I want to read from SOL BLOOM's book and his story on the Constitution:

We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved.

And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

Yet the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, who made both Thomas Jefferson and George Washington famous by distributing this periodical, now offers us this bill, 1776, that is the very antithesis of the stand taken by the fearless men who signed the Declaration of Independence. [Applause.]

It is interesting to also note that Thomas Jefferson, the founder and patron saint of the Democratic Party, once wrote this:

For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations, would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

Of course, Jefferson lived in the horse-and-buggy age, he did not know much, but he is the author of the Declaration of Independence, and he is one of the collaborators of the Constitution of the United States. And in connection with the sound advice he gave, so the Father of Our Country, who was also a pretty good American, had this to say in his Farewell Address:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow-citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious,

while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

Mr. Chairman, I never knew I would live to see the day when a good Irishman like JOHN McCORMACK, from Massachusetts, would openly admit that Great Britain is our first line of defense. [Laughter and applause.] That certainly is not the position taken by the distinguished Irish senior United States Senator from his State, who came out last night in New York against this bill.

Somebody called this our war. I say that that statement is not only untrue but it is cowardly. It is a dastardly thing to say that Great Britain is fighting our war when the United States had nothing whatever to do with this present conflict in Europe. It broke out over there without our advice and without our consent. When did Britain ever fight our Lattle? Was it in 1775 when some of our flesh and blood were spilled with Washington at Valley Forge to throw off the yoke of British oppression and to escape the heel of British tyranny? Was it in 1812 when our forebears tried to keep the British from burning this very Capitol? Was it in 1860 when Britain aided one side of the War between the States, not because of any love for that side but in order to sever us, when some of our own fathers were fighting to preserve the Union?

If this is our battle, we should long ago have been in it. When have Americans depended upon anyone else to fight their battles? Our own defense is our own selves.

When is it that Great Britain has ever fought anybody's battle except Britain's? [Applause.] Shame on anyone who says that the safety of America depends upon the British across the seas. I do not possess the prophecy or the clairvoyant powers, and I cannot speak with such dogmatic authority as some gentlemen do on world problems, but it has been my privilege to have lived and studied in different countries of Europe. I know something of the historic hatreds, entrenched interests, bitter animosities, racial prejudices, the religious intolerances, and the conflicting interests between those countries. I know that Thomas Jefferson never uttered a truer word than when he said that the nations of Europe are "nations of eternal war."

George Washington, in closing his Farewell Address, said:

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman finish it now? Read it all.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will give me time, I should love to read the whole Farewell Address of Washington, because I am sure the gentleman never absorbed any of it when he had it printed.

Mr. BLOOM. I will give the gentleman time if he will read what George Washington said about entangling alliances, as the gentleman said, or foreign alliances. Read it all.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman knows I have only 2 or 3 minutes left.

Mr. BLOOM. I will give the gentleman time if he wants to read the other sections in there. Go on.

Mr. SHORT. You find it for me, Sol.

Mr. BLOOM. I will show you where to read, if you want to read it. Read down to here, this part in here. Read it all.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is out of the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. To finish what Washington said.

Mr. SHORT. Is this out of the time the gentleman gives me?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. Go ahead and read it. I will give the gentleman the time.

Mr. SHORT. Has the gentleman given me the time?

Mr. BLOOM. I am giving the gentleman the time to read what Washington said about foreign entanglements.

Mr. SHORT. How much time does the gentleman yield me?

Mr. BLOOM. It will not take over 2 minutes, if the gentleman can find it.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; it is here. It is all worth reading.

Mr. BLOOM. You bet it is.

Mr. SHORT. I will read it:

'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise, to extend them.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; but how about temporary alliances? What does Washington say about them? Go on and read it.

Mr. SHORT. I do not want to take all the time in my speech.

In 1917 we were told by the same proponents who are now advocating union with Britain, going into another war, that we were entering it to fight for humanity and to fight for democracy. We got 2,000,000 men to France, we spilled their blood and spent our treasure, and we came out of that conflict without a dollar indemnity and without a square acre of territory. We got nothing and we asked for nothing. We got just what we asked for, except that we got 10 years of depression, 10,000,000 men out of work, \$13,000,000,000 of bad war debts we will never collect, and we got 4 cemeteries in France. The only thing we can get out of another conflict will be higher taxes, deeper debts, more graveyards, and a more prolonged depression.

There is one question I believe every Member of this body should ask himself before he votes for this bill, Am I willing to go the whole way? You cannot be half way in war and half way out of war. [Applause.] You cannot insult people, spit in their faces, slap their jaws, kick them on the shins, and then say, "We do not want to fight." There is no such thing as what is expressed by that sham slogan of "methods short of war."

You lifted the embargo on arms and started furnishing munitions. That was the first step. The next step is that you will furnish money. The third and final step will be that you will furnish men. Those are the three steps that led us to war in 1917 and they are the same three steps that are leading us into this conflict today; munitions, money, men.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman in everything he said about Great Britain. The gentleman has made a very splendid speech, which has received the thunderous and almost unanimous applause of his Republican colleagues. I ask him now, Does the gentleman favor aid to Great Britain?

Mr. SHORT. I favor aid to Great Britain. [Applause.] I am not talking for Great Britain or against any other country. I am talking only for America. It is not that I do not love Britain, but that I love America first. I hope the time will never come when we will have to take down that picture of George Washington and put the picture of George III in his place, or place the Union Jack ahead of the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

Regardless of where our inherent sympathies may be, our first duty is to our own country, the United States of America, and to our own people. We have almost reached the point today when, unless you put the interest of Great Britain first, you are branded as unpatriotic, un-American, or pro-Nazi. I have lived in both Germany and England, and I love both peoples. The great tragedy to me is that these two mighty civilizations, great peoples, which have contributed much to the world's culture, its philosophy, its science, literature, music, and art, are now tearing each other to pieces, while the real enemy of mankind—godless, atheistic Soviet Russia, the moral embargo against whom we have lifted, is standing on the sidelines laughing, hoping that the United States, the last great capitalistic nation, will become involved, and that we will be bled white, so that when the deluge is over she can move in and on the ruins plant the world revolution.

I hate dictatorships. I think that dictatorships are bad wherever they are found. God knows I despise fascism. I detest Hitlerism or nazi-ism. I hate communism. But I have no great love for British imperialism, and I do not think it is the duty of Uncle Sam to police the world or to underwrite this war of Britain's by surrendering our economic strength in this bill. Why should the United States of America, with a national debt of \$50,000,000,000, headed for bankruptcy, underwrite Great Britain's war when she is the mightiest and wealthiest empire in all the world. Where are Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and India? After this war we may qualify as a colonial possession or a dominion.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to Washington's Farewell Address—

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an attempt to break up the speech of the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is out of order. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor and the control of his own time.

Mr. SHORT. I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] can take the time to read the whole Farewell Address to us, and heaven knows—

Mr. BLOOM rose.

Mr. SHORT. No; I do not yield.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman has yielded.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. BLOOM. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOOM. I asked the gentleman if he would yield to me, and the gentleman, I understood, did yield to me. Now, after the gentleman yielded to me, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] interrupted, and I am just asking the gentleman a question because he had already yielded to me and I think I am in order in asking the gentleman this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SHORT. Since I have only 1 or 2 minutes left, I refuse to yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes and I will say to the gentleman that no one interrupted the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and I hope the gentleman will proceed without interruptions.

Mr. SHORT. That is all right. There will be lots of interruptions, I am afraid.

I want to say this to the membership of the House. I can conceive of nothing more dastardly or reprehensible than any legislator or statesman to vote for any measure that will put us into war or bring us nearer to an armed conflict that will send the youth of America away to fight in foreign fields, perhaps, for a cause in which he himself does not sufficiently believe to risk his own hide.

I think you should have just two amendments to this bill. The first would be to insert the word "not" in line 1, "be it not enacted." You can dress this measure up all you please, you can sprinkle it with perfume and pour powder on it, masquerade it in any form you please with these innocuous and meaningless amendments that have been offered, but it is still foul and it stinks to high heaven. It does not need a doctor, it needs an undertaker, and the minute we pass it we are completely abdicating our constitutional prerogatives. I confess we do not surrender the power of Congress to declare war, but every Member in this body knows that modern wars today are not declared. They start fighting without anyone ever declaring them. We do, in effect, repeal the Johnson Act by extending credits to the Government of Great Britain. We do, in effect, repeal the neutrality law that

will permit, or certainly not prohibit, the carrying of American munitions in American ships to belligerent countries. We do take not one or two but several other steps nearer the brink, nearer the precipice toward active involvement, and if you cannot kill this bill, then I would like to see you offer an amendment that the Members who vote for this vicious thing will, the day war is declared or we become involved, resign their seats and go in the front contingent. [Applause.] That, of course, will never happen.

This bill is a war bill, it is a dictatorship bill, and it is a bankruptcy bill, and as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has pointed out you cannot repeal any one of those three things.

I hope and pray to God that the Congress of the United States that has already surrendered control of the purse strings to the Executive, granting him vast discretionary powers over monetary affairs; I trust that the Congress of the United States, that has turned over to him the authority to negotiate treaties with foreign countries, without those treaties ever being considered, let alone ratified, by the United States Senate, will not go the last step in total capitulation, in complete surrender of democracy by giving the President the power to take funds of the American people in any amount or munitions of war, be they planes, tanks, or ships, and transfer, lease, lend, or even give away, dispose of in any manner that he may see fit, that would constitute an act of war and actually get us engaged in it.

These are my reasons for opposing this measure. I think in all seriousness that it is the most dangerous bill that has ever been presented to any free legislative body, and though my hope is very faint and though my faith is very weak, at last, perhaps, when it gets over into the other body, sufficient time will be had so that the American people can be advised and that they will awaken to the real dangers of this bill which would raise up a Hitler in America to get rid of one 4,000 miles away. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has followed his usual custom of delivering to the membership of the House a very interesting speech. You will notice that his entire remarks were generalized, that nowhere in them did he refer to any of the specific provisions of the bill. In fact, he seemed very careful to refrain from discussing any of the provisions of the bill, and the result is as usual with the speeches delivered by the gentleman—he delivered more heat than light on the subject. He did admit, however, that he is in favor of aid to Great Britain, which is something for that gentleman to admit. The gentleman did say that this bill would drive the United States in effect to dictatorship. I fail to see wherein this measure, H. R. 1776, any citizen of the United States or anybody of the United States is being deprived of the right of freedom of speech,

where anyone is being deprived of the right of free assembly, where anybody is being deprived of the right to worship God as he pleases, or where anybody is being deprived of the precious right of freedom of the press. The gentleman from Missouri declared his great love for the American democracy and its institutions. He praises American institutions, but does he want to do anything about them when they are in danger? No; he wants to sit idly by and do nothing to protect or defend them. In other words, his policy is to divide the unity of the country and to do nothing whatsoever for his beloved country in time of danger.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I believe in national defense, I believe in adequate defense, I think, as much as any Member of this body, and I have supported measures for it and shall continue to do so, but I want the defense to be for America, and not for some other country.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman again generalizes very freely. Of course, we all agree that he loves America and we believe that he wants to defend America, but when a specific proposition or bill is brought before the House he is always against it and has never once offered a substitute. Therefore, I have no reason to believe that he will offer any proposition any better than the one offered so far, and if the gentleman is going to criticize a constructive measure, it is his duty to offer some substitute or proposition so that the Congress can give proper consideration to it.

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman think it wise to give away our munitions, our battleships and planes when we are told that our domestic supply is inadequate to defend ourselves?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman has evidently not studied all of the provisions of the bill. The bill does not call for giving away munitions except when it is necessary and vital to the defense of the United States, and the first consideration of this bill is that it is necessary for the defense of the United States.

Mr. SHORT. But it leaves it in the hands of one man rather than the Congress.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Oh, surely the gentleman would not want any contemplated transfer or lease or exchange to be debated in this House by the membership. With all the silver-tongued orators there are here we would never come to a conclusion on anything.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman is logical, he would simply do away with parliamentary government.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon there came into my possession a newspaper which I understand has quite general circulation throughout the United States, evidently published in New York City. It is dated January 30, 1941. The name of the newspaper is the Free American and Deutscher Weckruf und Beobachter. On the first page of that newspaper, with a heavy black line around it, appears an article, as follows:

You German-Americans:

Show that you are Americans by exercising your American rights. As you love the United

States and its institutions, let your protest against the treason bill H. R. 1776 be heard in Washington. If you believe that your Senator or Congressman will pigeonhole it or consign it to the wastepaper basket, send it to Senator BURTON K. WHEELER. If you can't send a telegram or a letter, just write a post card:

"I am a voter and I take this means to register my protest against the passage of H. R. 1776."

Then sign name and address. Or write:

"As H. R. 1776 contravenes the letter and spirit of our institutions, I beg you to do your utmost to defeat the measure, however amended, since it empowers the President to make Britain's war our war."

Or write:

"The Congress of the United States has no constitutional right to surrender its power to the President, and I (we) urge you to do your utmost to defeat H. R. 1776."

It is your duty as a loyal American to do this unless you want your sons to fight Britain's war. If a million such protests pour in upon Congress, they will not fail to influence the fate of the proposed betrayal to the Republic.

There is no "emergency" save such as the President creates every time he wants a free hand to use the United States as a pawn for Britain's imperialistic purposes. The Tories, Anglophiles, interventionists, and international conspirators constitute a minority bloc, but they control the press, the radio, and the screen. The opposition, constituting 83 percent of the American people, are helpless to make themselves felt except by wiring and writing letters of protest.

Free America of its dictators by rendering them impotent to guide the country's destiny. Germany has been our friend from our infancy. It has no designs on our territory or our institutions, while England has been our constant enemy.

If America should succeed in helping England to win the war, the next great war for which your sons would be drafted will be between the British Empire and the United States.

Don't be a mollusk. Write today.

Mr. Chairman, I read that article and I wanted it to get into the RECORD because I think it illustrates very clearly, without any question, the depths to which the Nazi propaganda machine will go in attempting to influence the Congress in its deliberations on this bill.

This paper, Mr. Chairman, is published in New York City by the A. V. Publishing Corporation, Inc., G. Wilhelm Kunze, president; August Klapprott, vice president; Gustav J. Elmer, treasurer; and Willy Luedtke, secretary.

Mr. Chairman, the Nazi propaganda machine is making the same mistake today in its attempt to influence American people that the Germans made 20 years ago. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an insult to the thousands and thousands of loyal, patriotic, freedom-loving American citizens whose ancestors came from Germany. For myself, my father was born in the old country and he was known as a German, but if he were living today I know that he would resent with every fiber of his being such an insult to his intelligence and such an attempt to segregate class against class, nationality against nationality, just as I today, as a World War veteran, resent this from the very innermost of my being.

He calls this newspaper "the Free American" and he attempts to influence the people of the United States of America. "America is in no danger."

In other words, this agent of Hitler does not want any power given to the President of the United States. He wants this Congress to fail to pass this measure and thus accede to his wishes. This is Hitler's order. This is Hitler speaking. He has the nerve and the gall, in effect, to name a gentleman who is in the Senate of the United States as perhaps the leader of an effort to follow the wishes of Hitler. He calls upon the august Senator from the State of Montana to lead this fight and do his wishes. I think this should be resented. If a publication like that appeared in any of the countries under the domination and heel of Hitler, those responsible for its publication would not last one week.

Mr. Chairman, the able speech made by the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] covered the various provisions of this bill very well, I think. It is my conclusion that, with very few exceptions, everybody is agreed on the policy of extending the utmost material aid to Britain—all aid short of war. And we who agree on that proposition do not do so because we hold any extraordinary love for the British Empire but because we deem it the best policy in the interest of our own national defense and the preservation of our own democracy, and so I may say that practically all of us are in entire accord on the basic reasons which caused the introduction of this bill.

The only difference between those in favor of H. R. 1776 and those opposing it is a difference of opinion and judgment, as I see it, as to what will constitute the best procedure and the best method for security for ourselves—national defense—through the giving of aid to Great Britain and the other democracies fighting the onrush of the forces of aggression and the dictator powers.

I think I am correct in saying that the opposition bases its stand mainly on the premise that the bill would vest too much power in the hands of one man, but I think that if we can agree that an emergency exists at the present time, and in my mind it is an emergency of a most grave and serious nature, and that our future as a great world power depends on the outcome, then it must be admitted that in order to meet the emergency and to insure speedy and effective action that it will be necessary for the Congress to grant emergency powers, and the question then arises as to whom these emergency powers should be granted.

It is obvious to any student that democratic processes are slow. For Congress to attempt to debate and decide on every contemplated transfer, exchange, or lease would entail momentous and most likely disastrous delay. To me it also seems quite clear that it would be just as impractical to place the power of decisive action in a committee composed, if you will, of Members of the Senate and the House, or of a committee composed of Justices of the Court, or of industrialists or financiers or any committee, no matter how its personnel be chosen. The experience of all American history shows conclusively that every President, from Washington to the present time, has at all times exercised the utmost restraint and deliberate judgment, when it came

to the conduct of foreign affairs and the involvement of the United States in international disputes.

The Constitution gives to the President of the United States practically unlimited power to deal with foreign governments, and the Supreme Court of the United States has just recently upheld the wisdom of the framers of our Constitution in that regard.

The President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy, under the Constitution holds the fate of the United States in the hollow of his hand insofar as his ability is concerned to involve this country in a dispute with a foreign power, and if any President at any time desired to involve this country in war, he could, by an order to the Navy or to the Army, do so, regardless of any legislation that a Congress might pass in seeking to curb him. This Congress cannot take away any of the rights given to the President of the United States by the Constitution.

Opponents of this measure make much of the fact that too much power will be vested in the hands of the President. Let me call your attention to some of the powers which we, the Congress of the United States, have legislated to the President for authority during an emergency. All of us know that during the World War much power was given to the then President. All of us also know that since 1932 many emergency powers have been granted to the President. The President now has, if he declared by proclamation that an emergency exists, these powers:

To take possession of and assume control of all transportation facilities necessary to move the armed forces; to prohibit transactions in foreign exchange, suspend all trading on national security exchanges for 90 days; to take certain action in the extension of credit; to close any radio station or take it over for Government use and to require priority for communications essential to national defense; to take over power houses, dams, and conduits and reservoirs for the purpose of munitions manufacturing; to suspend provisions of laws prohibiting more than 8 hours of labor in any 1 day by persons engaged on work covered by contracts with the United States; to prohibit imports from countries which have restricted imports from the United States contrary to the law and the practice of nations, and to refuse clearance to vessels belonging to belligerent countries against which discrimination is charged; to requisition any merchant vessels documented under the United States laws, control the movements of foreign and domestic shipments in all continental and territorial waters; to take possession of such vessels and to remove their officers and crews; and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to set up such preferences or priorities as the President may designate.

Will any of us say that the President of the United States has so gloried in these vast powers vested in him that he has abused them or made unwise use of them, and these are domestic powers.

In the field of international affairs any President, knowing of the importance and the magnitude of decisions resting with him, would most certainly be conservative, careful, and circumspect, and would without any doubt whatsoever, confer and consult and advise with those persons most competent and most expert. No one will gainsay the fact that the present President loves the democratic way of

life. No one will deny the patriotism of the President and his fidelity to our institutions and to our form of government, and to me it seems almost a sacrilege to charge, or even to intimate that he will ever for an instant have uppermost in his mind any other course than the one which will be for the best and lasting interest of his country, and the preservation of its democratic institutions and the enlightened American way of life. For myself, I am willing to entrust him, and as a practical matter, I do not see how it is possible to effectively provide for the only kind of aid which will achieve the purposes we all have in mind without the granting of emergency power to the President, and the temporary suspension of some of the statutes which definitely hamper and delay the speedy action so badly needed.

Section 3 (a) contains the clause "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law." Many persons upon first seeing this clause might jump to the conclusion that all laws on the statute books, were in effect repealed. I would like to emphasize that this clause refers only to the subject matter contained in section 3 of the bill.

At the present time there are many statutes which relate to the disposition of War Department and Navy Department material, and the authority to dispose of many types of equipment is contained in those statutes. However, they were passed sporadically one by one during a long period of time. They have never been codified or revised, so as to form a reasonable or workable program of action.

The terms and conditions imposed on the transfer vary with the different types of equipment in a way which is haphazard and in many cases totally unrelated to existing conditions.

In many cases efforts to dispose expeditiously of any military equipment cannot be effected without enormous delay. In many cases the conditions imposed by the existing statutes are virtually impossible of fulfillment, although practical terms equally beneficial to the United States could be easily suggested. Often the statutes will authorize the disposition of the component parts of a unit, and yet it will not authorize the disposition of the complete unit equipped to function as an effective weapon. In such a confused state of the law you can see how impossible it would be to render the effective aid which is called for in the present crisis. If we are to proceed in a prompt and effective manner it is essential that the Congress provide in one bill specific and clear authority.

ACTS WHICH WOULD BE AFFECTED BY ENACTMENT OF THE LEND-LEASE BILL

Where a statute, limited in its operation to a specified time, covers a somewhat general field, such as the disposition of military and naval equipment to a foreign government, it suspends more specific statutes covering the same subject matter or inconsistent with it.

By way of illustration, the following are some of the statutes which would be temporarily suspended if H. R. 1776, as amended, were enacted.

For purposes of clarity they will be grouped under the following headings:

1. Manufacture of defense articles for transfer to foreign governments.
2. Transfer of existing defense articles to such governments.
3. Reconditioning of foreign-owned defense articles within the United States.
4. Acquisition by the United States of defense articles abroad.
5. Disposition of moneys received in consideration of defense articles transferred.

1. *Manufacture of defense articles for transfer to foreign governments*

Section 11 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 23) provides:

Whoever, within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, fits out and arms, or attempts to fit out and arm, or procures to be fitted out and armed, or knowingly is concerned in the furnishing, fitting out, or arming of any vessel, with intent that such vessel shall be employed in the service of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, district, or people, to cruise, or commit hostilities against the subjects, citizens, or property of any foreign prince or state, or of any colony, district, or people, with whom the United States are at peace, or whoever issues or delivers a commission within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States for any vessel, to the intent that she may be so employed, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 and imprisoned not more than 3 years. And every such vessel, her tackle, apparel, and furniture, together with all materials, arms, ammunition, and stores which may have been procured for the building and equipment thereof, shall be forfeited; one half to the use of the informer and the other half to the use of the United States.

Section 3 of title V of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 222; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 33), provides:

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

It is clear that section 3 (a) (1) of the bill suspends, so far as the Government is concerned, the provisions of those sections. That was the view taken at the time of the introduction of the bill in the Senate. (See 87 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 88, Jan. 10, 1941.)

2. *Transfer of existing defense articles to such governments*

Section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (Public. No. 703, 76th Cong.), provides:

Whenever the President determines that it is necessary in the interest of national defense to prohibit or curtail the exportation of any military equipment or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or material, or supplies necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation thereof, he may by proclamation prohibit or curtail such exportation, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe.

Since implementation of that statute is in the hands of the President and en-

trusted entirely to his discretion, it would not appear that any provisions of the proposed bill exercise a substantive effect on the section just quoted.

Section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, act of November 4, 1939 (54 Stat. 8; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 22, sec. 245j-6), provides, in part, as follows:

(a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 245j (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, or political subdivision thereof, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit (other than necessary credits accruing in connection with the transmission of telegraph, cable, wireless, and telephone services) to any such government, political subdivision, or person. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to the sale by any person within the United States to any person in a state named in any such proclamation of any articles or materials listed in a proclamation referred to in or issued under the authority of section 245j-1 (1).

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation.

(c) Whoever shall knowingly violate any of the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

In contradistinction to the scope of the Neutrality Act of 1937, interpreted in an unpublished opinion of the Attorney General to the Secretary of the Treasury, dated April 19, 1939, the 1939 statute covers extensions of credit by Government corporations. (See (1939) 85 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1655; (1939) 85 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 894.) If it is then possibly concluded that the United States as a legal entity is also within the purview of the act's prohibition, section 3 (b) of H. R. 1776 would suspend, pro tanto, section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939, since section 3 (b) of the lend-lease bill authorizes the transfer of defense articles on such terms as the President deems satisfactory. Such suspension, pro tanto, however, would not affect operation of the provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1939 on the conduct of persons other than the Government.

The so-called Johnson Act, act of April 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 574; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 804a), provides:

It shall be unlawful within the United States for any person to purchase or sell the bonds, securities, or other obligations of, any foreign government or political subdivision thereof or any organization or association acting for or on behalf of a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, issued after April 13, 1934, or to make any loan to such foreign government, political subdivision, organization, or association, except a renewal or adjustment of existing indebtedness while such government, political subdivision, organization, or association, is in default in the payment of its obligations, or any part thereof, to the Government of

the United States. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

As used in this section the term "person" includes individual, partnership, corporation, or association other than a public corporation created by or pursuant to special authorization of Congress, or a corporation in which the Government of the United States has or exercises a controlling interest through stock ownership or otherwise.

Since Government corporations are excluded from the operation of that act, a fortiori, the United States is not bound by its limitations. It cannot be maintained, therefore, that H. R. 1776 would suspend or modify the Johnson Act.

Section 3 (a) (2) and section 3 (a) (5) of the bill, authorizing transfer and release for export of defense articles to foreign governments, suspend section 3 of title V of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 222; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 33), set out in part (1) of this memorandum.

Section 14 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671, 76th Cong.), provides:

Notwithstanding the provision of any other law, no military or naval weapon, ship, boat, aircraft, munitions, supplies, or equipment, to which the United States has title, in whole or in part, or which have been contracted for, shall hereafter be transferred, exchanged, sold, or otherwise disposed of in any manner whatsoever unless the Chief of Naval Operations in the case of naval material, and the Chief of Staff of the Army in the case of military material, shall first certify that such material is not essential to the defense of the United States.

The Attorney General in an opinion to the President, dated August 27, 1940 ((1940) 39 op. Atty. Gen., No. 134), has intimated that the discretion of the military officers named is personal and may not be controlled by the President. Since the President is not similarly restricted in H. R. 1776, and since that statute is inconsistent with the provisions of H. R. 1776, it would appear that the limitation contained in the act of June 28, 1940, will be suspended.

Section 4 of the act of September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 787; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 50, sec. 165), provides in part:

No helium gas shall be exported from the United States, or from its Territories and possessions, until after application has been made to the Secretary of State and a license authorizing said exportation has been obtained from him on the joint recommendation of all of the members of the National Munitions Control Board and the Secretary of the Interior.

Enactment of the lend-lease bill would, through section 3 (a) (5), enable the President temporarily to transfer helium abroad to foreign governments without regard to the formal restrictions of the 1937 statute.

From time to time the Congress has enacted other statutes governing the disposition of war materials by the War and Navy Departments. Some pertinent sections will now be considered.

Section 2 of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 491), and section 5 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 599; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 492), provide respectively:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Navy to cause to be examined by competent boards of officers of the Navy, to be designated by him for that duty, all vessels on their return from foreign stations and all vessels in the United States as often as once in 3 years, when practicable; and said boards shall ascertain and report to the Secretary of the Navy, in writing, which of said vessels are unfit for further service, or, if the same are unfinished in any navy yard, those which cannot be finished without great and disproportionate expense, and shall in such report state fully the grounds and reasons for their opinion. And it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Navy, if he shall concur in opinion with said report, to strike the name of such vessel or vessels from the Navy Register and report the same to Congress.

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Navy to cause to be appraised, in such manner as may seem best, all vessels of the Navy which have been stricken from the Navy Register under the provisions of the preceding section. And if the said Secretary shall deem it for the best interest of the United States to sell any such vessel or vessels, he shall, after such appraisal, advertise for sealed proposals for the purchase of the same, for a period not less than 3 months, in such newspapers as other naval advertisements are published, setting forth the name and location and the appraised value of such vessel, and that the same will be sold for cash to the person or persons or corporation or corporations offering the highest price therefor above the appraised value thereof, and such proposals shall be opened on a day and hour and at a place named in said advertisement, and record thereof shall be made. The Secretary of the Navy shall require to accompany each bid or proposal a deposit in cash of not less than 10 percent of the amount of the offer or proposal, and also, except as provided in title 6, a bond with two or more sureties to be approved by him, conditioned for the payment of the remaining 90 percent of the amount of such offer or proposal within the time fixed in the advertisement. And in case default is made in the payment of the remaining 90 percent, or any part thereof, the Secretary, within the prescribed time thereof, shall advertise and resell said vessel under the provisions of this section. And in that event said cash deposit of 10 percent shall be considered as forfeited to the Government and shall be applied, first, to the payment of all costs and expenditures attending the advertisement and resale of said vessel; second, to the payment of the difference, if any, between the first and last sale of said vessel; and the balance, if any, shall be covered into the Treasury; *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent a suit upon said bond for breach of any of its conditions. Any vessel sold under the foregoing provisions shall be delivered to the purchaser upon the full payment to the Secretary of the Navy of the amount of such proposal or offer, and the net proceeds of such sale shall be covered into the Treasury. Except as otherwise provided by law, no vessel of the Navy shall hereafter be sold in any other manner than herein provided, or for less than such appraised value, unless the President of the United States shall otherwise direct in writing.

The Supreme Court has held that the terminal exception clause in the last quoted statute empowers the President not only to authorize a sale for less than the appraised value, but to direct a departure from the manner of sale as above set out. *Levinson v. United States* ((1922) 258 U. S. 198, 201) relied on in the opinion of the Attorney General to the President dated August 27, 1940 ((1940) 39 Op. Atty. Gen., No. 134). While by the terms of the statute the

President may direct a departure from its requirements, that is possible only when he acts by executing a writing. However, H. R. 1776 temporarily suspends the requirement of any writing.

Section 1 of the act of January 28, 1915 (38 Stat. 800; U. S. C., title 14, sec. 69), provides in part:

The President may from time to time cause such of the Coast Guard cutters as have become unfit for further service to be sold; and the proceeds shall be paid into the Treasury. * * *

Likewise here, section 3 (a) (2) of H. R. 1776 suspends the implied requirement of the 1915 statute that cutters sold must be unfit for further service.

The act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 605; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 493), provides:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to sell any or all of the auxiliary ships of the Navy classified as colliers, transports, tenders, supply ships, special types, and hospital ships, which are 18 years and over in age, which he deems unsuited to present needs of the Navy and which can be disposed of at an advantageous price, which shall not be less than 50 percent of their original cost, the money obtained from such sale to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The limitations as to age and unsuitability of the vessels to be transferred and the requirements with regard to sale price and the disposition to be made of its receipt are suspended by provisions of the proposed bill.

The act of March 2, 1906 (33 Stat. 837; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1372), provides:

No steamship in the transport service of the United States shall be sold or disposed of without the consent of Congress having been first had or obtained.

Clearly that statute is suspended by the lend-lease bill.

Section 2 of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296, as amended; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 544), provides in part:

No old material of the Navy shall after August 5, 1882, be sold or exchanged by the Secretary of the Navy, or by any officer of the Navy, which can be profitably used by reworking or otherwise in the construction or repair of vessels, their machinery, armor, armament, or equipment; but the same shall be stored and preserved for future use. And when any such old material cannot be profitably used as aforesaid, the same shall be appraised and sold at public auction after public notice and advertisement shall have been given according to law under such rules and regulations and in such manner as the said Secretary may direct.

The restrictions imposed by that statute must be considered suspended by section 3 (a) (2) of the proposed bill.

The act of July 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 850), as amended by the act of February 25, 1919 (40 Stat. 1173; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 314), provides:

The President is authorized, through the head of any executive department, to sell, upon such terms as the head of such department shall deem expedient, to any person, partnership, association, corporation, or any other department of the Government, or to any foreign state or government engaged in war against any government with which the United States is at war, any war supplies, material and equipment, and any byproducts thereof, and any building, plant, or factory, acquired since April 6, 1917, including the lands upon which the plant or factory may

be situated, for the production of such war supplies, materials, and equipment which, during the emergency existing July 9, 1918, may have been purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States; *Provided further*, That sales of guns and ammunition made under the authority contained in this section or any other act shall be limited to sales to other departments of the Government and to foreign states or governments engaged in war against any government with which the United States is at war, and to members of the National Rifle Association and of other recognized associations organized in the United States for the encouragement of small-arms target practice. * * *

If there are war materials falling into the category set forth in the above provision available for transfer as defense articles to foreign governments, the limitation with respect to eligible transferees is apparently done away with by section 3 of H. R. 1776.

The act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 105, U. S. C., title 1, sec. 1265), provides:

In addition to the delivery of the property authorized prior to July 11, 1919, to be delivered to the Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture and the Post Office Department of the Government, the Secretary of War is authorized to sell any surplus supplies, including motortrucks and automobiles, on July 11, 1919, owned by and in the possession of the Government for the use of the War Department to any State or municipal subdivision thereof, or to any corporation or individual upon such terms as may be deemed best.

If that statute might be construed as providing by implication that foreign governments are excluded as purchasers, its limitation is suspended by the provisions of the lend-lease bill.

Section 1241 of the Revised Statutes of 1873 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1261) provides:

The President may cause to be sold any military stores which, upon proper inspection or survey, appear to be damaged or unsuitable for the public service. Such inspection or survey shall be made by officers designated by the Secretary of War, and the sales shall be made under regulations prescribed by him.

The act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 949; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1262), provides:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell to any State or foreign government with which the United States was at peace on June 5, 1920, upon such terms as he may deem expedient, any matériel, supplies, or equipment pertaining to the Military Establishment, except foodstuffs, as or may be found to be surplus, which are not needed for military purposes and for which there is no adequate domestic market.

Under the proposed bill there is no requirement that defense articles to be transferred to foreign governments must be damaged, unsuitable for the public service, surplus, not needed for military purposes, or that there must be no adequate domestic market for their disposition. The implicit limitations of those sections are, therefore, suspended by section 3 (a) (2) of the lend-lease bill.

The act of July 26, 1919 (41 Stat. 272; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1252), provides:

No loan of tents shall be made except to the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Confederate Veterans, the United Spanish War Veterans, and to recognized organiza-

tions of veterans of the late World War by whatever name they may be known.

Assumed that tents are included within the category, defense articles, enactment of H. R. 1776 would suspend that statute to permit transfer of tents by the President to foreign governments.

3. Reconditioning of foreign-owned defense articles within the United States

The operation of section 11 of the Criminal Code, set out above in part (1) of this memorandum, appears to be suspended by section 3 (a) (3) of H. R. 1776.

Section 12 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 24) provides:

Whoever, within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, increases or augments, or procures to be increased or augmented, or knowingly is concerned in increasing or augmenting, the force of any ship of war, cruiser, or other armed vessel which, at the time of her arrival within the United States, was a ship of war, or cruiser, or armed vessel, in the service of any foreign prince or state, or of any colony, district, or people, or belonging to the subjects or citizens of any such prince or state, colony, district, or people, the same being at war with any foreign prince or state, or of any colony, district, or people, with whom the United States are at peace, by adding to the number of the guns of such vessel, or by changing those on board of her for guns of a larger caliber, or by adding thereto any equipment solely applicable to war, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 and imprisoned not more than 1 year.

Likewise, the prohibition of that statute is suspended by section 3 (a) (3) of the lend-lease bill.

Section 17 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 29) provides:

The several collectors of the customs shall detain any vessel manifestly built for warlike purposes, and about to depart the United States, or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, the cargo of which principally consists of arms and munitions of war, when the number of men shipped on board, or other circumstances, render it probable that such vessel is intended to be employed by the owners to cruise or commit hostilities upon the subjects, citizens, or property of any foreign prince or state, or of any colony, district, or people with whom the United States are at peace, until the decision of the President is had thereon, or until the owner gives such bond and security as is required of the owners of armed vessels by section 28 of this title.

A proper construction of that statute would seem to require a finding by the President, before he orders the release of a detained ship, that the vessel is not about to engage in any of the prohibited activities. Section 3 (a) (3) of H. R. 1776 would suspend the restrictions of the above-quoted section 17 when the President has authorized the Secretary of the Navy to recondition armed vessels (owned by foreign governments) for the commission of hostilities.

Section 11 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 22, sec. 245j-10) provides:

Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a foreign state will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its

citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe. Whenever, in his judgment, the conditions which have caused him to issue his proclamation have ceased to exist, he shall revoke his proclamation and the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation.

Pursuant to the authority there granted, the President, in Proclamation No. 2375, dated November 4, 1939, proclaimed:

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the foregoing provision of section 11 of the joint resolution approved November 4, 1939, do by this proclamation find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States, exclusive of the Canal Zone, by the submarines of a foreign belligerent state, both commercial submarines and submarines which are ships of war, will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, and to promote the security of the United States.

And I do further declare and proclaim that it shall hereafter be unlawful for any submarine of France, Germany, Poland, or the United Kingdom—India, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, or the Union of South Africa—to enter ports or territorial waters of the United States, exclusive of the Canal Zone, except submarines of the said belligerent states which are forced into such ports or territorial waters of the United States by force majeure; and in such cases of force majeure, only when such submarines enter ports or territorial waters of the United States while running on the surface with conning tower and superstructure above water and flying the flags of the foreign belligerent states of which they are vessels. Such submarines may depart from ports or territorial waters of the United States only while running on the surface with conning tower and superstructure above water and flying the flags of the foreign belligerent states of which they are vessels.

And I do hereby enjoin upon all officers of the United States, charged with the execution of the laws thereof, the utmost diligence in preventing violations of the said joint resolution, and this my proclamation issued thereunder, and in bringing to trial and punishment any offenders against the same.

And I do hereby revoke my Proclamation No. 2371, issued by me on October 18, 1939, in regard to the use of ports or territorial waters of the United States by submarines of foreign belligerent states.

This proclamation shall continue in full force and effect unless and until modified, revoked, or otherwise terminated, pursuant to law.

While by the terms of section 11 and of the proclamation itself, the restrictions on use of American ports by submarines may be revoked under certain circumstances, revocation apparently requires a formal act rather than a mere informal authorization. In consequence, section 3 (a) (3) of H. R. 1776 may be said to suspend section 11 and render inoperative the proclamation to the extent of permitting the President informally to authorize reconditioning of foreign-owned defense articles within the United States.

It is clear, nevertheless, that section 11 and the proclamation would remain in full force in respect of all situations where the President does not order otherwise under section 3 (a) (3) of the lend-lease bill.

4. Acquisition by the United States of defense articles abroad

Because of the expressed purpose and content of section 8 of H. R. 1776, it seems almost unnecessary to mention that the advertising and bidding requirements of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), are inapplicable. The similar stipulation of the act of March 3, 1893, 27 Stat. 732 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 566) concerning purchases of gun steel or armor for the Navy must be regarded as suspended for the purposes of the lend-lease bill. The above-mentioned statute provides:

No contract for the purchase of gun steel or armor for the Navy shall be made until the subject matter of the same shall have been submitted to public competition by the Department by advertisement.

It is also clear that the provisions of the so-called Buy-American Act, act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520; U. S. C., title 41, secs. 10a-10c), do not control Government purchases under section 8 of the lend-lease bill.

Section 1 of the act of June 19, 1912 (37 Stat. 137; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 324), requires the insertion in specified public contracts of a clause prohibiting the employment of any laborer or mechanic for more than 8 hours in any day of the week. The Comptroller General has ruled that that provision is inapplicable to contracts entered into by the Government in foreign countries and involving the services of foreign workmanship ((1939) 19 Comp. Gen. 516). By analogy, the so-called Walsh-Healey Act, act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 41, secs. 35-45), requiring compliance with certain fair labor standards on the part of persons supplying materials, and so forth, to the United States by stipulation for inclusion in the contract of representations by the contractor of his compliance with those standards—should be held inapplicable to acquisitions in foreign countries made pursuant to the authority of section 8 of H. R. 1776. In the case of each statute the purpose of enactment was to protect American labor, while in the case of contracts under section 8 the employment of foreign labor only would be contemplated. In no way, then, would the provisions of the 8-hour law or the Walsh-Healey Act be affected by the lend-lease bill.

Owing to the informality of transaction apparently permissible under section 8 of H. R. 1776, it is probable that the restriction imposed by the act of June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 796; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 219), is suspended from acquisition of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the specified foreign countries. That statute provides:

Whenever contracts in excess of \$500 in amount which are not to be performed within 60 days are made on behalf of the Government by the Secretary of War, or by officers

authorized by him to make them, such contracts shall be reduced to writing and signed by the contracting parties. In all other cases contracts shall be entered into under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

Section 307 of title III of the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 689; U. S. C., title 19, sec. 1307), provides:

All goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor or/and forced labor or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision.

It is not impossible that in some of the foreign countries specified by section 8 of the lend-lease bill arms, ammunition, and implements of war are produced under conditions of "forced labor" within the meaning of the statute prohibiting importation into the United States of convict-made goods. In consequence, section 8 of the bill suspends that statute to the extent that it would touch the specified defense purchases authorized to be made by the Secretaries of War and of the Navy with the President's approval.

5. Disposition of moneys received in consideration for defense articles transferred

In the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, act of June 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 1224; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 725, et seq.), provision was made for deposit into the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts, of the proceeds of sales of various military supplies, stores, and so forth. See sections 4 and 10 of the act (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 725c, 725i). Among the appropriations affected were those contained in section 2748 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 14, sec. 69)—proceeds from sale of Coast Guard cutters available for purchase of new cutters—and in the act of April 23, 1904 (33 Stat. 276; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 73)—moneys derived from disposition of Army ordnance available for replacement purposes.

Section 3618 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 487), provides, with certain exceptions not here applicable:

All proceeds of sales of old material, condemned stores, supplies, or other public property of any kind, * * * shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, on account of "proceeds of Government property," and shall not be withdrawn or applied, except in consequence of a subsequent appropriation made by law.

The act of January 22, 1923 (42 Stat. 1142; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 74), provides:

The net proceeds of sales of useless ordnance material by the Navy Department shall be covered into the Treasury as "Miscellaneous receipts."

The act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 605; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 493), provides:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to sell any or all of the auxiliary ships of the Navy classified as colliers, transports, tenders, supply ships, special types, and hospital ships, which are 18 years and over in age, which he deems unsuited to present needs

of the Navy and which can be disposed of at an advantageous price, which shall not be less than 50 percent of their original cost, the money obtained from such sale to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Under the terms of section 6 (b) of the lend-lease bill, moneys received from foreign governments in consideration for defense articles, and so forth, may revert to the appropriation out of which expenditures for such defense articles were made, and are then available for expenditure for the purpose of the original appropriation during the fiscal year in which the moneys are received and the ensuing fiscal year. It is apparent, therefore, that the miscellaneous receipts provisions of the other statutes referred to above are inapplicable.

It should be borne in mind in considering the effect of H. R. 1776 that it suspends existing Federal statutes only to the extent that it covers the same subject matter or is inconsistent with their provisions in terms of specific situations, and only for the period in which the bill, if enacted, remains in force.

It should be borne in mind that these various statutes are suspended only to the extent that they cover the same subject matter, or the extent to which they are inconsistent with the provisions of H. R. 1776.

The statutes mentioned are not the only ones applying to the disposition of material. I have recited some of them in the hope that it might impress you with the complexity and the maze of red tape under which the War and Navy Departments, and the various executives have been laboring.

Imagine, if you will, the staff of lawyers the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff of the Army would have to have at their elbow to advise them whether or not any contemplated action by them violated any of the minute provisions of any of these many acts. Is it any wonder that there is confusion and delay? In passing these various statutes at various times, the Congress was without doubt motivated by the best of intentions to protect the interest of the Army and Navy, as well as the taxpayer, but it is inconceivable to me that in the present crisis the Congress wants to hamper and restrain the President with such a maze of red tape. It is the duty of Congress to give clear authority to assure the prompt disposal of material, where such disposal will be helpful and vital to our own defense.

The same thing is true of our production efforts. Every possible effort should be made to simplify every step in the production of munitions. The plan is to make the United States virtually the sole purchasing unit for war materials to be ordered from the manufacturers in this country; that the Government shall thus become what might be called one great funnel through which all the production of such materials in this country will be ordered, and through which the materials will flow when finished and following that the United States Government itself will be in a position to distribute and apportion these munitions to ourselves and to the other democracies as best suits

the interests of our country. This plan will eliminate the competition of many different purchasing agents from different countries. At present there are perhaps a dozen different foreign purchasing commissions in this country. Under the contemplated plan, the manufacturer would deal almost entirely with the one purchaser—the Government.

For 20 years Army and Navy officials have been making studies and have devised a well-ordered system of placing contracts, and it is further contemplated that in the placement of all future contracts only those items will be manufactured which the Army and Navy of the United States can themselves use and with which the armed forces of our country are familiar as to utilization. For instance, rifles and guns of only the caliber that have been adopted by our armed forces would be produced. Only such ammunitions as could be used in the firearms adopted by us could be authorized, and so on down all along the line. This in itself is of tremendous importance to the future defense of the United States, and it will tremendously speed and increase production, and finally the United States Government would have complete control over the distribution of the munitions after they have been produced. Whatever we needed ourselves we would keep, and whatever we could spare or dispose of to best help our defense would be left to the discretion of the United States Government. Is this not a better plan than the alternative suggested of making a direct loan of \$2,000,000,000? With the competition which would ensue between the British Government's purchasing commission and the officials of the United States Government, more delay, more confusion, and less defense for the United States would result; and insofar as a loan of \$2,000,000,000 is concerned, we could not entertain much hope of ever being repaid, but the plan of H. R. 1776 is that the United States shall impose terms and conditions upon which any foreign government receives aid, and that these terms and conditions will be satisfactory to the President and of benefit to the United States, either by payment or repayment in kind or property or other direct or indirect benefit. Surely this is to be preferred over merely making what will amount to an outright gift of \$2,000,000,000.

The more one studies the provisions of H. R. 1776 and contemplates the plan of operation under it, the more certain he becomes that it is definitely to the best interest of the United States for the Congress to speedily make its provisions the law of the land.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, before entering upon a discussion of the pending measure I want to make my position perfectly clear upon the issue of aid to Britain. I am not an isolationist. I would like to be. That is, I would like to feel that it is possible for this country to live entirely independent of the remainder of the world. I would like to believe that what goes on in other quarters of the globe is no concern of ours. I would like

to believe that we can shut our eyes and our ears to what is going on in Europe and Asia and dismiss the matter by the simple statement, "It is a dirty mess and we will have nothing to do with it." Unfortunately, if we are honest with ourselves we can do none of these things.

There has been no time in our history when we have been free from the effects of what has gone on in the remainder of the world. The complete answer to those who contend that we are not concerned and are not affected by what happens on other continents is that we are today engaged in a national-defense program on a scale heretofore unequalled by any nation in the history of the world. The reason for this program is that we cannot isolate ourselves, we cannot ignore what is going on in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and we must make these tremendous preparations to meet situations which have arisen there and which vitally affect our national existence. That this viewpoint is recognized by all our people is shown by the fact that the defense program has the support of practically everyone, no matter what his previous views on international policy may have been.

I do not believe that this is our war. It arose over matters concerning which we have heretofore assumed no responsibility and over which we had no control. Nevertheless, it would be foolish to say that we do not have an interest in its outcome and that a British victory will not have a very different meaning for us than a German victory would have. Does anyone think for a minute that we would have embarked upon this great defense program if we were sure that Britain would win the war? This program, which may eventually involve an expenditure of between forty billions and fifty billions of dollars, is being undertaken as insurance against a Hitler victory. If England wins, it will be materially lessened and modified.

For these reasons I favor aid to Britain short of war. As long as Britain has or can procure dollar exchange to pay for war supplies I think she should pay for them. When funds are no longer available, then we should provide other means by which these supplies can be secured. I prefer outright grants or gifts to an extension of credit. Our experience with war loans ought to convince us that some other method should be used. It is almost a certainty that any war indebtedness incurred by Britain to this country will never be repaid. Because of our interest in the outcome of the struggle, however, we can well afford within reasonable limits to make advancements with no expectation of repayment. This is on the assumption that such advancements will bring about a British victory and save us the expenditure of many billions of dollars in the future.

I believe that a great majority of the American people share the views which I have just expressed. Those who are sponsoring the present legislation are attempting to sell it to this great group of our people on the ground that it is the only effective way of aiding Britain and other countries fighting the totalitarian nations at this time. I believe that many millions of people in this country

have been deceived by the ballyhoo and propaganda for this bill into thinking that this is true. I think that accounts for most of the popular support which the bill has received up to this time. I further believe that if people generally understood that Britain can be aided effectively without legislation of this type and understood fully the nature of the powers which are being relinquished by Congress to the Executive there would be a tremendous upsurge of opposition to the measure.

The passage of this bill is not essential in extending aid to Britain. Its initial result will be to establish a dictatorship in peacetime, its secondary effect will be to drag us into a war for which neither the Nation or its people are prepared.

Let me deal first with the question of aid to Britain. Up to this moment the British Purchasing Commission has had no difficulty whatever in securing for that nation such war material as is available. The difficulty that has occurred lies in our own failure to get into extensive production those items of equipment which were most desired. Later, when our vast industrial machine begins to function, there will arise the question of funds with which to pay for these supplies. That is a question, however, which can easily be solved without recourse to the drastic powers which are given to the President under this bill. As far as the urgent and immediate situation is concerned, there is not one thing which can be done under this bill which cannot be done without it, unless the proponents of the legislation are mistaken in their definition of the powers it gives the President.

This measure takes from the British Purchasing Commission, which has been doing a good job, the procurement of British supplies and turns that responsibility over to the President of the United States. I believe that the British Purchasing Commission working with our Office of Production Management can do as good and perhaps a better job of procurement than can be done if the President is forced to assume the responsibility for meeting not only the needs of this country, but of Britain, Greece, China, or any other country which he decides should be aided in the interest of our defense.

There is a greater reason, however, why I feel that we are making a mistake in giving the President the responsibility and the power to furnish war materials to Britain and every other country which may be able to convince the President that it is fighting in our defense. If we furnish to Britain, China, or any other country such supplies as they deem necessary for the conduct of their war, that is one thing. Such a policy does not make their war our war or tie us up in any way with future developments. If, however, the President of the United States undertakes the responsibility of saying what supplies Britain shall receive, what shall go to Greece, what shall go to China, to the Free French forces, to Turkey, or to any other nation which might conceivably enter the war, then in that event the President becomes the master strategist of the war. He has the power, if he cares to exercise it, of determining policies, of saying where campaigns shall

be fought, of what supplies will be used, and the character of the campaign to be conducted. In this age of machine warfare, the man who operates the arsenal and distributes the supplies from it is the man who dictates the course of the war. When this measure becomes law, the President of the United States rather than Winston Churchill, will take over the conduct of the war. From that time on it will be our war. We will be committed to its success or failure and will be bound to go through with it to the bitter end, if it takes 10 years and 5,000,000 men. In other words, if we pass this bill and the President exercises the powers given him, we are in the war and in it to the finish.

I know that there are those in this country and perhaps there are those in Congress who believe that we should get into the war as a belligerent. The great majority of our people, however, while for aid to Britain, are bitterly opposed to getting into the war or taking steps which might logically be expected to involve us. It may be entirely proper that consideration now be given to the question as to whether or not we will enter the war. If that question is to be considered, however, it should be debated openly and frankly. The American people have a right to express their opinions, and Members of Congress the right to vote their convictions as to whether or not we become a belligerent. The present bill will put us in the war in the end just as surely as if Congress had voted a declaration of war. We will be in for all purposes and to the finish. We will be in without any vote in Congress on the question and without the great majority of our people having any idea that this momentous step has been taken.

We are unprepared to go to war from the standpoint of matériel and equipment. Our people are psychologically and morally unprepared for war at this time. Let us look at this thing with our eyes open. Let us be realistic. This Congress would vote overwhelmingly against a declaration of war if the proposition were put up to it today. Our people would vote overwhelmingly against war if they had an opportunity to express themselves; yet we are preparing in what we still call a democracy to take steps which are equivalent to a declaration of war and are investing the President with powers which could only be justified if we were in a state of war and would be debatable even then.

I realize that if we were in a state of war strong arguments might be made as to the necessity for giving the President the powers contained in this bill, notwithstanding the fact that they are greater powers than the English people have seen fit to give Churchill after a year and a half of war. Granting these powers, however, after we are in war and granting them now is an entirely different situation. Once Congress declares war our policy is determined. We are in it to the finish. The paramount problem is to function as effectively as possible in the waging of war. It is not a question of determining policy, for policy has already been determined. Rather it is a

problem of the choice of methods to carry that policy into effect.

Here, however, we have an entirely different situation. The policy of the country has not been determined. Congress does not consciously determine it in this bill. Congress avoids the determination of a policy, but gives to the President vast and far-reaching powers in the field of policy making. In this bill the President is not only given the power to procure the construction and manufacture of new defense articles for any country to whom he may see fit to deliver them but he has the power to give away our Navy, our air force, and all of the equipment of our Army. He can give away every bit of the defense material, the construction of which has been authorized for our own defense. Within a period of slightly over 2 years he can make contracts and agreements which can be carried out for an indefinite period far into the future. To this extent the time limitation in the bill means nothing. In the end the powers granted in this bill mean power to get us into the war. It is almost incomprehensible that such powers should be delegated by a legislative body in a democracy in peacetime.

If it be granted that it is the will of the majority of the people of this country to aid Britain, then this legislation can be justified only on the ground that it offers the only way to extend such aid. That is definitely not the case. There are other methods, the simplest and easiest of which is to permit the British purchasing commission to carry on just as it has as long as its resources hold out and when those fail to make available to it credit or preferably grants in whatever amount the Congress of the United States feels to be necessary. Britain will not suffer under such a policy. The limit as to the amount of aid which can be given will in that case, just as it is now, be determined by our ability to produce and the extent of British need. Irrespective of the method we take of making it available to them under that kind of a program, it will be Britain's material and Britain's war. If we pass this bill, it will be our material and our war.

We do not want to make this our war. The American people want peace. They are anxious to contribute their part in bringing about world peace. No man in these times can see far into the future. God grant that our Nation may be able to remain at peace. If, however, the changing course of world events should make it seem that our best interests will be served by becoming a belligerent, then the question should be faced fairly and squarely. It should be debated in Congress, in the press, and in every public forum. Finally, with our eyes open and with a full realization of the consequence of our action we should decide the question, having in mind one thought: What is the best policy for our beloved country? [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, on the 3d day of January 1941 we, as Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress, took an oath to defend and support the Constitu-

tion of the United States. We were not sent here by our constituents to obey the instructions of, or comply with, the desires of someone else. We came here bound only by our oath of office to honestly and fearlessly discharge our constitutional functions, not in the light of what is best for us from a partisan standpoint, not in the light of what is best for other nations of the world, but in the light of what is best for the United States of America, and any Member of this body who casts his vote for H. R. 1776 should be able with a clear conscience to say to himself, "I have performed my constitutional duty for the best interest of the United States of America," and that I cannot do as this bill is presented to us.

This bill is the most extraordinary, and in my opinion unconstitutional, delegation of legislative authority that has ever been proposed by any President to the Congress of the United States either in peacetime or in wartime. That it is a departure in the history of lawmaking in this body is beyond the pale of argument.

Notwithstanding the fact that we have passed through several very critical periods in our national history, no President has ever asked or been granted authority that begins to compare with that provided in this bill. During the War of 1812, when the very existence of this Nation was at stake, when the Capitol had been burned and the officers of the Federal Government were fugitives, made so by the fortunes of war, no one ever suggested that the ordinary processes of democratic government were not sufficient to meet every issue then facing this Nation. Even during the Civil War, when the enemies of the Republic were knocking at the gates of the Capitol and had reached Fort Stevens, now within the limits of the city of Washington, the immortal Lincoln did not ask Congress to surrender all its power and authority over national defense to him. But now, with the enemy 3,000 miles away, and with our high-ranking military and naval authorities agreeing that we are in no danger of immediate attack, we are feverishly asked to delegate to the President authority which contains a complete pattern for a military dictatorship in this country just as powerful and arbitrary as any dictatorship existing anywhere in the world today.

This bill describes the defense articles over which it gives the President power to do with as he chooses as any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat; any machinery, facility, tool, material, or supply necessary for the manufacture, production, processing, repair, servicing, or operation of any article; any component material or part; any other commodity or article for defense; and, I repeat, any other commodity or article for defense. This means, if I can understand the English language, that if in his discretion he so desires, all the resources of the United States would be defense articles under the absolute control of the President.

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, this bill provides the President with authority to control every farm, every factory, every ship, every piece of equipment, and every human being in the United States. It provides him with au-

thority to sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of our entire Navy, the whole equipment of our Army, and every airplane we now possess or hereafter may acquire. It provides him with authority to open our ports as bases for foreign nations. It provides him with a blank check of at least \$20,000,000,000 which he can spend without further action of Congress. It provides him with authority to purchase war materials from any country in the world and transfer them to any other country he might desire. It provides him with authority to manufacture in Government-controlled arsenals, factories, and shipyards, or otherwise procure, any defense article for any country whose defense he deems vital to the defense of the United States. It provides him with authority to release for export to any nation, under terms and conditions that he alone may approve, any such defense article. Section 9 of the bill provides the President with authority from time to time to make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of the act.

It was the results of just such provisions as section 9 of this bill that caused the Seventy-sixth Congress to pass the Walter-Logan bill in an effort to relieve the people of this Nation from the all-embracing dictatorial powers assumed from time to time as a result of the rules and regulations promulgated by the various departments and agencies of the Government.

What happened to the Walter-Logan bill? You all know that when it reached the President, he vetoed it. He did not want any of his departments and agencies to be faced with the probability of surrendering any of the power and authority they had assumed under the provisions of language exactly like that which is contained in section 9 of this bill.

Is there any Member of this House that doubts for one moment that the rules and regulations promulgated under this section will not be as far-reaching as the extraordinary powers therein specifically delegated to the President? If there is, take a look at the rules and regulations already promulgated by this administration under similar authority in other bills that have been passed by Congress.

Most dangerous of all is the authority this bill gives the President, coupled with his power as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to commit acts of war and make war against foreign nations without the consent of the Congress or the people of the Nation.

Even in Great Britain, enveloped in total war, Parliament has not been asked to yield so much of its power to its Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, and remember this, Parliament's control over Churchill is absolute because it can remove him from office in an hour's time if it so desires. But once this Congress delegates the authority contained in this bill to the President, it will only revert back to the people, through the Congress, only on the expiration of the time limit placed therein or by repeal which may have to be passed over a Presidential veto.

As the full implications and far-reaching potentialities of this bill become apparent the American people are going to realize, too late for them to do anything about it, if Congress passes this bill, that they have been stripped of their freedom and that they have been led as a blindfolded and deceived people step by step into war.

Only you and I, as Members of Congress, can prevent this usurpation of authority and this last master step to war—and if we fail—the next time our people accept a pledge as they did in the last election they will see to it that they get more valuable security than they got last November.

There is not a Member on this floor who hates Hitler and all he stands for more than I do. I am of English extraction. My grandfather was an English sailor. I have relatives who are citizens of and live in England at the present moment—and of course I want to aid England—but I want to do it without weakening our own defense; without involving this Nation in war; without the Congress surrendering its constitutional functions and duties, and without granting dictatorial powers to the President—and such aid to England can be speedily accomplished without involving this Nation in war by amending H. R. 1776 to conform to the provisions of the report of the minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee or by substituting therefor H. R. 2790, introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

If the proponents of this so-called lend-lease bill will permit it to be amended as provided in either the minority report or H. R. 2790, so as to maintain inviolate the constitutional powers and duties of Congress and protect the people in their God-given rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States, I will give it my wholehearted support. But if they will not—I am not willing to gamble every dollar of wealth, every dollar of property, and the life of every young man in America to satisfy a will for power.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, like every other Member of the House, I have given this bill a great deal of earnest and prayerful thought. I have tried to banish both sympathy and prejudice from my mind and come to a logical conclusion based on premises I believe to be true.

There is general agreement on certain facts. Great Britain is engaged in a desperate struggle for existence against a foe stronger in manpower and in all categories of military weapons except naval vessels. Her own capacity for the production of arms and munitions is inferior to that of her enemy. Therefore it is almost a certainty that Great Britain will be crushed without prompt and substantial aid from abroad, and we are the only important source of supply.

Only a few dispute that the success of the Axis Powers would constitute a grave threat to our American institutions and way of life. There is an almost universal demand in this country that we mobilize our human and material resources for

national defense, that we build a Navy strong enough to defend ourselves and protect our friendly South American neighbors in both the Atlantic and the Pacific. People fear aggression from abroad but not from Great Britain, Greece, or China.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] described the danger so eloquently on Monday his words are worth repeating:

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 a new dark 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.

I think the gentleman from New Jersey has drawn too dark a picture, but there can be no doubt that our vital interests are on the side of Britain. She desperately needs war materials, which we alone can give her. It is clear that we must supply them.

Many Members have stated that they favor all aid to Britain and the other victims of aggressor nations "short of war." That is an adroit catch phrase, but it means very little. No man can know the last step short of war until after it has been taken, just as one cannot know the straw that breaks the camel's back until the back breaks. I do not believe the increased aid to Britain contemplated by this bill will enlarge the danger of our active involvement in war. Although I was one of those who voted for the Neutrality Act and against the lifting of the arms embargo, I realize that today it is foolish to attempt even the pretense of neutrality. Hitler will turn his guns on us if and when he deems it to his advantage. There is far less danger of it while Britain fights than after she lays down her arms.

Not only the sentiment but the best opinion in this country is opposed to sending our armed forces across the Atlantic. Although we fervently wish for Britain's success for her sake as well as our own, it is not our war she is fighting, and we are by no means willing to concede that we cannot successfully repel any invader who attempts to set foot on American soil either on the Atlantic or the Pacific coast, or both. The safer course, however, is for us to help Great Britain and the other nations resisting the Axis Powers now.

We have already been committed to a policy of material aid to Britain and that policy has popular support. The immediate problem is how best to give it. The bill confers on the President the power to determine what defense articles shall be transferred, on what terms, and to what nations, provided he deems such transactions to be in the interest of our own defense. These are questions which we

must trust the Chief Executive to decide in consultation with his chief military and naval advisers, whether we like it or not. In the very nature of things, the two Houses of Congress could not determine such questions without endless debate and dangerous delays, even if they had the constitutional authority to do so. The power to conduct negotiations with foreign nations and make prompt decisions can only be exercised by one supreme head, and that must be the man in the White House.

There is much to be said in favor of the alternative plan of extending aid to Great Britain by the making of loans of money or credit on fixed terms and for specific purposes. I believe, however, that better results can be obtained by the direct transfer of war materials. Our gigantic defense effort and our aid to Britain can be coordinated, the industrial resources can be organized on a Nation-wide basis, competition between various purchasing agents, and working at cross purposes can be eliminated under the provisions of this bill.

The power to be conferred upon the President is stupendous and frightening. Every reasonable limitation should be imposed and I should like to see a number of safeguarding amendments adopted in addition to those offered by the committee. I think the powers should be granted for a definite period with the proviso that they may be terminated at an earlier date if Congress shall so determine by concurrent resolution. I think the President should not be given power to transfer naval vessels if by so doing the strength of the Navy will be weakened below its present strength in any of its categories.

I do not believe the President has any intention of depleting our own defenses; I do not believe he desires war. No sane man elected to his high office by the American people could so betray his sacred trust.

There is no safe course for us. War is raging on three continents. Unpredictable things have happened and events are moving with incredible swiftness. We are witnessing a second World War and perhaps a world revolution, too. We cannot look into the future and plan our movements, but we must act to meet exigencies as they arise. Despite its dangers and imperfections the bill before us will go a long way toward solving our immediate problem of arming ourselves and promoting our national defense by aiding those who are fighting the totalitarian powers.

All the nations of the world are watching our proceedings this week. As Members of the House we are confronted with the alternative of voting for this bill with the best amendments we can obtain, or of voting against it. We know the bill will pass. Every vote for it will strengthen and hearten the nations we wish to help and every vote against it will give encouragement to our potential enemies. I regret that the President and his advisers did not call into consultation a group of thoughtful and patriotic citizens representing divergent points of view for the purpose of working out a bill that could receive practically unanimous support. It

could have been done because there is little disagreement among us as to objectives. With the situation as it is I feel it my duty to vote for the bill.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is one from which momentous consequences may come for every American citizen. Its far-reaching implications must be appraised for each one of us in terms of what is best for the Nation as a whole, regardless of any other consideration. It must be considered against the background of the tragic world situation and in the light of all available evidence, including the most expert military and naval opinion available.

Like our distinguished and beloved colleague from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], I am neither an isolationist nor an interventionist.

I favor every possible aid to Great Britain, in her valiant fight, consistent with our security. I favor, as stated repeatedly during the campaign, every possible aid to Britain consistent with our needs for national defense and keeping out of war. I favor giving the President any legislative power which may be necessary in this connection.

I am opposed, however, to stripping ourselves of items essential for national defense. I am opposed to plunging this country into war, lamentably unprepared as we are. I am opposed to the delegation of legislative power to the President unnecessary to assure maximum aid to Great Britain.

I regret that the bill under consideration has been offered to the House in its present form. I regret it because I am wholeheartedly in favor of its ostensible purpose—aid to Great Britain short of war. I regret it because, in my judgment, the bill, in its present form, is not the type of legislation which is best calculated to assure the desired purpose, either from the standpoint of America or from the standpoint of Great Britain.

In my judgment, there is a far better and far simpler way in which to assure every possible aid to Great Britain with minimum risk to America. Britain does not need this form of lend-lease bill. To accomplish the main objective of this legislation, she needs two things and two things only. She needs, first, the maximum industrial production at the earliest possible moment under the leadership of Mr. Knudsen. She needs, second, the assurance of financial assistance when her dollar balances become exhausted, to enable her to purchase all of that production, or other articles of defense, which we can safely spare. The simple and straightforward way to meet these needs is by authorizing an appropriation not exceeding \$2,000,000,000, or such other sum as the Congress may determine, for loans or credits to Great Britain to make possible the purchases in question. A simple provision of this character, with such additional features as may be desirable, would assure Great Britain of the maximum aid which can be safely given, would relieve Great Brit-

ain of direction or dictation from the White House, would reduce to a minimum the risk of being plunged into a war though woefully unprepared, and would retain in the Congress the legislative power which properly belongs to it.

I can see no aid which could safely be given under the pending proposal which could not be given under the proposal revised in this manner. I believe the revised proposal would be far better for England and far safer for America. I shall support proposals for revision or amendment which will be offered to this end.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], a member of the committee, 15 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be an interesting question if it were not too embarrassing to ask the members of the committee who are here this afternoon who have read these hearings through from cover to cover to raise their hands, but I am not going to ask that question. I do, however, want to urge those of you who have not read the hearings—and I am afraid there are many—to do so before you vote on this important legislation. I recommend it for the reason that I believe many of you perhaps who intend to vote for this legislation will do so expecting to find substantiating evidence for your vote in these hearings. It is not available. As you study them after the vote you will be surprised to find that that which you expected to find in the hearings is not there.

I believe one of the conclusions you will quickly arrive at will be a surprising one, and that is that witness after witness for the administration was quick to disclaim any responsibility for authorship of the bill. The first witness who appeared before our committee was Secretary Hull, and Secretary Hull was the first witness to disclaim responsibility for this legislation. I quote to you from the hearings, on page 18, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] talking to Mr. Hull—

May I ask you, Mr. Secretary, whether your office drew this bill, or whether you drew it?

Secretary HULL. I have stated three times before that the Treasury Department drew up this bill.

With that background, it is not surprising that when Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, was before our committee, he was asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] whether or not he had drawn up this legislation. I quote you now from page 57 of the hearings, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] talking to Mr. Morgenthau—

This is the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] talking to Mr. Morgenthau:

Am I correct in saying that you initiated the bill in the Treasury Department?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. No; I do not think you are correct.

Therefore, exit Mr. Hull; exit Mr. Morgenthau, and we go to the next witness for the administration, Mr. Stimson, Secretary of War, the man who, in connection with a real national-defense bill, should certainly be consulted and should have a large part in drawing the

bill. He is interrogated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]:

Mr. TINKHAM. Now, I would like to know whether you helped draw this bill?
Secretary STIMSON. No, sir.

Exit Mr. Stimson.

In order to make this more conclusive, I want to quote another question asked Secretary Stimson by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], a member of the committee:

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Secretary, I have some very simple questions.

Oh, how cleverly the art of woman disarms her adversaries.

Here is the question:

We learn from the testimony we have had that the Secretaries did not sit in on the original drafting of the bill. Am I right in that?

Mr. STIMSON. I did not.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with a very strange and a very unique situation—a situation in which the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, charged with the responsibility of maintaining the peaceful neutral relations of America, refuses to admit that he had anything to do with drafting the legislation now before us. We are confronted with a situation in which the Secretary of the Treasury, who had been charged with initiating the bill, who is charged also with the responsibility of rescuing this country from bankruptcy, if he can, disclaims any authorship of the bill. Stranger than that, we are confronted with a situation in which the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, a man certainly who by his belligerent advocacy of quick and vigorous steps, shorter and shorter of war, marks him as a man who would not disclaim any responsibility in this respect, the Secretary of War charged with defending these United States, a Secretary of War who must operate under a bill labeled "for purposes of national defense," repeatedly states he had nothing to do with drafting the bill. He said he did not see it until its draft was completed—and so it goes. Secretary after Secretary testified in that fashion.

It may be that those portions of the bill which say "for other purposes" have some well-known consultants who helped draft the bill; but insofar as the other portions of the bill at least are concerned, and insofar as its national-defense purposes are concerned, we find this strange piece of legislation disclaimed by the Secretaries of the President's Cabinet. We find this piece of legislation—surreptitiously conceived, individually disclaimed, of unknown parentage—placed before us, like a baby in a basket on our doorstep, and we are asked to adopt it.

I think it is mighty important, Mr. Chairman, that we pause to wonder a bit why this legislation, containing so many powers that the President says he did not ask for and that the President did not want, was drawn in such a unique manner, because it is kind of stimulating to contemplate what person or what power put into this bill those undesired and undesirable powers, since they are definitely found in the legislation. We are asked to violate all pretenses of neutral-

ity; we are asked to disregard the remaining vestiges of international law; and the Secretary of State, charged with the responsibility of maintaining our peaceful relations, disclaims authorship.

I have said that this bill is a very important piece of legislation and that it was conceived in a most unique manner. I think that the vast delegation of powers taking place in this bill, enormous as they are, probably are equaled and excelled only by the anonymity of their enormity. I think it is amazing that we are confronted with a situation of this type in a bill of this importance, when Secretaries testifying before this committee, members of the President's Cabinet, argue that the bill may be necessary but answer as few questions as they possibly can concerning whether or not the bill is wise.

If this bill is designed primarily, as I am afraid it is, for "the other purposes" aspect of this act, this evasiveness is understandable; but if the bill is devised primarily for the national-defense purposes of this act, it seems to be uncommon strange that those charged with administering it should disclaim any responsibility for initiating this particular legislation.

I think, too, that this Congress should be slow to strip itself of powers reposing in it and to delegate them to the President, when he says he does not want them, when he says he will not use them, and thus turn back the pages of freedom 700 years to the days of the Magna Carta, when freemen won for the first time control over the purse. This bill would leave freemen with that sole remaining control—an uncertain restraint on the purse—and all the advancements in human legislative freedom of the past 7 centuries would be discarded, and we would have to start all over again, as they did in 1215 with a faltering control over the purse. I do not believe you Members willfully and willingly wish to support legislation as comprehensive as that.

A careful study of the hearings will reveal something else equally surprising as the anonymity of the sponsors of this act. There are two reasons—and two valid reasons alone—for bringing new enabling legislation before this Congress at the present time, and I remind the Members that, after all, we are not here this week to decide whether or not we will aid Britain and her gallant associates in their brave fight. That decision was made more than a year ago. Our decision today is something altogether different from that. We are deciding today how far we shall go in a program of aid to England and her associates, and we are to decide how best to implement a program of aid that will not involve us in war and which will not weaken the national defense of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the decision which faces us today should be that simple one and not a discussion of a comprehensive bill like H. R. 1776 which brings a dozen other matters into consideration, including the decision whether or not this country should go back to the formula of medieval Europe and accept the doctrine that the king can do no wrong, with its inevitable

corollary that the Representatives of the people cannot be trusted to do right. I do not believe that should have a part in this discussion, but unfortunately it is the most important part because it is the vital "for other purposes" aspect of this highly, comprehensive and unprecedented legislation.

I say the hearings disclose two valid reasons, and two valid reasons alone, for even discussing new legislation at this time in our desire to be of assistance to our friends across the seas.

The first is that foreign purchasing power is running low. Mind you, it is not said, and it is not proved, that foreign purchasing power has run out. Foreign purchasing power is running low. That is the first valid reason for bringing new legislation before this House.

The second valid reason brought before this House is the fact that there is a reasonable desire for greater coordination for procurement of defense materials, so that orders placed here by foreign countries and by the United States can be handled more efficiently.

We are now sending from 80 to 90 percent of the new war planes manufactured in this country overseas and much of the other new defense materials being produced. You can read the hearings from cover to cover, you can read the bill word by word and paragraph by paragraph, and I defy you to find any single sentence or a single phrase which will enable us to produce an additional plane. Our limitations on sending new supplies across the seas today are limitations of production, and not of legislation. You do nothing in this bill to increase the production, nothing in this bill to meet the emergency spoken of by the majority leader when he said that in 60 or 90 days a tragedy is apt to take place. There is nothing in this legislation to avert such a tragedy if, unhappily, it is on the horizon. In fact, this bill in its present form, with its possibilities for disrupting existing production and its potentialities for putting political puppets in charge of industrial plants, may well do more to decrease than to increase production.

The second aspect I wish to call to your attention is that today we are sending overseas such defense articles from our existing supplies as the chiefs of staff will certify are not necessary to our national defense. There should be nothing in any national-defense bill permitting us to strip our national defenses beyond the point where the chiefs of staff say they have reached a minimum essential to our national defense. So, unless you are willing to sacrifice and jeopardize the defense of this country, which you took an oath to support; unless you are willing to do that, there is nothing in this bill which in any way at any time could give any assistance to the countries across the seas from the existing war materials on hand or on order at this time.

This being true, I submit to you as legislators that our job is to devise legislation—and pass it quickly—which will answer the only two deficiencies presented to us in this volume of testimony which I have before me. Our job as legislators is to meet the problem, and to

solve it, which was presented to us by the testimony of these witnesses. Those of us who want to aid England and her associates, and who couple with that desire a desire to make good our responsibility to keep America out of war, and who also wish to preserve the integrity of Congress, have a responsibility I well recognize, to offer a substitute piece of legislation which will meet the difficulties brought out by the gentlemen appearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs as expert witnesses. Such legislation can be written simply and it can be quickly passed. Such a program is what America wants. Such a program is what 90 percent of your constituents want.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Such a program is a program behind which 90 percent of America can unite. Such a program, unfortunately, is what your constituents think they are going to get if we pass H. R. 1776. But when they find out, as find out they must, that you and I have deceived them by betting the United States on the outcome of the war, by divesting Congress of all its prerogatives to protect the peace of the United States, their disappointment, I dare to prophesy, will be excelled only by their disillusionment when the act which we now put in operation leads this country into war, which I fear is inevitable if this legislation is passed, and which each of you in his heart must recognize as the probable outcome of such legislation.

Along that same general line, may I say that he who votes for this great gift of power, he who endorses this bill on the final roll-call vote, votes for the last step in the operation of the act when he votes for the first step in adopting the act. He who accepts responsibility for endorsing this legislation accepts responsibility for every act, for every transfer, for every movement under the act, because no matter how he might protest against it, he has deliberately voted to divest himself of any and all future control of such matters of our public policy. Let no man satisfy his conscience, then, by voting for this bill and saying, "I can disclaim the consequences."

Let me point out that any man who approves this bill, who accepts this road, accepts the route, accepts the goal, accepts the destination to which this road will take us. When the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, speaks about the decision between action and inaction, he fails to recognize that in-between these two extremes are 90 percent of the Americans, who want neither action leading to war nor inaction showing indifference to the problem. There is a vast contrast between the attitude of an iron deer standing in a park and that of a wild stampede rushing to destruction. In-between can be many proposals such as the substitute I am going to offer under the 5-minute rule, such as I placed in the RECORD on the 29th day of January, where you can find it. It is H. R. 2790, and you can get it in the document room. In-between the two extremes mentioned

by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] there is an American approach to this problem. In between there is an approach which would answer the two deficiencies brought out by the witnesses before our committee. In between is a course which will not divest Congress of all its powers and will not set up one-man government in our country, but which defines the limits to which we are going to go and describes the path we are going to follow in giving legitimate and early assistance to our friends across the seas, and in declaring again that we are not going to enter this war as an active belligerent unless attacked.

My bill, H. R. 2790, is along lines suggested by Senator Johnson of Colorado, by Mark Sullivan, by Gen. Hugh Johnson, and others. It provides aid to those with whom we sympathize, but it also protects democracy at home. Unlike H. R. 1776, it is not a step in the dark—it is a decision to stand on American ground.

The bill H. R. 1776 is a method to solve these problems, and only that. It is an approach, and only that, an approach anonymously conceived. Who knows what Secretary Hull might have brought in had he written this legislation? Who knows what Secretary Stimson might have produced had he conceived the bill? They tell us now this is the only answer to the problem, still the Secretaries who have to administer the act had no part in its original writing. By what strange magic has this bill now become so suddenly the only answer to the problem?

I say there are other approaches, there are other answers. Like loyal members of the President's Cabinet, to be sure, the Secretaries came before our committee and testified for the administration policy. They could do no less and with honor fail to resign their posts. But we wonder what type of legislation might have come had they in the first instance written the bill now before us.

As a proposed amendment to this bill, I say, I offer the bill H. R. 2790. I hope you will read it. I hope you will do your constituents and your conscience the justice to study it. I think it offers a reasonable approach. It provides not in excess of \$2,000,000,000 of immediate purchasing power for England and her associates.

It meets every argument advanced by Mr. Knudsen for further coordination of procurement and it meets every argument advanced by Mr. Morgenthau for new purchasing power. It does not tie the hands of the President, nor does it put Congress in a strait jacket for the duration of the war. I introduced this bill as separate legislation on January 29 after failing to have it accepted as an amendment in our committee.

Congress can give additional billions afterward if this initial step proves wise. My bill provides that all orders supplied for countries benefiting from this extension of funds supply their orders in America through the Office of Production Management and on terms approved by it, thus providing for 100-percent coordination of foreign and domestic defense orders. There can be no greater degree of coordination than 100 percent,

and we do not need to risk war to get it nor to abdicate as legislators to secure it. My proposed substitute answers every need revealed in nearly 3 weeks of testimony before our committee and it does it in an American way, for an American purpose, to encourage democracy abroad and in perpetuation of democratic processes at home. Ladies and gentlemen, you can vote it down if you will, but you cannot add to the defense purposes of H. R. 1776 by so doing; you can only add to the "for other purposes" objectives of this legislation, and it is my solemn conviction that the more you add thereto the more the country and our cause will lose.

Except for those who would have us extend supplies overseas far enough to include men and war, and except for those who are unwilling to give any further aid to England and her Allies, my proposed substitute will answer every argument for new legislation at this time, including the fact that it will give new stimulus to the morale of those fighting aggression without deceiving them into believing that our men are again going to follow our materials into battle.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Let us meet the issues squarely and honestly. If more is wanted than new purchasing power and complete coordination, just what power is wanted? And why is it wanted? And what will be done with it? True, we can try to define these powers under H. R. 1776 by amendments here and restrictions there, but unless we would flirt with fate and waddle toward war we need take no desperate chances with our own peace, and with the lives and liberties of our own people to implement the aid which we all want our friends to have. It can be provided by a simple substitute.

I used to work as a boy in a country store where part of my duty was to candle eggs. The first day on the job, I came across a discolored egg and asked the owner what to do with it. "Discard it," he said, "The only way to amend a bad egg is to trade it for a new one." Let us be equally wise. Let us substitute a clear and direct bill for H. R. 1776 and pass it quickly. Such a bill will give aid faster by many days than H. R. 1776 because it will not be delayed in the Senate and by conference reports; such a bill will give America the united front we want because it implements the heart-beat of America and does not lead to war. Such a bill will not give us a cure which is worse than the disease but will enable us to treat with the disease at its source. Above all, such a bill will retain congressional powers in congressional hands, put Presidential powers in Presidential hands, and deny to the world the seductive deception that democracy cannot function when we need it most.

To my mind that is the saddest travesty of all and I hope this House will unite in nailing such a libel to the cross that future generations of Americans—yes

and Europeans too—will know that this Government of, by, and for the people is so cherished by the people that through their Representatives in Congress they can prepare to defend it, they can protect it against invasion from without and against erosion from within, and that above all this form of free government which is worth fighting to protect is fit to be relied upon while men are fighting. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the observations just made by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ever since H. R. 1776 was introduced into Congress there has been speculation as to its origin. Just who drafted the bill? By quoting the hearings, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has made it clear that Mr. Stimson, Secretary of War, disclaims all knowledge of its authorship; that Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, in answer to a question, replied, "I have stated three times before that the Treasury Department drew up this bill"; that Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, denies that the bill originated or was drafted in the Treasury Department. While the genesis has not been discovered, we are making progress by the process of elimination.

The gentleman from South Dakota also made it clear that at this time only such national-defense articles, from our own existing supplies, are being sent overseas as the Chiefs of Staff of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps will certify are not necessary to our own national defense. To me this is most gratifying, because our own national defense must come first. However, when this bill becomes a law, those experts charged with our national defense will no longer control, and the President alone will be the judge.

Mr. Chairman, it is contended by the proponents of H. R. 1776 that during the Presidential campaign in 1940 there was complete agreement between Candidate Roosevelt and Candidate Willkie as to the foreign policy of this country in connection with the wars raging in Europe and in Asia. It is claimed that the electorate was fully advised, and in the election on November 5, 1940, approved President Roosevelt's foreign policy, thereby giving him a mandate to carry out his announced program.

Well, in the language of one of the Nation's most distinguished citizens, let us take a look at the record.

The best evidence is to be found in the platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties, the interpretation of those platforms by the candidates, and the campaign promises made by the candidates to the people. I summarize:

The Republican platform, written at the Philadelphia convention, said:

The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war. * * * We favor the extension to all peoples fighting

for liberty, or whose liberty is threatened, all such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of national defense.

The Democratic platform, written in convention at Chicago, said:

The American people are determined that war raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa shall not come to America. We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. * * * We pledge to extend to these peoples all the material aid at our command consistent with law and not inconsistent with the interests of our own national defense.

Candidate Willkie, running on the Republican platform, on October 4, 1940, and many times thereafter by transcription over the radio, said:

If I am elected President of the United States I shall never lead this country into any European war. As a matter of fact, I shall never lead the country into any kind of a war unless the people, through their representatives in Congress, insist upon it, and I shall also refrain from indulging in extravagant attacks upon other nations. The best way for us to keep out of this war is by rebuilding our domestic economy and by the building of a great national defense and by bringing our people into one united, common purpose to develop our own country and to keep out of other people's troubles.

Speaking in Boston on October 12, 1940, Mr. Willkie said:

We can have peace, but we must know how to preserve it. To begin with, we shall not undertake to fight anybody else's war. Our boys shall stay out of European wars. There is only one way. We must become strong. We must build ourselves an air force, a Navy, and an Army so strong that no dictator will dare to tamper with our commerce, our interests, or our rights. That is the defense program we must have.

Speaking from Baltimore, on October 30, 1940, Mr. Willkie said:

I have given you my pledge many times over. I will work for peace. We are against sending our boys into any war other than the defense of our own country.

Speaking in New York, on October 26, 1939, President Roosevelt said:

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogeyman. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any State government, or in any city government, or in any county government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner, or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless and dishonest fake.

President Roosevelt, addressing the Teamster's Union, on September 11, 1940, said:

I hate war, now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all that I can to keep war away from these shores for all time. I stand, with my party, and outside of my party as President of all the people, on the platform, the wording that was adopted in Chicago less than 2 months ago. It said: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and

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

Speaking at Philadelphia, October 23, 1940, Candidate Roosevelt said:

We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

Speaking at Boston Garden, on October 30, 1940, Candidate Roosevelt said:

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. The purpose of our defense is defense.

In a fireside chat, on December 29, 1940, President Roosevelt said:

There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

In his message to Congress on January 6, 1941, President Roosevelt declared it to be the policy of the American Government to defend freedom and democracy everywhere in the world, and he said:

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

The President stated the truth. The respective political platforms, as well as their candidates, advocated aid to the democracies, but only by "measures short of war" and measures "within the law." The people had a right to believe, and did believe, that any assistance to be rendered to the democracies was to be assistance "short of war" and within national and international law.

"He kept us out of war" was an effective slogan in 1916. "All aid short of war" was an effective slogan in 1940. It is devoutly to be hoped that the 1940 slogan meant more than the 1916 slogan. It is interesting to note, however, that so far as I can learn, the President has made no reference to "measures short of war" since the 1940 election. After the election was over, we began to hear about "all necessary aid" and, finally, "all-out aid" not only to Britain but to all the democracies. Yes, Mr. President; the American people thoroughly believed that this country was not to get into any foreign war and elected you on that basis.

In November 1940 the people did not have the remotest idea that the President was going to demand any legislation akin to this lend-lease-give bill. In no sense did they give the President a mandate to require such legislation by Congress. We might take a different view if, instead of the President's promises which I have just quoted, he had promised the American people this:

If I am reelected, we are going to go all-out for England. If I am reelected I shall demand that the Congress delegate to me the power, in my own discretion, to conduct undeclared American war anywhere in the world in defense of the democracies, and to employ for

that purpose any weapons, munitions, aircraft, and vessels, commodities, and facilities whatever; and power, moreover, in my own discretion to make such laws as may be necessary. I should have the power to select our friends among the democracies and to determine which are the aggressor nations and which nations should be our enemies. And then, my friends, we need not waste your time and my time debating whether or not to repeal the neutrality law, the Johnson law, or any other law that interferes with any program of national defense I may think advisable.

Now, is there a single Member of Congress who is so naive as to believe that the American people would have elected President Roosevelt last fall on any such platform?

I challenge anyone to find a scintilla of proof in either platforms, or utterances of candidates, giving the slightest suggestion that the Congress was to be asked to abdicate its war powers in favor of the Chief Executive. Where is the mandate given to the President for all-out aid to the democracies of the world? Where is the direction for this country to underwrite a military victory in any foreign war? No; my colleagues, the people of this country, in solemn conclave at election time, did not direct the Congress to authorize the President to do those things that might require American boys to fight on foreign soil.

If there was any controversy between Candidate Roosevelt and Candidate Willkie in reference to our foreign policy it was a contest between them as to which could give the stronger assurance to the American people that, if elected, he would keep this Nation out of foreign wars; that only such material aid would be extended to foreign countries as was consistent with the Johnson Act, the neutrality law, and every other law of the land. The people were promised that we would not participate in foreign wars except when we were attacked; that we would develop our own country and keep out of other nations' wars. In short, both candidates were for peace and against war. Regardless of whether one voted for Roosevelt or Willkie, he had the right to believe that he was voting for peace and to keep out of war.

Section 3 is the heart of this bill. All the rest is window dressing. The bill is artfully drawn. It could be shortened by striking out everything after the enacting clause and inserting the following:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to do that which in his opinion is for the best interests of the national defense, all laws, national and international, to the contrary notwithstanding.

H. R. 1776 is just that broad. Let us be frank about this matter. I said the bill is artfully drawn because it does not specifically repeal, change, or modify any law of the land. It does, however, authorize the President to waive or ignore any law of the land when he is so disposed for the purposes indicated. I do not say that the President is a dictator. I ask the question, however: What more power could any dictator have, concerning national defense, than that granted in this bill? After Hitler took over Germany, he had the Reich pass a law au-

thorizing and directing him to act for the Reich. Since that authorization the Reich only meets when Hitler desires, and for the purpose of saying "yes" to what Hitler demands. Oh, yes; there is a Reich or a Congress in Germany, but what power has it? What function does it perform?

The Constitution lodges the war-making power in the Congress. The majority of our people do not understand that this bill gives the President the right to determine the aggressor nations, the right to select the democracies we are going to aid, and not only the amount of aid but the manner and kind. The President will choose our allies and our enemies as well as the countries for whom this country is to be the arsenal. In short, this lend-lease-give bill gives the President the power to do that which amounts to making war and carrying on undeclared war at such times, in such places, anywhere throughout the world, as he may determine. Do the American people want their Chief Executive to have any such power? I do not believe they do. Would they vote for this bill if given the opportunity? I do not believe they would.

When the boys returned home after the last World War, the American people, with one accord, said, "Never again." Since that time we have been groping for some solution or some formula that would make it possible for this country to keep out of these recurring foreign wars. Pursuant to that desire, the Congress, in 1935, enacted a neutrality law. In 1937 this neutrality law was amplified and strengthened. In 1939, at the President's request, the cash-and-carry provision of the neutrality law was adopted. By this act neutrality was abandoned and our country took sides and became a nonbelligerent in the pending European war. The neutrality arms embargo was lifted and by that act this country made a promise to the democracies and a threat to the totalitarian nations. In the debate in the House, when that bill was under consideration, I said:

Much is implied in that word "promise." If the Congress, by the removal of this embargo, leads France and Great Britain to believe that we are to become their ally in the production of war supplies in the eventuality of war, then in good morals we must fulfill the promise. We must at least be a silent partner in the war. Great Britain has cash enough to pay for munitions from this country for a time, but it would not be long before her cash supply would be exhausted, exactly the same as was the case in the World War. The next step in the partnership would be for our Allies to ask this country for credit, the money to be spent in the United States, as was done in the World War. In the meantime our munitions factories would be expanded, our whole economy would be changed, and we would be enjoying that which for the moment seemed like economic prosperity. However, we would be paying for that prosperity with the money we loaned the Allies. In the end we would be "holding the bag," just as we were after the World War. We would have gone so far that it would be very difficult to cease; because if we did, first, we would be breaking our implied promise and pledge and deserting our Allies. Second, we would be upsetting our whole local employment and economic situation.

Well, we have followed that road since 1939. We have gone so far that it is very difficult to cease. And if this bill becomes law, we will travel to the end of that road—total war, if necessary, under the all-out-aid promise.

H. R. 1776 will implement any agreement or understanding which the President now has with the democracies. It will make it possible for the President to underwrite not only British victory but the victory of all democracies throughout the universe. By the same token, the President will be able to guarantee, insofar as this country's financial and manpower resources are concerned, a complete military defeat of totalitarianism everywhere.

Where is the American frontier—on the Rhine, in the English Channel, or where the Western Hemisphere begins? If I believed that our frontier was in Europe and that the European war is our war, then I would have the courage to say so. Candor and forthrightness are still virtues even in high government places. The proponents of this bill insist that it is a peace measure and not a war measure. I cannot bring myself to that conclusion. To me this is an involvement war bill and is just another step in the program that has been followed since the neutrality law was amended in 1939. Then the war sentiment in the country was negligible. Gradually, but surely, war psychology is becoming more general. The radio, the picture show, the columnist, and the lecturer are making it clear that war is inevitable. This is but history repeating itself. Many years ago, the late Mark Twain, in his own inimitable way described our present situation precisely when he said:

There has never been a just war or an honorable one. I can see a million years ahead and this rule will never change. The loud little handful will shout for war. The pulpit will object at first. The great big, dull bulk of the Nation will rub its sleepy eyes, and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say, "It is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it." Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against war and at first will have a hearing and will be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will outshout them and presently the antiwar audiences will thin out and lose popularity.

Before long you will see this curious thing: The speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men, who in their hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers—but do not dare say so. And now the whole nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open.

When this lease-lend-give bill becomes a law, the Congress will have written the biggest blank check of authority ever given to a President in this country. This bill will make us an actual belligerent in an undeclared war. It will put the United States economically, morally, and officially in the war. A declaration by Congress will not be necessary. I do not believe that any President should be permitted to assume any such responsibility. Billions of dollars will be necessary to fulfill the obligations assumed by the enactment of this law. These dollars

will follow the lease-lend-give bill as the night follows the day. The die will have been cast, and there will be no turning back. This country will take over the wars of other nations and assume responsibility for their successful conclusion. Our people will be called upon to implement the policy and to finance and police the world. To me this is an adventure in futility. It is an impossible task. It means lowering the standards of living in our own country, if not actual bankruptcy. It means a sacrificing of freedom and liberty which we now enjoy.

Thomas Jefferson once said:

For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality, and a respect for the equal rights of nations, would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

He knew the problems of Europe in his day and generation, and those conditions have not changed. Europe's fighting never ceases. Its quarrels are never settled, and for us to become entangled on one side, to pay their bills and fight their battles, endows the words of Thomas Jefferson with importance never before appreciated.

It is regrettable that all of our people do not understand this lend-lease-give bill with its tremendous implications. Very few of my constituents are for getting into this war. At the same time, a large majority of them are for furnishing all aid short of war to England. They believe this bill stops short of war. You and I know that all-out aid is not aid short of war. Under this bill our country will produce the defense articles. We all know that the democracies are in no position to come and get all of this war material. In these circumstances, the next step will be for this country to deliver these defense articles to the democracies in the lands where they are needed. Of course, this means transporting in our own ships, convoying with our Navy craft, or actual transportation by means of subterfuge; that is, the time will come when the argument will be made that all-out aid contemplates delivery by us in war zones. This means that the totalitarian nations will sink our ships and our convoys in order to prevent the fulfillment of our mission as the arsenal of the democracies. Will this not put us into the active shooting war? I believe that it will. When our all-out aid has progressed to this stage, and some of our convoy ships have been destroyed, what will be the attitude of the American people about getting into the war, even to sending men? Will they say that it is dangerous for us to proceed further along the charted course and insist upon the withdrawal of this all-out aid, or will they proceed, as Americans always have proceeded, to finish the job? To finish the job will mean American soldiers fighting on sea and eventually on land in order to fulfill the pledges written into law in H. R. 1776. Many eminent military experts tell us that there can be no complete victory in this war in Europe without invasion. Navies can start wars easily enough, but they cannot finish them. England must be invaded before there is a complete capitulation. The Continent must be in-

vaded before Hitlerism is eradicated from Europe. The only alternative is a negotiated peace and the President is opposed to that. I cannot escape the conclusion that the policy established in this bill will reach fruition only with American soldiers fighting in war zones and on foreign soil. So believing, to vote for this bill would be doing violence to the pledge which I have made to my people that I would not vote to send our boys to fight in any wars outside the Western Hemisphere. I shall keep faith with my constituents.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman:

This Nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women.

Those words, Mr. Chairman, are not original with me. They are the solemn words, meant to convey confidence and hope to the American people, voiced by the President just a month ago in his message to this Congress on the state of the Union. That declaration is the foundation of our faith in the ability of free men to determine their destiny. It is the cornerstone of our structure of self-government. It is a denial of the need of dictatorial powers. It is an affirmation of the sufficiency and the competency of our orderly processes of representative government to continue to function at a time which the President described as "unprecedented in the history of the Union." It is all of these and something more. It is a denial of the need of delegating dictatorial power to any man to determine the destiny of a free people.

To me, Mr. Chairman, that declaration is most significant and pertinent today as we consider the bill now before us. I am persuaded of its significance and pertinency because of my fear that this measure is a complete and categorical contradiction of that declaration—my fear that this bill will substitute for "the hands, and heads, and hearts of its millions of free men and women" as the determining factor of our national destiny, the will and plans and purposes of one man. To a large degree this is the issue with which we are confronted—whether parliamentary processes—that is, the powers of the Congress—must give way to an unprecedented and unheard of delegation of authority to the President in this critical hour of destiny.

Differences of opinion have developed since the introduction of the bill. For the most part, Mr. Chairman, I believe the opinions that have been entertained by the Members are honest opinions, reached after conscientious consideration and painstaking study. I accord to those who may differ with me the right to their convictions. I crave, and I believe that I enjoy from them, the same privilege. It is probable that opinions may be changed as the debate continues and as amendments may materially affect the terms of the bill.

I have carefully followed the hearings on this measure and have directed my attention to the debate here on the floor. Of one thing I am certain—im-

patience, intolerance, and irritability will contribute nothing to either the intelligent discussion of the issues involved or to the wisdom of the ultimate decision which will be made. If we have learned any lesson from the recent events in Europe, it is that impatience, intolerance, and irritability have been the distinguishing characteristics which have marked the road of autocratic arbitrations. And that road must be avoided if free institutions are to survive.

One thing has impressed me, Mr. Chairman, during the course of the hearings and throughout the debate on this bill—a reluctance on the part of the proponents to make a free and full disclosure of the purposes and plans embraced in the proposal. A veil of secrecy has been thrown about certain features. The advocates insist that these objectionable portions are absolutely necessary for the consummation of the plan. I can have little confidence in any plan which presupposes that the execution of the plan is its only possible proof of merit, and that the ultimate purposes toward which the plan is directed dare not be disclosed. Can the destiny of the Nation be determined by "millions of free men and women" if conjecture is to be their only guide. I can have no very exalted opinion of the virtue of any plan which depends for its acceptance simply on the blind credulity of the citizen and on which the proponents appear to resent the intrusion of an intelligent and impartial investigation of its purposes.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to understand the need of a complicated legislative scheme, involving as it does an adventure into fields which are hazardous to our constitutional system of government, for the doing of a comparatively simple thing—the attainment of a defined goal. Intricate and involved policies ever have and always will produce confusion and uncertainty. Simple and straightforward methods which can be appreciated as easily at the beginning, as cunning ones can at the end, are still the surest and safest approach to any problem. The present case is no exception.

The professed purpose of this legislation is to aid Great Britain in her valiant and heroic struggle. With that purpose I am in accord, and should like to have the opportunity of rendering substantial assistance within such defined limitations as are consistent with our own defense needs and which are consonant with our commitments to the American people. I intend to support any and every effort made to reach that objective. I believe that our own defense needs must be our first concern. Our primary objective should be our own security—national security—security for the millions of Americans who still cherish the hope that they may be spared from the scourge of war—security for the humble, honest toiler in field and factory, in the office and in the shop—security for those tireless toilers who make the homes of our land the citadels of our faith and the foundation stones of our institutions—security, not primarily for those who can

have a sense of security by reason of prestige or power, but security for those who must rest their case on their faith in the strength of our common welfare and in the ruggedness of our national integrity. That objective I insist must be of paramount importance to us.

Nor can I dismiss, Mr. Chairman, the commitments made during the last campaign by both major political parties. Solemn pledges were made to the people at that time from which they had every reason to assume that we would pursue every precaution possible against being drawn into war. If the extraordinary powers conferred upon the President in this measure are granted, the Congress will have passed over to the Executive these commitments. To say that the Congress retains the right to declare war, even though this measure is enacted, cannot be considered tenable. With the investiture of authority and discretion in the President such as this bill provides, acts may be committed, incidents may even be invited, which would make war inevitable and its declaration an unnecessary gesture. I need not dwell upon details here. And further, there is no need for exaggeration where the reading of the bill and the plain inferences and deductions which every reasonable man can make, prove beyond a doubt that forces may be set in motion by the Executive under this delegation of power from which there would be no escape but war if our honor as a nation is to be maintained.

No one will deny that this bill confers on the President far wider powers than have ever been granted to any President. Our duty is to judge the bill on the basis of what it grants—not on any assurance that the powers will not be used.

Have we come to the point that our security depends upon delegating to the President the right to make military alliances with any nation in the world on any terms which he alone considers best for our welfare? Can this be said to be compatible with the declaration that "this Nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women?" Will it contribute to our own national security to permit the President to manufacture munitions for foreign nations as he deems vital to our defense and in addition, to sell, exchange, or give away any Army or Navy equipment now owned or to be acquired in the future by this Nation? Has self-government—"the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women" become so enervated, so helpless that recourse must be had to measures such as these for our own safety? Of what value will the treaty-making power of the Senate be, and remember, that is a power conferred upon the Senate by the Constitution—of what value will this power be if the President is permitted to embark upon an excursion into foreign relations such as this bill contemplates? Will there be a need for treaties if secret alliances have already been entered into? Have treaties no part in the determination of the destiny of the Nation—that destiny that has been "placed in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free

men and women?" I need hardly remind you that experience has demonstrated that power and authority, once secured, are seldom surrendered.

Objections to these delegations of power have been met with the plea that unity and loyalty demand an extraordinary degree of confidence and that only as such commitments of confidence are made can we hope to present to the world an expression of our position. If this be true, then every vestige of representative responsibility vanishes. A plea for confidence will then commandeer us into any position. I do not believe that the loyalty of "millions of free men and women" should be, or for that matter, can be commandeered. That unity and loyalty must be challenged by reposing in them the confidence that permits them to determine their destiny, by forthright declarations of purposes, by candid statements of policies, and by an all-embracing course of conduct which assures them that they are the arbiters of their fate—the captains of their souls.

Those who urge upon us the enactment of this measure demand that we make a choice between our desire to aid Britain and our willingness to surrender the time-tested securities of our own freedom. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that such a choice is not necessary. I believe that we can render effective and immediate aid to Britain without tearing down our traditional bulwarks of Constitutional liberty and making impotent the representative branch of our Government. Such a course is possible. There is no reason why it cannot be pursued. Suggestions have already been made which would provide assistance with promptness and dispatch to the British people. I believe those suggestions are practical and constructive. I plead with the proponents of this measure to dismiss the fears of those who oppose the delegation of power and bring to a speedy consummation our earnest desire to join with them in the enactment of a measure which will secure almost unanimous support.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan issue. It is an issue which is fundamental—an issue which strikes at foundations. Self-government, self-determination are at stake. I have sought to be painstaking in my study, temperate in my judgments and reasonable in my conclusions. We are dealing today with possessions that are precious—the heritages which have been bequeathed to us by courageous ancestors—the institutions which have given form and substance to those bequests, the hopes and ambitions of those who still cherish freedom and love liberty, the security, the contentment, the happiness, and the peace of our people. It is a grave and serious responsibility.

God give us men! A time like this demands Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;

Men whom the love of office cannot kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking—
For while the rabble with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions, and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice sleeps!

There recurs to me, Mr. Chairman, the solemn words of the President that "this Nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women." I have but one purpose in mind, one hope in my heart, one pledge to fulfill—to make real and practical and effective that declaration. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], a man who loves peace and hates war, as much time as he may desire to use.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, my ancestors on both sides came from the British Isles and I have great sympathy with the democracies, but I am trying to look at this proposition from the viewpoint of America first. Instead of having a paltry 3 days to discuss this bill, 3 months would not be too long a time too acquaint the people with its epochal meaning.

My chief worry over this bill is concerned with what I believe it would do to the Congress of the United States and thereby to our American form of government. During the debates connected with the framing of the Constitution there was a fierce struggle as to where the war power should be placed, whether in the President or the Congress. The monarchists wanted that power vested in the President as Chief Executive. The Democrats of that time, headed by Thomas Jefferson, recalling how tyrants had wantonly made war without the consent of the people, were determined to place the power to make war as closely to the people as possible. The means of communication were then so imperfect that a referendum to the people on war was obviously impossible. So, the Jeffersonians combined their efforts to secure a constitutional provision placing the power to declare war exclusively in Congress, which was as near to the people as it could be lodged under the conditions then existing.

After long debate and a memorable battle the Jeffersonians won. The aim of the monarchists of that time to give the President the power to declare war was defeated and Jefferson, referring exultantly to that victory for the people, in a letter to James Madison, said:

We have already given one effectual check to the dog of war by transferring the power of declaring war from the Executive to the legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who have to pay.

If the lend-lease bill passes it will nullify the war-making clause of the Constitution so sacredly fought for by Jefferson and his compatriots. In effect, it will transfer to the President the power to make war without a declaration of war. Under the power that would be conferred upon him in this bill any

President could commit a thousand acts of war and handle our foreign affairs as he pleases without reference to Congress. The lend-lease bill would set aside the Congress of the United States, as far as our foreign relations are concerned.

Whether they realize it or not, the Members who vote for this bill will be voting for congressional abdication and for the establishment of a dictatorship in the field of foreign affairs. In the circle of domestic affairs the Congress already has voted so many blank checks of money and power to the Executive that the influence and authority of Congress has sunk to the lowest point in all of its history.

Shall Congress, by now abdicating its authority and prerogatives in the realm of foreign affairs, become a complete rubber stamp in every respect? This would be a black-out of the ideas of the founding fathers, who created, as they thought, three coordinate branches of government of equal dignity and responsibilities, giving to the Congress, as they imagined, the major function in respect to making war by vesting in it the exclusive authority to issue a declaration of war.

If the founding fathers could have resumed the status of sentient beings they would have been astonished I am sure if they had looked in on this Chamber on January 10, 1938, when the might of Executive authority, clamped down on Congress, prevented the law-making body from even considering my resolution to give the people a right to vote on sending their boys into overseas wars, and I am positive they would be more than astonished—they would be dumfounded—if they could realize the destructive nature of the pending lend-lease bill on our democratic form of government and how it would bring about the abdication of Congress in the field of foreign relations.

As an American who believes our Government is the greatest government ever conceived by the mind of man, and whose motto at all times is "America first," I am heartsick over the great amount of whittling that has been going on, and by that I mean the whittling down of the powers of Congress. I do not think that this process of weakening the congressional authority and piling up Executive authority is good for the country. I would like to see Congress recapture and reassert the powers it once held. In other countries the experience has been that the whittling down of the legislative bodies which represented the people has invariably been the first step toward a totalitarian dictatorship.

Germany once had a law-making body to which the world gave its attention and respect. Who cares what the Reichstag says these days? It might as well be extinct. All it amounts to is that it furnishes a little window dressing whenever Hitler cares to use it for that purpose.

God grant that the time will not come when the Congress of the United States will become mere window dressing. I am sure it will not if the spirit of 1776 is still alive in this country. Every war

this country has fought has been fought within the four corners of the Constitution and I cannot see why it is necessary in a time of peace, in order to furnish aid to Britain, that Congress shall abdicate its constitutional functions and surrender its authority. Hard-pressed as the British are at this time, they have not done that. In the midst of a war for their very existence, the Parliament at London is functioning 100 percent, with all of its powers in full use.

It is difficult for me to imagine anything worse that could happen to our country than the surrender of congressional authority over the war power. Suppose, for instance, that some act of war should be proposed under the authority conveyed in this bill and that Japan should say that if that act were committed she would declare war on the United States. That is just a hypothetical instance, one of a thousand that might happen. The people of the United States, who are unqualifiedly opposed to entering foreign wars, would then say to their representatives in Congress: "We are opposed to entering this war 10,000 miles away and we are depending on you to keep us out."

Would it not be most humiliating for Members of Congress to have to say: "We regret that there is nothing we can do about it, as we passed legislation in the winter of 1941 surrendering the war power."

Is there any doubt that the people would be bitterly resentful or that their wrath would be visited on the Members of Congress who, in abdicating their power over war, let down the constituencies who sent them here?

Let me cite another hypothetical case: I never imagined that I would live to see the day when one of my constituents out in Indiana would have the few remaining red financial corpuscles squeezed out of him to raise the taxes to buy a gun to give to a Greek to shoot an Italian. If that is not mixing in the world's affairs with a vengeance, I do not know what would be. Nobody ever asked me where I stand on this bill. Everybody assumed that I was against it. Everybody was right. I am not out shooting people in far-away parts of the globe and I want my constituent, whose brow is deeply furrowed with care and whose back is already broken with taxes, to have an opportunity to use his few remaining red financial corpuscles to buy food to feed the hungry mouths of his precious little ones and to clothe them as they should be clothed, and to educate them so they may grow and bloom and be a credit to their father and mother and to their Creator.

As a member of the small Subcommittee on Deficiencies through which all extraordinary defense appropriations are routed for inclusion in appropriation bills, I have voted for every dollar of the colossal amounts required to build up our defenses to the highest point of perfection, and I shall continue to do so. At the expense of being repetitious, let me say that my main objection to the pending bill is that it sets aside the Constitution and takes away from Congress

its authority over foreign relations, giving the President the power to make war without declaring war. My objection to the bill is all the more strenuously and insistently urged because it is wholly unnecessary to dissolve Congress from its control over foreign affairs in order to achieve the declared objective of the bill, which is the furnishing of aid to Britain. We cannot preserve democracy by surrendering it.

Instead of being a poor, weak mortal I wish that I had the tongue of angels that I might plead with you, my fellow Members, not to make a blanket surrender of the powers of Congress and thus destroy our priceless heritage of democracy made possible to us through the agonies at Valley Forge and the blood and tears of the founding fathers. Let us insist instead that every separate transaction which amounts to an act of war shall be brought before this Congress and receive congressional approval before it becomes effective. Instead of a wider separation, amounting to a complete divorcement between the executive department and Congress in handling international affairs, which this bill would bring about, I would like to see closer-knit cooperation between the White House and Congress, with frequent consultations between the executive department and the legislative department before, and not after, momentous decisions are reached.

To save my life I cannot see how the statesmen and press of America view with such complacency the approach of the totalitarian state. I cannot see how they reconcile themselves to the threatened collapse of our American democracy. I would think that they would be screaming an alarm from the housetops to arouse the people to the danger that hangs over our country. The great American democracy that was proclaimed in 1776 will be dealt a terrific, perhaps mortal, blow if H. R. 1776 passes Congress.

I was raised an old-fashioned Democrat, and my belief in democracy—the democracy of our fathers—as the best form of government is deeply ingrained in my being. There are several features of this bill which I think are dangerous and likely to involve us in war at a time when we are woefully and tragically unprepared, but let me again say that I am chiefly concerned over what it does to our American form of government.

To the extent that it takes away from Congress its control over foreign relations it paralyzes our legislative processes and establishes here in our own country a prototype of the dictatorships of foreign countries which we Americans have always professed to abhor as being utterly repugnant to our American way of life. For these reasons I cannot conscientiously support the pending bill. I will never, never do what I think I would be doing if I were to vote for this bill. I will never vote to stab my country in the heart. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in degree of sympathy for the

victims of aggression in other lands. I stand ready to do my bit to succor them just so long as help can be given without jeopardizing the peace of my own country. I am sure that full aid to England, consistent with international law and the defense of the United States, has the approval of a vast majority of Americans. I have backed the President in every request for such aid thus far. There is a sharp division of opinion, however, whether aid to England should be at the risk of war and, further, to be permitted to interfere with the functioning of our system of free government.

I am opposed to passage of the "lend lease bill by which we would surrender to the executive branch of our Government important fundamental rights delegated by the people through their Constitution to their Congress.

It is to me astounding that any man, or group of men, would suggest that national defense requires substitution of dictatorship for representative democracy. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support H. R. 1776 which I consider utterly in conflict with my oath to support the Constitution.

In my opinion, abrogation of constitutional government can never serve the defense of democracy but can only cause its destruction and lead to war. No man has answered the question, "What can be done short of war under H. R. 1776 that can't be done and isn't being done now under authority of Congress?" The President already has power to dispose of military equipment as demonstrated in turning over of 50 destroyers to England. As Commander in Chief, he determines what part of our production shall be kept in the United States and what part should go to England or any other country. So, it is very apparent it is not necessary to have the so-called lend-lease bill in order to help Britain. In fact, aid to Britain is not mentioned in the bill. That is not the issue. Do not be confused.

The only argument seriously advanced for these powers is that Britain does not have the finances to continue purchases in this country. This is a mooted question. All of the British Empire is not yet in this fight. Other countries, notably Holland, would suffer more than we from an Axis victory. With her far-flung colonial possessions, Holland could render great material help to England. Then there is the matter of island possessions off our shores that England could convey to her defense credits. May I add right here that we should be satisfied with nothing less than fee simple title to any defense bases on such islands. A 99-year lease may be all right as a private business transaction. It is a very brief span in the life of a nation. My own grandfather, if living, would now be 111 years old. Many of our grandchildren will be living when the leases given in exchange for our destroyers have expired. Who knows that England may not be ruled by a dictator as ruthless as Hitler 99 years hence? Are we to tax our children for forts that may be used against our grandchildren? God forbid. Yes; there are many ways by which help can be given to England without creating a dictatorship here.

This bill goes far beyond any powers ever granted an American President even in time of war. And may I remind you that one of the first requests this President ever made of Congress was for more power. Such requests have come from him to the people's representatives at frequent intervals. Many additional powers have been granted; none have been surrendered.

I listened with interest to the eloquent words of the President spoken in this Chamber a few days ago when he said:

We are seeking a world founded on freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

The President pictures world conditions devoutly desired, but as long as the hatreds of Europe exist we shall frequently hear the tramp, tramp of many feet and see the silent upturned faces of the battlefield. Not until practice of the Golden Rule supersedes such hatreds will peace come to abide in Europe. This change will come not from the sword but by Christian evangelism. If America wants to serve humanity, let her hearken to the words of the immortal Jefferson, who said:

For us to attempt to reform Europe and bring them back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

Europe's fighting never ceases. Their quarrels are never settled. They are the results of hatreds engendered by frequent conflicts through the centuries. If we keep meddling, their hatred for America will soon implicate us in eternal wars.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, if we want to help the oppressed, let us do it in compliance with our Constitution and international laws. Let us do it short of war, which phrase is ominously missing from recent utterances of the President. The conclusion is inescapable that the President is reconciled to active military intervention if such intervention is needed to defeat the Axis in this war.

"But our boys are not going to be sent abroad," says the President.

Well, he has promised many things during the last 8 years and has done the opposite thing.

Nonsense, Mr. Chairman; even now their berths are being built on transport ships.

Even now tags for identification of the dead and wounded are being printed by the William C. Ballantyne Co., of Washington. Here and now I go on record as unalterably opposed to American participation in any war except a war of defense.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I pledge full and hearty cooperation in the plan for strong national defense and any aid that can be given to England under present national and international laws without weakening our own defenses. But never by my vote will American youth be sent to help settle the age-old quarrels of Europe; never by my vote shall crosses rise row on row in another Flanders Field. This bill means war. My vote will be recorded "No." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following letter from the Springfield Chamber of

Commerce, Springfield, Mo., and also a brief article from the Washington Post of today:

SPRINGFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
Springfield, Mo., February 3, 1941.

HON. PHIL A. BENNETT, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENNETT: At today's meeting of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce the following resolution was adopted:

"To the directors of the chamber of commerce:

"On Monday, January 27, 1941, there was referred to the legislative committee of the chamber of commerce a communication from the United States Chamber of Commerce in relation to House of Representatives bill No. 1776, commonly known as the lease-lend bill, with a request that said committee make a study of this bill together with the suggestions of the United States Chamber of Commerce and report our conclusions with respect thereto.

"Your committee begs leave to report that on Wednesday, January 29, 1941, it held a meeting to consider same, at which a quorum was present; that after much study and discussion of said bill and communication from the United States Chamber of Commerce, your committee begs leave to report as follows:

"1. That we recommend that our representatives in Congress give full support to the administration in the objectives of providing adequate national defense, and all aid to Great Britain and other oppressed democracies who are resisting the attack of totalitarian or aggressor nations.

"2. That while we recognize that when national emergencies arise, such as now exist, that power of direction to preserve the integrity and stability of the Nation must of necessity be reposed in our chosen leaders, yet in view of the fact that we are chiefly concerned about the present war and world conditions because they menace our ideals of a democratic form of government throughout the world, we believe that we should, in the preparation of our defenses and in furnishing aid to Great Britain and other democracies, move as far as is possible within the orbits of our democratic form of government; and to that end we propose the following amendments to the bill before the Congress known as the lease-lend bill, to wit:

"(a) That a ceiling be placed over the amount of credit or cash that may, on direction of the President, be furnished to Great Britain and the other democracies in which this Nation is interested.

"(b) That no ship owned by the United States, or flying its flag, be sent into the war zone as defined by the Neutrality Act, except with the prior express approval of the Congress.

"(c) That no soldiers, sailors, or other representative of the armed forces of the United States, other than high-ranking officers, be sent into the war zone except with the prior approval of the Congress.

"(d) That in providing aid for Great Britain and the other democracies, that no act of war be committed as recognized by international law. That the President be required to make periodic reports to the Congress of all military properties as now or hereafter may belong to the United States, which have been sold, leased, or given to the British Empire and other democracies, which said reports shall provide the Congress with detailed information of the country to whom such military properties have been sold, leased, or given, and the nature, quantity, and the terms thereof.

"(e) That the bill as presently written be so amended that the powers conferred thereby shall expire in not to exceed 2 years from the date of final passage and approval.

"3 Your committee further recommends that, if this report shall be adopted, a copy thereof be forwarded by air mail to Congressman BENNETT and Senators TRUMAN and CLARK, and that a copy be furnished to the United States Chamber of Commerce.

"ARTHUR M. CURTIS,
"Chairman, Legislative Committee."

The above for your information.
Sincerely,

LOUIS W. REPS,
For Springfield Chamber of Commerce.

NEARLY \$150,000,000 GOLD BROUGHT FROM AFRICA IN CRUISER

WASHINGTON, February 4.—Nearly \$150,000,000 of gold brought from South Africa by the American cruiser *Louisville* helped swell gold imports last week to \$166,115,127, the largest amount in any week since June.

The Navy and Treasury have announced that the cruiser brought gold from South Africa, but declined to give the amount. Today the Commerce Department disclosed \$149,633,653 worth of the metal arrived from South Africa in the week ended January 29. Presumably all or nearly all of this amount came on the *Louisville*.

Coincidentally, the week's import total was the largest since another Navy movement of gold. In June the Navy carried about \$300,000,000 of French gold across the Atlantic.

When normal shipping methods were used in subsequent weeks, gold imports fell as low as \$4,152,581 recently and amounted to \$21,577,682 in the week before last.

Other large shipments last week were \$5,458,003 from Canada, \$4,501,498 from India, and \$3,150,243 from Colombia.

Part of the incoming gold, instead of being sold to the United States Treasury, was deposited under earmark to the credit of foreign governments and central banks. The total of such deposits in the Federal Reserve System increased \$24,510,494 to a total of \$1,848,104,978.

Silver imports amounted to \$895,997 last week, about the same as the preceding week, but slightly below normal. Imports included \$284,990 from Mexico, \$212,203 from Canada, and \$195,179 from Japan.

No gold was reported exported. Silver exports were \$19,782.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] as much time as he may desire to use.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in this debate or, indeed, to take part in these deliberations, except to exercise the prerogative of suffrage secured to every Member.

I am, as all of you well know, a freshman in this Chamber, and perhaps custom, as well as wisdom, would decree that I remain silent. But, Mr. Chairman, as spokesman for almost a quarter of a million peaceful, liberty-loving, pure-blooded American citizens of the Middle West, engaged almost exclusively in the vocation of agriculture, and who will be affected perhaps more than any other class by the changes sure to come with war, I think I would be derelict in my responsibility were I to remain silent.

May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that often in the discussion of matters where opinions so sharply conflict gentlemen sometimes almost forget that in this Chamber each Member is presumably the peer of every other, and that perfect freedom should abound and the utmost of candor mark our bearings, never forgetting, however, that every Member is

entitled to an honest expression of what is in his heart and to be attributed with the best of faith and sincere motives.

I want to be understood from the outset that I am in favor of aid to Britain—and lots of aid. As was so ably suggested by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New Jersey, who for more than 15 years has been a member of this committee:

This is more than simply a war between foreign nations, waged to decide issues affecting only the particular nations involved.

We need only look to Hitler's own utterances to satisfy ourselves about that. You will recall that in his recent birthday speech he said, in substance:

The time will come when the so-called democracies will send a committee to us asking us the detail of our plan for social justice. Our aim is to unite all Germans into one great Reich. We stand ready—

He declared—

to strike when the time comes—to enforce our demands.

He denounced as impudent liars those asserting that he had set out to conquer the world, but failed to set any limitation upon the conquests necessary to unite all of the German people under one great German Reich.

While inveighing conditions under democracies, he made no comparison of such conditions prevailing in Germany and its subjected states under the tyrannical rule of Hitlerism, where all the freedoms are denied and all the people are in servitude.

With his record of murder, slaughter, and tyrannical rule, it does not lie within his province to talk about a plan for social justice, and it will be a distant day, indeed, when a committee from any civilized country goes to Hitler for plans of social justice.

I therefore hope that those of us who oppose this bill in its present form may do so without being branded as Hitler sympathizers, disloyal American citizens, or have applied to us the already too-much-over-worked term "appeaser."

This bill will not accomplish the purposes for which the people have issued the so-called mandate which we hear so much about; namely, aid to Britain short of war. Because if this bill were enacted today it would not make the slightest difference in our war production next month, or the next, or the next. Our Army and Navy have placed orders running many months ahead and still have plenty of money unallotted.

Presumably, our production is already geared as high as the administration and American industry can gear it. If not, the remedy lies elsewhere. This is not a bill to increase production.

It cannot be rightfully termed a defense measure, because if carried out to its ultimate aims, it could totally strip this Republic of everything necessary for its own defense.

It goes without saying that the average American is sympathetic with the British and other democracies in the present world struggle. Various polls have clearly indicated that more than 90 percent of our people hold such views.

But the matter of sympathy and the matters of practical aid are two separate problems. In the last World War there was similar sympathy, and that expert propagandist, George Creel, coined the phrase which was put into the mouth of President Wilson that "we must make the world safe for democracy."

Well, we tried it. We won the war for the ever-quarrelsome democracies of Europe—and we are still paying for it.

But where is the safety for democracy? Did those allied nations really want all democracies to be safe?

The question is old, but very new, and as the proponents of this bill now attempt to hurry through this measure, granting to the President unprecedented and extraordinary powers, unlimited, it is to be wondered just what is safe for democracy. Should we endanger our own in order to guarantee such a form of government to other nations, some of which, whatever their contentions, have maintained at best a very doubtful form of democracy?

In the bill in its present form, in order to lend aid short of war, must we commit technical acts of war? Must we violate our own neutrality laws? Must we invest a President, the head of our Republic, with the powers of an arch dictator? Must we clothe him with a further mantle of indispensability and leave to him alone to decide when and under what conditions this mantle shall be discarded, if ever?

There is very little doubt about the course intended to be pursued under this demanded grant of power. The President, and he alone, will decide just what aid is short of war. And the facts being what they are, it is patent that much of the aid that the proponents of this bill have in mind is not short of war. The destroyer deal was not short of war.

How much further the President would go with the unlimited grant of power given to him in this bill is only a matter for conjecture. According to the press reports, when asked what would be the first thing that would be done for England upon the passage of this bill, he stated that he might stand on his head on Pennsylvania Avenue.

I submit that the matter is far too serious to joke about. When our boys start coming home in wooden overcoats it will not be a joking matter with the mothers of this country.

If this is a defense measure or has for its purpose aid for Britain short of war and is not merely a grant of extraordinary and unprecedented power, what can be the objection, as suggested by the gentleman from New York, to placing a limitation upon the amount authorized to be appropriated?

Why do not some of the gentlemen who are proponents of this measure tell us what is wrong with a plain, simple, straightforward bill granting Britain a certain specific sum of dollars' worth of American credit, to purchase war supplies as she may need from time to time?

Why cloud the simple issue of aid to Britain with unheard-of delegations of power?

The ideas and ideals of democracy of the proponents of this measure, if we are to believe the record of the past few years, are very much different than those held by Woodrow Wilson when he was attempting to "make the world safe for democracy"; and the theory of indispensability having gained such force in the minds of some, at least, is cause for the gravest concern over the present scheme to acquire further dictatorial powers and set up for all practical purposes a form of government that—merely during the present emergency, but for years thereafter—might be maintained at the will of the Executive and who would have the power to renew and maintain emergencies.

I repeat, sirs, the reasons involved in this bill are matters for the gravest anxiety. They concern not only active involvement, should the Axis Powers finally find time or sufficient force to actively resent our acts of war authorized by this bill—which clothes the Chief Executive with authority and power to carry on an undeclared war—but also, in the fact that in an advertised effort to again "make the world safe for democracy" we have lost our own liberties and destroyed our own democracy.

I regret the spectacle of an independent, coordinate branch of the Government, charged with the high responsibilities and duties that are vested in this body, subordinating its own judgment and its own opinion to the opinion of the Executive. When this Government was founded our fathers who created it were speaking from the very shadows of the throne of despots. They had felt upon their backs the lash of autocratic power. They surveyed the then present history as well as the ancient history of the world, and they knew that power feeds upon power. They believed and knew that no mortal man ever born of woman was so good that he could be trusted with unlimited power. Prophetically almost, they understood that the Executive naturally draws to himself power, because, being a single individual, he acts with a certainty and with full knowledge of his own purposes and intents. Whereas, in a great legislative body, made up as it is of men from the various walks of life, there is a division of counsels and of opinions.

And so, they gave to the Executive exceedingly limited powers. They did not give him authority to originate a single act of legislation. They took away from him every kingly prerogative. They created a body of representatives, one branch of which must respond to the people every 2 years at a popular election. They gave to that body the sole power of originating legislation.

They gave the Executive only two powers with reference to legislation; one was the mere right to recommend, and the other was the right to veto; and they provided that the veto could be overruled by a two-thirds vote of the respective legislative bodies.

They gave him no power to issue decrees.

They did not give him the power to raise an army. Not a soldier can he

raise. That power is vested in the Congress.

They gave him no power to declare war. They vested that authority in the Congress. By so doing they took away from the Executive the chief authority and the chief power that kings had exercised—and that dictators today exercise—for the oppression of their people.

And yet, with all safeguards that they created, who is there within the sound of these walls today who in the past few years has not seen the constantly growing aggression of the Executive and the centralization of power in his hands?

I say to you, sirs, that if this country is to remain a republic, it will be safe only so long as the three coordinate branches function independently and within the limits of the Constitution of the United States. Whenever the legislative bodies of this country cease to function independently, exercising their own judgment unawed by authority and unseparated by patronage, the liberties of the people of the United States will be in peril—and in this respect the Congress is not blameless, because for many years it has been creating boards to be appointed by the President to function under rules prescribed by those boards, and those rules have been construed by the courts and sustained until they amount to almost a delegation of legislative authority.

As far as I am concerned, I shall not, while a Member of this body, encourage any further march in that direction. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I expect to follow the example of the very able gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY], a member of the committee, who said this afternoon that he expected to vote against every amendment and then vote against the bill, because the bill's purposes are bad and we ought not to amend it at all. Those are my sentiments, and I do not even ask an extension of remarks in the RECORD. I think I have said enough. [Applause.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS], a member of the committee.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, in the fall of 1939, at a special session of the Congress, this House voted to repeal the arms-embargo section of the Neutrality Act, thereby permitting the shipment of war supplies to belligerent nations, subject to such restrictions as were still imposed by other sections of the act, and other legislation.

This was accomplished only after a long and bitter struggle, which had begun at the regular session in the spring, before the actual outbreak of war. The opponents of repeal brought to bear every weapon in the arsenal of lobbying. Members were inundated with such a flood of letters and telegrams that it was reported that some had given up the attempt even to count them and had resorted to the use of scales to determine the weight of opinion. Those of us who favored repeal were accused of leading

the Nation down the road to war. The sound and fury were such as had not been witnessed for years.

With the passage of repeal it became at once apparent that the action was in accordance with the wishes of the great majority of our people. Since then a national election has been fought; and it is a conspicuous fact that no major party ventured to make a campaign issue of repeal. It is my considered judgment that repeal of the arms embargo acted as a safety valve, and that without it the pressure of popular opinion in favor of aid to Britain might have led us nearer to war than we are today.

As this new bill comes before us, its opponents, with a few extreme exceptions, start with the premise that they, too, are for aid to Great Britain. And yet they are substantially the same people who in 1939 were opposing the repeal of the arms embargo, without which it is doubtful if Britain would still be on her feet today. I submit that this gives them very little claim to be regarded as fair and impartial judges of what the people of this country are willing to do for England now.

As her vast expenditures have mounted, Great Britain has found herself nearing the end of those dollar resources which our Neutrality Act makes necessary for purchases in this country. Some new step became necessary if we were to carry on the accepted national policy of aid to Britain. The administration has decided that the present bill constitutes the best way out of the difficulty. I believe that the administration was right in seeking to help Great Britain with arms and munitions of war not merely out of sympathy for a people fighting against aggression but as a vital element in our own national defense. If the administration was right then, it is likely that it is right now. At times like these we must have national leadership. Granting that Congress has the right and the duty to scrutinize the legislation carefully in matters relating to foreign affairs, we shall be safest in following the guidance of the Executive of the day, whoever he may be. If the opponents of the bill had manifested last December the same interest in loans to Great Britain that they are professing today and had come forward with nonpartisan proposals to insure the continued supply to her of war materials, they might have had a real part in formulating the necessary legislation and in uniting the country behind it. By their policy of persistent and purely negative opposition they have made it imperative that the administration bring in its own bill, and they have contributed a major share to the confusion that exists in the minds of our people today.

I do not propose to discuss every aspect of the bill, but wish to address myself for a moment to the charge that it sets up a dictatorship. This is a striking example of the use of a word in the place of argument, and it is a word that has been employed on the floor of this House and in the public discussion by people who should have been above such a petty appeal to popular fear.

The Bill of Rights embodied in our Constitution gives the people of the

United States freedom of religion. The European dictators have suppressed such freedom wherever they saw fit. This bill does not affect it.

The Bill of Rights gives freedom of speech, and of the press; there is no such freedom under a dictatorship. This bill gives the President no power to suppress it.

The Bill of Rights protects the people against unreasonable searches and seizures; such searches and seizures are everyday affairs in Germany, Italy, and Japan. This bill does not authorize them.

The Bill of Rights gives the citizen rights before the courts, which are denied them in the dictator-ruled countries. This bill leaves those rights intact.

In addition, Hitler and Mussolini have made war on foreign countries by their own personal fiat. This bill reserves to Congress its constitutional power to declare war.

Such are the powers assumed by dictators. The powers granted to the President in this bill in no way touch the liberty of the individual. They do not increase the powers he already has to take action outside the United States which might lead to war. They include only powers to be exercised within the United States in the one field of regulating American production and distribution of war materials for our own forces, and for those of nations whose defense is deemed vital to our own defense. In view of these facts, the word "dictator" can be used by opponents of the bill only to stir up fear and suspicion in the public mind, and its employment goes beyond the bounds of legitimate debate.

In time of national emergency the Presidents of the United States have always exercised special powers, either directly granted by Congress, or assumed by them without such grant.

I have found in my mail a publication which inquires in glaring headlines: "What would Abe Lincoln say to H. R. 1776?" Well, the fact is that in a national emergency Abe Lincoln seized, without so much as asking Congress, very great emergency powers; and the northern Democrats were saying about Mr. Lincoln in 1864 very much the kind of thing that Mr. Roosevelt's opponents are saying about him today. And yet neither Mr. Lincoln, nor, later, Mr. Wilson, permanently deprived the people, or their Representatives in Congress, of any of their constitutional liberties. I do not believe that Mr. Roosevelt will do so any more than they did. I do not believe that this bill would make it any harder for the American people to resist any attempt on his part to do so.

The powers of the President in foreign affairs are greater than is realized by most people—even many Members of Congress. It has been held by the Supreme Court that all the powers of the British Crown are vested in the American Executive, except as the Constitution expressly delegates them to Congress; and this is above all true in matters that concern our relations with other governments.

When this war started it was suggested in Congress that the United States ought to occupy Greenland. The President

could do this tomorrow, without consulting Congress. The President already has the power to order our Navy to convoy merchant ships. This is a constitutional power, vested in him by reason of his authority as Commander in Chief. Congress did not give it to him, and Congress cannot take it away from him.

We have never had a President with a greater respect for the Constitution than Mr. Coolidge, or one with more native caution, and yet Mr. Coolidge landed marines in Nicaragua in 1926, without asking the advice or consent of Congress.

When previous grants of special powers to the President are referred to, the reply is made, "Ah, but that was when the country was at war!" We are not belligerents, it is true; but we are living in a world where everything is conditioned by the existence of the war in Europe. It is natural and inevitable under our Constitution for the President to receive emergency powers in time of war. So much seems to be granted. But we are making great efforts and undertaking vast expenditures to arm ourselves, in the hope that by arming now we may be able to escape involvement in war. Is it not equally foresighted to give the President emergency powers now, in order that he may use them to expedite our rearmament and so make surer our staying out of war?

As I said at the beginning, this bill has caused a great deal of popular emotion. Some of this is based on sincere misunderstanding of the bill—some of it has been deliberately organized and promoted.

But this legislation is needed to put the necessary speed and efficiency into the two related purposes of aiding Britain and thereby gaining time for the building up of our own national defense. And when it has been enacted into law, and the excitement has died down, the American people will find that their liberties are still intact, and they will be satisfied and relieved at the impetus that it will give to the great united national effort on which we are all embarked.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York kindly yield to me?

Mr. FISH. Certainly.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL], and in that connection I take occasion to say, although I do not belong to his party, that I know of no man who is trying harder to keep this country out of war. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Chairman, these are momentous days pregnant with foreboding, for good or for evil. What we say here during this debate is of little consequence. What we do here within the next 2 days will be of tremendous importance, and, in my humble judgment, decide the destiny of democracy not only for us in America but for the people of the whole world. This is no time for personalities nor petty partisan-

ship—it is rather a time for issues and fundamental principles. It is very unfortunate that both in the Congress and elsewhere the charges of pro-British and pro-German are being hurled. Let us be more tolerant and sincerely believe that we are all motivated by a patriotic zeal to defend democracy—to protect our common country and its cherished institutions that we love. That does not preclude our having honest convictions and frankly expressing them, even though such a course may and does disappoint some of our dearest friends and cause some of our colleagues to become apprehensive. In so vital a matter as that before us, I want to quote George Washington:

Do not suffer your good nature, when application is made, to say yes when you ought to say no—remember that it is a public and not a private cause that is to be injured or benefited by your choice.

So whatever I say or do regarding this bill must be considered in that light and as a matter of conviction.

During my four terms of service in this body I have been called a New Dealer and a supporter of the President. I have been proud and happy of this because I have sincerely believed in and heartily supported the President's policies of reform. But I never have been and never will be a rubber stamp for anyone, and will at all times reserve the right to express my opinions and vote my own convictions. [Applause.] The first important vote I cast in that historic 1933 session was against the President's Economy Act sponsored by the Liberty League. My vote on Friday will be against the President's lend-lease bill, sponsored by the war-minded Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. If this be treason to the administration, make the most of it. [Applause.] Had these eminent, able, and patriotic gentlemen confined themselves to building up an adequate defense of the Western Hemisphere—every item of which I voted for—they would deserve the gratitude of the American people. But now we are confronted by a measure that has no historic precedent and which will inevitably plunge us into the European holocaust. I shall oppose this bill with all the efforts at my command. It is argued by some of its proponents that it does not give the President any additional powers. If it does not, then why any provision whatsoever? Frankly, I not only want to refuse to give any more power but want to recall some of the vast authority already granted. It is too much authority for any one man to exercise. [Applause.] It was stated on yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that similar power had been granted to Lincoln and McKinley and others. But, sir, that was only during wartime. Yes; it has been stated time and again on this floor that we are already in the war. If that were true, why bandy about the words "aid to England short of war"? If it is our war—and God forbid that it is!—then let us be frank enough to declare war, to give our boys, our boats, and our bonds to the limit. I maintain that

we are not at war. I maintain that we do not have to get into this war. I defy the newspapers, the magazines, the radio, and all the mediums of war propaganda that have been for months trying to create a war hysteria to prove that we have to enter this war unless we will to do so. Hitler, with all his power, cannot cross the 20-mile English Channel and penetrate England. How can he possibly cross the Atlantic and land troops in the Western Hemisphere? Even if he was foolhardy enough to try, what, with our stupendous defense program, would we be doing while he was making the attempt? And while his forces were absent from Europe, what would Norway and Holland and Finland and France be doing—that is, those millions there who still resent his dictatorship, his ideals, his ideas? I thank God I am no military or naval expert. I thank God that He has given me just the common sense to know that with our adequate defense program, neither Germany nor Japan, nor any group of nations, can invade the Western Hemisphere, and that the American people will not let our leaders invade either Europe or Asia on the false pretense that we are saving democracy. In this respect I am unorthodox enough to be with Colonel Lindbergh, President Hutchins, General Wood, Norman Thomas, and the eminent historian Charles Beard. What are the aims and purposes of the British Empire? What are the real purposes of the administration?

What irony in calling this bill H. R. 1776. Have the proponents of this bill forgotten whom we were fighting and why in the year 1776 A. D.? Have they forgotten who in 1812 burned the original Capitol in which we are now assembled? Have they forgotten who vainly tried in the sixties to promote a secession and division of the United States? Read Sandburg's Lincoln if you have. Have they forgotten how they forced the opium trade on China; how, for centuries, they have denied Irish freedom and how for decades they have oppressed helpless India. We hear much today about how Japan has mistreated the great Kagawa, but little is said about the mistreatment of Mahatma Gandhi by the British Empire because of his peaceable resistance to dictatorship.

Have they forgotten how the leaders of the British Empire pleaded on bended knees with us to come to their rescue in 1917 and how they repaid us by calling us "Shylock"? Listen to this from Churchill, the present Prime Minister, only 4 years ago and the comment by Columnist Flynn:

Of course this is what will happen again. Nothing could ever be more fantastic than a loan to Britain. Britain has never been able to pay the four billion due since the last war. She owes \$32,000,000,000 in debt, chiefly for the last war, and no one knows how many billions additional for this one.

When the war ends such a loan would be a perpetual irritant and England would do what she did before. It was about the debt contracted in the last war that Mr. Winston Churchill, England's Prime Minister, only 4 years ago, said, "Legally we owe the debt to the United States, but logically we don't, and this because America should have minded her

own business and stayed out of the World War. If she had done so, the Allies would have made peace with Germany in the spring of 1917, thus saving a million British, American, and French and other lives and preventing the subsequent rise of fascism and nazi-ism.

How does that sound to you who want to give aid to England "short of war"? An old German who had been "taken for a ride" by a loan shark made this observation when approached again: "If you fool me vunce, dot is your fault—shame on you; but if you fool me dvice, dot is my fault, damit!" I am not pro-Stalin nor pro-Fascist, nor pro-Hitler—neither am I pro-British. I am pro-American and, by the grace of God, I am going to vote as I speak here today. [Applause.]

Great Britain has over 4,000,000 square miles of territory in the Western Hemisphere to our 3,000,000. She has untold assets here. Let her pay for whatever supplies we give her. Her leading statesman has denounced us as a Shylock—in view of her failure to pay her World War debt let us "have the game as well as the name." She refuses to permit us to feed the hungry in Europe. It is loudly proclaimed that she is the last defense of democracy. I am here to tell you that had there been no Versailles Treaty—had there been no Lloyd George and Clemenceau to scuttle the Fourteen Points there could have been no Hitler. Where was she when the German democracy under von Hindenburg was struggling for existence? Where was she when Ethiopia was ravished, when Czechoslovakia and Austria were conquered, when Poland was pillaged, when Finland, Norway, and Holland were ravaged?

It may not be very popular with my colleagues here but this has been, is, and will be my stand; Millions, yet billions, for adequate defense of the Western Hemisphere, but not one cent for European or Asiatic aggression.

In the tenth chapter of Isaiah is described the fierce attack by the Assyrians on the people of Israel. The ancient prophet did not approve of the Assyrians but he frankly said that this scourge came upon the chosen people of God because of their sins and their worship of strange gods. Hitler is a modern scourge and menace and a threat to both Christianity and civilization. But who can say that the British Empire by its sins of both commission and omission is not visited by this scourge to bring it to real sanity, real service, real democracy? May I repeat an old axiom: "He who comes into court must come with clean hands." Rudyard Kipling in the Victorian Golden Jubilee wrote: "Lord God of Hosts be with us yet, Lest we forget, lest we forget!"

As for this country of ours, the best, the most democratic, the best place in all the world in which to live—do we, too, need to be drawn into this maelstrom and catastrophe? Have we erred so deeply as to make it necessary for us, too, to be chastised with whips of scorpions to teach us to make it impossible for men, women, and children to starve in the land of plenty, to make it impossible for willing men to seek in vain for work in the

land of opportunity, to make it impossible for injustice to prevail in a land founded and organized on the fundamental principles of democracy? If so, then pass this bill, another step in the downward path that leads to war and death and wreckage.

Woodrow Wilson, the great idealist, had a great vision and called it the New Freedom. When the World War came, he abandoned this vision for the slogan Make the World Safe for Democracy. How miserably he and we failed in this! We forgot Jefferson's sage injunction:

For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

Franklin D. Roosevelt had a great dream—and I fondly hoped that he was a practical dreamer. His dream was the New Deal and by it he was to make real the splendid sentiment of his famous cousin, Theodore Roosevelt, who said:

This country in the long run will not be a good place for any one of us to live in unless and until it is a good place for all of us to live in.

He is now so far forgetting the New Deal as to urge the cutting to the bone of appropriations for the welfare of the one-third ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed. He has no time to see Members of the coordinate branch of this Government, the Congress, because forsooth he has to drive 50 miles in a storm to do the unprecedented in kingdoms as well as republics of personally escorting the aristocracy of the British Empire to its District of Columbia Embassy. He has forgotten that over 90 percent of the American people are opposed to going into this war.

Woodrow Wilson abandoned his new freedom and lost the prestige in American history that he might have attained. Franklin Roosevelt is abandoning his New Deal and will thereby lose that splendid place in history which his true friends hoped and prayed he might achieve.

Mark my words, if this bill passes—even though its proposed benefits will not accrue for almost a year—our soldiers and ships will be in the hell of a European war inside of 6 months. I for one refuse to be stamped into this march. With a few others I may go down to defeat but I will hold my head up, I will have a clear conscience, and with the approval, I fervently trust, of Almighty God.

In conclusion, may I say that I believe in America first, but in the spirit of this splendid sentiment by Bishop G. Ashton Oldham:

AMERICA FIRST

Not merely in matters material, but in things of the spirit.

Not merely in science, inventions, motors, and skyscrapers, but also in ideals, principles, character.

Not merely in the calm assertion of rights, but in the glad assumption of duties.

Not flaunting her strength as a giant, but bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world like a Good Samaritan.

Not in splendid isolation, but in courageous cooperation for world peace.

Not in pride, arrogance, and disdain of other races and peoples but in sympathy, love, and understanding.

Not in treading again the old, worn, bloody pathway, which ends inevitably in chaos and disaster, but in blazing a new trail, along which, please God, other nations will follow, into the new Jerusalem where wars shall be no more.

Some day some nation must take that path—unless we are to lapse once again into utter barbarism—and that honor I covet for my beloved America.

And so, in that spirit and with these hopes, I say with all my heart and soul, "America first."

[Applause.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURGIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Chairman, my approach to the lease-lend bill is one of deep humility. I realize that its provisions are very far reaching, perhaps more so than any legislation which has been considered by the Congress in many years, except a declaration of war. I further realize there is not much contribution I can make, as I doubt very seriously that any speech made during the debate on the bill will seriously change the opinion already formed by the Members of this body. However, my own convictions will be strengthened by a public statement.

This measure has been referred to as a war bill, a dictator bill, a bankruptcy bill. If I thought for one moment that it was any of these three, I would not support it. I am supporting the bill because I believe it best for our own selfish interests, and I use the words "selfish interests" in the broadest terms. We were told in many quarters before the outbreak of war in Europe that there would be no war. We were also told, after hostilities began in Europe, that it was a phoney war. We all realize now the grave war situation and that it is not a phoney war. Further, we were told before the outbreak of the war by opponents of this measure that the President was a war-monger and was trying to implicate us in war because of his various messages advocating more adequate defense. Then, after facing the fact that there was a war, the President was severely criticized for not preparing more adequately for our national defense. It seems to me that he could not be guilty of both of these accusations.

We are now keenly aware of the fact that the aggressors, led by the notorious Hitler, have almost completely dominated most of the other parts of the world, and the only citadel in Europe not dominated is Great Britain, and I frankly say that I am terribly fearful of the outcome there. This bill, in my opinion, instead of being a war bill, is our greatest guaranty at this time against being involved in war. This is the opinion of the President of the United States, who is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and who has intimate knowledge of the situation, and he believes that our chances of keeping war away from America would be greatly enhanced by the enactment of

this legislation. This is also the opinion of the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, and other officials of our Government, all men of the highest integrity and patriotism.

Moreover, the matter of aid to Britain short of war was emphasized in the platforms of both major political parties, and the candidates for the Presidency of these parties openly and repeatedly advocated aid to Britain short of war, and I believe this policy had the popular approval of the great majority of voters who supported these candidates.

With very few exceptions, Members of this Congress, irrespective of party, have expressed themselves as willing to aid Britain, and I believe that they are sincere, patriotic men. There is, of course, some division as to just how they wish this to be done. Therefore, the question is whether or not this bill is the right method. Some advocate an outright gift of money, some advocate an exchange by Britain of her properties for munitions, and some, of course, no aid at all unless cash payments can be made by Britain. We are told by the Secretary of the Treasury that the dollar resources of Britain are exhausted and they cannot pay on the barrel head.

There is some objection to the extension of the grant of power to the President. I realize that this is an extra grant of power to the President in peacetime, but in view of the conditions of the world at large and the threat to our security, I am fully prepared to place this extra power in the President's hands, with the limitations that are in the bill. Any appropriations that will be asked for under the authorization of the bill will have to have congressional approval, and with these checks I believe that the Congress and the American people are safeguarded. The situation in the world is not a theory but a very alarming and tragic fact.

I think I sense some opposition to the measure in quarters that distrust the President. May I make this observation: If you are sincerely in favor of the principles of this measure, it will have to be carried out through the now duly constituted offices of the American Government. We have just had an election, and the President has been returned to office, and, whether you like him or not, I trust him explicitly, and he will be the Chief Executive for 4 years more. This is not a partisan measure, or should not be. It is being advocated by men prominent in the councils of both parties, one of its strongest advocates being Hon. Wendell Willkie, who was a candidate for the Presidency on the Republican ticket last election, and who, in my opinion, is rendering his country, by the courageous stand he is taking, a very fine, outstanding, patriotic service.

I therefore urge the speedy passage of the measure without any additional amendments except those submitted by the committee. I fear, as do many others, that it is already later than we think.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI].

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is my first opportunity to address this honorable body, and I feel particularly privileged to appear today in support of what bill 1776 proposes to do.

I was singularly honored to be selected to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I have listened with eagerness to proponents and opponents of this bill. On the one side I heard concrete suggestions for aiding a distressed people—on the other I heard vocal support of aid to Great Britain—and then a multitude of buts. Either we should help Great Britain or we should not. If we want to help her, let us get to work and stop speaking loudly with a soft stick.

Overseas an embattled people are withstanding a holocaust too terrible to imagine. Gallant free people are fighting for their very existence against ruthless aggressors that are attempting to create a world ruled by force. I favor every possible support to these people in the way of arms, armaments, and machinery of war.

I do not favor this support on the grounds that they are fighting our war, or that we must save the world for democracy, but rather because I believe it is to our best interests that these invaded people be victorious. I do not fear a successful invasion of this country, if we are adequately prepared, but even an attempted invasion of this country or any country of the Western Hemisphere will take its toll of property damage and human life.

At the very least, a victory for the totalitarian powers would throw us into competition with the slave labor of the conquered countries. It would thereby greatly reduce our standard of living and destroy our foreign trade. It would enter us into an armament race that would eventually leave us exhausted and bankrupt. A wave of Nazi propaganda would harass us and attempt to break down our morale and might eventually involve us in a war without any friends or allies. We do not fear Hitler, but we abhor war, for we know the tremendous sacrifices and sorrows a war entails. This war was started away from our shores and that is where we would like to see it finished.

There is no question that the people of this country favor aid to Britain. They favor it, I believe, for the same reason that I do. By aiding Britain, we in America may be able to stay out of Europe's infernal holocaust. With the almost unanimous belief in the principles of aid to Britain as an important phase of our national-defense program, it boils down to a simple question of method. The bill before the House is not a mere aid-to-Britain measure—it is not a step toward war—it is plainly a measure for our own national defense.

When a bill is considered by so vast a deliberative body as Congress, it is practically impossible that it should satisfy everybody. At most we shall emerge with a bill that will meet the views of the majority. Personally, there are some changes that I should like to see incorporated into this bill, but even if no changes are made in the bill, I will support it because I am, in common with most Americans, in favor of what this

bill proposes to do in the interest of national defense. To date no better method than that proposed by this bill has been brought forward; therefore, let us eliminate the major objections, if there be any.

Though I do not question his sincerity, nevertheless I was shocked to hear the testimony given by Colonel Lindbergh before the Foreign Affairs Committee recently when he stated that it made no difference to him which side won this war. This is not a question of neutrality in a war between England and Germany. This is a question of neutrality in a war between our Christian civilization and a now thoroughly debunked gangster type of "wave of the future." This is a struggle of democracy and freedom against tyranny and oppression.

In so grave and important a combat, can any man be indifferent to the outcome, particularly when its results will be so far reaching. No man can be indifferent to such an outcome, for, as the Scripture says, "He who is not with me is against me." It is surprising that Colonel Lindbergh cannot see this issue as it really is and not as he would like it to be.

Those professing impartiality tell us that Hitler has no designs on us; that he cannot attack us, anyway—that we can live side by side with him. I for one do not trust Hitler. The roll call of valiant nations who had negotiated treaties and had trusted Hitler is the death knell of all these hopes—Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, and, yes, even England trusted him. Today look at them, all of them.

I read in the papers Monday evening that a former Governor of my State told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that he opposed this bill. With his brilliant flair for the unusual, the learned gentleman recalled a private conference he had with Mr. Daladier in 1939. He states now, 2 years later, that Daladier informed him that France expected materials, money, and men. This is now February 1941. If he believed the conversation important, why have we not heard from him before? If he had such information, it was his duty to disclose it.

The issue before this House is not a partisan issue; it is an American issue, deserving the support or opposition of the Members of this body without regard to party lines. For that reason I am happy to see Members of the minority party fighting for this bill and, contrarily, Members of the majority party fighting against the bill. This alone should wipe out the charge of "dictator bill" which is flaunted so loosely throughout the country.

Yes; again we hear the cry of dictatorship used against this bill, the same cry that has been used against every other bill proposed by the administration in the past. Yet we are able to sit here and openly debate this and every other measure; we are able to worship openly as we see fit; we have the same free press we have always had. What freedom have we surrendered that our forefathers fought to obtain for us? Today the man who calls dictator is like the man who called wolf. The record has worn thin.

I stand squarely behind the principle of aid to the remaining democracies because it is to our interests to keep this infernal madness from America. We want no black-outs, no air raids, and no slave labor for America. We need time to build a strong national defense, a national defense so strong that no nation will dare even consider a military or economic invasion of this hemisphere. The invaded democracies can give us the time we need if we give them the arms and munitions they need. For weeks we have conducted public hearings and open debates on this bill. All those who have had an opinion to express have had the opportunity to do so. We have used valuable time to a good purpose, but we cannot abuse that discretion. We must act now, for even now is later than we think.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, was here this afternoon expecting to make some remarks. He has been called to the hospital on account of serious illness in his family. I ask in his behalf unanimous consent that at this point he may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to hear complete testimony and thorough discussion on the lease-lend bill. And as a new man in Congress I have listened with particular interest to the hearings on this important measure. I have carefully noted the evidence submitted in support of the bill. On the other side I have heard charges of dictatorship and threats of inevitable war. Through it all, I have been impressed alike with the sincerity of administration leaders and other advocates, and that of conscientious opponents of the measure.

But I have weighed the evidence for myself. And that is what you, as Americans and as Members of this great deliberative body, will do. I have weighed the evidence and I am for the lease-lend bill. All that I have heard and read about it has served to strengthen my convictions. Briefly, I will tell you why.

The hearings have shown conclusively that Britain is approaching the end of her rope financially. Remember, we have not given Britain anything. Britain has paid with hard cash for every article of defense secured in the United States. But the end is now in sight for Britain's cash purchases. Her dollar exchange is nearly gone. She is finding it increasingly difficult to convert her remaining resources into dollar exchange, and as that difficulty grows, it becomes harder and harder for her to pay cash for goods in the United States. Now, let us remember, too, that under our present laws, Britain can secure in the United States only such material as she buys for cash.

Obviously Britain must have supplies in great quantity to carry on her gallant fight. Obviously she cannot produce them in the amount she needs. And among the nations whose markets are

open to Britain, only this country—the United States—can produce supplies of war in sufficient quantity to be of material assistance. In final analysis, Britain's only chance to carry on her fight lies in obtaining supplies from the United States. Our people know this. Our Government knows it. And after very careful study, the lease-lend bill has been proposed as the most effective and economical way to get those supplies to Britain quickly. That is the principal issue involved.

Other questions have been raised. They are important ones. Many of my colleagues fear that the United States is in danger of early invasion. That view was held by some of the experts who testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I do not share their apprehension. I think there is but small danger of actual invasion of the United States by armed forces. I believe that is one of the last things we have to fear, for I know the quality of this Nation and the fiber of its people.

Given a just cause and the strength of the thing we call Americanism, our people will rally to meet any threat of arms which may confront us. The patriotism of the American people has never failed to insure whatever sacrifice may have been required to carry on armed combat. And while I can conceive that huge odds may be thrown against us, I say that the American people can defend these United States, perhaps at fearful price, but safely, against attack. And I do not think all of our time will be spent in defense action.

Only in case of national bankruptcy and a disunited people is there danger from war. So I do not fear war now. We are united. We are strong. We are not bankrupt. But I do fear a new and sinister weapon more devastating in its effect on the morale of a people than war. I fear the thing we call totalitarian economy—trade war—economic unrest—weapons which strike silently and ruthlessly into the homes of a people and destroy courage and initiative and faith.

No; I do not fear Hitler's guns. The American people do not fear Hitler's guns. But totalitarian trade war can again bring depression crashing down around us. And depression now or in the future when we are weak financially from the cost of recovery and the cost of defense, can be worse than we have ever known. Totalitarian trade war can send men again to tramp the streets and the highways, seeking, begging work. Totalitarian trade war can pinch the stomachs of little children with cold and hunger. Totalitarian trade war can make men rise up in desperation against their own brothers. It provides fertile ground for the never-ceasing work of the "fifth columnist." It gives that sinister agent his opportunity to prey on the prejudices of a people; to stir them to hatred and rebellion.

Remember when you fight an economic war there are no bugles, no stirring martial music, no uniforms, and flags and parades to stir patriotism and incite people to sacrifice. But there is misery and misunderstanding and men grow poorer until they will stand no more. Then in desperation they turn to whatever offers

a promise for change and better. In Germany they called it nazi-ism.

I have painted a gloomy picture. But may I remind you that today Britain and Germany are locked in mortal combat, and that combat will determine whether Europe and Asia will follow a capitalistic economy—such as we have—or a totalitarian economy. If Germany conquers, we may expect Europe and Asia speedily to adopt Germany's totalitarian economy. We know what kind of economy that is. In many instances goods are produced by enforced labor—slave labor. In all instances there are long working hours, there is low pay, and there is modern, efficient machinery. Do not try to believe that Germans are not efficient and productive. That mistake has been made too often already. Americans have no monopoly on initiative.

In plain language, we will be trying to sell on a world market goods that we produce with \$40-a-week men working 7 hours a day. Those goods will compete with similar merchandise produced by \$10-a-week men of equal skill working 10 to 12 hours a day. Which goods can be produced more cheaply? Which can be sold more cheaply? Which will be sold on the world market? The farm picture will follow a closely related pattern. South America, whose economy is in no way geared to ours, can be driven away from us. We can, under such conditions, be left behind a Chinese wall of trade. It will not make a pleasant picture. But a totalitarian trade war can hardly develop unless Britain is defeated. That is a very good reason for aid to Britain.

There are other reasons—humane reasons—and it is for humane reasons that America really wants to help Britain. America has not given thought to trade wars. America is thinking of a way of life—a democratic way of life that it wants to help preserve—and I am proud to live in a nation that is not devoid of sentiment. The question of aid to Britain was settled months ago in the minds of the American people. We have determined that we will help Britain with all possible aid short of war, for we know that Britain fights to maintain a way of life which we want maintained. We know that Britain fights for the kind of freedom which made this great Nation possible; that victory for Britain is defeat for world-wide forces of darkness and oppression—forces which, if not checked, we inevitably will have to meet.

Charges of dictatorship have no place in the discussions of this measure. The accusation that he seeks to become a dictator has been hurled at Franklin Roosevelt in connection with every important measure voted by Congress since his first inauguration. The American people answered all such charges last November in the American way—with the votes of free men. We believed in Franklin Roosevelt then. We can and should and will believe in him now as he carefully steers the ship of state on its perilous course in this great world emergency.

To me that is the case for the lease-lend bill—a bill which we, as Americans, can safely and proudly support.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. Chairman, the House has just heard a very remarkable speech by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL]. [Applause.] Mr. HILL, as every Member of the House knows, is one of the leading New Dealers in this body. The speech he delivered was one of the most logical and most convincing and the best that has been made in this debate, and I hope it will be read by Members on both sides of the aisle. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us presents one of the most important issues that has ever been before Congress. This proposed legislation may affect the entire future course of our Government. Its importance transcends all partisan consideration. The issue raised seems to have divided the country in thought as much as any issue that was ever before the American people. I have had many letters, telegrams, and petitions from people in the district I have the honor to represent and the overwhelming majority of them are opposed to the passage of this bill.

The real issue in this legislation is hidden under talk about "aid to Britain," and the proponents have sought to make the public believe that H. R. 1776 must be passed in order to give aid to Britain. The fact is that this bill does not give aid to Britain or to any other country. It does not give anything to anyone except to the President of the United States. It gives to him more power than any other President ever asked for; to use the words of Secretary Hull, "more power than a good man would want and more than a bad man should have." Never before has the setting aside of our traditional constitutional form of government ever been proposed and the entire history of our country does not disclose that it was ever before proposed that in order to have national defense that we should substitute dictatorship or government by decree for representative democracy.

Under this bill the President could, without consulting Congress or anyone else, have United States arsenals, shipyards, and factories make any articles which the President decided were defense goods, and to sell, transfer, lend, lease, or otherwise dispose of—even give away—any such defense articles and to take payment or no payment as he should desire to do, for such goods, and to spend any amount of Government money for anything he sees fit, so long as he says it is for defense.

This bill also gives the President the power to do all the above "notwithstanding the provision of any other law." This provision gives the President the power to set aside the laws of the country. Under this bill the President could give away our entire Navy, all our planes, cannon, tanks, ammunition; in fact, he could give away every defense article we have, either on hand or "on order," including everything covered in current appropriations totaling the sum of twenty-seven and a

half billion dollars appropriated for 1940 and 1941.

This bill gives the President virtual power to take us into war on the side of any country or countries he thinks we should be allied with, and there are many people who firmly believe we will be in active participation very soon and apparently the administration is preparing for just that, as they have ordered 4,500,000 tags for identifying war dead and wounded. It gives him complete power to run our entire war effort without consulting Congress in any way and virtual power to control the war effort of any country he desires to control. And if these vast, unprecedented powers are given the President, who knows how he will use them? Who is able to answer whether they will be used wisely or not? The future can only determine. Again the question. Why give such vast powers to any man when they are not needed? Why take the chance of these powers being used unwisely or being used to put us into war?

The proponents of this bill argue that the bill is needed in order to get immediate aid to Britain, but they know that Britain is already getting, and for many months has been getting, all the aid from the United States that our industries have been able to produce. The way to help Britain is to produce more of the things Britain needs. The real need for haste in aid to Britain is not for haste in passing this bill, but is for haste in speeding up our industrial output. Everyone knows that the President has utterly failed to get maximum production; then why pass this bill and give him complete control? Would it not be better to take production out of his hands and place it in the control of people who are qualified and who can and will get immediate maximum production? Lord Halifax agrees with this view, as shown by his statement upon arriving here last Friday. He was asked what he considered the most urgent need, and his reply was, "Mobilization of your great industrial strength and translating that into action in supplying us with ships and supplies we need." A few days ago the House passed legislation providing for the construction of 200 cargo vessels. Congress can be depended upon to speedily pass all needed legislation. The only possible thing which might interfere with aid to Britain is the matter of payment, and if it is the desire of the United States Government to grant credit to Britain or to give defense articles to Britain, this can be done by a simple act of Congress and without establishing a dictatorship here.

If this bill becomes law, it might be a great handicap to Britain, as the President would then have the power to tell Britain what she should have, and there are many who believe that Britain knows best what she needs and that Britain should be permitted to secure the things she needs, and not let that be dependent upon the judgment of the President of the United States. Great Britain knows more about her needs than does the President of the United States, and she should be left free to secure the things she needs.

Under this bill the President asks for greater power than the British Parliament has given to the King of England or to Mr. Churchill. It seems very apparent that the President is using this situation as an excuse to gain dictatorial powers not only over the United States but over a vast part of the world.

There are many people who favor giving Britain every ounce of aid possible, but are not in favor of giving the President the vast powers he asks for. They realize that all possible aid can be given Britain without this bill being passed. The question has been repeatedly asked, "What aid can the United States give Britain under this bill that is not already being given Britain and which cannot be given without this bill?" This question has gone unanswered.

Surely it is not necessary to destroy democracy in the United States to save democracy any other place. Our challenge is to show that democracy is the best form of government for the people and that democracy can and will successfully meet all situations. How can the President consistently plead for the cause of democracy while at the same time he is asking the passage of a bill that would destroy this very democracy in the United States? It is safe to presume that if democracy is destroyed in the United States, through enactment of this bill, it cannot survive in any other part of the world.

The issue raised by this bill is not one of "aid to Britain," but rather the future form of government of the United States. If the administration actually wants to help Britain, why does it not put our production facilities to their maximum strength and permit Britain to obtain the things she needs without being dependent upon the judgment of the President as to what those needs are.

Every Member of Congress has given this bill his most careful and sincere consideration. It is my desire to represent and to be guided by the wishes of the people of the district which I have the honor to represent. They are vitally interested in this bill and I know they have not considered it from a partisan viewpoint, as many fine citizens of all political faiths have urged me to vote against the bill. They feel that this bill carries the power to destroy our representative form of government, the very Republic itself.

The responsibility resting upon the Members is very great and this legislation should be considered upon its merits, in a cool, calm, and deliberate manner and not upon emotionalism or hysteria. The calling of names and display of temper does not add anything to the proper solution of the issues.

It has long been established that all the wisdom does not rest within any one man. Has our democracy become so weakened that we must abandon it and become a Nation governed by one man instead of by the people? [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. It is now my honor to introduce to the House that mighty Nimrod who will go to war at any time in defense of the Constitution of the United States, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the very splendid introduction of

the gentleman, but did not understand how much time he was to be yielded.

Mr. FISH. I yield the gentleman 15 minutes. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under discussion, with its delegation of limitless powers to the President to intervene in war anywhere in the world with all of the resources of the United States, is a war bill of monstrous implications. The passage of this bill means the adoption by the United States of a policy of unrestrained, brutal, naked power politics for the domination of the world. This policy is imperialism gone mad.

This bill sets up a dictatorship in the presidency with the approval of the Congress. It sets aside constitutional provisions with regard to the declaration of war, the expenditure of public moneys, and the making of alliances; it threatens our Bill of Rights; and it violates fundamental principles of international law. It destroys our republican form of government and substitutes for it a totalitarian state.

The bill is just such a bill as Hitler and Mussolini forced through their parliamentary bodies at the beginning of their tyrannical regimes. The American people are opposed to the "nazification" or the "fascistification" of the United States, and they will not tolerate a Hitler or a Mussolini in Washington.

If the Congress approves this proposal, the Congress abdicates. It surrenders its rights and its responsibilities. It becomes another mere reichstag.

The politicians in Washington in their misleading and mendacious representations of policies and purposes are being as false to the American people as the French politicians recently were false to the French people. The consequences will be as disastrous.

It is patently disloyal to the American people to involve them in war against their will, and that is precisely what the enactment of the bill H. R. 1776 will do. The bill does not empower the President to declare war, but it does empower him to make war. In these days, war is seldom formally declared.

War means the setting up of a complete dictatorship here. It means the abolition of free economics, the imposition of censorship and espionage, in short, the establishment of a totalitarian government. The establishment of a totalitarian government here to fight totalitarian governments elsewhere would be the pinnacle of lunacy for the United States, a country which professes to believe in liberty and freedom, and which can maintain its neutrality and preserve its integrity.

Our duty is to maintain our Republic here. It is not our duty to endeavor with fire and sword to impose our form of government all over the world. We are responsible for the peace, prosperity, and order of the United States, not the peace, prosperity, and order of the world. To attempt to reform the whole world by force is to bring poverty, chaos, and revolution here. It is a maniacal undertaking utterly impossible of accomplishment.

The bill before us gives tangible expression to the purposes set forth in the address of the President to the Con-

gress four days before its introduction. The bill cannot be severed from that address. In that address the President stated that the United States was committed to "full support" of any country which resisted aggression, he alone to determine what was aggression, and he added that the United States would never "acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers."

The clear implications of these statements are (1) that the United States will enter into an alliance, offensive as well as defensive (in war, offense cannot be separated from defense), with any country resisting aggression, even communistic Russia; and (2) that the United States intends to participate in any proposed peace to carry out the assertions and the promises of the President.

Entering into alliances means active participation of our manpower in war if the present wars continue. In fact, it envisages our manpower in Europe, Asia, and Africa if England and China and Greece, and any other country that may become involved in defensive war, cannot win the wars in which they are engaged without the assistance of our manpower.

In his address to Congress the President also stated that he looked forward to "a world founded upon four essential human freedoms": (1) "Freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world"; (2) "freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world"; (3) "freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world"; and (4) "freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world."

If this bill is enacted, a dictatorship and a totalitarian government will be set up in the United States.

With the establishment of a dictatorship and a totalitarian government, "freedom of speech and expression" will disappear from the United States.

With the establishment of a dictatorship and a totalitarian government our constitutional guaranty of "freedom of every person to worship God in his own way" will vanish.

"Freedom from want" will not be obtained by the waging of war and the subsidizing of world wars, which inevitably bring crushing debt and taxation, and by the regimentation or confiscation of industry. From all this comes poverty.

"Freedom from fear" in the United States will not be obtained by the destruction of our Constitution, the suspension of our Bill of Rights, and the plunging of the United States in war in Europe, Asia, and Africa; and it is fantastic to believe that the United States can disarm the world. Reality has been abandoned and all history repudiated for a disordered, fatal, and spectral delusion.

The President's address to Congress was a clear declaration that the United

States intends to impose upon the whole world, by force of arms if necessary, our principles and our beliefs. No ruler in all history, with the possible exception of Mohammed—not even Alexander, Caesar, or Napoleon—ever publicly declared such a bloody world mission.

The United States will unquestionably become actively engaged in war if this bill is enacted.

Secretary of War Stimson testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that this bill permits the President to transfer the United States Navy "on considerations that he thinks concern our defense." He added, "I can foresee conditions that might make it desirable that the Navy be transferred. A situation might arise where it would be to our advantage to do so."

The Secretary of War thinks that it might be desirable for the President to commit an act of war. The Congress is asked to pass a bill empowering him to do so.

Senator BARKLEY and Representative McCORMACK, who introduced this bill in the Senate and the House of Representatives, issued an explanatory statement concerning the bill in which there appeared the following:

The provision is broad enough to permit the use of any of our military, naval, or air bases to outfit and repair the weapons of countries whose defense is vital to the defense of the United States.

Such acts would be violations of a vital principle of international law of long standing. They would also violate written understandings recently made with the South American countries. Such acts would be acts of war and would unquestionably bring war to the American continent, because such military, naval, or air bases would be subject to bombardment by enemy belligerents.

There have been no warlike acts committed against us. If we make war upon a nation which has committed no overt act against us we become the aggressor.

The bill allows the President to buy arms and ammunition and other war supplies not only for the United States but also for foreign countries, and it gives him full power to dispose of the goods as he sees fit. He can turn them over to whatever country he chooses and on such terms as he chooses. Thus, the President is given power to direct the present wars. The United States becomes the economic general headquarters and the President of the United States becomes the international commander in chief. Strategy of war then rests with him.

The bill repeals the provisions of the present law prohibiting ships from entering the war zones. It authorizes the President to ship contraband material to belligerent countries in American ships. It makes possible the convoy of these ships by American naval vessels. One ship sunk, one naval vessel sunk, and the United States is at war.

This bill would abrogate the Declaration of Independence. The last paragraph of the Declaration of Independence states:

* * * That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent

States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved.

The bill makes provision for an alliance with Great Britain. In fact, that is the essence of the bill. Such an alliance might well mean the end of the United States as an independent country. If the United States should remain an independent country, such an alliance would be tantamount to the guarantee by the United States of British political commitments all over the world. Great Britain is constantly at war on account of these political commitments. If the United States undertakes to guarantee these political commitments, she too will be constantly at war.

I reject with indignation the assertion that the United States has to hide behind the British Fleet. We can stand on our own feet with our own strength, as we always have. The danger to our Republic is not from destruction from without; it is from assassination from within.

The United States has been knowingly and designedly committed in advance to active participation in the present wars of Europe and Asia. As long ago as 1937 the President repudiated neutrality in his "quarantine speech" at Chicago. On March 7, 1938, Winston Churchill disclosed to Parliament that an agreement had been made for the "pooling" of the American and British Fleets in case of war in Europe. On April 6, 1939, it was announced that the United States and Great Britain had entered into a political alliance in the Pacific by assuming "joint control" over the strategically located Enderbury and Canton Islands. On July 26, 1939, the Secretary of State gave notice to Japan of the abrogation of our commercial treaty with Japan in preparation for cooperation with Great Britain for the protection of British interests in Asia. The most recent evidence of our commitment in advance to active participation in the present wars of Europe and Asia was the President's message to Congress followed four days later by the introduction of the bill now under discussion.

If the Congress enacts this bill, it puts its stamp of approval on this carefully planned involvement of the United States in war in Europe and Asia.

President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull prate continually about "principles of morality" and the "moral order." All the while they are at work on a propaganda of hate and fear to promote United States involvement in war.

Recently they removed the "moral embargo" on shipments from the United States of strategic war supplies to Soviet Russia in an attempt to appease that homicidal, communistic country. They took into their arms that most bloody aggressor. Now we have the public admission of Secretary of State Hull that the United States, although not attacked, has abandoned international law for the savage, barbarous purposes of force and power politics.

The United States has been set on the road to war bereft of character and moral standing. Once this bill is passed, the die is cast. The American people will

have no choice between peace and war. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the American people have been led by the administration to believe that the enormous sums of money which the President has asked for during the 8 years of his incumbency have provided us with an adequate national defense. Up to the time President Roosevelt asked Congress to adjourn and go home, because, as he said, there was nothing more for the Members to do but "make speeches," there had been none of the extra appropriations for additional billions for the national defense asked for by the President.

Hitler and the totalitarian menace have had their rise wholly during the Roosevelt administration. Whatever the present dangers which face this Nation from Europe or the Orient, they arose wholly within that period. President Roosevelt was the one man who had access to complete, world-wide information through the multifarious agencies of this Government, military and civil. He was the one man who knew, or who ought to have known, the dangers to this Nation that were arising. No one can by any specious argument whatever acquit Mr. Roosevelt of his responsibility in this regard. Congress has not refused to give him anything within reason he has asked, especially for the national defense, and it has given him much beyond reason in the 8 years of his Presidency.

The membership of this House will be intrigued by an examination of this table and can judge for itself whether this administration has lived up to its responsibility in providing for our national defense. This table is taken from the hearings on H. R. 9209, a bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Senate. This information was put into the record of the hearings on May 17, 1940, by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff. I assume these hearings are available to those desiring them.

Item	On hand May 1, 1940	Will be on hand upon completion of program
ANTI-AIRCRAFT		
3-inch guns.....	448	500
90-mm. guns.....	168	317
Directors.....	142	273
Height finders.....	194	276
Sound locators.....	15	801
37-mm. guns, anti-aircraft.....	1,014	1,423
.50-caliber machine guns.....		1,682
SMALL ARMS		
Semiautomatic rifles.....	38,000	240,559
37-mm. antitank guns.....	228	1,386
60-mm. mortars.....	3	3,758
81-mm. mortars.....	183	853
Machine gun, caliber .50 (pack).....	83	962
FIELD ARTILLERY MATERIAL		
75-mm. gun, modernized.....	141	1,432
75-mm. howitzer (field and pack).....	80	319
105-mm. howitzer.....		120
155-mm. gun, long range.....	4	96
8-inch howitzer.....		48

Item	On hand May 1, 1940	Will be on hand upon completion of program
COMBAT VEHICLES		
Scout cars	485	1,246
Combat cars	113	293
Tanks, light M2A4	10	734
Tanks, medium M2	18	194
TRACTORS AND SPECIAL ORDNANCE VEHICLES		
Tractors, light	93	129
Tractors, medium	261	559
Tractors, heavy	65	777
Trucks, small arms repair	79	145
Trucks, instrument repair		53
RAILWAY ARTILLERY		
8-inch railway gun and carriage		24
AMMUNITION		
Ammunition bomb, 500-pound	11,928	84,924
Ammunition bomb, 1,000-pound	4,336	14,511
Caliber, .30 A. P.	17,268,000	73,920,000
Caliber, .50 ball	25,220,000	53,117,000
37-mm. tank and antitank	75,000	1,205,000
81-mm. antiaircraft gun	46,000	2,624,000
81-mm. mortar	43,000	373,000
75-mm. howitzer, H. E.	142,000	332,500
155-mm. howitzer, H. E.	925,000	1,131,000
8-inch howitzer, H. E.		29,000
ENGINEER CORPS		
Ponton bridge, 10-ton	1	32
Ponton equipage, 23-ton	1	8
Water-purification unit	4	45
Searchlight, 60-inch mobile	285	1,028
CHEMICAL WARFARE		
Gas masks	407,606	1,297,000
QUARTERMASTER CORPS		
Cloth wool uniform, yards		5,500,000
Field ranges	667,000	5,000
Pack saddles, cargo	434	2,235
SIGNAL CORPS		
Radio set SCR 16L	390	1,849
Radio set SCR 171	26	491
Radio set SCR 194	809	2,138
Wire (field wire) (miles)	16,800	65,491
Field telephones (miles)	15,800	47,602
Detector sets		182

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the fact that the figures in the right-hand column in the table above disclose the complete program as of May 1, 1940, of supplying modern equipment for our Army. It should not be forgotten that prior to this date Europe had been ablaze with war for months. Poland was invaded September 1, 1939. Two days later Great Britain declared war. Denmark, Norway, and Finland were invaded. The invasion of Holland and Belgium began May 10, 1940, followed by the invasion of France. All this took place before the President suggested that the Congress adjourn and go home, because there was nothing further for it to do.

Following that, when Congress refused to quit and go home, the President apparently suddenly discovered that a great emergency existed and that there was a dire need for a real national defense, and began asking for one appropriation after another, running into the billions. He is still asking. He then began to tell the country what a fine national defense we had "on hand or on order."

Therefore, in view of these circumstances, it was natural that the Congress and the country should be shocked by the revelation by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson that Gen. George Marshall, who supported the lease-lend bill—strangely in view of his own military convictions—was asked whether, with that authority, we could not transfer to Britain surplus stores of Army equipment, he said:

Stores? We have no stores. It will be a happy day when we can speak about stores of Army equipment * * * we have a need for all the modern equipment delivered to us.

And he might well have added, "and much besides."

This is certainly a shocking admission on the part of the Army's Chief of Staff.

The table above reveals that we were woefully short of modern defense equipment. Not only woefully short, dangerously short. Critically short. It will be seen that the Army had on hand, on May 1, 1940, only 38,000 semiautomatic rifles, caliber .30. They had but 228 37 mm. antitank guns. They had only 3 60 mm. mortars. They had only 183 81 mm. mortars. They had only 319 .50 caliber machine guns. They had only 86 .30 caliber machine guns. On that date, according to the testimony in the hearings, there was not a single automatic rifle, caliber .30, in the Army.

Down through the entire list of ordnance, artillery, tanks, and other combat vehicles, anti-aircraft equipment, the story was the same. The "on order" defense the President talked so convincingly about could not be completely delivered before late 1941 or the middle of 1942, and those dates have since had to be set forward, and nobody knows when our "on order" defense will ever be on hand.

While all this neglect and short-sightedness was taking place, we were, as is shown in the extracts below from the November 1940, Monthly Summary of the Department of Commerce, industriously shipping to other nations our iron and steel scrap by the millions of tons—and today we are short of this valuable and necessary product. We were shipping to other countries, including Japan and Russia, and the subjugated countries, ferrous alloys and nonferrous metals by the hundreds of millions of dollars' worth. We shipped nearly a billion pounds of copper abroad in the first 11 months of 1940, and have had to draw upon our reserves to replenish our necessary stock.

The extracts referred to are as follows:

Exports of domestic merchandise, by articles

Articles	November 1940		11 months ending November 1940	
	Quantity	Dollars	Quantity	Dollars
GROUP 6				
Iron ore	127,741	418,357	1,385,792	4,621,099
Iron and steel semimanufactures		30,419,820		340,731,154
Pig iron	27,838	746,986	484,615	11,237,746
Iron and steel scrap	73,809	1,272,398	2,725,533	45,915,213
Tin-plate scrap	25	475	2,866	55,433
Tin-plate circles, strips, cobbles, and scroll-shear butts	396	22,453	3,969	215,954
Waste-waste tin plate	97	7,088	5,588	309,575
Terneplate clippings and scrap	22	1,365	15,102	471,107
Steel ingots, blooms, billets, slabs, sheet bars, and tin-plate bars:				
Not containing alloy	226,437	9,209,079	2,024,000	76,288,223
Alloy steel, including stainless	58,404	2,757,079	236,982	10,932,443
Iron and steel bars and rods:				
Steel bars, cold finished	35,099,120	716,141	116,001,738	3,929,137
Iron bars	1,765,483	64,793	29,021,639	916,377
Concrete reinforcement bars	18,536,438	470,689	271,178,328	6,990,574
Other steel bars:				
Not containing alloy	85,008,390	2,252,151	991,743,414	25,398,929
Stainless steel	664,377	290,710	2,998,854	1,113,126
Alloy steel, other than stainless	4,617,978	588,577	84,738,986	7,551,198
Wire rods	49,659,257	1,034,007	607,602,057	13,279,967
Iron and steel plates, sheets, skelp, and strips: Boiler plate	2,201,441	57,472	23,013,235	741,347
Other plates, not fabricated:				
Not containing alloy	121,945,796	2,839,716	1,104,477,000	25,466,753
Stainless steel	100,675	35,362	1,012,304	347,185
Alloy steel, other than stainless	6,867,211	148,276	11,705,107	449,561
Skelp iron or steel	48,264,909	951,502	309,675,805	5,861,138
Iron sheets, galvanized	1,267,724	80,582	19,246,193	803,885
Steel sheets, galvanized:				
Not containing alloy	22,192,693	867,974	318,987,678	12,221,588
Stainless steel				
Alloy steel, other than stainless				
Iron sheets, black	95,662,506	2,659,064	957,095,727	29,141,839
Stainless steel	331,792	116,691	3,602,089	1,446,306
Alloy steel, other than stainless	2,759,051	218,694	20,295,143	1,320,250
Iron sheets, black	2,630,870	98,894	55,102,062	2,118,760

Exports of domestic merchandise, by articles—Continued

Articles	November 1940		11 months ending November 1940	
	Quantity	Dollars	Quantity	Dollars
Strip, hoop, band, and scroll iron or steel:				
Cold rolled:				
Not containing alloy.....do.....	22,553,705	755,170	127,641,730	5,328,586
Stainless steel.....do.....	59,126	19,298	1,415,358	404,471
Alloy steel, other than stainless.....do.....	52,877	16,967	1,067,187	193,020
Hot rolled:				
Not containing alloy.....do.....	19,684,788	559,194	277,128,122	7,704,742
Stainless steel.....do.....	50,540	10,709	490,121	96,346
Alloy steel, other than stainless.....do.....	277,051	45,023	2,350,092	192,717
Tin plate and taggers' tin.....do.....	30,931,078	1,546,047	810,710,108	41,976,041
Terneplate, including long ternes.....do.....	666,778	29,214	12,529,072	521,596
Nonferrous metals, except precious.....do.....		14,179,611		200,389,508
Aluminum.....do.....		920,049		23,333,767
Bauxite and other aluminum ores.....tons.....	7,489	92,023	67,048	849,666
Alumina.....do.....	1	425	18	4,407
Other bauxite concentrates.....do.....	2	108	8,684	707,268
Aluminum ingots and alloys.....pounds.....	223,529	51,131	24,408,641	5,843,410
Aluminum scrap.....do.....	24,542	2,841	1,910,070	331,649
Plates, sheets, bars, strips, and rods.....do.....	1,210,699	461,926	28,365,399	11,866,612
Aluminum foil.....do.....	190,972	79,040	2,572,529	1,120,390
Tubes, moldings, castings, and other shapes.....do.....	179,380	76,070	2,378,951	1,216,405
Table, kitchen, and hospital utensils.....pounds.....	77,728	51,700	737,489	430,309
Aluminum and aluminum-bronze powder.....do.....	59,472	29,498	826,665	347,909
Other aluminum manufactures.....do.....		75,287		1,115,742
Copper.....pounds.....	35,807,382	4,522,025	829,098,500	106,510,242
Ore, concentrates, matte, unrefined copper as blister, converter copper, or anodes (copper content).....do.....	2,263	206	588,546	79,623
Refined copper in cathodes, billets, ingots, bars, or other forms.....do.....	26,778,304	2,793,928	693,759,378	79,763,973
Old and scrap copper.....do.....	347,857	29,578	13,286,209	1,417,691
Pipes and tubes.....do.....	427,789	110,484	7,313,749	1,539,570
Plates and sheets.....do.....	755,791	144,233	6,698,484	1,270,011
Rods.....do.....	3,255,101	369,541	40,326,857	5,030,654
Wire (bare).....do.....	1,137,754	174,177	15,468,251	2,320,773
Insulated copper wire and cable:				
Rubber-covered wire.....do.....	693,451	175,568	32,143,833	8,913,562
Weatherproof wire.....do.....	187,785	31,039	1,488,276	281,446
Other insulated copper wire.....do.....	2,221,287	468,860	18,024,917	4,453,120
Other copper manufactures.....do.....		224,411		1,434,819
Power-driven metal-working machinery.....do.....		7,413,932		217,788,776
Engine lathes.....number.....	1,020	2,173,214	7,268	14,505,589
Turret lathes.....do.....	387	1,765,503	3,685	16,015,704
Other lathes.....do.....	615	1,952,385	6,927	12,255,436
Vertical boring mills and chucking machines.....do.....	126	1,050,307	1,119	8,988,255
Thread-cutting and automatic screw machines.....do.....	419	2,005,015	4,143	18,251,743
Knee and column type milling machines.....do.....	454	2,742,799	2,397	11,783,969
Other milling machines.....do.....	665	3,310,786	5,152	20,545,413
Gear-cutting machines.....do.....	109	466,281	1,429	7,001,078
Vertical drilling machines.....do.....	904	436,143	4,268	3,464,824
Radial drilling machines.....do.....	68	271,162	771	2,722,200
Other drilling machines.....do.....	733	949,514	4,847	5,380,189
Planers.....do.....	41	301,461	362	2,549,809
Shapers.....do.....	112	267,874	812	2,741,540
Surface grinding machines.....do.....	258	434,342	2,232	5,168,192
External cylindrical grinding machines.....do.....	84	579,676	985	6,058,852
Internal grinding machines.....do.....	60	354,789	1,177	7,253,718
Tool grinding, cutter grinding, and universal grinding machines.....do.....	363	1,197,733	3,322	6,896,050
Other metal-grinding machines and parts.....do.....		1,376,574		11,480,765
Sheet and plate metal-working machines and parts.....do.....		637,181		8,966,111
Forging machinery and parts.....do.....		757,854		7,738,818
Rolling-mill machinery and parts.....do.....		1,653,819		14,681,834
Molding machines.....number.....	11	15,114	218	350,180
Blast cleaning and tumbling machines.....do.....	5	8,054	140	121,558
Other foundry equipment and parts.....do.....		163,481		1,483,640
Other power-driven metal-working machinery and parts.....do.....		2,542,871		21,383,309
Other metal-working machinery.....do.....		911,038		8,334,249
Pneumatic portable tools.....number.....	1,223	93,175	26,526	2,050,285
Other portable and hand- or foot-operated metal-working machines and parts.....do.....		161,117		1,856,740
Chucks for machine tools.....number.....	9,029	50,649	100,358	537,355
Milling cutters, machine-operated threading dies and taps, and similar machine-operated metal cutting tools.....do.....	28,401	260,451	115,972	1,475,458
Other metal-working machine tools and parts.....do.....		345,646		2,414,411
Textile, sewing, and shoe machinery.....do.....		1,505,271		21,392,847
Aircraft, parts, and accessories.....do.....		26,737,709		279,646,097
Land planes (powered).....number.....	286	13,446,194	3,061	173,490,930
Seaplanes and amphibians.....do.....	1	11,235	24	1,387,679
Glinters and lighter-than-air craft.....do.....	4	1,700	7	3,090
Land planes minus engines.....do.....			71	3,385,404
Parts for aircraft (for assembly and replacement):				
Parachutes and parts.....do.....		64,387		986,601
Engines.....number.....	440	5,216,560	4,427	43,107,450
Aircraft engine parts and accessories.....do.....		2,747,548		17,126,446
Aircraft instruments and parts.....do.....		1,214,386		6,188,117
Propellers and parts of.....do.....		915,159		9,319,337
Aircraft parts and accessories, n. e. s.....do.....		3,120,540		24,651,043
Firearms, ammunition and fireworks.....do.....		5,456,733		56,834,445
Firearms and ordnance:				
Revolvers and pistols.....number.....	11,192	222,485	92,585	1,617,530
Rifles.....do.....	8,567	78,013	932,639	7,026,682
Shotguns.....do.....	1,643	19,198	29,546	280,407
Machine and heavy ordnance guns and carriages.....do.....	10,711	1,994,590	143,059	16,860,894
Ammunition:				
Shot shells.....M.....	936	22,384	12,751	292,321
Metallic cartridges.....M.....	50,941	1,505,123	484,278	12,163,338
Explosive shells and projectiles.....pounds.....	20,000	10,000	29,485,632	12,967,264
Other.....do.....		1,572,008		5,412,493
Fireworks.....do.....		32,932		182,516

Mr. Chairman, it will be seen that steam engines, locomotives, power machines of every character, machine tools, such as engine and turret lathes, milling machines—the very implements which are the bottlenecks delaying our own defense—in values of hundreds of millions of dollars, were going out in an enormous stream to the other countries, including Japan and Russia and the countries now subjugated by Hitler.

Some of those machine tools have just within the last few weeks gone to Russia, and the British are now complaining that the war materials we have sent to Russia are finding their way into Germany.

Everybody knows the story of how our airplanes have been sent over while we denied ourselves of our own defense.

In the first 11 months of 1940 we shipped abroad more than 92,000 revolvers and pistols, nearly a million army rifles, 29,000 shotguns, more than 143,000 machine and heavy ordnance guns and carriages, nearly a million metallic cartridges, and 29,500,000 explosive shells and projectiles of the 1-pound size.

Little wonder indeed that General Marshall sadly says:

Stores? We have no stores. It will be a happy day when we can speak about stores of Army equipment. * * * We have a need for all the modern equipment delivered to us.

No man in Congress or out, except Mr. Roosevelt and his confidants, knows the actual state of undefense of this Nation.

These are the shocking reasons why so many Members of the Congress are gravely debating today whether or not to pass the so-called lease-lend bill, which has been more aptly described as the "lose-lend" bill, which will authorize President Roosevelt to give away or sell to any country which he may choose such further part of our pitifully scant national defense as now exists or as can be delivered to us in the future.

The administration knew, of course, that this flood of munitions, matériel, and implements of war was flowing out to Japan and Russia and other countries. Nothing was done to stop it until very recently. Under the terms of the so-called lease-lend bill, Mr. Roosevelt could absolutely denude this Nation of its naval power, if he saw fit. The proponents of the bill contend he would not do these things. The transfer of 50 destroyers to the British without approval of Congress and the facts and the figures which have been given in the foregoing do not bear out this contention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a table from the Senate hearings, and also extracts from the Department of Commerce summary of exports for the month of November.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for H. R. 1776, as amended, because I am convinced that it is a measure which is decidedly in the interests of our national defense.

Every poll of public opinion and the letters which I have received from my constituents indicate that the vast majority of the American people favor all aid to Great Britain short of war. They favor our sending planes, munitions, and implements of warfare to Great Britain as speedily as possible, which is what this legislation seeks to accomplish. We hereby seek to improve and strengthen our own defense by helping Great Britain to defeat the Axis dictatorships and thereby prevent their attacking and invading the Western Hemisphere and our own country. We provide the young men of Great Britain with the implements of warfare in order to obviate, if possible, the need and necessity of our own young men having to use similar weapons in the defense of our country. Is this a wise and prudent policy for us to follow? It seems to me that it is. In other words, we seek to keep war out of the United States and thereby keep the United States out of war.

We have succeeded in keeping out of the war to this date, and we are the only nation in the world which has not suffered loss of life or property. Under all the conditions and circumstances, this is a miraculous achievement and is the best evidence of the desire of President Roosevelt and Congress not to involve our country unless and until we are ourselves attacked. This has been and remains our principal objective.

The main purpose of H. R. 1776, as amended, is to enable the President to more effectively defend the United States by measures short of war, within the Constitution. As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President already possesses enormous constitutional powers. The President can sever diplomatic relations with foreign powers. The President can send the Army and Navy wherever he deems advisable. The fact that he has exercised none of these constitutional powers is positive proof of the fact that he has sought to avoid war, for he has refrained from exercising any of the constitutional powers which might and very likely would precipitate hostilities. H. R. 1776, as amended, will better enable the President to coordinate production and the allocation of armaments to satisfy British and American needs and in collaboration with the Army and Navy Departments render a maximum of aid to Great Britain and at the same time better build up our own national defense. Is not this a wise, prudent, and salutary policy to follow? It seems to me that it is, and there is not a single sound, valid objection which can be urged against it. [Applause.]

As indicative of public sentiment in the State of Washington, I append the resolution which has just been adopted by an overwhelming majority in both branches of the Washington State Legislature. Every member of the senate and house present from my Third Congressional District voted in favor of the adoption of the resolution. [Applause.]

The resolution reads as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 1

Relating to the foreign policies of the United States

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled:

Whereas the citizens of this Commonwealth have given overwhelming endorsement to the foreign policies of President Franklin D. Roosevelt; and

Whereas at the present moment the free peoples of the world are engaged in a life and death struggle with the totalitarian powers, who seek to crush those fundamental rights dear to all Americans, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas the Honorable Wendell L. Willkie, titular head of the Republican Party, has shown his high patriotism by endorsing the program of the President in this great world crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the efforts of our President to give full aid to the valiant free peoples of the world in their battle to preserve the principles of democracy, and that we call upon our representatives in Congress to support him to the utmost in his magnificent fight to keep our country out of war while giving full aid to the democratic nations engaged in a valiant struggle against barbarian aggressors; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately sent to the President, the Secretary of the Senate, and Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each of our Representatives in Congress.

The roll call in the senate and house was as follows:

Senate: For, 40; against, 2; absent 2.

Against: Atkinson, Murfin.

For: Baldwin, Bargreen, Black, Copeland, Dawson, Drumheller, Duggan, Edwards, Egbert, Haddon, Huntley, Jackson, Keller, Lindsay, Lovejoy, Malstrom, Marsh, Maxwell, McDonald, McGavick, McMillan, McQuesten, Miller, Moe, Mohler, Morgan, Murphy, Neal, Orndorff, Percival, Ray, Roberts, Rosellini, Schroeder, Shorett, Stinson, Sullivan, Thomas, Joyce, Wall.

Absent: Balfour, Farquharson.

House: For, 79; against, 18; absent, 2.

Against: Bernethy, Custer, Dootson, Eaton, Eddy, Hurley, Lauman, Needham, O'Gorman, Pennock, Pettus, Shadbolt, Sisson, Vernon A. Smith, Taylor, Todd, Trombley, Woodall.

For: H. C. Armstrong, Ralph L. J. Armstrong, Backman, Beierlein, Bienz, Boede, Broome, Callow, Carty, Chervenka, Clark, Cowen, Devenish, Doherty, Dore, Erdahl, Robert M. Ford, Dr. U. S. Ford, Foster, French, Gallagher, Gates, Graham, Hall, Hanks, Julia Butler Hansen, Alfred J. Hanson, Henry, Harry F. Henson, Isenhardt, Walter A. Johnson, George H. Johnston, D. W. Jones, John R. Jones, Judd, Kehoe, George G. Kinnear, Leber, Lee, Lennart, Loney, Lyman, Martin, McCutcheon, McDonald, McPherson, Floyd C. Miller, Fred Miller, Montgomery, O'Brien, Pearsall, Phillips, Pitt, Reno, Edward F. Riley, Rosellini, Ruark, Ryan, Sandegren, Schumann, Sexton, Jurie B. Smith, Sweeney, Taft, Thomas, Tisdale, Trunkley, Turner, Twidwell, Underwood, Van Buskirk, Vane, Warnica, Watkins, Wenberg, Wiggen, Zent, Mr. Speaker (Reilly).

Absent: Murphy, Savage.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the floor following the epoch-making speech of our leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. The speech he delivered on the floor this afternoon will rank as one of the notable speeches in the history of the American Congress.

His clear and convincing exposition of the bill, the high plane upon which he pitched his argument and the eloquence with which he maintained it, leaves nothing to be added. Any further argument in behalf of the bill would be superfluous. I shall not discuss it further. I shall follow him implicitly in this supreme hour of his statesmanlike and effective leadership. But just a word on a phase of the question not yet touched upon in the course of the debate. It is a broad subject with far-reaching implications radiating in many directions, and there is always the possibility that in our deep interest in its primary objective in international relations we may overlook its inevitable reaction on our domestic economy.

The bill provides for the transportation of products, commodities, goods, wares, merchandise, and services in unprecedented quantities. To quote the language of the bill, it provides for the fabrication, processing, distribution, and disposition of any "defense article" which, of course, includes the products and joint products of both labor and industry. I am wondering if the provisions of the bill are to be interpreted as including also the products of agriculture as well as those of labor and industry. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in charge of this bill, who has handled it with such skill and success in both the committee and the House, if we are to understand that the provisions of the bill apply to farm products as well as to manufactured products?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman is correct in so understanding. It does so provide in the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There has been some discussion as to whether farm products are included but this statement by the chairman of the committee which considered and reported the bill conclusively disposes of any doubts which may have arisen in that connection. It is certain then that the Government under this authorization will send abroad not only the products of our plants and factories but vast quantities of food, feed, and fiber grown on the American farms. Only one further fact remains to be determined. Will the farmer be as well paid for his labor and products thus contributed to the program as labor and industry are paid for those which they supply. The Government has already indicated its deep concern in seeing that both labor and industry are amply compensated for their services. All contracts awarded up to this time have contained cost-plus provisions or have been negotiated at figures which insured protection against loss and legitimate profits for all concerned. And where it has been necessary to further assure industry, the Government has provided facilities, built plants, supplied equipment, and made loans to be amortized out of the products produced under the contract.

Likewise labor has been protected and wage scales guaranteed by the clauses in every contract requiring meticulous observance of labor laws providing for minimum wages and maximum hours and otherwise insuring the payment of the highest wages under the most favorable

conditions ever enjoyed by labor in any land.

This is as it should be. And only one more step is needed. That is for the Government to give similar assurance to the farmer that when cotton, wheat, corn, pork, beef, rice, tobacco, and dairy products are shipped abroad with guns, planes, tanks, and munitions, the Government will pay him as fair a price for his toil and as fair a price for his products as it pays labor and industry.

Happily, there is no difficulty in determining what farm prices should be. While Congress was enacting laws specifying minimum wages for labor and maximum prices for industry, it also enacted laws promising the farmer minimum parity prices and providing formulas for determining parity prices. Here are the prices computed by the Department of Agriculture under those formulas:

Parity prices of farm products

Estimates of average prices received by farmers at local farm markets based on reports to the Agricultural Marketing Service. Average of reports covering the United States weighted according to relative importance of district and States]

Product	5-year average, August 1909-July 1914	December 1940	Parity price, December 1940
Cotton, pound.....cents..	12.4	9.33	15.87
Corn, bushel.....do....	64.2	54.5	82.2
Wheat, bushel.....do....	88.4	71.5	113.2
Hay, ton.....dollars..	11.87	7.53	15.19
Potatoes, bushel.....cents..	69.7	54.9	86.5
Oats, bushel.....do....	39.9	32.3	51.1
Soybeans, bushel ¹dollars..	(²)	.81	1.73
Peanuts, pound.....cents..	4.8	3.22	6.1
Rice, bushel.....do....	81.3	76.3	104.1
Tobacco:			
Flue-cured, types 11-14, pound.....cents..	22.9	12.1	122.4
Burley, type 31, pound.....cents..	22.2	17.3	121.8
Apples, bushel.....dollars..	.96	.86	1.23
Beef cattle, hundredweight dollars.....	5.21	7.56	6.67
Hogs, hundredweight.....do....	7.22	5.59	9.24
Chickens, pound.....cents..	11.4	13.0	14.6
Eggs, dozen.....do....	21.5	26.8	37.0
Butterfat, pound.....do....	26.3	34.8	36.8
Wool, pound.....do....	18.3	31.2	23.4
Veal calves, hundredweight dollars.....	6.75	9.01	8.64
Lamb, hundredweight.....do....	5.87	7.88	7.51
Horses, each.....do....	136.60	69.10	174.80

¹ Post-war base.
² Soybeans for seed.
³ Prices not available.
⁴ Adjusted for seasonality.

And here are computations of parity wages from data supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics:

Parity wages in building and construction, and of factory workers

Occupation	June 1, 1940	
	Earnings per week	Estimated parity earnings
	Dollars	Dollars
Plumbers.....	58.10	37.13
Electricians.....	58.04	33.42
Stonemasons.....	59.60	36.18
Steam fitters.....	59.91	35.24
Carpenters.....	55.15	32.78
Painters.....	50.32	31.56
Bricklayers.....	64.85	43.24
Factory workers.....	25.77	17.11

I do not happen to have with me a tabulation of parity prices for industrial

products but they are available. And a glance at the financial page of any newspaper will show conclusively that industrial prices are far above parity, some of them, as in the case of building materials, having increased as much as 50 percent in the last 90 days.

I think no one will deny, in the face of these official reports, that agriculture is entitled to receive a bare parity price, at least, for all farm products shipped to England under the provisions of this act, when the Government is so aggressively demanding minimum wage scales and maximum prices on all industrial products shipped to England under the provisions of the act.

In every past war agriculture has borne the brunt of the economic recoil which always attends and follows military campaigns, whether foreign or domestic. The American farmer has invariably been caught between the upper and lower millstones of uncontrolled inflation in the price of everything he bought and the imposition of arbitrary regulations freezing the price of everything he had to sell.

Legislation by Congress in recent years authorizing parity prices for farm products should prevent the recurrence of such conditions under the operation of this bill. And it is to be hoped that the Committee on Agriculture in furtherance of this established policy, will shortly report legislation implementing this authorization. In the enactment of such legislation, organized agriculture earnestly solicits the aid and counsel of all representatives of organized labor with whom the American farmer has always cooperated so wholeheartedly to secure legislation providing the highest possible standard of living for American labor.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, there is no substantial number of American citizens who desire active participation in the bloody European carnage.

Our present national course and foreign policy will have no bearing or effect upon the probability of our becoming involved in the war. It all depends upon Hitler and his criminal allies, who will not hesitate to strike as foul a blow against the United States as was struck against Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, defenseless Denmark, and the other neutral and peace-loving neighbors of Germany—Luxemburg, Belgium, Holland, and Norway. No provocation was given there, none will be necessary here to strike down our country. Military expediency only and the ability to get away with arson, rape, and murder will be the deciding factors in any attempted fulfillment of the objectives of Mein Kampf. Germany never before needed an excuse to attack her neighbors; she needs one much less today. The historical record of her depredations always bad, became intensely worse during the period of 1864 to 1939. During these 75 years, without provocation she murderously struck down her neighbors five times. We as a sovereign people are safe from involvement by German attack as long as Britain and her fleet bars the way across the broad Atlantic highway; for concededly it is not

the water in the narrow moat known as the English Channel that thus far has kept the Germans out of England—it is the British fleet and nothing else.

There is no reason at this time why the United States should in reality or by any binding and formal alliance become a belligerent partner of England; but America, as the best possible means of self-defense, immediately should supply Great Britain with bombs, barbed wire, buckshot, and baled hell in unlimited quantities, for cash or as an outright gift. Our merchant ships should be used to shorten England's life line by carrying her supplies from distant parts of the world to Boston, Montreal, Halifax, and other New England, Nova Scotian, and Canadian ports for transshipment over the short trans-Atlantic route over which ships could be more easily and safely conveyed by the British to their own ports.

The number of Americans who oppose aid to Britain is about in balance with those who on the other hand demand our immediate and outright declaration of war and joining with England. The number constitutes but a small fraction of the population.

It is my studied and unswerving opinion that by concentrating our efforts upon maximum possible production of ships, planes, tanks, and munitions which should be supplied Britain to the greatest possible extent consistent with our own needs and safety, that we will best serve ourselves, and saving democracy we will restore the subjugated peoples of blood-drenched Europe. That is the only safe course and as I see it the only one which offers promise of noninvolvement.

This is no time for temporizing, speculating, or silly sentimentalism. We must face realities, we cannot dicker, bargain, or compromise with Germany. She is without honor—she has no word. We must observe the ever-increasing number of victims that have fallen beneath the crushing weight of her ruthlessness. We must remember, too, that in every instance trusting victims were attacked and their sovereignty destroyed after a solemn pledge had been voluntarily given by aggressor Germany.

We are unchallenged today and beyond the reach of the predators because of the limited aid thus far given to England. Our future will be made permanently secure by a British victory made possible by our continued material contributions.

Those who would attempt to prevent the flow of these essentials of war to the struggling democracies cannot hide their real purpose, the success at arms of Nazi Germany and her allies.

You Republicans misunderstand the philosophy, the temper of the American people. You insist upon being wrong on the question of sound foreign policy when you could so easily be right by following our patriotic and inspired President. Pay heed to the head of your party, to your chosen leader. Listen attentively to his advice bearing upon the pending question. Do not repeat the same mistake you made as you looked forward to the campaign of 1940. Forget politics. Let 1942 take care of itself or it will take care of you. False prophecies such as the one who stood in this well

and predicted that the Republicans would gain 80 seats will lead you into the wilderness and political oblivion. Throw away your white cane and tin cup, open your political eyes, and quit this everlasting hopeless groping. Most of you are not so blind as to be unable to see the danger which threatens America, civilization, the world, all of us without regard to partisan affiliation. A certain amount of comedy is necessary even when public hearings are being conducted on serious questions. It was nevertheless pathetic to see the rehearsed burlesque which the people witnessed during the recent appearance of a barnstorming stunt flier who gave advice from the storehouse of his inexhaustible ignorance about America's foreign policy, about her invincibility and security. It was a show, the best show the public ever saw and the chorus rose and applauded. The sum total of Lindbergh's advice could be totaled at zero. If you do not get down to realities, you will lose the public confidence and your party hide. Why not invite "Wrong Way" Corrigan to testify? He performed a greater trick flight than did Lindbergh. Why not invite the expression of the eight or nine other trans-Atlantic fliers who crossed the ocean ahead of Lindbergh and Corrigan; they could give testimony just as valuable and authoritative as that of the Lone Eagle.

Judging the attitude of the minority by the conclusions contained in the report the inevitable and logical interpretation could only be that the testimony of the following list of credible and experienced witnesses were of no weight or import. Among these you will find men and women of the highest order, diplomats, labor leaders, statesmen, military and naval experts of the highest rank, industrialists, journalists, and, last but not least, the brilliant and experienced Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, his worthy cabinet associates, Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury; and the Secretaries of War and of the Navy, Henry L. Stimson and Frank Knox.

A dictator bill the Republicans labeled H. R. 1776. It is an anti-Hitler bill, aimed to make America safe for us all. The combination of numerals designating the bill have a deep significance at this time. Patriots will rally to its support as did the patriots in that historic year of 1776, when our independence was declared, our Government born, and the rights of Americans everywhere permanently established. We shall carry on now to preserve our American way of life.

Precious time is being wasted in a useless and a protracted debate that has been transferred from the news pages to the floor of this House. It may be dangerous trifling with the security of our own Nation, upon which today the civilized world depends. The great majority of the Members will not be affected by the gas attack, the wind, and hot air, but will be influenced by the pressing need of the hour, guided by patriotism. In the House the bill will pass with reasonable promptness and carry by a substantial margin. Then it is destined to face a withering attack after leaving here. The purpose

being to delay action, in order to handicap the struggling democracies in favor of Germany, so she may retain her ill-gotten gains and continue the enslavement of millions of proud and civilized people.

The Chinook winds from the Northwest will blow like a fury, pseudo-isolationists will employ every trick phrase their genius is capable of inventing, and this they will level against the proponents of the bill. But the sanity, patriotism, and courage of the majority will withstand the onslaught, the bill will pass and become law, and civilization will be saved by America's magnanimous and fearless action.

I hope that when the bill is discussed in the Senate we may as a part of the debates find out the source of the malodorous eight-point proposal for a negotiated peace. I refer to the one which seeks to enslave permanently the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the other countries, and attempts to let the criminal Nazis go stark free for their arch crime of all time. It is without a doubt Nazi-ist in origin. It could not be otherwise. It is cut exactly according to their own pattern, and, if I am wrong in my suspicions that a special courier or "fifth columnist" did not take advantage of the proponent, then I can only say that mental telepathy and kindred spirits work in a way that is strange and effective. The Lindbergh plan along this line, which aims at a stalemate or a combat draw, is inspired by the same philosophy, if not original with Goebbels and Hitler. Someone in the Senate might ask some pointed, embarrassing questions which might satisfy the craving for knowledge of the American people. I do hope so.

Every time the administration proposes a bill and it then becomes the responsibility of the majority to expedite its passage, the Republican minority yells "dictatorship," "bankruptcy," "abdication by Congress," "rubber stamps," "unconstitutional," and employs every other verbal and written bogey they can bring to bear against the measure. We heard it used against the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Gold Standard Act, and again when we debated the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Every time we considered a relief bill this Chamber resounded with high-pitched voices and the stereotyped phrases. Similarly, these same old charges were hurled at the majority as part of the reorganization debates, and again when the neutrality, embargo, and wages and hours bills were debated.

My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], the spearhead of many spirited battles, among other ridiculous statements, on Monday, said:

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.

It is startling news to me that we are only now to become rubber stamps.

I thought I heard Republicans shouting loud and long about our mental and physical resiliency or ductility so many times that we believed we were confirmed and vulcanized implements used to register the will of the President. That line of bunk is so old, outworn, and ineffective

that the people have at last learned that it is a fake and a foible. Democracy goes on safe in the hands of the Democrats, to the chagrin of a bewildered Republican minority.

Is it the Republican Party idea or that of the purblind variety within it to hamstring the Chief Executive during a time of continued emergency? Are we to quibble, argue, and debate in order to procrastinate, in order to encourage the dictators of Germany, Italy, and militaristic Japan? The red tape of insincerity and legislative privilege must be cut to the limit. This bill does not authorize or confer any dictatorial power upon the President; it does not eliminate or surrender congressional control; it is not unconstitutional. The bill aims to free the hand of the Executive, within proper bounds, to deal expeditiously with any emergency now existent or which may momentarily arise. The bill will permit counter moves to circumvent German and Japanese threats wherever they may appear to menace our American rights and interests, whether in China, in Europe, or in the Western Hemisphere. The bill will save the lives of American boys and girls.

The bill may bear directly upon prospective deals and may allow some horse trading. I am not going to handicap the Commander in Chief of my country so that he forfeits in trade a thoroughbred for a broomtailed pony.

The battleship *King George V*, which recently visited our shores when the new British Ambassador arrived, is to be traded for American destroyers, so it is rumored. The newspaper story written by Cliff Prevost, outstanding Capitol correspondent for the Detroit Free Press, was promptly denied. In view of what is happening in Indochina and the threats of the Japanese toward the Dutch East Indies, it might be most reasonable to assume that battleguns of the greatest possible gun power for the United States are the need of the hour.

If we are to stand by our oft-repeated declarations of policy, if we are to defend the flag as long as it waves over the Philippines, if we are to protect our vital far eastern trade routes, our missions, and our rights, then we must be prepared for any eventuality. The yellow peril of the Pacific, stimulated by the poison of German cohesion and phobia, each day threatens America with ever-increasing boldness. The war lords of Japan are inching their way toward the acquisition of territories and bases which will strangle American trade in the Far East, pinch off essential raw materials, and destroy American industry with the aggregate result of reducing our living standard to an intolerable level. Japan will not fight the United States only because she cannot do so successfully at this time. She will attempt to gain every advantage she can, and we must act in concert with Great Britain and Holland to stop her in her tracks; there is no time to lose. Not a shot will be fired, not a single life will be lost if we act with determination and promptness, if with courage, we act now. All hell's affire, and broken loose, and here we are fiddling and fuddling about whether we ought to

fight it or learn to live with it. Some ponderous debate has been going on as to whether we should supply the English fireman with a squirt gun gratis or charge him for it.

I am in favor of all-out aid to England as long as they are willing to continue this heroic fight for Christianity, democracy, and for humanity. I only hope that if and when they get the Hun on the run that they will burn his tail feathers off so close they will reduce him to cracklins. Hitler and his supporters know that if England gets our continued increased material assistance that he may as well be in hell without a fan as to try to defeat the heroic Britons. So he tried to bulldoze the United States, but in this he failed. "We do not scare so easily," so said our great President. I confess, I will never be satisfied until Hitler's mangy, worthless hide is tanned and nailed to a barn door. To accomplish the destruction of Nazi-ism, I am willing to stand a tax increase of 100 percent to pay for all the buckshot and baled hell the British can deliver to the Nazis with my compliments.

Hitler's most recent declaration is the most brazen and contemptible lie beneath which we find the broken remains of the victims, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Norway, Denmark, and others soon to follow. Will Ireland be next? The scab paperhanger can be relied upon to do just the opposite of what he tells the world. In other words, if he disclaims any desire to attack the United States or to invade Ireland, the opposite is exactly what he will do, and if peaceful Ireland, trying so hard to maintain her difficult neutral position, is invaded by Germany, then I say to you that our Navy should meet them head-on and blow the pirates into eternity. With me that will be the last straw.

For the two reasons, first, because it will indicate clearly their westerly advance toward our American shores by extending the German battle line 800 to 900 miles from their westernmost boundary; and second, because Ireland must be spared the suffering and the mass murder which otherwise awaits her sons and daughters. I am voting for the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I am utterly opposed to the pending resolution. I am opposed to it with or without amendments. I am opposed to its very essence and its very reason for being. I am opposed to the foreign policy which it symbolizes and is intended to implement. I am opposed to it because it means and spells war—war for America and American youth on foreign soil. I am opposed to it because it means and spells military dictatorship for all America here at home.

In this hour of tragedy all over the world, America stands at the crossroads. Down one course lies the destiny of our great Nation based on a policy of America for the Americans, while down the other lies our destiny based on a policy of internationalism. To those of us entrusted with the votes representing the

will of our people falls the vital responsibility of committing this country to either one of these two courses. There is no middle ground.

There can be no doubt that H. R. 1776—which numerical designation must be causing our patriots of Revolutionary fame to writhe restlessly in protest—commits us irrevocably and irretrievably to a course of internationalism and imperialism. We cannot follow the President's call to free the world from oppression, repression, and insecurity without at the same time committing ourselves to the far-reaching responsibilities and implications of such a crusade. The idea of wrestling with the unemployment and insecurity problems of the world finds me quite cold and unresponsive, particularly when I have daily reminders calling to my attention the many millions in the United States who even today, at this very hour, are hungry, cold, and clothed in rags. Recent statements of Bevin of Britain and his comrades indicate that they, too, are leaders in a similar crusade based on economic immorality and equality for the whole world.

This must mean then that we are brothers in the flesh and the spirit of this grandiose international moral spasm but to attain this lofty ideal, our mutual objective, we must first engage in the great holocaust of war. Well, that is one effective way to reduce unemployment. At least H. R. 1776 will be the means to this partial satisfaction of our idealistic crusade against world unemployment and poverty. The title of this resolution should be amended to read:

A bill to liquidate the world unemployment through war and its mass employment of human cannon fodder.

What an indictment of our collective intelligence that we once again, after less than a quarter of a century, permit ourselves to be the willing victims of foreign war plans and war propaganda. But here we are at the cross roads regardless of the clearly marked signposts of the past 3 years, almost crowding in our eagerness to get down the road to war. And, once again, in the name of Christianity, morality, and humanity, ironically enough we orient ourselves down the road to hell itself.

And for what purpose is it proposed for America to make this horrible sacrifice? What is the purpose of this resolution?

We are told that it is to save democracy for the world. But we know that to be false, for we know that the only democracy remaining in all this world is here in the United States of America where this resolution cannot save but only can destroy it. We know this is not a resolution to save America, for, if it were, it would be a resolution to remedy the ills of an American people one-third of whom are ill-housed and ill-clothed and ill-fed.

We are told that it is to save the people of Great Britain whose financial resources are exhausted. But we know that also to be false, for we know that the financial resources of the British Empire are far from exhausted, that the existing wealth of that empire is enormous, that the possessions of the British Crown are of incalculable worth, and that the aggregate wealth of the subjects of the British

Empire—these subjects in whose name this falsehood is presented—is beyond that of any other nation upon the face of the earth.

We are told that the purpose of this bill is to save England by giving to it the ships and the defense weapons, the airplanes, and the guns of the American people. But we know that likewise to be false, for we know that today Great Britain possesses more merchant shipping than ever before in her history—so much that her ships are reported still to be carrying oil from Venezuela and copper from Chile, and the Lord only knows what other war supplies, to Spain for probable transshipment to Italy and to Germany to be used in the mass murder of Great Britain's own people; and her ships are busy making private profits in the Asiatic trade which that same Great Britain hesitates to entrust to American ships because Great Britain fears we will not return that trade after the war.

In the matter of increased supplies of airplanes, guns, and I O U's, authorized in this bill, we also know that this resolution will not help England to meet this impending so-called crisis, because we now are sending too her more than generous allotments of the materials of warfare which our productive capacity is currently turning out. The immediate crisis upon which the present need of this bill is being sold to the American public will not be affected one iota by the passage of this bill, unless we are to give away more of our existing naval and military strength. We are advised that this further stripping of our own meager defenses is not contemplated at the moment. Therefore it seems to me quite clear that any emergent urgency of this bill, insofar as immediate aid to England is concerned, is just so much window dressing to develop further the already distressing war psychosis of our people which is daily being fanned into a higher flame by militants, even of our clergy, who would have us commit murder in the name of Christianity and God.

But this resolution, Mr. Chairman, is flying false colors. It has no right to be called a resolution, for there is no resolution in it. This is a child of irresolution, of fear, and hysteria, and downright pusillanimity cowering behind the pretext of aiding democracy while cravenly proposing to permit the poor, deluded common people, the sacrificed and misguided people of Britain, to defend us, as they have been deluded into defending their own money-grabbing, imperialistic aristocracy, while our own poor, misguided people suffer the consequences of our lack of courage and of our incompetence—yours and mine. We are afraid to face the truth. We are considering betraying America and all it stands for because we are afraid to face the truth. And this resolution is the written confession of it. This is what this misconceived resolution is, and every thinking man and woman knows it. It proposes the surrender of the last democracy upon earth into the hands not only of a military dictatorship but of the international brigands whose god is the calf of gold. On the basis of buying time at the ex-

pense of the blood of the poor people of England, what a crass and a sordid stand America takes as it enacts the principle and policy of this legislation.

Let us suppose that this horrible resolution is passed, then let us contemplate the inevitable result. Dictatorship at home and abroad while the war goes on. Dictation by foreigners if the end is defeat. And if the end is victory for Britain, and us, what then? Inescapable necessity for the establishing of American influence over and responsibility for the war-prostrated peoples of all the world, for the sponsoring by America of governments everywhere and the policing and feeding and financing of the entire world. That, Mr. Chairman, is the inevitable harvest of what is sought by the instigators of this monstrosity we have before us. That is the harvest they invite, wittingly or no. Is that what we want or what our people want?

Mr. Chairman, I say to you and to the Members of this House that, cry though my voice may in the wilderness, never shall I vote nor acquiesce in such craven abandonment of reason as this resolution offers, nor such hollow mockery of truth as that to which it pretends. This is not a resolution for the defense of America. It is a resolution for the defense of international financiers and aristocrats desiring to cling to their own ill-gotten wealth while their own poor people fight the war and America's poor people pay the bills.

This resolution is predicated on the proposition that this European and Asiatic threat to the British Empire is our war. It assumes that our defense and the security of the Western Hemisphere depend upon the defeat of the Axis Powers. I deny such an assumption and reject any such premise. Stripping the false face of obvious war propaganda from the contention of the arm-chair strategists that the Western Hemisphere faces a military invasion, it seems crystal clear to me that the worldly financial and trade interests of the United States and the British Empire then stand forth as the real reason for this interventionist foreign policy. If this is the case, and I believe that it is, then, the two to three billions of dollars' worth of normal and average export volume of the United States is not in my opinion worth the shedding of one drop of blood of a single American youth in war on foreign soil for the protection of the same. For me, then, there is only left the trade and financial interests of the British Empire as the reason for being of this bill which, God forbid, that America should be committed to foreign wars to preserve.

We are told that we cannot survive in a world where force runs rampant and dictatorial governments reign, and yet for the 150 years of our national being, during which period America has done pretty well for itself, there has been only one decade that has not had from one to eight armed conflicts and clashes of force between nations. During the same period dictators all over the world have come and gone. So now we are to change all this through the world-paternalistic and interventionist foreign policy of

Uncle Sam as outlined in this legislative monstrosity now pending. In other words, our Government plus Comrade Bevin, of England, are to create the world holding company for good will and security for all men; but, first, superlatively ironical as it is, we must go to war in the interests of this good will and security. When will the American people refuse to be lulled into a mental coma by such continuously recurring unmitigated eyewash? International good will will find its most fertile soil in the solution of economic maladjustments within nations which are nearly self-sufficient and then permitting any resultant surpluses to overflow to the less fortunate nations of the world; that is, when international financial interests permit such an ideal to be developed.

In conclusion let me state that my opposition to the policy of war, briefly summarized, is based on a two-fold viewpoint:

First, no individual or nation ever swaggered around looking for trouble without getting it and paying plenty and dearly for it, and that is the policy laid down in this bill for the United States to follow; and, second, the United States with the sole exception of the first World War and a few minor martial aberrations, has always done pretty well for itself by keeping its nose out of foreign entanglements, and we would do mighty well to follow that course now, but I fear that the national proboscis has already pushed out over 3,000 to 7,000 miles of water, asking for punishment which we will inevitably get, win, lose, or draw, as we may, in this war.

In brief, as to my position in connection with H. R. 1776 and the foreign policy, it symbolizes, I am constrained and honored to "string along" with that brave and courageous American, Lindbergh. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, for 3 long and hectic days we have listened to debate on this bill, with many instances of heat, passion, fiery denunciation together with more solemn warning than I have heard at any time during my 4 years in this body—and these last 4 years have been momentous. I truly believe that there is no exaggeration in the statements made by gentlemen on both sides of the aisle that this is a momentous bill, for I truly believe that this is the most critical time our country has faced in a generation, and accordingly, this bill may be of deepest significance. I had about made up my mind to listen only and say nothing this time excepting by my vote. However, I cannot let slip this last opportunity to indicate my feeling and attitude in such a crucial hour.

Let us look at facts and act accordingly. America has the blueprints of a two-ocean navy and it was good to have Chairman VINSON's statement that we have at this moment more than blueprints. However, practically our entire Navy is in the Pacific. There must be some very good reason why it is in the Pacific. I would like to see our present naval strength, which is today in the

Pacific, remain there. Now, we are told, that we cannot have a two-ocean navy before 1946. It is certainly to be hoped that we do not feel the need of a two-ocean navy prior to its completion.

As a member of this national policy determining branch of our Government I am, as is each one of you, interested in the total defense of our whole country. Yet, it is rather natural for me to be thinking of the far West and the sunset shores of America, which might be vulnerable, if for any reason our present Navy should be called from the Pacific to the Atlantic at any time prior to our having a two-ocean Navy. Of course, our Navy would certainly be brought from the Pacific to the Atlantic, if America were menaced from the east, even though we might also be menaced from the west at the same time, for the bulk of our population is in the eastern part of the country. A greater task of protection exists for the Navy over here because the bulk of our wealth and population is adjacent to the Atlantic Ocean. Certainly, it seems to me that it is a part of good judgment to assist any friendly navy controlling the Atlantic Ocean and not permit it to fall into unfriendly hands at any time—and certainly not prior to 1946. Now, regarding that friendly foreign navy—it does not make any difference whether I like the uniform, or the pronunciation by the men, or the flag of such a fleet, so long as it is friendly and effective.

There is a widespread, and I believe well-grounded, fear in this country that America is in danger. High officials of the Government have said so publicly, and many of my constituents, whom I represent, have said so to me privately and in correspondence. This Nation is in danger because of the ill-will, the contemptuous spirit, and hostile attitude of powerful outlaw leaders of outlaw governments. How long has that ill-will and contempt and hostile attitude toward us existed? It has existed much longer than the past 8 years. It has not been engendered by the sharp words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It existed long before this Roosevelt became President. One of the foremost of these international outlaws is Hitler and he leads a nation, many of whom have been imbued with a feeling of superiority. However, that feeling has not just lately sprung up in central Europe among the storm-troopers who carry the swastika. A generation before found their fathers speaking of "kultur", which they thought was the product of the race of supermen. We have had trouble with the Government and leaders of that people, several times in American history. For proof, ask Woodrow Wilson; ask Theodore Roosevelt; ask Admiral Dewey; ask Grover Cleveland; or ask any one of the millions of German immigrants who fled from the fatherland and came to this country to escape its oppressions.

Some say that our President has been too sharp in his characterization of these aggressors and that he should have been more diplomatic. I can scarcely see how he could have gained any less of the contempt of Hitler, or of Mussolini, if our President had exhibited lamb-like meekness in his speaking of them or

agreeing with them. I do not believe that if America must finally have hostilities with Hitler, that it will be due to anything that has happened in the past few years that would not also have happened due to our clashes and hatreds by German leaders through former years. If there is anyone who supposes that Hitler may declare war on us—or more likely still make war on us without a declaration—because of anything that the Congress or President has done during the past 8 years, such a person is ignorant of a lot of history that transpired prior to 1933.

During this debate we have heard much said about the British Empire, with an effort to make it appear that the supporters of this bill want solely or chiefly to uphold the British Empire. It has even been said that there is mighty little to choose between British imperialism and Nazi imperialism, entirely unmindful of the fact that the British Empire is not what it used to be. Well, I can see a lot of difference, if that were the real choice; but that is not the choice.

At this moment civilization is at the crossroads. Certainly, Christian civilization is at a greater hazard today than it was when Charles Martel shattered the forces of the soldiers of the Crescent on the fields of Tours. The fate of the Christian world at that time hung in the balance, and western civilization was menaced by warlike frenzied fanaticism of those who had a superiority complex. They thought they were the possessors and the propagators of the only true religious faith. Today Christianity and western civilization is likewise menaced, and at a greater hazard from a more numerous, a more warlike people—the fanatical supporters of the swastika who are imbued with a different kind of superiority complex such as that of race and culture, as well as of religion. This time on the fields of Tours the horsemen of the fanatics were not conquered, but their tanks and the torch blowers overcame the defenders.

I am no Anglophile, but I do have a great admiration for my cultural heritage, and I have respect for the mother country which was the origin of so much of that cultural heritage. It is true that those same Britons conquered my ancestors, but I bear them no resentment any more than I do my grandmother for the spanking she gave me when I was 2 years old. I do not recognize any language, literature, or culture, any law, government or social system as superior to that which has been evolved in western Europe and on historic islands off the west coast of Europe in which my ancestors and yours had a part. That is not to say that I am condoning all that may have happened in British history. I recognize faults as well as virtues.

Apparently, we are fairly well agreed that we ought to give aid to Britain, but many of the opponents of this measure object to the bill because of the power which they say it gives to the President. Yesterday, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] quite properly pointed out that under our constitutional government, the President has power to involve us in war. That distinguished

Republican said as earnestly as I can say it that he did not believe that President Roosevelt wanted to involve us in this war. Truly, I believe that the President is doing everything possible to keep us from being involved with manpower and in actual fighting now, or for our grandchildren to be involved because of this war.

Yes, most of us feel that we must give aid to Britain, but how far shall we go? I am not willing that we shall declare war or actually send our soldiers to engage in this war with or without a declaration of war. I firmly believe that if the Axis Powers win this war, that we are going to have to fight them desperately later and that we will have to make vastly more preparation and arm vastly more men at that later date than we would have to do today if we should enter the war now. Even so, I would not send men today. I believe we can bring our economic powers to bear with immediate and sufficient aid to Britain so that the madmen of Europe will be stopped in their tracks, and it will not be necessary for us to send a soldier across the seas.

I firmly believe that if the Axis Powers should win a victory in Europe, Asia, and Africa, that this country of ours must outdo Sparta of old in military organization and equipment through unborn generations to come. This would impose such a crushing burden of taxation, such an abrogation of the Bill of Rights, such a doing away with our personal liberties, and such a change in our American way of life, that its burdens would be next to slavery under the Nazi regime. Therefore, whatever wealth we contribute now to avert an Axis victory abroad will be but a drop in the bucket to what, in case of failure now, we shall have to contribute later to prevent an Axis victory throughout the world in the years to come.

In all of my thinking in regard to this matter, I am holding America first, and the preservation of American ideals and way of life as the chief consideration. I may be willing to support certain amendments, certainly the committee amendments to this bill and possibly some others, but I do feel that the bill as probably amended ought to pass, empowering the President to render such aid as will make a victory of the aggressors and a domination of the world by them impossible.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair advise me how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has consumed 8 hours and 23 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has consumed 8 hours and 12 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN], a member of the committee.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the minority says that there have been two reasons given for new legislation: (1) Britain is running short of dollar exchange, and (2) we need to coordinate British procurement with our own efforts; and that this bill does not provide dollar exchange for Britain and is not needed

to procure coordination of our defense efforts.

The minority's argument fails to recognize the realities of the situation. It is true the bill does not provide dollar exchange for Britain, but let us inquire further. What is dollar exchange, and what is its importance in the present picture? Obviously, the only purpose dollar exchange serves from the present British standpoint is that it is a means of securing much-needed military supplies and equipment from this country. Dollar exchange is not an objective in itself—it is simply a medium through which the true objective can be obtained. The present bill, however, goes to the root of the problem by providing for the immediate manufacture and procurement of defense articles and for their transfer to Britain and other democracies on the best terms that this Government can get. To talk about dollar exchange at this point is as if a man whose neighbor's house was on fire should undertake, when the neighbor came calling for help, to lend him money, instead of a hose, so that the neighbor could purchase the help.

Our neighbor's house is on fire and there is grave danger that the fire may spread to our own home if the conflagration is not checked. In selfish self-interest, therefore, if for no other reason, let us supply all the help we can in the form of equipment as quickly as possible. Let us do it, to be sure, on the best possible terms we can get, but let us always remember that the primary goal from the standpoint of our own interest is the quickness and effectiveness of the help and not the amount of return we shall get for it. If Britain wins with our help, we shall be saved enormous defense expenditures in the future. Even if the worst happens and Britain loses, our help to them will at least have delayed their defeat and gained us valuable time to arm against world aggressors.

Contrary to the views of the minority, the lease-lend bill is definitely needed to procure coordination of our defense efforts. Under the bill this Government will have charge of the entire production and procurement program, both for our own needs and those of Britain and the other democracies. The advantage of this from our standpoint is tremendous. It will greatly facilitate the standardization of defense supplies which is so indispensable to rapid mass production. The problem after all is essentially how to best use and best allocate between Britain and ourselves the production facilities of this country which are still wholly inadequate for the defense needs of our two great nations. As a practical example, let us assume that after the enactment of this bill we should order 10,000 planes with the intention of transferring them to Britain. Since this Government would be in charge of production and procurement of these planes, we could make sure that they were of a type best suited to our own military needs so that in the event Britain should fall, we could take the planes over as they come off the assembly line and quickly integrate them with our own Military Establishment. While the existing procedures already make possible the coordination of British

procurement with our own, let us remember that no degree of coordination can make two or more separate procurement programs as effective as a single integrated procurement program. This will be possible under the lease-lend bill.

The minority attacks the committee amendments with the statement that they—

do not prohibit our conveying merchantmen; do not require our Army or Navy officers to determine our own defense needs; do not place a constitutional 2-year limitation on the life of the bill.

First. One of the amendments recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee provides that nothing in the bill "should be construed to authorize or permit the authorization of conveying vessels by naval vessels of the United States." The language could hardly be plainer. Even prior to the amendment there was nothing in the bill which in any way touched the power of the Navy to convoy vessels, and to make assurance doubly sure the committee decided on the amendment quoted. The minority is, therefore, apparently resorting to red-herring tactics.

Second. The Constitution makes the President Commander in Chief of the Army and Commander in Chief of the Navy. No President would act in any important defense matter connected with the Army or the Navy without consulting responsible officers of the Army or the Navy. Nevertheless, again to make assurance doubly sure, the committee has recommended an amendment to the bill that military or naval equipment not manufactured or procured pursuant to paragraph 1 of section 3 (a) of the bill, shall not 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. The minority, however, would require certificates by "our highest Army and Navy officers" as a prerequisite to the sale of arms to Britain by this Government. This perfectly exemplifies their willingness to violate the spirit and perhaps the letter of the Constitution of the United States if that is necessary to an attack on the present incumbent of the office of President of the United States. As the Attorney General of the United States has said:

To prohibit action by the constitutionally created Commander in Chief except upon authorization of a statutory officer subordinate in rank is of questionable constitutionality.

Third. By their statement that the amendments do not place "a constitutional 2-year limitation on the life of the bill," the minority craftily seeks to create the impression that such a limitation is a constitutional requirement. This is, of course, a flat falsehood.

The only limitation of this sort is a provision in the Constitution that appropriations to raise and support armies shall not be made for a longer term than 2 years. This limitation applies only to appropriation acts. As every signer of the minority report and, indeed, every Member of Congress knows, the present bill is not an appropriation act. Not one

nickel can be withdrawn from the Treasury of the United States after this bill is enacted. The bill is by its terms merely an authorization for an appropriation, and appropriation acts to carry it into effect will be necessary before any money will be available for the purposes of the bill. These appropriation acts will be the customary 1- or, in some instances, 2-year statutes which comply in every respect with the letter and spirit of the constitutional limitation on Army appropriations. Entirely aside from the foregoing, your committee has recommended an amendment limiting the life of the present bill until June 30, 1943, only 2 years and a few months from today.

The minority gives as one of their reasons for opposing the bill that it would give "the President absolute power over every concern in this country manufacturing war materials." This is another example of the distortions and inaccuracies with which the report is replete. The fact of the matter is that the President was given power to take over and operate any plant in the country for defense procurement purposes by section 9 of the Selective Service Act, which became law on September 16, 1940. Similar power of a somewhat lesser scope had previously been granted by section 8 (b) of an act of June 28, 1940. Since the granting of that power to the President was one of the much-discussed issues in the last election campaign, I am amazed to find that the minority now has the temerity to attempt to deceive the American people by telling them that the lease-lend bill would grant this power to the President for the first time, or that anything in H. R. 1776 grants any such power.

The minority in its report proposed seven specific amendments to the present bill:

1. A \$2,000,000,000 credit to Britain, to be used in this country for purchasing arms when her dollar balance for this purpose is exhausted, requiring reasonable collateral security if available.

The lack of realism of this proposal has already been discussed. It merely introduces an extra and unnecessary step into a situation in which there is little enough time for any steps. The bill in its present form goes straight to the heart of the problem.

2. Permit the sale by our Government of arms to Britain only when our highest Army and Navy officers certify in writing such arms are not necessary for our national defense.

The lease-lend bill authorizes the President to dispose of arms to Britain only when he finds that it is in the interest of our own national defense. The Constitution specifically makes the President the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He is, therefore, the highest officer of the Army as well as the highest officer of the Navy. For Congress to attempt to require him to act only on the written certification of one of his subordinates would certainly violate the spirit of the Constitution and probably its letter.

3. A 1-year time limit on all extraordinary powers. Congress meets again next year and can easily extend the time limit if our interests require it.

An amendment recommended by a majority of the committee limits the life of the bill to June 30, 1943, slightly over 2 years away. This is in harmony with the time limitations which Congress has placed on other extraordinary emergency powers given to the President in the past 8 years, for instance, in the case of the stabilization and monetary powers and the reorganization powers.

4. Provide that no vessels of the United States Navy shall be disposed of without the consent of Congress.

The Secretary of the Navy assured the committee that there was no present intention to dispose of any vessels of the United States Navy under the bill, nevertheless a situation might arise in which a few of our vessels might mean the difference between victory or defeat for the British. A situation of this character could develop very quickly. Congress could not possibly act quickly enough to fill the needs of such a situation. The power to act quickly and decisively must be vested somewhere, and the head of the executive branch of the Government and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy is the logical recipient for it.

5. Prohibit the use of our ports for repair bases for belligerent ships. We must not bring the war to American ports.

This is another example of the minority's willingness to talk of their desire to aid Britain and their unwillingness to reduce their aid to terms of practical realities. Let us suppose, for example, that the great British battleship *George V* had been torpedoed off our coast during the recent trip on which it brought the new British Ambassador, Lord Halifax, to the United States. The minority says it desires to aid England, but it apparently prefers that if that battleship should succeed in limping into one of our ports, it should not be repaired and returned to active service but would have to remain there crippled for the rest of the war, though the loss of such a great man-of-war would mean a serious impairment of Britain's naval striking force.

6. Prohibit the use of American vessels to transfer exports to belligerents.

This amendment would be entirely superfluous since section 2 (a) of the Neutrality Act of 1939 prohibits the use of American vessels for the purpose of carrying passengers or cargo to belligerents.

7. Prohibit the convoying of merchantmen by our Navy. One sunken ship might plunge us into war.

I have already discussed this matter. In the first place, there is nothing in the bill that in any way affects or endangers any existing powers to use our Navy for convoying merchantmen. Secondly, a majority of the committee has recommended an amendment which specifically states that nothing in the bill shall be construed to authorize such convoy work. The powers of the President to order the Navy anywhere on the high seas do not stem from Congress but from the Constitution.

The minority also states that Congress should specify the nations to receive aid.

To leave it wide open would mean the President could, now that we have lifted the moral embargo, give aid to Russia, by sending planes and war materials. Congress is to be in session for some months. It can extend aid to other countries if it is necessary.

As a practical example of the logic of this reasoning, let us assume a surprise attack on Brazil from African bases. Every American would insist that the United States Government rush all aid to Brazil immediately, but if the minority had its way, nothing effective could be done until Congress had met and amended existing legislation to specifically designate Brazil as a possible recipient of American aid.

The two things that stand out most after studying the minority report are: First, that the minority stubbornly refuses to recognize the verdict of the American people last November, that Franklin Delano Roosevelt is the President of the United States; and second, that the minority is attempting to confuse the American people into the belief that this bill is an attempt on the part of the President to make himself a dictator and to lead the country into war.

It would be amusing, if it were not tragic, to recall that the very same people who are now trotting out the old clichés about dictatorship and concentration of power are the same ones who a few weeks ago were bitterly criticizing the President for not delegating to a single man all of the President's powers and responsibilities for supervising and directing the national-defense program. The fact of the matter is that many of the powers which the lease-lend bill would give to the President, in many respects, merely make it easier for him to do what he already can do and has done by more involved methods. As to the argument that the President seeks to lead us into war, and that this bill will give him the power to do so, no one with any true understanding of the constitutional background of the powers of the Presidency of the United States and the historic precedents in connection with the exercise of those powers could make such a statement in real sincerity. Under the powers granted directly to the President by the Constitution—not merely to this President but to every President—he is not only the Chief Executive, not only the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, but also the sole organ of the Government in all foreign relations.

Jefferson did not seek the authority of Congress when he dispatched the Navy against the Tripolitan Pirates in 1801. Pierce did not ask the consent of Congress before he ordered a naval vessel to bombard the town of Greytown, Nicaragua, in 1854. Lincoln did not ask for the approval of Congress when he proclaimed a blockade of the Confederate States in 1861. McKinley did not first ask for statutory sanction before he sent naval vessels and troops to China during the Boxer Rebellion in 1900. Nor did Wilson when he sent ships and troops to Vera Cruz in 1914, or ordered the Pershing punitive expedition into Mexico in 1916. Coolidge did not find congressional authority necessary to wage what

has been termed his own private war in Nicaragua in the middle twenties. These are only a few examples of the many that could be cited.

To say, therefore, that the lease-lend bill will give the President power which he does not now possess to take the country into war is deliberately to disregard the constitutional powers of the Presidency and the interpretation which past Presidents have placed upon them. It is useless to deny that a wicked or irresponsible President could unaided and without the bill in question put the country into an actual state of war for any reason or for no reason within a matter of days. In these matters, therefore, the Nation must depend, as it has always depended, upon the conscience, the integrity, the responsibility, and the good judgment of the man whom the majority of the American people have chosen as their President in a free election. That trust I have—though the minority apparently does not. It is not invidious to suggest that that is perhaps why they are the minority. I appeal to them now to cast aside their partisanship and join with us in the struggle to save democracy and civilization in America. The lease-lend bill is an instrument which will place in the hands of our Government the means of carrying on this struggle effectively. The minority will have a heavy burden on their conscience if through their efforts this bill should be defeated or crippled into uselessness. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, after listening patiently and intently to the testimony given before the Foreign Affairs Committee and for the past 3 days to the splendid men and women who have spoken either for or against H. R. 1776, my personal reactions have crystallized into a few questions. Answers to these have not as yet been given in a form satisfactory to myself, nor do I believe, satisfactory to many of you.

Question No. 1: I believe, as a foundation to this query, that 90 percent of the people of the United States view with abhorrence the actions of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin. I believe, also, that 99 percent of the Members of this House are in full agreement that the defenses around the Western Hemisphere should be made impregnable against all possible attack and that our Nation's greatest job right now is to attain that degree of defense, regardless of cost.

Furthermore, it is my firm belief that the great majority of our people want all possible aid given to the courageous British, Greek, and Chinese people in their death struggle against the new so-called benevolent order of totalitarian despots; provided, however, that that aid does not bring a recurrence of 1917 and start again a steady stream of our best young men into the trenches and many of them into their graves.

Moreover, I discard as unworthy our discussion in this body the premise that

Britain and the British Navy is our first line of defense. If that is the case, God help America. Rather do I subscribe to the Monroe Doctrine as reaffirmed by Congress last year. I absolutely refuse to concede that the destiny of our great Nation is indissolubly linked with that of Europe, Asia, and Africa, where the slogan, "Might makes right," has for all history prevailed.

With this statement as a foundation, I would like to have the answer to this question, namely, "Why is it necessary, in order to help Britain with material aid that she needs and that most of us here want to give her, provided her own resources are exhausted, that we as a Congress must abdicate our powers to the President? Must we become a body servile to one man, who already has more power than any other President ever had except in wartime? As has been so aptly stated on this floor before, must we surrender our democracy in order to help other democracies retain theirs?"

Question 2. Why should we not be honest with ourselves and the people we represent and change the title of H. R. 1776 from "An act to promote the defense of the United States" to its actual title, "An act to aid democracies fighting for their lives against totalitarian nations by giving to those democracies untold billions of our war material, to be taken from the stock acquired by our ten billion national defense fund of last year and the proposed seventeen billions in funds asked for in the name of national defense this year." Let us further amend the title to read, "To be given outright to such nations, without expecting repayment and said billions to be given at the discretion of one man."

Third. Why can we not give, by special act of Congress, without red tape and without becoming another Reichstag, \$2,000,000,000 of war material as an outright gift from one democracy to another? Yes, I would vote today for such an outright gift provided I would not have to surrender to our President my prerogatives as a Congressman elected to represent here over 300,000 people.

Fourth. Why must we incur almost absolute certainty of involvement in this war by not definitely prohibiting the conveying of this material into the war zone? One of our warships sunk will mean eventually our entrance into this second World War. Just the other day we heard rumors of over 4,000,000 identification tags ordered for the Army. When I think of these tags, I also think of a dear brother of mine, just a number in a veterans' hospital; just one of several hundred thousand boys who in 1917 marched through streets behind brass bands over to trenches in France and for many of them oblivion. Our job as Congressmen is to prevent a recurrence of our troops again being used abroad. Yes; we will always protect our own, but I cannot but feel that H. R. 1776, backed up by the glaring headlines of the war-minded eastern press and the propaganda ground out in the movies, owned in large part by the same group who dominate this press; I cannot but feel that all of this, together with the wrapping of our flag about this so-called

lend-lease bill, is but a prelude once more to brass bands again accompanying our brothers and perhaps our sons on a march to a war of destruction in a foreign country, a war which we had no part in starting. No; neither were we consulted with by Britain at Versailles nor at Munich. I sympathize with the poor people in Europe today, with my own relatives in one of the Scandinavian countries now under the heel of the oppressor, but the clammy, cold hand of death accompanies the conveying by our warships of supplies going to their aid.

Fifth. Have we not the right to ask of Britain, in return for even two billions of our property, once an enormous sum of money, that she sign over to us as collateral most of her possessions in the Western Hemisphere, with the exception of the Dominion of Canada? Is it too much to request of her the bases vital to our own defense, not for 99 years but for eternity?

Oh, yes; I have heard the statement made that we must not attach the sordid dollar sign to our aid bill designed to help sister democracies.

Does not our Nation demand even interest on that same "dollar sign" in all of its dealings with our own farmers and home owners? Our Government requires every farmer and home owner to pay interest and principle when due on the loans which adversity has forced on these same people. If delinquent, these farmers, my neighbor and yours; these home owners, your friends and mine, are either hounded by collectors or turned out to exist as best they can.

Oh, yes, I have heard this "sordid dollar sign" statement, but I see it each day in the steady flow across my desk of beseeching and pitiful letters from old people of my district who tell me that they cannot live on \$19 or \$20 a month. I see it throughout the Middle West, where only those farm buildings owned by insurance companies are painted. I can see these same farmers trying to meet increased costs and taxes and at the same time try to farm not on parity but on three-fourths of parity with industry and unionized labor.

Oh, yes, my colleagues, the sordid dollar sign does exist. When I glance at this scrap of paper, this bill H. R. 1776, carrying within its covers no one knows how many billions in gifts to a sister democracy, but at least as much, in my honest opinion, as is the total farm mortgage indebtedness of nearly 40,000,000 farm people in America; yes, when I study this bill, I begin to wonder, do we not perhaps forget too much our own people and should we not perhaps just request a little collateral, sordid word though it may be, in return for untold thousands of millions in outright gifts to other nations?

In conclusion, I want to help Britain. I want to see Hitler and his ilk defeated, but also cold realism tells me, as my conscience often does, that this so-called lend-lease bill places far too much power in the hands of one man. It makes Congress a puppet body, and places no limitation whatsoever upon the billions of our taxpayers' dollars to be poured out in lend-lease material; ships, guns,

food, which you and I know deep down within us, can never, and will never be repaid.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, cold realism also calls to my mind the danger of this bill involving us in war, just a few months after both major political parties pledged that never would a single one of our boys be again sent to foreign wars. I for my part can hear that inward voice, whatever it may be and wherever it may come from, whispering, "Our beloved Nation is at a crossroads of destiny. Let us stop, look, and listen." [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, after reading the minutes of the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee, and now, after listening to 3 days of debate on H. R. 1776, one significant fact stands out, the preponderant sentiment of the Members of the House is to give aid, as quickly and effectively as possible, to Great Britain and the democracies.

With this general accord as to what all of us desire to bring about, it does seem to me to be a pity that we have not thus far, even in a small way, redressed or conciliated the conflicts aroused by this bill. And we are already in the third and final day of general debate.

I think we are aware, poignantly so, that the disharmony and discord here is having a tragic effect on our country. Instead of passions being allayed, they are becoming more furious—a lamentable fact and a matter of great concern to all of us, I am sure.

Before we can expect the people of our land to present a common front in the emergency that faces us in this war-torn world, we must calm the discord right here. It is here that we must provide the basis for national concord.

It is not too late to bring about concord on the objectives we all have in mind. We can do it and we must do it, if the people are to be united—not divided—and we must reach a decision to which they will give their spontaneous, common, loyal acceptance and support.

If we do not reach this objective we shall have failed.

Let us understand the fundamental difficulty, the root of our discord. And, understanding it, perhaps we can eliminate it.

In my view the reason lies in the fact that this bill, by its terms—Not the announced statement of its operations by the administration—but the bill by its own terms, goes far beyond the natural, the positive wishes, purposes, and resolutions of the overwhelming majority of our people.

This bill sets up the President as a virtual director of the war. The lives and liberties of our 130,000,000 people will be gravely affected by the powers we are asked to grant him. The constitutional power of Congress to declare war may become an empty thing. Power to dispose of sums of money, estimated at astronomical figures, without appropriation or control by Congress, is given.

This bill would short circuit the rights of the people. Their forum, the Congress, would be gone.

They could petition, but without redress. For under this bill if the stated powers are given away to the Executive, the Congress would be powerless.

The Congress would be placed in a strait jacket of its own making. It would surrender the rights of the people; and this while we are still at peace. And this with the knowledge that England, while at war, still finds its Parliament supreme.

The argument has been made that so long as Congress retains the actual appropriating power, that its authority remains. But in the declaration of authorization of appropriations in this bill, the Congress pledges, as policy, that the appropriations will follow without time limit. We shall have been pledged, committed, and, in turn, on that pledge and commitment to appropriate. The President, in turn, has blanket power to commit this country to any expenditure within the boundless authority given him.

How can it be argued persuasively, therefore, that the power of the purse is still in the hands of Congress under this bill? For Congress to try to recapture it under the blanket authorization given would mean the repudiation of its own pledge to provide all funds the President makes commitments for, and the repudiation, also, of the commitments, pledged commitments, of the Chief Executive himself. The Congress would therefore, in the effort to recapture the purse strings, have to dishonor its own authorization and the commitments of the Chief Executive of our country as well.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that we must grant these tremendous powers in order to give the aid that we all desire.

I think I should point this out also. From the tremendous number of letters I am receiving in relation to this measure, people generally understand that immediate material aid—more than they have been receiving—will become available to the democracies. After listening to Mr. Knudsen's testimony, it seems clear that there will be no great increase in our material aid, even if this bill is adopted, until the latter part of this year or the first part of next year.

There are many who believe that this bill cannot be amended properly and that a new bill should be introduced. I am not one of those. I sincerely believe that proper limitations, so far as time is concerned, a ceiling on the amount of money to be granted, and other limitations can be made by amendment to this bill. Mr. Chairman, your party is in control of this House. This bill was prepared without consultation with any minority Member although the President, on many occasions, has spoken of the necessity of working as a team during this crisis. Your party can pass this bill in its original form, but, like my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], I sincerely believe that the unity of the country will best be served if proper amendments, limiting the power of the President and keeping intact the appropriating power of the Congress, are accepted by the majority party.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to that Lincolnesque statesman from the South, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSON], 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am very glad to have an opportunity to express my views on this important bill. This is a fateful time in the history of this Nation. Perhaps this is the most important bill that has come before any American Congress in the 152 years of its history.

This question transcends all partisanship. I wish to commend the large number of Democrat Members of the House who have stood on this floor during the 3 days of this general debate and courageously expressed strong opposition to this bill. It required real courage to oppose this measure so strongly urged by their Democrat President.

I do not represent a district of pacifists or appeasers. In fact, the people of my constituency do not faint when they smell gunpowder or when they see blood. Ninety-nine percent of my constituency as well as myself are made up of English and Scotch parentage in Virginia, North Carolina, and Kentucky before the Revolution. I doubt if I have as many as half a dozen Germans in my congressional district and not many more Italians.

I have always admired Great Britain and her able statesmen. She has had through the centuries very able and loyal leadership. From a few small islands they have helped their country to acquire at least one-fourth of the earth's surface and 500,000,000 of the 2,000,000,000 population of the entire world. They possess more square miles in North America than the United States. Their statesmen have never given up an inch of ground once taken possession of by the British Empire and they have never bankrupted themselves for any other country. They look after the interests of Great Britain, and they are doing that now. Every ship and every plane, almost, that comes to our shores from Europe brings some duke, prince, lord, or baronet spreading propaganda, urging us to pledge our Navy, Army, air force, and our resources to bail out again the British Empire. The King and Queen also came.

For the first time in the history of this country the President of the United States made a trip on a cold, drizzly night to Annapolis to welcome the Ambassador of a foreign nation. It was Lord Halifax. In the next day or two that British Ambassador visits certain leaders in the House and Senate, inquiring about H. R. 1776, the bill before us. I wish all those who enjoy the benefits of our great country would manifest the same zeal and devotion to our country as British statesmen show to the British Empire.

With the background of the ancestry of myself and my constituency, I naturally sympathize with the British Isles, and I think this is the feeling of most of my constituents. My constituents and their ancestors have always had a passionate love for the United States and an unswerving devotion to our flag. They know but one flag, the Stars and Stripes, and one country—the United States of America. They have always hated op-

pressors wherever they might be in the world. I share their feeling. I shall strive, however, not to permit my partiality for Great Britain or my dislike for Hitler, Mussolini, and their ilk to warp my judgment in doing the very best thing possible to protect and preserve the best interests of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

I was elected and took the oath to uphold our Constitution and to serve our country and not some other country. [Applause.]

All we desire down in my district is to be known as good, liberty-loving, loyal Americans, loving but one flag—the Stars and Stripes; owing allegiance and devotion to but one country and its ideals—the United States of America. [Applause.]

I do not share the fears expressed by some of the proponents of this bill or subscribe to the thesis that Great Britain and her Navy are our first line of defense and that she has saved and protected us through all the years. The ancestors of some of my constituents served with the naval heroes—Paul Jones in the Revolution, Oliver Perry in the War of 1812, Admiral Farragut and Admiral Porter in the War between the States, and many other great naval heroes. They were never defeated. I wonder if they might not turn over in their graves when we are now told that we cannot survive without the protection of the British Navy, although it is now admitted that we have the finest and most powerful Navy of any country on the earth and we are adding to it hundreds of fighting craft from battleships to submarines. [Applause.] Under this bill, however, the President can cripple that Navy.

The war in Europe is not our war. We were not consulted; but, on the contrary, our Ambassadors, Mr. Bullitt and Mr. Kennedy, testified a few days ago that they warned France and England that they could not expect the United States to aid them in another world war if one was started. Yet, with that warning, and the various acts of Congress, and the American press, and the speeches of our public men and women, and the resolutions of hundreds of organizations warning against war, England and France told Poland to hold on to Danzig, a German city; and just as soon as Germany attacked Poland, England and France declared war on Germany.

I do not for a moment condone or approve of the action of Hitler and Mussolini, or any other war lord, but it cannot be said this is our war. Ambassador Bullitt, testifying for this bill, admitted that the Versailles Treaty in the last World War and Danzig brought on this war. He pointed out that President Wilson tried to restrain the greed and selfishness of the Allies—Britain, France, and others—and pointed out to them that that treaty would cause another war. Our United States Senate refused to ratify that treaty.

We made unusual sacrifices in blood and treasure to help England and France disarm Germany and the other Central Powers. We cannot be blamed for Britain and France permitting Germany to become strong and powerful again.

Must we sacrifice millions of our young men and untold billions of treasure every 20 or 25 years and go to Europe to help Great Britain disarm her enemies?

It is not our war, and Great Britain is not fighting our war, and neither is she or her fleet our first line of defense. She is fighting her own war. If it is our war, let us meet it honestly, openly, and squarely. Let the administration bring in a resolution to declare war and let Congress under its constitutional powers and as representatives of the American people vote direct as to whether or not we shall go into that war. I am frank to say that I would not vote to go into that war.

The national conventions of both parties in 1940 pledged the American people that they would not take this country into any foreign war unless we were attacked. President Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie and every Member of the House and Senate made like pledges to the American people. I made speeches, sent letters and copies of speeches to tens of thousands of voters in my district, in which I solemnly pledged them I would not vote to put this country into another European-Asiatic-African war unless we were attacked, and I propose to keep my pledge, and I think Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie should do likewise.

Mr. Willkie charged Mr. Roosevelt with grabbing dictatorial powers from a subservient Congress and that if Mr. Roosevelt was elected he would lead this country down the road to war. Mr. Roosevelt bitterly denied these charges time and again and made a great plea for peace over the radio on the night before the election. We did not hear from Mr. Willkie until this bill came up, and his first utterance was not to keep us out of war but urging the American people to swallow this bill giving to the President more power than any President has ever been given and insist on all-out aid to Britain. His first speech was for Great Britain, and not for the people of the United States.

If the Republican convention had known of his attitude, he would not have been nominated, and if the American people had known that President Roosevelt would back a bill like the one now before us, he never would have been elected. It is hard to say now which one is exerting the greatest effort to get us in the war, Mr. Willkie or President Roosevelt.

If the administration feels that Great Britain should have some credits, why did not they bring in a bill specifying the character and the amount of credit we would extend to Great Britain? I understand a substitute bill will be offered, cutting out these unlimited powers of the President, protecting and preserving the constitutional powers of Congress to declare war, raise and support armies, and provide and maintain a navy, retaining in the Congress the power over the sword and the purse, and the bill will extend credit to Britain for at least \$2,000,000,000 and make it available at once to the British Government so that she could buy anything in this country that she might believe would be helpful in her defense. But mark my words, the administration will fight extending any credit to Great Britain unless there is

attached to it these dangerous limitless war powers to the President provided in H. R. 1776, and unless these unlimited powers are stricken from the bill I shall vote against it.

The President did not want Congress to stay in session last year. Veterans' organizations and others and citizens in great numbers urged that Congress remain in session to keep the President from involving us in the European-Asiatic-African war. We remained in session for 366 days. Now some of the Members of this House propose to give to the President power to carry on wars for and against any nation or nations in the world. It does not seem consistent to me. I wanted to keep him and this country out of war all last year, and I am still determined to do what I can to keep our President and our Nation out of the European-Asiatic-African war.

UNLIMITED AND DANGEROUS POWER

I have been reading and studying H. R. 1776 from the time it was introduced. The oftener I read it and the more I study it, the more alarmed I become.

We have been informed that Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, prepared this bill. It was not written by any Member or any committee of the House or Senate. No one man could have prepared this bill. Those who prepared it evidently had in mind two purposes: One, to grant to the President more power than has ever been sought by any American President, or granted to him by any American Congress; two, and there was an overpowering desire to aid a group of nations engaged in the European-Asiatic-African War.

In my opinion, the real purpose behind this bill is not to secure dollar credits or authority to manufacture guns, boats, planes, or munitions. The real purpose is to grant authority to dispose of defense articles already manufactured or which are in the process of being manufactured. This bill is supposed to be predicated on the idea that it is going to grant immediate aid to Britain and other countries we desire to help. Secretary Hull, Secretary Stimson, and Secretary Knox testified that Britain is facing a great crisis and that she must have immediate help. They say this crisis is likely to come within 60 to 90 days. Now it has been admitted by many of the proponents of this bill on the floor of the House during this debate and by our colleague the able and distinguished former Senator WADSWORTH from New York that none of the defense articles which are to be manufactured and covered in this bill could be produced in less than 8 to 12 months.

Soon after the bill was introduced, Senator BARKLEY expressed the belief that this bill would go through by the 1st of March. The crisis, as described by the proponents of this legislation, will have come and gone before a single gun, ship, boat, or plane, can be produced under this bill.

Britain, while she is short of dollar credit, is not short of liquid or liquidable assets. A few days ago the Federal Reserve Board in one of its bulletins showed that Britain had in this country more than \$8,000,000,000 in cash

and liquidable assets in the way of high-class stocks, bonds, and other securities that she could sell and secure the money. How much has she in other countries?

I invite your attention to some of the sentences and phrases that have not been emphasized in this debate. This bill constantly refers to defense articles. The bill defines defense articles. What are defense articles under this bill?

First. Any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

Second. Any machinery, facility, tool, material, or supply necessary for the manufacture, production, processing, repair, servicing, or operation of any article described in this subsection;

Third. Any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in this subsection;

Fourth. Any other commodity or article for defense.

From that definition, it means that the President can take hold of any weapon or defense article now belonging to the United States or any foreign government, or to which we may hereafter acquire title, possession, or control. Yes; he can go out and take anything that belongs to the United States or belongs to any of its citizens; or ships, boats, tanks, planes, or guns, of other countries. You can see at once the purpose of this bill is to give the President absolute control of all the defense articles belonging to this Government or to any private citizen, or belonging to other governments, to use and dispose of them now.

That is the big idea in this bill, according to my views. And I wish to call your attention further to some words in section 3 that have an important meaning. This section is the very heart of the bill, with the definition of "defense article" applied. It says—

Sec. 3. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law—

This at once repeals the law prohibiting the President or any other officer from disposing of any part of our Navy or the equipment, guns, tanks, planes, and other equipment of our Army and air forces until and unless the heads of the Army or Navy, as the case may be, certify that such ship, gun, plane, or other defense article is surplus and is not necessary for the defense of this country. Those few words repeal that law, and they repeal the neutrality law that Congress was urged to pass to keep this country out of war. Those words also repeal the Johnson Act, that protects the United States Treasury from future raids by defaulting nations. Those words, in effect, take away the constitutional powers of Congress to declare war, to raise and support armies, and to create and maintain a navy, and turn the powers over to the President.

Now, after those laws are repealed and Congress has abdicated its powers and turned them over to the President, what can the President do? He can order his Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, or any other head of any department or agency of the Government to—

(1) Manufacture in arsenals, factories, and shipyards under their jurisdiction, or otherwise procure, any defense article—

The words "otherwise procure" makes the sky the limit.

For whom are we to manufacture and procure defense articles? The bill says "for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States."

You can see at once all this power to manufacture, or procure is not to manufacture or procure any ship, gun, tank, plane, or other munition for the United States. It does not propose to add one ship, gun, plane, tank, or other defense article to the Navy, Army, or air forces of our own country. It all is for some other governments. The bill says "any country"—it takes away any discretionary power of Congress to say what country or countries we are to help—and places it solely in the hands and control of the President to help any country, anywhere, anytime, with any of our defense articles.

After we have accumulated ships, guns, planes, tanks, shells and other munitions, what disposition is to be made of them? The President, by himself or through any person or agency selected by him, can do what? "Sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of." I am calling your attention to those brief words "or otherwise dispose of." Does anyone believe the President is going to sell any of this defense material and get money on securities for them? How can we, when he has said, "We must remove the silly dollar mark from our plans to help these other countries"? The words "otherwise dispose of" could mean any one of a dozen things he could do. He could have our soldiers, sailors, and flyers use them for Britain or other countries. He could put British sailors or British officers in charge of them. He could convoy British merchant ships or American merchant ships, and take our Navy right into a war zone, in direct conflict and violation of our neutrality law, except this same section of the bill provides he can do these things "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law."

Now, to whom can he sell, lend, lease, or otherwise dispose of these defense articles? To any such government as he might think would help the defense of the United States. And what articles could he dispose of? The bill says "any defense article." Every ship, boat, plane, tank, gun, or other weapon, and all munitions of our Navy, Army, and air forces that are now a part of our Navy, Army, and air forces or that we may manufacture or otherwise acquire are articles of defense and come within the provisions of this bill and could be disposed of by the President at any time to any nation anywhere on the face of the globe.

The President and his advisers know that our shipyards, plane, tank, and munition factories are full up with priority orders, and orders placed for the manufacture of any defense articles under this bill could not be reached in less than 8 months. This bill is being pushed through to enable the President to meet this so-called crisis in Great Britain and to enable him to sell, lease, lend, or dispose of in any other way he might desire any of our ships, boats, tanks, planes, and

munitions of our Navy, Army, and air forces. He wants the power to use the defense materials of our Army, Navy, and air forces in that fight that they say will likely come in 60 or 90 days.

Of course, that means he will put us directly in that long, bloody, costly war.

If we propose to go to war, let us not carry on an undeclared war. Let the war resolution come up squarely before Congress and the American people, and let us say whether or not we desire to get into that war.

No American President was ever given such limitless powers, even when we were in a life-and-death struggle for the preservation of the Nation in the Civil War or in the World War.

This bill also provides that we can repair, outfit, recondition, or place in good working order any defense article, not for the United States, but for any other government on the face of the earth. We can permit foreign warships and other vessels to occupy our shipyards, our ports and docks, in violation of recognized international law and in violation of our neutrality act, and this will bring the war right to our shores. This bill starts section 3 by saying that the President can do these things "notwithstanding the provisions of any other law."

This is not all. The President has a right to communicate and turn over to not merely Great Britain but to any government or its representatives any or all of our most vital and valuable military and naval secrets. We have many great secrets that have always been jealously guarded. The President can turn over these secrets so that they may become common knowledge to any government or governments on the face of the earth if, according to his mind, it is to the best interests of this country.

It was admitted by Secretary Knox of the Navy that the President could give away any or all of the United States Navy, any gun or plane, or other defense equipment or article. The President says, of course, he is not going to give away the Navy, but the Congress and the Nation already know that he did, in violation of a positive law passed by Congress, dispose of 50 improved destroyers on the active list of our Navy, secretly to Great Britain. It was an accomplished fact before the slightest intimation was given to Congress or the American people. He did attempt to contract and dispose of 20 of our latest and most up-to-date submarines that were almost completed. We had but a handful of submarines. We needed these submarines very much for our own Navy and the defense of our own country, but the President was willing to let England have them without consulting Congress. Senator WALSH, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, and the American people generally denounced this as a violation of law, and the President was forced to back up. The President claims, and so does the Secretary of the Navy and others, that he has the power to convoy navy and merchant ships and go right into the war zones in Europe. The President says he has no thought of giving away our Navy or using it as a convoy. Secretary Knox admits the use of our Navy for

convoying ships would clearly be an act of war. The President says he is not going to use this power—well, why should he be given this power?

This bill, as introduced by the administration, boiled down, means that the President is given unlimited power for an unlimited period of time, backed by the unlimited resources of this country, with a blank check for God know how many billions, and our Navy, Army and air forces with their equipment, in his hands to go out and carry on undeclared wars for or against any nation or nations on the face of the earth. Such powers and the exercise thereof are bound to plunge us into the longest, costliest, and bloodiest war in which this Nation has ever taken part.

This bill is to implement, in my opinion, the purpose of this administration when the crisis comes to use every defense article of this country now held by it or which it may acquire to get into that war in Europe when this so-called crisis comes, under the theory, they claim, that Great Britain and the British Navy is our first line of defense.

I do not agree with the proposition that Great Britain or the British Navy is our first line of defense. When was it that Great Britain or her Navy defended this country or upheld the rights of American citizens? Was it during the Revolutionary War when we had to go out and fight her on land and sea, and gain our independence? Was it in the War of 1812 when we again had to fight her on land and sea to preserve our independence and gain for ourselves the right to sail the seven seas of the world? Was it during the dark hours of 1861-65 when the life of this Nation hung in the balance and England had come to the conclusion that this country was growing too big and wanted to divide us and she took sides with those who were trying to destroy the Union and preserve African slavery in this country? She was against the United States in the Revolution, in the War of 1812, and in the Civil War. She threw her army and navy and her possessions here on the Western Hemisphere against this country. Our Navy and our country were England's first line of defense when our Navy, our manpower, and our resources went to her rescue in 1917-18. A million American soldiers and sailors through wounds and disease gave their lives, our hospitals are filled with blind, crippled, and disabled, we have a million widows and orphans of those who served in that war. We still have a great national debt hanging on our shoulders as a result of that war, and before we are through paying compensations, pensions, and hospitalization, that war will have cost us a hundred billion dollars. We helped to disarm the Germans and other enemies of Great Britain.

Who encouraged Hitler to overthrow the democracy of Germany and to build up power in Germany? Who encouraged Hitler to rearm and obtain stronger powers? Who appeased Hitler through the years? Great Britain; and now Congress is called upon to surrender its constitutional powers, the American people are called upon again to furnish

the blood and tears and to bankrupt themselves and surrender their liberties to save the far-flung British Empire. And yet, we are told we must save her because she and her Navy are our first line of defense. It is time America and Americans devoted a little time to saving themselves. Let us develop our own national defense on land, sea, and in the air, and make ourselves strong within by building up our economic life, and clearing out enemy aliens so that we can protect ourselves against any and all who may assail us, preserve the liberties of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Dictators have marched, have come and gone in Europe, Asia, and Africa for centuries, fighting, as they are now, for territory, lands, trade routes, commerce, markets, and political power; and they will continue until the angel Gabriel places one foot on the land and one foot on the sea and proclaims to the world "Time is no more." Europe, Asia, and Africa have always handled their dictators—they will do it this time. Hitler and Mussolini are not going to take Great Britain and the British Empire and their Navy, and it is my honest opinion, unless there is a break-down in Germany, that the United States and England combined, even though we bankrupt our country and furnish millions of soldiers, cannot march into the middle of Europe and win a total victory there under present conditions.

Russia, to whom the administration recently gave a certificate of good moral character although she is gorged with the loot and spoils of this war and her hands are covered with the blood of millions of innocent men, women, and children, and she has taken the lands and destroyed the liberties of other millions, is sitting back waiting and waiting until noncommunist nations, including our own, have exhausted and destroyed themselves to erect upon the ruins a God-hating, liberty-hating, communistic government of the world.

I am unwilling for our Nation to dissipate our weapons of defense, exhaust our credits and resources, give up our liberties, and to bankrupt our people unless we have first been attacked. Let us make ourselves strong enough to meet successfully assaults from any and every source in the world.

H. R. 1776 IS A WAR BILL

This bill should be styled "A bill to promote war, unlimited power of the President, and final bankruptcy in the United States." This bill clearly gives the President the power to dispose of any part or all of our Navy, any or all of our airplanes, any or all of the guns or equipment for our Army, together with any or all of our naval and military secrets. He could transfer all of these materials and secrets on such terms as he may think best for this country and give them to any country or countries on the face of the earth that in his opinion would help the defenses of the United States. The sky is the limit on the amount of the appropriations and authorizations in this bill. Some contend he could spend at least \$40,000,000,000 and could make contracts for any period of time in the future. The sky is the

limit in the amount he can spend or contract for and he can operate throughout the world. He will at once become the W. P. A. Santa Claus for the world. Harry Hopkins is now in Europe. He is no doubt working out plans by which this Nation proposes to aid countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa. The President is not limited except by the boundaries of the great, wide world.

The Ways and Means Committee has agreed to report a bill increasing the debt limit of this country to \$65,000,000,000. It will not be long until our debt limit will reach that sum. What we are about to do authorizes the spending of money which, in my opinion, will be only the first installment. Other billions will be required from our people and taxpayers. The national debt will jump by leaps and bounds.

They will finally call for our ships and our boys. If this measure is passed and we become involved in Europe, Asia, and Africa, I can see nothing before us except actual or undeclared wars, complete bankruptcy, the lowering of our standard of living, the loss of the lives of many of our fine young men, a great increase in the great army of widows and orphan children made by the last World War, our old hospitals and new hospitals filled with the lame, the halt, and the blind, a complete upset of our social, economic, and political life, and, worst of all, a loss of our own liberties. Our people already have been called on to do more than the powerful, rich, and big dominions of the British Empire. Canada has not passed any draft act, forcing her young men into a foreign war. Great Britain is paying the people of her dominions for what defense articles and material she buys from them. Some of our citizens are insisting that we again make donations of billions of dollars and supplies to the British Empire. Let us not overlook the fact that we must borrow this year at least \$10,000,000,000 to carry on our own defense program and we shall continue as we have for the last 10 years or more to spend more than we are taking in. While Great Britain may not have cash dollars enough in this country to meet its purchases, she does have liquid assets and she does have these islands in the Western Hemisphere that would be helpful to our defense for which our country would pay her billions of dollars. Is it right to bankrupt our citizens and our country to carry on a war to help Great Britain carry on her war when she has billions of dollars of assets available? Yet I am willing to lend to her a reasonable sum on a reasonable basis but I want to know what we are giving and the terms thereof and not give to the President a blank check to dispose of billions and at the same time put into the war any part or all of our Navy, Army, or air-force equipment.

My first concern is to see this country thoroughly equipped to defend itself. No one now claims that Hitler and Mussolini can cross 3,000 miles of the Atlantic and attack this country or the Western Hemisphere. The President greatly frightened the American people with that sort of a claim last summer, but in his recent annual message to Congress he

stated that no one believed Germany and Italy could invade the United States or the Western Hemisphere until and unless they acquired naval and air bases here on the Western Hemisphere. With our most powerful Navy in the world and with proper build-up of our air forces, there can be no such danger. I might say that it is generally known that we are turning over to Great Britain 75 percent of our production of airplanes, and so forth, while the American people believe we are only turning over 50 percent and keeping 50 percent for ourselves. This country must not be stripped of its defenses for any other country, and that is one of the strong reasons for my opposition to this bill; it makes it possible to do that very thing.

The President appears to be so strongly in favor of taking care of Great Britain I am afraid he will neglect and impair our own defenses. I do not propose to give him the power to do so. When we were called on last year and recently to vote billions and billions of dollars we were told that these huge sums were for the purpose of building up our own Navy, Army, and air force. There was no hint that a bill like the one before us would be brought in to enable the President to use these billions or the equipment that has been manufactured or will be manufactured to aid any country in the world according to his opinion and judgment.

AMENDMENTS WILL NOT PROTECT US

The administration was forced to agree to the acceptance of four amendments.

First. The President can spend and make contracts and incur obligations under this bill to June 30, 1943. It developed the other day that some of the departments made contracts for perhaps \$10,000,000,000 in a few days. Billions and billions could be spent and contracts and obligations made before June 30, 1943. During the last 8 years the President under the pressure of some 40 or more emergencies has secured from a subservient Congress many extraordinary powers. Limitations were put in those bills for a year or 2 years; but he still has the powers. He is able to have these powers extended from time to time, and more than likely we will be so much involved before June 30, 1943, that we will be unable to extricate ourselves and conditions will develop that he will be demanding more and more powers.

Second. Another amendment requires the President to consult with the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Naval Operations, or both, before he turns over any of our defense materials to other nations. That amendment means nothing. The President appoints the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations. He is their commanding officer. He can discharge them at any time and appoint new chiefs. They agree with him or else. There is nothing in the bill that requires him to accept their suggestions or advice. Judging from Mr. Roosevelt's past record, when he gets a man in who does not carry out his wishes, he gets the man out of office. Secretary of the Navy Knox admitted that personally he would not approve of turning over the Navy or any material part of it to any other na-

tion, and he did not think it would be wise to convoy merchant vessels to the war zone, yet he admitted that if his Commander in Chief, Mr. Roosevelt, ordered him to do so he would follow his superior officer's orders.

Third. An amendment was written which provides that the President shall report at least every 90 days what he has done under this bill to Congress, unless in his opinion to make such a report would be incompatible with the public interest. That simply means that he would not have to report at all. He would merely have to say that he was not reporting about certain acts because it would be incompatible with the public interest.

Fourth. It is urged that the fourth amendment would help the bill. This amendment provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or permit the convoying of merchant vessels by our Navy into the war zone in violation of the present neutrality act. Secretary Knox and others admitted that the President already has such power if he desired to exercise it and it would not be necessary to grant him any such power in this bill. Therefore this amendment is less than an idle gesture. This convoying of merchant vessels into the war zone is very important, because if any of our naval vessels or merchant vessels should be blown up while in the war zone it very likely would mean war. In fact, it is an act of war, as admitted by Secretary Knox, for a naval vessel to convoy a merchant vessel in a war zone, but he said if his Commander in Chief ordered him to use the Navy to convoy these merchant vessels he would do so.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have listened for 3 days to the arguments on the floor of this House both for and against this proposed legislation. In law one who institutes a suit is required to prove the justice of his contention by a greater weight of the evidence. It seems to me that the same rule is or should be applicable to those who propose the enactment of laws before a lawmaking body. They should prove to the satisfaction of the majority of their colleagues that the legislation, if enacted, will be of general benefit to the people of the nation or state, as the case may be.

The people of the United States in their Constitution granted serious and far-reaching power to Congress. They have a right to expect that that power will be exercised judiciously and soundly. It ought not be disregarded or delegated to others. Congress has no right to evade responsibility. It has no right to shirk its constitutional prerogatives. With the session just beginning, there is no need of shifting to the executive authority which, if reasonable and necessary, he could get for the asking.

This bill is fraught with danger to the very existence of our form of government. Its proponents, in the 3 days of this debate, have not to my satisfaction explained the necessity of the enormous grant of power which it gives to the

President. The title of the bill is, "To promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes." They have not explained except in a vague manner how it will promote our national defense and have not given us a true picture of the other purposes. They contend that its passage will aid England, but they give no logical reason why we in America should set up a dictatorship of our own in order to do so.

They say its passage is necessary to defeat Hitlerism. Yet if enacted our Nation will have taken a lengthy stride toward adopting the very form of government that Hitler has created and which we condemn in no uncertain terms. Most certainly we shall have lost our struggle against Hitlerism if we yield to the philosophy of totalitarianism. Can we, as true Americans, down Hitlerism by aping it? Can we defend ourselves against it by adopting its principles and methods? Hitlerism is dictatorship. This bill should rightfully have been termed "a bill for the destruction of the American Republic." It seeks to place in the Chief Executive an unlimited dictatorship with power over the lives and property of the American people and power to make alliances with foreign powers as suits his fancy. It actually gives the President the same right to declare war as is, under the Constitution, vested solely in the Congress. Do you remember, Mr. Chairman, the German Reichstag and the Italian Chamber of Deputies? It has been a long time since we have heard of any activities of those supposedly legislative assemblies. Why? They consented to their own destruction. Are we going to do likewise? If we do, we are preparing the cradle from which an American dictator will rise and control the destiny of 130,000,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, we are told that this is a bill which will aid England and that by its passage we will be aiding her in her battle against totalitarianism, but, Mr. Chairman, is it necessary for us to create totalitarianism here in America in order to aid England? I think not.

In their testimony before Congressional committees, members of the President's Cabinet, apparently basing their opinions on information which they have received from abroad, stated that they expected the crisis in England within the next 90 days. How then is this bill to help England? Without the enactment of legislation such as this, we have been extending aid to her practically without limit. We have turned over certain of our warships. We have allowed her to take priority to hundreds of airplanes, tanks, cannons, machine guns, rifles which she is receiving from us, and she has been given priority to the allocation of the products of our munition industries. This bill is not required to convert America into an arsenal for Britain. We are that already. If British funds are believed to be inadequate, why does not the administration, instead of asking for powers over the lives and destiny of the American people and the abdication of the American Congress, ask the legislative branch of our Government to lend or give to Great Britain whatever sums are necessary for her to "carry on"?

I have not heard it explained by any of the proponents of this legislation how, with the crisis 3 months away, the passage of this bill will save England or assist in saving democracy.

Let us as Members of Congress of the United States avoid the fate of Hitler's Reichstag. Let us preserve democracy by retaining it here in America. This totalitarian bill should be defeated. We, my fellow colleagues, are the chosen representatives of the people. Ninety percent of them are opposed to our Nation getting into this war. The passage of this legislation will draw us closer to it. They abhor totalitarianism and dictatorship. This bill gives it to them. They don't want an American Reichstag. They want a free and unhampered Congress. They do not want a dictator. They do not want war.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD].

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, permit me to say at the outset that I have no far-reaching love for Great Britain. My entire concern is for the future welfare of this Nation. My earnest desire is that our boys be kept out of war. It was in that spirit that I, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, entered into the extensive hearings on H. R. 1776.

We, as Members of Congress, have a sacred duty to perform. On our decisions may rest the future of this Republic. We have seen the officials of European nations lulled into a false sense of security, and even propagandized against the continued existence of their own governments.

In April of 1939 I was invited to listen, in the studios of WRC, in Washington, to the speech of Chancellor Hitler, and afterward to comment on the speech over the same N. B. C. network. I said, in part, as follows:

Chancellor Hitler definitely declines the conference table. We, as a Nation, should dedicate ourselves anew to the task of adequately and efficiently preparing ourselves for the defense of this great new Nation that we all love so well. * * * I think there can be no doubt about his intention to continue until he achieves his aims. That is where we come in—we don't know how far his ambitions and his ego would lead him.

It has been the desire of the membership of this House to remain neutral with respect to the warring nations of the world, but in view of what has happened in Europe, and the aggression and butchery performed by Japan with respect to China, and by Mussolini in Ethiopia, Albania, and Greece, is it any wonder that today practically everyone in both bodies of Congress agrees that our future welfare as an independent Nation depends upon the defeat of those bound together by the tri-partite agreement? The dictators now in control of those governments have openly bragged that they have pooled their strength for the purpose of establishing in the world, "a new order." It just happens that in that "new order" a democracy, such as ours, has no place assigned to it.

With all my thoughts concentrated solely on the future welfare of this Nation, I was anxious, in the hearings just concluded, to ascertain the opinion of not only those in positions of great responsibility within our Government, but of others who appeared, as to whether if Great Britain should fall, we would eventually have to fight the aggressor nations not only with all the materials we are able to assemble, but with our manpower. I arrived at the decision that such would undoubtedly be the case. The history of conquerors is that they do not stop until they are "stopped." Every witness summoned by the majority and minority side, except one, Colonel Lindbergh, was of the opinion that our future welfare was tied up with a victorious Britain. They, of course, differed as to the policy this Government should pursue.

I must admit that I do not concede defeat for this Nation in the event of an Axis victory, but our future would not be alluring, nor pleasant to contemplate. The products of South American countries would be needed by the victors, and the manufactured articles, much required by our neighbors to the south, would be produced by enforced cheap labor under Hitler, Mussolini, and the rulers of Japan. The goods of our manufacturers would disappear from the continent of South America. Their military machines would follow their commercial travelers. Oh, yes; the victors would require some of our products, but on their own terms of barter and trade. To show how that works, about a year ago I was talking with an official of one of the agricultural Balkan states near Czechoslovakia—a manufacturing nation. When the Czechs had an independent existence her manufactured articles moved to this agricultural nation, and, in turn, her agricultural products were sold to Czechoslovakia, each on a cash basis. But, when Hitler took over this latter country, the trading was entirely different; and the prosperity of this agricultural nation "flew out the window." She needed to sell her agricultural surplus and Czechoslovakia was her logical and only market, but to do so she had to enter into a barter and exchange arrangement with Herr Hitler as to what her products were worth, in terms of cheap and unsuited manufactured articles that Hitler was willing to send her. Life became intolerable. In fact, today, she is under German domination.

Accustomed as we are in the United States to a high standard of living on our farms and in our industries, I can foresee poverty and internal strife that will render this Nation a very fit subject for "an inside job." God forbid that such an end should ever be ours.

It is not my purpose to go into the mechanics of this bill. Others have done so. Large powers are necessarily placed in the hands of the President, in whom they rightfully belong. When we, as a Nation, were sick in 1933, the Congress did not hesitate, almost unanimously I believe, to lodge much more far-reaching powers in his hands. He acquitted himself with credit, and the reconstruction job was far on the way, when war

clouds of gigantic proportions appeared on the horizon. The citizenry of this Nation were satisfied with the resurrection of our internal economy, and affirmed their confidence in him, in an election just passed, to guide us through the troubled waters that surround us. Therefore, as a Representative of the people, as well as of my own volition, I am thoroughly willing to place in his hands, temporarily, the large powers necessarily granted in this bill, introduced for the purpose of further promoting the defense of the United States.

Much has been said of the cost of defense and national preparedness. Something should be said of the cost of failing to defend and the cost of failing to organize national preparedness. On this latter subject, current circumstances necessitate the reference to the experience of others who failed to prepare and, accordingly, failed to defend. Now, here is some of the information which I have dug out from magazines, newspapers, and other publications.

The rapid military conquest of Poland, the Low Countries, Norway, and France is a manifestation of the superb planning and organization on the part of the Germans, and throughout this speech by Germans I mean Nazis, and in referring to Germany I mean Hitlerized Germany. This same planning and organization has now been transferred to the systematic economic and financial exploitation of the conquered countries. For such countries a formal cessation of armed hostilities only marked the beginning of a newer form of hostility which, from a long-range point of view, will have more profound consequences to the social and economic life of the conquered countries than complete military defeat in the traditional sense. The Germans are now well advanced in the conquered countries on a program of economic and financial subjugation and enslavement on totalitarian lines, in the interests solely of Germany. The Germans in numerous ways, some patently illegal, others, having exactly the same consequences, but dressed in a cloak of legality, have operated in so complete and devastating a manner that regardless of what the ultimate outcome of the present war may be, the whole life of the invaded areas, and particularly the economic and financial structure thereof, will forever bear the mark of German aggression and totalitarianism.

The economic exploitation of other countries by Germany began long before the outbreak of the present conflict, when Germany took advantage of her military and economic dominance over the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe and, to a lesser extent, even of nations as far away as South America. Yet, even though those countries were exploited by a great variety of cunning devices, they were comparatively fortunate, for they did receive something from Germany in return for their goods and services, even if it was only mouth organs and aspirin. Today the conquered areas receive nothing, unless they receive what Germany considers to be absolutely essential to keep them alive for further exploitation.

Germany has followed traditional methods of conquest in conscripting labor, confiscating property, and sacking the public treasury. These crude methods of looting and pillaging have been supplemented everywhere, and particularly in western Europe, by the more sophisticated "buying up" of the resources and the manpower of the conquered areas through newly created German money, called reichskreditkassenscheine, which are valueless outside of the conquered area; through staggering indemnities exceeding by many times any costs of an occupying army; through direct extension of credit to German interests by the banking systems of the occupied countries which have been placed under German control; through the forced accumulation of blocked marks by conquered countries in connection with clearing agreements; and, through the use of forced labor of both civilians and prisoners of war coming from the conquered countries to work in German industries and mines and on German farms. Through all these methods Germany is as literally and completely stripping the occupied countries of their resources as does a plague of locusts in a field of grain. The economic resources thus looted by the Germans have enormously increased her potential for achieving her next military objectives. We may be sure that if Germany succeeds in defeating Britain, Britain's world-wide economic resources in turn will be exploited by Germany to enable it to carry its final assault on this country.

In Poland, the total value of property confiscated outright by Germany, without even a suggestion of compensation to the former owners, has been estimated at between \$2,000,000,000 and \$2,500,000,000. In the areas next to the former German frontier, all Polish-owned land and industrial enterprises were confiscated outright; the Germans did not even go through the form of making out a valuation for this property before taking it over. German behavior in Poland is completely consistent with the policy outlined by their Minister of Agriculture Darre in a speech which he is reported to have delivered to an inner circle of Nazi party officials in May of 1940, in which he said:

All soil and industrial property of inhabitants of non-German origin will be confiscated without exception, and will be distributed primarily among worthy members of the party and soldiers accorded honors for bravery in the war. Thus a new aristocracy of German masters will be created.

The occupation of Czechoslovakia was accompanied by the "visiting" of numerous concerns in Prague by representatives of German firms. Such German representatives were, of course, in the company of Gestapo agents. The directors of the Czech firms were simply thrown out or arrested and their offices taken over by German representatives. This was the fate of the great Vitkovice Iron Works. Needless to say, the great German banks, particularly the Dresdner Bank and the Deutsche Bank, shared prominently in the spoils. In other instances, the same end was attained through the formalities of a reorganization in which a large block

of the new shares in the corporation was issued to German owners for a nominal contribution to the real assets. All these firms, and the materials that these firms produce, were placed at the disposal of the German Army. Hitler, in his speech of November 9, 1940, announced that the Schneider-Creusot Steel Works of France, the Fokker Aircraft factories in the Netherlands, the Belgian and French heavy industries, the Danish and Norwegian shipbuilding yards will be utilized to capacity to produce for the German Army in its preparation for the Battle of Britain.

Wherever the Germans went they requisitioned existing food and petroleum stocks, irrespective of the minimum needs of the local population. At least 1,500,000 tons of petroleum stocks were seized in France and perhaps a half million tons in other western European countries. This 2,000,000 tons is, roughly, equal to one-fifth of Germany's needs for a year of active warfare. Over 2,000,000 tons of wheat reserves were nominally purchased in the occupied countries, excluding an unknown and perhaps considerably larger amount taken from occupied France. The Danes were forced to reduce the number of pigs from 2,900,000 to 1,400,000. In Holland 23,000,000 out of the former stock of 29,000,000 poultry were killed. In Norway one-fourth of the cattle were slaughtered and the meat shipped to Germany. Norway was further required to furnish Germany with 200 tons of fish per day in spite of a domestic shortage of all kinds of foods. Had the 1940 crop and part of the stocks on hand in continental Europe been equitably distributed, there would be little abnormal shortage of food any place in Europe today and certainly no widespread starvation. Current bare subsistence rations, or less, are the direct results of deliberate German policy.

Outright confiscation sometimes assumes the cloak of collective fines on whole cities or communities. For instance, in Bourdeaux during the past week a collective fine of 2,000,000 francs was imposed on the municipality because a group of French citizens "molested" a single German soldier.

Even the symbols of taxation are prostituted to accomplish outright confiscation. Thus, on August 8, 1940, the German individual income tax was modified to provide for an additional levy of 15 percent of the total income of all Poles in the German Reich and the annexed Polish territories. This is called a social equalization tax, and the idea behind it, as expressed by the highest German officials, is that it equalizes the circumstances of Poles and Germans because Poles, being members of an inferior race, need less food, less clothing, and less of all other cultural goods. When this tax was adopted the proper German ministries were given further discretionary authority to extend it to all other nationalities under the Reich's control. It has already been extended to the Jewish population in all areas occupied by Germany.

In all the invaded territories the conquered country is required to pay in cash the full cost of the army of occupation,

as estimated, of course, by the German authorities. This may explain the fact that the common German soldier in occupied Holland is today receiving 8 marks per day salary, or the equivalent of \$3.20 per day. In France, occupation expenses have been set at 400,000,000 francs a day, which means 146,000,000,000 francs a year. This amount is, roughly, equivalent to one-half the total national income of France for the year 1938. This figure, obviously, does not represent the total annual contribution which France is today compelled to make in support of Germany's war expenses, but merely that portion represented by occupation costs. The Norwegian occupation bill represents the equivalent of 40 percent of the national income of Norway under normal conditions. The occupation costs for Belgium will amount to a sum in excess of the average of the whole pre-war budget for Belgium.

The funds necessary to meet these costs are provided by the simple device of the central bank of issue in each invaded country creating new money and turning it over to the Germans. Under the circumstances of widespread scarcity produced by war conditions, the large-scale financing of additional purchases with new money creation would, normally, have resulted in a very considerable inflation. This, however, would have defeated the ends of the Germans in levying a fixed monetary tribute on the occupied countries. Therefore, the Germans took steps to preserve the value of the monetary tribute which they levied, by imposing rigid price and wage controls. The cost of goods which the Germans wanted was, in this way, held relatively stable. The effect of this whole process was to drain the occupied countries of goods, and leave them stuffed with new money with which they could, under present conditions, buy nothing.

Actually the so-called occupation costs far exceed current operating expenses of the Germans in the conquered countries. The differential is being used to penetrate by purchase the industries, banks, and security holdings of the conquered countries and their nationals. In France the Germans have recently purchased the controlling interest in the largest copper mines in Europe, the Mines de Bor in Yugoslavia. The backbone of French industry, namely her coal and steel resources, is being brought under German control both through purchase and through the imposition of an international cartel which will allocate to the French plants such production as is in conformity with German needs and plans.

In addition to the occupation costs, in each of the conquered countries the Germans have established control over the banking system so that they could extend to themselves banking credits with which to buy up both current industrial output and the capital assets of existing firms. The skill with which the Germans have operated in bleeding the conquered countries is evidenced by their preference for using the ordinary domestic money and credit facilities of each occupied country rather than creating a new and strange medium of ex-

change. Thus, when the Frenchman sells his heritage, he obtains in return, not German marks, but rather French francs; certainly nothing could on the surface appear to be more legal to the individual Frenchman. In some instances the credit facilities of an occupied area have been marshalled by the creation of a new central bank of issue controlled by the Germans. In other instances, the more subtle device of simply stationing a commissar at the head of each of the important banking institutions has been used.

Wherever the Germans have gained control they have established a further procedure for milking the occupied country by integrating the local exchange controls with that of the Reich. This results in compelling each of the occupied countries to extend clearing credits to Germany to finance exports to Germany. On the surface, this appears to be merely a multilateral clearing agreement. Actually, the end product is that each of the clearing partners is made to extend forced long-term loans to Germany. Thus, in Denmark, immediately after occupying the country, the Germans transformed a small clearing credit into an enormous clearing debt. By the end of 1940 the Germans had accumulated a clearing debt to Denmark of about 1,500,000,000 crowns—roughly \$300,000,000—an enormous amount for a country of less than 4,000,000 people.

The amount which Germany thus extracted in clearing loans from Denmark in 8 months of occupation is, roughly, equivalent to the total value of all Danish exports during 1938. Naturally, these extraordinary exports have resulted in draining Denmark of a large part of her capital. Of course, Denmark got paper credit in exchange which hypothetically entitles her, assuming she can obtain priorities, to German goods at some future date. And it must be emphasized that Denmark occupies a preferred position in the German economy due to her accepting Germany's protective custody without armed resistance.

Germany confiscated all of the gold and foreign currencies found in Holland, Belgium, and France. Germany sealed all of the safe deposit boxes in the conquered areas preventing the owners from withdrawing their property. Germany has either seized the contents of such safe deposit boxes or set the stage for such seizure as German needs may require. These are the countries who deliberated and hesitated to use their foreign gold and foreign exchange assets and other resources to build up the defense of their own independence and who are now being compelled to turn over all of these assets to their conqueror to enable Germany to continue on its course of worldwide depredations. All of these countries are now paying annually as tribute to Germany far more than they have ever spent in the defense of their own independence. If it were not for the fact that this country took immediate action to protect the \$4,000,000,000 worth of assets in this country belonging to the conquered countries and their nationals these huge sums

would also have been turned over to the Germans to finance their wars.

Finally, Germany has been able to build up her war potential by depriving the occupied countries of their manpower. Reliable reports are to the effect that the total civilian workers transferred from the conquered countries to Germany number between 1,200,000 and 1,500,000. To this enormous total must further be added an uncertain number—anything up to 1,000,000—of prisoners of war who are working in German industries, mines, and on German farms. The total of the newly acquired labor force in Germany—including both civilians and prisoners of war—approximates 2,500,000. This new labor force constitutes perhaps 10 percent of the total workers employed in Germany, excluding the armed forces. The prisoners of war have, of course, no choice about working to build up the German war machine. The civilian laborers, who have been brought in from the occupied countries, have, in actuality, very little more choice than do the war prisoners. The invasion of the conquered countries produced untold disruption which, in turn, precipitated an unemployment problem of unparalleled magnitude. This unemployed manpower was given the alternative of employment in Germany or a denial of unemployment compensation benefits in its own country. As a consequence, there was a draft of human power throughout the occupied territories for the direct contribution for the war effort of the German Empire.

This is the history of democracies who failed to realize the need for cooperative action in marshaling and using their economic resources to create an adequate defense against totalitarian terror and aggression. Having failed to make sensible use of their resources to protect their own independence they are now compelled to divert those resources to further their own subjugation and to advance the world-wide imperial aims of Germany. Shall we repeat the mistakes of western Europe or shall we use our economic strength in the most effective manner to defeat this menace to our institutions and civilization? [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I am oppressed with a feeling almost akin to despair as I observe the repetition of arguments by Members, which seems to me to so nearly approach pure partisanship on an issue which should be far above party lines. I should despair entirely were it not for the fact that I accept and applaud the statement of my distinguished and able friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], who on Monday said that insofar as the consideration of this bill is concerned that he was not an isolationist or an interventionist, not a Republican nor a Democrat, but an American. This is indeed the attitude in which every Member of this House should approach this subject, and I am sure that it is the true attitude of the Members of the minority who have by strange coincidence been almost alone as they followed each other into the well of this

House to proclaim their belief that America should build up her own defense and aid Great Britain, but who have with three or four outstanding exceptions protested that we should follow some other method of extending aid.

I know, and the Members of this House know, that this apparent partisanship has been but a coincidence, because we know the high character of the men and women who have repeated this time-killing doctrine that is received in Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo with so much gratification. We know that these spokesmen for delay have not consciously planned to encourage the Axis dictators even though their attitude does much to wipe away the chagrin of the African defeats suffered by the junior member of the Axis. We know that this attitude does not reflect the will and the determination of the American people. We know that America recognizes not only the need for defense—we also know that the American people realize the need for prompt action and the necessity in time of danger of using the tools that are available.

The danger in this respect is not that the American people will be diverted from the main issue—the protection of America, the danger lies in the possibility that the dictators may be misled into believing that there exists a serious breach in American solidarity, and that so believing they will decide that it is safe for them to apply the now famous “squeeze play” to America. That in event of an apparent refusal of America to extend prompt aid to Britain, that Japan will assume the role heretofore played by Italy, of entering the war in the hope of sharing the spoils.

On the home front, however, there is a very real danger—a danger that the people will not understand that honest men and women can sincerely urge in one breath national defense and in the next protest against taking what seems to most of us to be the obvious steps to assure our own defense by stopping the danger before it reaches us.

Nor can I understand this attitude, Mr. Chairman, although I repeat that I do not question the sincerity and patriotic intentions of those who urge such a contradictory course. It seems to me that there are, however, two or three vital matters on which we are all agreed. Surely every man and woman in this body will agree that the United States of America wants peace. Surely we will all agree that this Government owes a sacred duty to our people to do everything within its power to maintain an honorable peace. We are not obligated to defend Great Britain or any other nation, except as such defense adds to the security of America. We can also agree with at least 99-percent unanimity that the United States should prepare to defend itself—at least our votes so indicate. We have, with only one exception, I believe, joined to support the greatest national-defense program ever undertaken by any nation.

Certainly such a program—such staggering expenditures, such disruption of the lives of our people, and particularly our young men—can be justified only on the ground that we believe that America

stands in danger and very real danger of attack. Surely you did not vote to burden your people for generations to come simply because of vague rumors which you now term “fantastic dreams” or “British propaganda.” Surely, when you voted these billions of dollars representing the accumulated toil of millions of Americans throughout years to come, and when you voted to take your neighbor's boy out of his job and send him to a training camp, you had in mind some definite and concrete threat to the safety of America. Surely you did not fear an invasion by Ecuador, nor were you preparing to resist the menace of the Republic of Finland, which so frightened the utterly helpless Soviet Union with its 150,000,000 people. Nor were you fearful that stricken Holland or Czechoslovakia would send an expeditionary force against our shores. No, we had a definite threat in mind—at least I did—but the threat we feared and still fear was not the threat of the democracies. I know that there are those who for some inexplicable reason seem reluctant to name the threat they feared. I shall not try to put words into my colleagues' mouths, but as for myself, I feared and I still fear an attack from the dictators, who control and direct the “new order of violence” in the Old World. I fear no one of them, but I do fear the pack.

I fear this trio of international bandits because I have observed their actions and I know that they will take anything they want and have the power to take without any scruples as to the rights of other people. I have seen Japan grab a piece of China each time an opportunity presented itself. I have watched her move on to Siam and to French Indochina just as soon as these regions seemed to be more helpless than China. I have listened to the words of Adolf Hitler after stripping Czechoslovakia of her great defenses proclaim, “I have no further territorial ambitions in Europe.” I recall his assurance that he would never violate the neutrality of Holland or Belgium, and I have, within the last week, heard him make the same statements relative to his territorial ambitions in the Western Hemisphere, and his relations with the United States. I do not think it is safe to trust the existence of my people to the word of a man who has demonstrated that he recognizes no obligation to make his actions conform with that word. I have also watched the spurious Fascist model of the Roman Empire sit by until it thought that the democracies were defeated and then rush in for what it believed to be the kill. Such a record—such indisputable evidence of bad faith—and willingness to lead their own people to war simply to take the property of their neighbors, convinces me that our only safety from the same kind of treatment lies in our ability to resist the combined forces of these exemplars of violence.

We can resist any one of them. We can rely on our ability to utterly defeat Japan, for instance, if we were called upon to deal only with Japan. So long as Great Britain stands and the British Fleet controls the Atlantic it is safe for the United States to keep our great Navy

on the Pacific, and there is no danger of a Japanese attack. But, with the British Fleet destroyed, or, worse, yet, in Axis hands, could we dare leave the American Fleet in the Pacific? If we did not, what would stand in the way of a Japanese attack on Puget Sound and the Golden Gate? Yet, if we did leave our fleet in its present location, what would protect the great industrial areas of the North Atlantic seaboard, or this Capitol itself? With no fleet to offer opposition, the Atlantic, rather than constituting a barrier, would become a highway for an Axis invasion. Or would those who say there is no danger have us divide the fleet and court utter destruction on each ocean? Does not the utter impossibility of protecting the coasts of two continents with one fleet appall you? Of course, you voted to build a two-ocean navy just as I did. Why? You knew that it could not be in existence for 4 or 5 years. You knew that the fate of Europe and the British Navy would be determined long before our new fleet was ready for action. You said by your vote that you felt there was real danger on both sides. What do you propose to do to provide for the defense of your country while the new fleet is building? I shall not undertake to answer for others, but as for me, I shall extend every aid possible to the forces that stand between my home and danger.

It is with me a pure matter of self-interest. I might have a neighbor whom I heartily disliked, but if I was downstream from him and if I saw his levee about to break I would do my best to help him fix it, or if a fire was sweeping in my direction but was presently threatening only his house, which stood between my home and the fire, I would not hesitate to help him save his house, and in so doing I could not be justly charged with approval of his practice of whipping his wife or beating his debts.

So today the stream of conquest is breaking on the chalk hills of England. If those hills stand as they have for a thousand years as a bulwark of democracy, America is safe. I am, therefore, going to do all I can to protect them because I love the chalk hills and black valleys of central Texas, and the men and women who make their homes among them, and I want to see those men and women spared the horrors that have been suffered by other men, and women in Belgium, in China, or in Ethiopia.

The United States is not going to go to war at any time because we want to. If we go to war it will be solely because the European dictators decide that they want us to be at war. Of course, they will not force us into war until such time as they feel that they have a reasonable opportunity to destroy us. They have little opportunity to destroy the United States, Great Britain, China, and Greece all at the same time. They are not, therefore, at all likely to force the United States into war so long as Great Britain and China continue to put up the magnificent fight that they are now doing. These democracies can continue to do this so long as we give them every possible material aid. It is, therefore, as I see it, to the selfish advantage of the United States to give all possible aid to Great

Britain, China, and Greece right now without delay, without limitation, and without counting the cost. It is to our advantage to do so because it protects the United States from attack. I am, therefore, for a British victory. I am in favor of giving Great Britain all possible material aid now, as the best method of protecting the United States further down the line. It is true that our aid may be both too little and too late, but it is a chance we must take. Our failure to aid Britain would surely lessen our chances of avoiding war. A British victory will mean we will escape the horrors of war. A British defeat is, as I see it, absolutely certain to lead us into war—into a war that we will have to fight alone and unaided. I cannot sit idly by and see my country drift into such an unhappy situation.

But many of the speakers have said in effect, "I agree with you in the desirability of aiding the democracies, but I don't want to do it this way." Of course, Mr. Chairman, I would not say it, but there are people in this country who will say that certain Members of this House would never be satisfied with any method of giving this aid so long as the plan had the support of the President of the United States. Now, I would be willing to accept almost any method that looked as if it would help now, but I know, and so does every Member of this House, that under our form of government any kind of procedure that we can pass must have the approval of the President to make it immediately effective, and therefore, as practical men and women, we can prove the sincerity of our desire to aid those who are now protecting us by supporting the measure that can pass rather than by urging further delay—more hearings, new plans, and always still further delay.

I am for this bill because it is practicable. It can and will pass. It provides a workable method of administration. It is in keeping with the American form of government. It creates no dictatorship as has so unfairly been charged. It takes from Congress no power. It but expresses the legislative will that the President exercise the powers already conferred upon him by the Constitution as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. By the terms of this bill, Congress, the legislative branch of government, determines the policy of the United States—determines this policy to be one of self-protection through aid to the democracies. This determination of policy is a legislative function, and it is not delegated to anyone. But someone must carry on or administer the provisions of the bill. A hundred and fifty years ago we discovered that Congress could not act as an administrative body, and for that reason we abandoned the old Continental Congress of the Confederation and established a new government of three coordinate branches under the Constitution. Under the Constitution the administrative or executive power was taken from Congress and placed in the hands of the President. This bill carries out the plan of the Constitution and places responsibility for the administration of the bill in the hands of the President—the Chief Executive. The

power conferred upon him is not legislative but executive in nature. The legislative powers, such as the making of appropriations to carry out the objectives of the bill, are very definitely retained by the Congress as they should be. But for the existence of specific prior acts of Congress the President would have every power conferred under this bill—and his power comes not from an act of Congress but from the Constitution itself. This bill, in the final analysis, does not confer any power on the President—it simply removes whatever barriers the Congress itself may have in the past erected, which at this time might stand in the President's way as he attempts to carry out the legislative will of Congress that we give prompt and effective aid to those who are fighting our battles.

Nor can I overlook the cruel and unfair charge that the President and the Congress deliberately seek by this bill to lead the country into war. A more unworthy statement was never circulated through the Nation. I know that it has been repeated by thousands of honest, but unthinking people, but it is so clearly false that it could have originated directly with Dr. Goebbels himself. The bill in nowise changes the power of Congress to declare war. That power and responsibility is fixed by the Constitution, yet not one single Member of either House has ever suggested war, nor has a single resolution calling for war been introduced in either House. If the Congress wanted war it could have it—this bill adds nothing to our power in that respect. Of course, every honest and intelligent person knows that the Congress does not want war. But they say the bill will enable the President to lead the country to a point where war will be inevitable. The President needs no new legislation to confer such power. He already has that power under the Constitution, which vests in his hands the control of our foreign affairs. There has not been a day since President Roosevelt has been in the White House that he could not have created a condition that would have inevitably brought about war had he been the monster that some would like to picture him, and certainly had he been more attached to his personal political welfare than to the welfare of the great Nation which he serves so faithfully, he would have led us down the bloody path last fall when he had a personal interest rather than now when he is safely re-elected. No, Mr. Chairman, even the blind can see the cruel falsity of this horrible charge—but there are none so those who will not see.

Let it not be said of us that we would not see. Let it not be said of us that we refused to take prompt and effective action to help our neighbor stay the flood that if not stopped now will so surely engulf us. Let it not be said that we were unwilling to use American money and American munitions now as a means of saving American lives later on. Let us pass H. R. 1776 as the only effective method of protecting the liberty we gained in the year 1776, and of preserving the peace that we enjoy in 1941. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL].

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress, as well as the entire Nation, realize the tremendous importance of the present issue before us. The problems confronting us are so involved and varied, and so numerous and often so complicated, that to me, it seems advisable, at times, to strip all of these many problems and propositions down to their essentials, and ask ourselves, just what is our goal and for what purpose are we striving.

Surely we are not concerned with that phase of the European war which has to do with desires for more land and colonies. That is a factor in the war, but it does not primarily concern us. We are not directly interested in that phase of the struggle which will determine who will dominate Europe. That is a big factor in this war but that alone will not threaten to involve us.

It seems to me we have appropriated billions of dollars for defense; changed all our traditions by adopting peacetime conscription; produced all Army and Navy equipment on wartime bases; for just one fundamental reason and that is adequate protection for our way of life; for the right to govern ourselves. There can be no other motive in my mind.

It is true, we must honestly face the problem of greater aid to other nations; the problem of granting further powers to the President; the spending of more billions and the raising of taxes to finance those expenditures. Yes; even the problem of whether or not we shall go to war with that fundamental principle in mind.

If we are to fight for our democracy against a totalitarianism of Europe by creating a dictator here at home, it seems to me our program is wrong. A dictator is a dictator. An American brand of dictatorship is preferable to a European brand, but it is still dictatorship.

If we go to war in an effort to save the liberties and rights of Europe, and by so doing we lose our freedom here at home, we have accomplished little.

Based upon the above thoughts, I have tried fearlessly and courageously to analyze the bill now before us, H. R. 1776, as reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee, and have come to the conclusion that I cannot support this measure.

First, let me say that I am deeply resentful at the attempts to smear the character and motives of those who have disagreed. Colonel Lindbergh is a fine American. He volunteered information along aviation lines on which he was qualified to speak as an expert. Attempts were made to trap him into expressing personal views, and he has been branded as a "fifth columnist" and pro-Nazi by many of those who disagree with him. I have at times disagreed with Senator WHEELER's political positions, but I do believe that Senator WHEELER is a true American. I resent the efforts to smear his reputation that have been made against him because of his opposition to this bill.

We are all Americans. We are all entitled to our opinions and the right to express them. I may be as wrong as anyone else but my stand is based on an honest conviction of what is best for this Nation. Those who disagree with that stand may have just as high motives and I have nothing but respect for their viewpoints.

I am going to vote against this measure, first, because I am opposed to America entering this war. In my opinion this is not a lease-lend bill, it is not a bill to provide all-out aid to Britain, or even a bill to defend democracy. It is primarily a war measure.

Much as I hate to believe it, I am convinced that this bill is destined to put America into a war to which I believe we have been drifting for many months. I do not believe that it is to the best interests of this Nation, nor to the cause of democracy, that we enter this war. I believe America's first duty is the preservation of democracy and Christian ideals here in America. By such action, I am convinced we can best serve not only ourselves but the spirit of liberty and freedom everywhere.

Second, I am absolutely opposed to granting to any one man the unlimited power over our destinies and our children's futures that this bill grants to the Chief Executive. I would not grant unlimited power to any man, regardless of political party. Our Constitution grants certain specific rights to government, dividing them between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches. All other rights are retained by the people. I have unlimited faith in the American people. I cannot pin all my faith on any one man.

Under the provisions of this bill the President could, entirely on his own initiative and without the consent of Congress, give every ship in our Navy, every cannon in our Coast Guard, every airplane we possess, every rifle, every mess kit, and every piece of military equipment we own or can manufacture, not only to Britain, but to Greece, China, or to any other nation which he desired to help. The amendment providing that 90 days later he must tell Congress about it, I think is meaningless. That amendment would only make locking of the barn door after the horse is stolen, an official act.

Under this bill the President has the full power to put this country into the war on the side of anyone he desires without asking or receiving the advice or consent of anyone. Certainly he could put this Nation into the war on the side of Great Britain. However, he could also put us on the side of Russia, the greatest totalitarian dictatorship on the face of the earth and the one nation which has done more than any other to undermine our democracy. The administration has already lifted the moral embargo against Russia, thus allying ourselves to some extent at least with one totalitarian despot while hurling invectives at the others.

The administration accepts a limitation of 2 years on these powers and feels it has made great concessions to self-government. The powers of dictatorship granted to Hitler were limited to 4 years. The German people did not

get them back at the expiration of that time. The President's right to devalue the dollar was limited to 2 years. Congress did not get that power back at the end of that time. It does not have it yet. Under that power the present administration has not only financed this war carried on by the military dictators of Japan in China but has built up Japan's military and naval forces to the point where they are now a menace to us.

I am going to vote against this bill because I believe America must have a national defense strong enough to withstand any power or combination of powers in the world. That is America's safeguard. I am convinced that the American people are willing and ready to make any sacrifice necessary to attain that security. I do not believe that we are willing to make those sacrifices and then give to one man the power to strip those defenses of everything we have provided and give them to some friend across the seas. Even though we admire and respect that friend, I think America's defenses come first. There is an element of selfishness in that, I admit. Where America is concerned, I admit I am selfish. I admire Great Britain and I glory in the fight she is making for her existence. I loathe totalitarianism and all that it stands for. But first I love America and her way of life, her ideals, and her safety.

The President has said he has no intention of ordering our warships to convoy munition ships, but administration leaders refused to accept any amendments actually prohibiting him from ordering such convoys. Opening our harbors to warships for repairs opens our ports to saboteurs and danger. Convoys mean we will be attacked and at war.

In my opinion, this bill is entirely unnecessary. Congress is as much concerned with our safety as the President. I am sure that Congress can be kept in continuous session, ready at any time to carry out any emergency move necessary. It can and will do so quickly. The \$4,000,000,000 authorization for a two-ocean Navy was passed in 2 hours, without a roll call. There is no need for Congress to abdicate. The best way to fight totalitarianism is with a successful continuation of democracy and democratic functions.

I am not opposed to all possible legal aid to Britain. I think we should sell to Britain everything we do not need for our own defenses. I do not believe passage of this bill will make possible a single airplane, ship, or arms that is not possible for her to get now, except we go to war and give her everything.

Instead of abandoning our democratic functions, instead of voting all-out powers to any one man, let us give Great Britain all the legal aid we can, but let us do it in a democratic way with normal functioning of our democratic government. Then, and then only, can America stay out of war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman to ask him a question.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLOOM. Just for the RECORD, did I understand the gentleman to say that he was opposed in some way to this bill because of the discourteous treatment that Mr. Lindbergh received at the hands of the committee?

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I did not mention the committee, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLOOM. In his examination before the committee?

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I did not say that.

Mr. BLOOM. Did not the gentleman say something about personal questions being asked Mr. Lindbergh and that he objected to that?

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I said that because of his position there were those who criticized him and condemned him, but I did not mention any member.

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman that I personally received a letter from Colonel Lindbergh stating that in all his experience he had never been received or treated with more courtesy than he was treated at the hearings when he appeared before our committee, and I wanted to be sure about that because the committee has been praised by the press and everyone else about the way the hearings were conducted, and I would not want the impression to go out to the country by reason of the gentleman's speech that any person appearing before the committee, either for one side or the other, was treated discourteously.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I heard his very nice compliment paid to Colonel Lindbergh and I thought it was very fine sportsmanship.

Mr. BLOOM. I thank the gentleman very much.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as the gentleman may desire to my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

A TRADE OF CREDITS FOR BASES WILL AID BOTH BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, on the opening day of this session, the distinguished Speaker of the House brought cheers from every Member when he said:

It will be my unswerving aim to preserve, protect, and defend the rights, prerogatives, and power of the House of Representatives.

Under the Constitution, one of the responsibilities of the Congress is to pass on the issue of war or peace, the power to declare war. The bill, H. R. 1776, proposes that Congress shall abandon this responsibility and empower the President to take part in any war in any part of the world with everything except men.

That is more power, Mr. Speaker, than one man should have in a republic; it is more responsibility than the Congress should abandon.

I have not overstated the situation. Nothing can exceed the plain language of the bill. It provides that the President may transfer to any nation any defense article on any terms he deems satisfactory.

Defense articles are defined not merely to include any weapon, aircraft, or vessel but any tool, any article or commodity for defense, food, clothing or materials,

raw or manufactured, any plans or information—in short, anything of value to a nation at war.

The President may manufacture or procure, but need not even procure; he may transfer what we already have. That will require no appropriations whatever.

LITTLE CONTROL THROUGH APPROPRIATIONS

Although many have claimed Congress would retain control over the situation by control over appropriations, you will recall the answer of the majority leader to my question on that point this afternoon. Upon questioning, he did agree that the bill granted the power for immediate transfer of equipment on hand or on order.

He expressed the opinion, however, that at least 95 percent of the aid to be given would come from future appropriations. If that be true, what becomes of the argument that England needs help now? How much can be appropriated for, bought, produced, and delivered in 60 days or 90 days?

Personally I think that if England needs aid she will need it this spring. And if she needs credits, she needs them in time to buy equipment on hand or in process that can be delivered this spring.

This bill is one way to make it possible for England to get that aid; it is not the only way. But it makes aid possible because it does grant immediate power to transfer without any appropriation whatsoever. And it authorizes the President to procure and manufacture, and, of course, Congress will later pay the bill, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] pointed out.

So, under H. R. 1776, Congress will control neither the purse nor the sword.

STILL PRESIDENT OF OUR COUNTRY

Now, I do not believe that this President or any President is going to give away our Navy or any other thing he thinks we need, but his judgment or the judgment of any one man on when and where we should engage in war with everything except men is not infallible and delegation of such power is not compatible with our responsibility to the people of the Republic. Certainly not, unless we are at war.

If we were to accept the claim that this Nation is already at war, more could be said for this bill. Under the power and the responsibility of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, I agree that he can place and direct our armed forces. That is true in peace; it is certainly true in war.

So I do not argue too much on this point of power. I do not think it is wise; I do not think it is fair to the President to increase his responsibility and I do not think it is fair to the people for Congress to delegate it. To me, however, there is a far more practical question involved. That is the security of the United States.

ARE WE ENDANGERING OUR DEFENSES?

What concerns me, fellow Members, is that the passage of this bill in its present form will mean taking the last step short of sending men. What then concerns me is that we may be endangering our own defense. If that is not so, why wipe out the requirements of existing law that the Chiefs of the Army and Navy, re-

spectively, must certify in writing that the equipment can be spared before it is transferred?

Those are the practical questions before us.

Aid to Britain approved by the recent election? Aid to Britain approved by various polls? A mandate given? If so, remember that it was a mandate to give aid short of war.

Search every speech made by the candidates for the Presidency. Read every platform utterance. You will find not one phrase that proposed waging war with everything except men in any quarter of the globe.

Every commitment was against involvement in foreign wars. Every commitment was for aid short of war. This bill proposes to wage war with every weapon, every tool, every commodity, every dollar that the President deems desirable. It is not aid short of war. It is all-out aid short only of men—at this time.

I am not objecting to aid for Britain. I am not pleading for neutrality. I am not pleading for international law. The time has passed for those things.

NEUTRALITY ABANDONED LONG AGO

We abandoned neutrality when we repealed the Neutrality Act. I opposed that repeal because, as I said at the time, our decision then would chart our course. It has. That was a step short of war but nevertheless an irrevocable step in that direction.

And steps short of war have brought us where we are—one step from war.

So, then, when that first step was taken, immediately I resolved to work aggressively for measures which I conscientiously thought would add to the true strength and security of the United States. In my work on the appropriations subcommittee for the War Department, I have endeavored to make the United States so strong that no nation would even want to attack us much less try.

I did draw attention to the Espionage Act of 1917 which stopped the transfer of the mosquito fleet but I did it without bitterness and I did it for two good reasons: One that such a transfer was a plain violation of the criminal code of the United States, and the Judge Advocate of the Navy and the Attorney General upheld that position; the other reason was that, in the words of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, the transfer would weaken our defenses as these were the only motor torpedo boats that we had.

Not one word of bitterness or partisanship was spoken by me in the affair. Members on both sides of the House approved the citation of the law, and one of the leading majority members came to me and thanked me for saving the administration from a terrible mess with officials in violation of a major criminal statute.

WE CAN ACT IN SELF-DEFENSE

And I did not oppose the transfer of the over-age destroyers for bases, because, setting aside the thin logic by which the Attorney General drew a distinction between the old destroyers and the new mosquito boats, the deal obtained for the United States some off-coast bases

which I had long believed essential to the defense of the United States.

I subscribe to the idea that the United States can act in its own defense.

Indeed, immediately after the vote by which we abandoned neutrality, I assembled material for a resolution on the acquisition of off-shore bases.

During our hearings on the Panama Canal bill, I developed testimony on the need for these bases when General Strong was before us. He was then chief of the war plans division. When we reported the bill in February 1940, months before the destroyer deal, I introduced a special resolution, H. Con. Res. 49 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, on the subject.

My bill did not merely provide that credit be given defaulting nations on old war debts; it specifically proposed that gold in the \$2,000,000,000 stabilization fund be used to pay in part for the island or land bases to be acquired.

In my remarks at the time, I pointed out that this plan would not only give us bases that we needed, but that it would help to reestablish gold in international exchange, and, equally important, that it would establish credits for the nations who would need them in the days ahead.

That day is here. England tells us that she has scraped the bottom of the barrel. If she has not reached that point actually, it probably will be agreed that she is approaching that point. So today we face the question of aid that was inevitable when we abandoned neutrality and encouraged the nations of Europe to continue their war.

When we made purchase of arms and airplanes legal we committed ourselves as a nation morally to making it possible for England and her allies to acquire supplies within the limits of cash and carry. That ended our moral concern for international law and our practical concern for the conduct of any offended nation. We took the gamble.

PROBLEM IS UNITED STATES SECURITY

The only practical problems before us now, then, are those which deal with the actual security of the United States. And the fair question is, Which method among those proposed will add most to and detract least from the strength and security of the United States?

In my judgment, we can answer that question in a way that will contribute doubly to the strength and security of the United States while affording fullest possible aid to England short of sending men.

That answer is to adopt the substitute measure proposed yesterday by my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable MELVIN J. MAAS, ranking minority member on Naval Affairs, and regarded, I believe, by Members on both sides of the aisle, as one of the best posted, most courageous, most ardently patriotic men in the House.

The Maas proposal is that we offer Britain enough for her island possessions in this hemisphere to retire the old war debt and to establish a \$10,000,000,000 credit, good for whatever she wants to buy.

This will buy time for us, Mr. Chairman, if that is what is wanted, although those who use that argument would be in better position if they would devote their

eloquence and energy to getting time and production today from those who are losing it in strikes and lock-outs on the domestic front.

MAAS PROPOSAL ANSWERS THE QUESTION

This proposal of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] provides England with what she needs; it provides us with what we need properly to organize our defenses in a world changed by fast boats and faster flying machines. If we found it desirable to acquire the Virgin Islands in the World War, even more compelling are the reasons for acquiring these other islands at this time.

As the gentleman from Minnesota has pointed out, these islands are too far from European nations to have a defense value for them; they are valuable to them only as an offensive outpost against us. They are too close to our shores to have an offensive value against European powers if ever we were foolish enough to want to invade Europe; but they are altogether essential in any sound defense plan for this hemisphere.

When the time comes, then, I hope you will support the Maas substitute plan. It meets every avowed purpose of the bill, adds to our strength and security, and it is a step away from war instead of that last step toward it.

THEY LOOK TO US

In closing these remarks, Mr. Chairman, may I use the words spoken a few days ago by the distinguished Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. She said, "Nothing matters but America."

Nothing does matter but America. Not our sympathies. Not our personal affairs. Not our political lives. But America does matter.

The other day I received a post card from a correspondent who has written me many helpful letters. It said, "We sit with helpless hands and look to you."

They do look to us, my colleagues, those folks at home. They look to us to preserve and to strengthen America. They look to us to vote and to act in such a way that this Nation, under God, may preserve for the world the idea of individual freedom. We cannot do that if we weaken our defenses. We cannot do that if we again hurl our civilization into the maelstrom of European wars.

I do not think England is going down. She has chosen to fight and she will carry on and win the last battle. I do not expect capture of the British Isles, but even that would not end the Empire that is Canada and Australia and India and South Africa. Will the British Navy abandon Canada or Australia or the other dominions that have sent their men to fight for Mother England? I do not believe it.

And Hitler is not coming to this hemisphere with his armies. He knows too well the power of mechanized forces strafing troops far from their base of supplies. He has invited the British to tell him where they want to invade the Continent so that he can evacuate the spot and let them land and then repeat the horrors of Dunkirk. No; Hitler is not leaving Europe behind him with its millions of downtrodden people; not with the Russian Bear at his rear waiting to move farther into Europe, and certainly not

with the Army and the Navy and the air force of the United States properly based on our natural outposts, ready to meet him.

America is not going down. We will get through what we start. I plead with you, however, that we remember those who sit with helpless hands and look to us to preserve America as a land where men and women and boys and girls can plan their lives without being condemned before they are born to the round of wars which has marked the history of the Old World. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the Congress is asked by the terms of the bill, H. R. 1776, now before us, to surrender to the President two traditional and fundamental powers vested in and heretofore exclusively exercised by the legislative branch of our National Government. What are these powers? They are to make war and to control the purse strings of the Nation. They are among the delegated and limited powers entrusted exclusively to the Congress by the supreme will of a free and sovereign people.

To retain these powers in the legislative branch, where the Federal Constitution has placed them, is vital to the preservation of representative government. It is the sworn duty of every Member of this House to preserve and protect these basic principles of free government. Wrench these supporting principles from the foundation of the Republic and the whole structure must ultimately fall.

Throughout history, designing rulers have resorted to all the arts of intrigue to gain control of this war-making power and the control of the purse strings. For centuries bitter and bloody battles have been waged to wrest these two fundamental and vital attributes of liberty from the greedy and grasping hand of tyranny. A thousand years is but a grain of sand upon the shore of time, and every century furnishes innumerable illustrations of the lust for individual power. Let me single out one from the many instances where power has been demanded in the name of liberty and the commonweal. I have chosen an incident that occurred at a time when men were fleeing from Europe to this continent to escape the tyranny of arbitrary power:

On May 22, in 1685, King James II of England summoned the Commons to the Bar of the Lords. Seated on his throne, the King addressed both Houses. He declared himself resolved to maintain the established Government in church and state. But then His Majesty directed this most extraordinary admonition to the Commons: He was "apprehensive," he said, "that they might be inclined to dole out money" to him from time to time in the hope that they should thus force him to call them frequently together. But he must warn them that he was not to be so dealt with, and that if they wished to meet him often, they must "use him well." What was the implication of this admonition? It was that if the Commons did not give him as much

money as he demanded, he would take it. The debate in the Commons that followed is not without interest and not unworthy of reflection. A member rose to inform his colleagues that it was not his wish that the Parliament should withhold from the Crown the means of carrying on the government, but to inquire, Was there indeed a Parliament? He reminded his colleagues that great dangers impended over the civil constitution of the realm; that the Habeas Corpus Act, the rampart of liberty, was marked for destruction; that never was there a time when it more concerned the public weal that the character of Parliament should stand high. The Commons went into committee and promptly voted to the King, for life, the whole revenue enjoyed by his brother.

It may be proper to inquire, Is this to be a House of Representatives, or is it in this crucial hour to abdicate and to thus relinquish its control of the sword and the purse?

It was not alone the sword and the purse that some rulers sought to control, but other departments of government essential to the preservation of individual liberty. An independent judiciary has always been anathema to arbitrary rulers. King James II called before him the chief justice of the court of common pleas and told the justice that he must either give up his opinion in a pending case or forfeit his place. The chief justice replied:

For my place I care little. I am old and worn out in the service of the Crown; but I am mortified to find that Your Majesty thinks me capable of giving a judgment which none but an ignorant or a dishonest man could give.

To this rebuke the King answered:

I am determined to have 12 judges who will be all of my mind as to this matter. Your Majesty—

Replied the chief justice—

may find 12 judges of your mind, but hardly 12 lawyers.

The King promptly dismissed the justice from the bench and forthwith packed the court.

It was this background of tyranny, many times multiplied, that caused the framers of our Constitution to be alert, vigilant, and realistic in the distribution of governmental powers.

What did George Washington have in mind when he admonished his countrymen—

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres; avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position.

On the part of those who advocate that Congress shall surrender the power to make war and the control of the purse

to the Executive it is urged that he will not abuse the powers so granted, and that he will use them prudently and effectively during the period for which they are given. Could any answer to such sophistry be made with greater force and clarity than the reply made by Thomas Jefferson, when confidence was said to outweigh principle:

It would be a dangerous delusion—

Said Mr. Jefferson—

if our confidence in the men of our choice should silence our fears for the safety of our rights. Confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism. Free government is founded on jealousy and not in confidence. It is jealousy and not confidence which prescribes a limited Constitution to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power. Our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence will go. In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

This injunction, this warning, is directed to every official, high and low, in the Federal Government to whom the powers of the people are entrusted under the safeguards of constitutional definitions and limitations and a solemn oath of office.

I maintain that all aid to Great Britain, short of neglecting to immediately build up an impregnable defense of our own, can be achieved without the powers asked for in the lend-lease bill. I am opposed to sending our Navy, our air force, or our Army to Europe. England desires the products of our industries, and these she is getting as rapidly as they are produced. England, so far as I can ascertain, now enjoys a priority on essential war materials that is stripping the United States of the very implements necessary for our own defense. It is an undisputed fact that for several years our country has also been sending war materials in large quantities to the aggressor nations—the very nations that now comprise the Axis Powers. The belated but partial embargoes placed on these shipments might well have silenced the cry of our high officials that the Axis Powers must be stopped to give the United States time to prepare.

The Executive powers demanded in the lend-lease bill as an aid to Britain are, when analyzed, the most colossal bid for one-man power over the destinies of this and other nations to be found in history. If these powers are granted to President Roosevelt, he can dictate the whole military policy of Great Britain. He will become the knight errant of the world. He will be clothed with arbitrary power to act as purchasing agent for Great Britain for essential war materials, fighting implements of every kind and character, and he may, if he so desires, require as a condition precedent to their present or future delivery, that he be consulted as to how, when, and where they shall be used. The more Great Britain becomes dependent upon the United States for supplies the more she will, of necessity, be forced to accept the views and dictates of the one man who controls the output and the allocation of the products of the American arsenals, assuming that the

Congress passes this lend-lease bill in its present form.

When I speak about entrusting these powers to one man I would call attention to the recent repeal of the moral embargo on the shipment of war materials to Russia. Great Britain feels that this is inimical to her best interests at this time, yet we are asked to grant greater and more far-reaching powers to the President on the theory that he will use them wisely in aid of Great Britain. We can give the aid Great Britain needs without giving such powers to the President.

The lend-lease bill as now written is not merely a step but a long stride toward our participation in the European war. Whatever one may think about our future involvement, the English point of view on this subject appears in the November 16, 1940, issue of *The Economist*, a publication that usually presents with accuracy and clarity the opinion of the ruling classes of Great Britain. I quote:

What, then, should we in England hope for—a larger and earlier slice of a small cake or a smaller slice of a much larger cake? If the answer is to be given from the somewhat narrow viewpoint of our own material needs, it must be that we should prefer America to be nonbelligerent in 1941, belligerent in 1942. We must hope for her eventual participation in the struggle with all the strength of an armed continent.

I do not see how England can draw any other conclusion from the steps already taken by the United States, especially in view of the present provisions of this bill.

The first great task that confronts Great Britain, I assume, is to stop Hitler, to prevent him from crossing the channel and invading England. This is an achievement we all hope will be accomplished by Great Britain. This in and of itself may be sufficient to lead to a peace parley, but I doubt it, unless utter exhaustion of the belligerents impels this course of action. Even so, the menace of Hitler still remains unless hunger, pestilence, and internal revolution remove him from his position of military prestige and power. There can be no security for England until Hitlerism is crushed. What world power can accomplish this unless the United States is called upon to finish the job? How far do the American people wish to assume responsibility for furnishing the millions of men and billions of dollars to crush the Hitler war machine, reduce it to such impotence that it will be, in truth and in fact, a war that will end wars?

This line of approach takes us into the field of speculation that requires the answer to many questions: How many transports, how many soldiers, how many planes would it require to enable our military forces to obtain a fighting foothold on the Continent of Europe? How many tons of food and guns and tanks and munitions would it be necessary to send over to enable our Army to strike the initial blow and then follow through? How long would it take to produce all these essential materials and implements of war to enter upon such an enterprise? Has any military expert estimated within billions of dollars the probable cost of such a venture?

I do not know how many men Germany mobilized for her battle with France, but those who are advocating the adoption of this war measure in its present form may know. It seems to be the opinion of our General Staff that Germany mobilized six or seven million men for the drive against France. Could the United States conduct a successful invasion of the Continent of Europe with fewer men? Would it be possible to land an army and fight on to an all-conclusive victory with an army of less than 10,000,000 men? I do not know the answer and neither do our military experts. The last invasion of Europe by our Army "to end wars" and "make the world safe for democracy" raises a subject which has received scant consideration during this debate. But we do know and our records show some of the results of our previous attempt to settle affairs in Europe. The last annual report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs presents these ghastly facts relating to the tragic consequences of war. He reports that on June 30, 1940, compensation was being paid to 348,164 veterans suffering from disabilities connected with service during the World War.

The Administrator reports that an analysis of the major disabilities, for which this compensation is being paid, discloses that neuropsychiatric diseases are the disabling cause in 19.74 percent of the awards, tuberculosis in 15.76 percent, and general medical and surgical conditions in 64.50 percent; that 166,000 men were wounded in action. Compensation was being paid to the widows and children and dependent parents of 99,479 veterans of the World War who died in service as a result of diseases or injuries incurred in service during the war. Death claims have been paid to date to the widows and dependents of 158,597 deceased World War veterans.

This war business is not a matter of flag waving and bands playing—not for our dead, disabled, and blind; not for the insane who have gone through the hell of a living death these past 23 years.

I firmly believe that President Roosevelt now has sufficient power to furnish all aid to England, short of war, without the extraordinary powers he demands under the terms of the lend-lease bill. If, however, certain specific objectives are to be attained, then I believe it would hasten all necessary aid, short of war, to Britain, not covered by the present power possessed by the President, if he were to state his specific objectives and request specific powers.

The Congress has been in continuous session ever since this war emergency arose and, in strict compliance with the demand of the public, has remained here, ready to take action when any emergency might arise. The Congress will continue to remain in session at all times, ready to act promptly on any specific request to accomplish any specific objective that may be in the interest of national defense, aid to Britain, or any other extraordinary emergency. The people then can feel the same sense of security that they evidenced when the Congress declined to adjourn last June. They cannot feel secure when their protection rests with the wisdom of one fallible man.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, this debate is drawing to a close and the time is becoming very short. All of us obviously will not have an opportunity to state our full views upon this most important bill. For fear I may not have that opportunity I desire to make at least one complete statement at the outset. I make it as briefly, as plainly, and as emphatically as I can. It is this: I am for total national defense; for a military, naval, and air establishment so huge, so complete, and so perfect that no nation or combination of nations will ever risk the consequences of attacking us. Furthermore, and because I believe that aid to Britain, at this particular time, will implement and strengthen our own national defense, I am in favor of extending to Britain, immediately, all of the material aid that we can extend without actually becoming engaged in the war ourselves and without actually weakening our own national-defense requirements.

I am in favor of extending this aid to Britain by a simple, straightforward, honest, mandatory law of the Congress. That is the only constitutional way, and the only effective way, to do it. It can be done in that way, and it should be done in that way. There are several bills now pending in Congress which propose to do exactly that. Two of them I hold in my hand. One is H. R. 2612; another is H. R. 2805; another is H. R. 2790. Still another method is that proposed by the recommendations of the minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the report upon this bill. This direct, effective, mandatory aid to Britain can be immediately accomplished by enactment of any one of these individual bills, or by substituting any one of them by way of amendment to the bill before us—H. R. 1776. It can also be accomplished by way of the motion to recommit, which will be offered by the minority side at the conclusion of this debate. This legislation, mark you, Mr. Chairman, does not consist of mere suggestions. It is in the shape of bills actually here before us—bills whose provisions will be incorporated in the motion to recommit, and upon which a direct vote will be taken at the close of the debate; and by this legislation we propose to give to Britain aid 10 times more valuable and effective and a thousand times less dangerous to the security of the United States than that proposed in the pending bill, H. R. 1776. Our proposal, in brief, Mr. Chairman, is to make available to Britain and her Allies the entire productive capacity of the United States in planes, tanks, guns, and all other war equipment, under such safeguards as will properly protect our own defense requirements, and to make it immediately possible for Britain to procure this equipment by making her an outright gift, through a direct appropriation of the funds with which to procure it. That, Mr. Chairman, is the most valuable aid we can give to Britain, and, furthermore, it is the only kind of aid which Britain has ever said she wanted or needed.

I am opposed to the bill, H. R. 1776, which we now have under consideration

I am opposed to it because I am convinced that it is a complete and all-inclusive delegation of the entire legislative authority and responsibility in this field to the President—an authority and responsibility which the Constitution reposes exclusively in the Congress—a delegation of legislative power so far reaching that it will be dangerous, if not disastrous, to our very system of representative government. I am further opposed to this particular bill because I honestly and conscientiously believe, after the most thorough study I can give it, that if it passes it will not promote but, on the contrary, it may destroy the defense of the United States, and that, moreover, it will not give Britain the kind of aid she needs. Therefore, I am opposed to it, and unless it should be amended in such a way as to remove these fundamental objections I shall vote against it.

I wish now in the short time allotted to me in this debate to discuss briefly what I conceive to be the issue, and the only real issue, involved in the consideration of the bill H. R. 1776. But, first, I am going to make an observation which, perhaps, I should not make. For the most part, the debate on this question has been proper, decorous, and devoid of partisan and hysterical statements and insinuations. I have sat in my place today, however, and listened to some irresponsible, demagogic statements by politically minded partisan proponents of this bill, in which the patriotism and Americanism of those who oppose it was challenged. Personally, I resented that. The impudent insinuation was made that the opponents of this bill were anti-British, that their opposition was in line with Nazi propaganda, and that they had no feeling for the gallant Britons who today are fighting with their backs against the wall for the preservation of their homes and of the democratic way of life. I find it hard to overlook that kind of insult, and I merely want to say to those gentlemen who had no better taste than to indulge in remarks of that kind that my own ancestors happened to be British. They came to this country from England more than 300 years ago—more than 140 years before our American Revolution. Their direct descendants were American soldiers in the American Revolutionary War. They have taken part in every war in which this country has been engaged from the Revolution down to the World War, in which, incidentally, in a humble way I was privileged to have a humble part as an enlisted man in the United States Navy. That is all I desire to say; but I hope to hear no more of that kind of criticism or insinuation from the other side of the House during the remainder of this debate. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, what is the issue involved in this bill? In my opinion, the issue arises out of two or three rather simple questions. The first is, What does the administration claim for this bill in the way of aid to Britain? What do they claim it will do; and just what kind of aid do they propose to give to Britain under this bill? The second question is whether the kind of aid they propose is necessary or desirable from the viewpoint

of national defense of the United States. The third question is this: Why is it necessary, in order to give this aid to Britain, to resort to a bill of this character, under which we certainly provide no mandatory aid of any kind, but under which, instead, we merely transfer from the Congress to the President the entire jurisdiction upon this subject which is now vested in the Congress by the Constitution? If we want to aid Britain, why must we surrender our legislative power to do so by passing this bill, which merely gives to the President unlimited discretion to do as he pleases in this regard?

That is the issue, and the whole issue, involved in consideration of this bill, and those are the questions out of which that issue arises.

Most of the arguments that have been advanced here, it seems to me, are entirely beside the point. There is certainly no controversy over the question of total national defense, because, as every gentleman knows, the Congress of the United States by mandatory law has already provided for the total defense of the United States. The Congress has done this of its own volition, upon its own initiative, and wholly upon its own responsibility as the lawmaking body of the Nation. It has fully authorized the defense establishment, which, when completed, will be the largest and most powerful on earth; and it has provided the money with which to do it. The administration and execution of this mandatory law of Congress is vested in the President, who, under the Constitution, is charged with the sole duty and responsibility of carrying it out.

Let me take time to call attention briefly to the several phases of the defense program. I want to do this because it has been charged that the Congress is slow, that it has not taken the proper initiative, and that therefore supreme power should be vested in the President, as provided in H. R. 1776. The first and probably the most important phase of the defense program is the two-ocean navy and the expansion of our shore facilities. If any member of the Naval Affairs Committee is present, he will certainly concur in my statement that that proposal did not come from the President; that both the affirmative action and the direct proposal came from the Committee on Naval Affairs; and that it came long before the President ever accepted it as a part of his policy.

That was the case also with another very necessary part of naval defense, the naval air station establishments. I think in the debate on a naval bill the other day I reminded you of the fact that it took us 5 years to establish the first naval air station in our present expansion program before we could get the consent of the President to let that proposal go through. I am not criticizing the President, and I want that plainly understood. I desire to give the President full credit for all he has done, and he has done a great deal; but I also want to give the Congress full credit for those things it has done. I want to remind you that in times of emergency like this the Congress always acts. It usually acts before the

Executive is ready to accept its proposals. It acts with wisdom based on the long and expert experience of its committees. It has proved itself always to be far-sighted. It has invariably chosen the right time to act, and when the time came it has acted, as a general rule, with even greater speed than the Executive could act.

The next thing the Congress did in our program of total national defense was to pass the conscription bill, under which we are now raising and implementing the most powerful, the most modern military establishment in the world. And that bill, Mr. Chairman, did not come from the President. It was introduced in this body by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] without any initial approval or even cooperation of the President and without consulting the President. It was introduced in the Senate by an opponent of the President and, in fact, by one of the principal purgees of the President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very informative speech. I yield him 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MOTT. That bill, the conscription bill, was passed, and is a part of national-defense program. We are also now on our way to establishing the greatest air force in the world, all for the purpose of getting this country prepared to defend itself when that time comes. And I hope you gentlemen will remember, when they have the propaganda that Congress must now surrender its power to the President, because only the President can act in an emergency, that it was the Congress and not the President which did these things I have referred to.

I have never been one to say that there was no danger to this country from the aggressor nations. On the contrary, for years both in committee and on this floor I have tried to point out the very decided probability of a war, not only with one of these dictator nations, but with a combination of all of the dictator nations. That is why I wanted a two-ocean Navy, and why I advocated it as early as 1938, and that is why I have wanted all of the other things that make up our national-defense establishment.

Very well; we passed those laws; and where do they stand now in regard to our present efforts to aid Britain? As a part of those and other laws we have given the President complete authority over priorities in the manufacture and delivery of war equipment to Britain. Britain at this time has several billions of dollars of orders for planes and other war material in this country. The President under existing law is authorized to determine how much of the whole production in America shall go to Britain and how much shall go to our own Army and Navy. During the past year the testimony before the Naval Affairs Committee shows, so far as naval planes and equipment are concerned, something more than 75 percent has gone to Britain. In Army planes and Army material it is even higher than that, and the President has full authority under existing law to order the delivery of 100 percent

of the entire American war production to England if he wants to. So I say that his power in that regard is complete; that he is fully exercising that power and has been doing so ever since these laws were passed; and that deliveries of war material to Britain at the present time are limited solely by our capacity to produce.

Now, what does Britain need? What kind of aid should we give her? Let me say in the first place that Britain herself ought to know what kind of aid she needs, and I call your attention to the fact that British authorities have repeatedly said that what they want is planes, and tanks, and munitions, and more planes, and tanks, and munitions. Delivery of this war equipment, as I have said, is limited only by our own capacity to produce, and that capacity is increasing rapidly every hour.

Now, lately Britain has said that after the present orders are filled she will not have enough cash to pay for any further orders. I say if that is the case—and I am willing to take Britain's and the administration's word for it—then the aid which I propose, and which the minority has here proposed and will propose again upon its motion to recommit, is the proper and the most valuable kind of aid—namely, an appropriation of as much money as Britain needs to continue to purchase this war equipment. I say that that, together with the war equipment which the President is already giving Britain from our Government-owned naval and military supplies, is complete aid to Britain; it is the most real and effective kind of aid; and we can give that aid without surrendering any of our own legislative jurisdiction and without passing a bill that will drastically alter our representative system of government.

The provisions of this bill, H. R. 1776, have been so thoroughly discussed that I cannot add much to the discussion; but I simply want to say this: There is nothing to be gained by any Member's trying to deceive himself as to the scope of this bill, because no intelligent man can possibly deceive himself. This bill is absolutely unlimited in scope—as unlimited as legislative language can make it. It transfers the whole legislative jurisdiction in this field to the President, and it simply gives him discretionary authority to aid Britain in any way he pleases, upon any terms he pleases, and under any conditions he pleases; he is the sole judge of what aid, if any, shall be given and of the terms and conditions upon which it shall be given. It gives the President the power to make treaties, alliances, commitments, and binding agreements with any nation on earth without ratification by the Senate and without the consent or approval of the Congress, and without even the knowledge of the Congress. It allows him to make any kind of trade he pleases with any belligerent power he pleases. It allows him to sell, trade, lend, or give away the whole or any part of the United States Navy; to purchase American merchant ships and send them into the war zones; to convoy them by naval vessels; to repair and outfit battle-ships of foreign belligerent nations in

American harbors; to purchase foreign warships; and to do anything and everything he may choose to do in regard to anything defined in the bill as a "defense article," which includes everything from bread to machine guns. It allows him to have an important part in the conduct of this present foreign war; and that, I think, is probably the most important as well as the most dangerous thing in the whole bill.

I have never been one of those who say that the President wants to get this country into war. I do not believe he does. I do not believe the President has ever wanted to get this country into war; but I do say it is my sincere conviction—and I base that upon the very terms of the bill and upon what we all know to be the real foreign policy of the President. That policy was announced by the President in his Chicago speech in 1937, and he has never changed his position on it. The policy announced then was that the United States should help to police the world and that it should take parallel action with the other democracies to put down the dictators in all parts of the world. That was, as you recall, his famous "quarantine" speech.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] for his courtesy. I say that policy was announced by the President long before this emergency ever began, and that he has never changed it. His present proposal to make the United States the arsenal for democracies is merely another name for it. Whether his policy is right or wrong, under the unlimited authority given him by this bill he will now have the power and the opportunity to put it into full effect. If those powers are put into effect the inevitable result must be to lead this country into war, even though the President does not desire it, because it is impossible to exercise those powers and still keep the United States at peace. There are provisions in this bill which, if exercised, would bring about situations the natural and inevitable consequence of which would be war. I think no one doubts that. In fact, it has been freely admitted here in this debate by some of the most able and conscientious advocates of the bill.

For this reason it is clear to one that the bill permits the President to do acts which will result in war, thereby putting the country into war without the constitutional requirement of a declaration by Congress. One of those acts would be the reconditioning and overhauling British battleships in New York Harbor. I am familiar with those facilities in New York Harbor. I voted in committee for the bill which authorized the building of them, but I never expected to see a bill which would permit the President to use them for repair of battleships of a nation with which we were not actually in war as an ally. In our war plans, as you know, we must consider all kinds of probable war situations—wars in which Eng-

land, or any other nation, may be our ally, and in which England or any other nation may be our enemy. It is right and necessary to make those plans and to prepare the facilities for any probable contingency. The time may come when it might well be to the advantage of the United States in her own defense to repair British battleships in our docks in New York Harbor, and if we do we must expect retaliation to follow as a matter of course. That would be the risk we would have to take in those circumstances. Such retaliation, by the way, now is possible, because we have Navy bombers which have a radius of 7,000 miles and are able to carry a full load of bombs for that distance. So if and when we do repair British battleships in New York Harbor, we are, of course, in war.

Now, I have said that sometime it may be to our advantage to go to war by that route; but when that time comes, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, which is charged by the Constitution with the sole responsibility of exercising the war-making power, I insist that I myself retain the right to vote whether we do that thing or not. I am not willing in advance to leave it in the discretion of the President by voting now for this bill, which will transfer the war-making power to the President, and to leave the people whom I have sworn to represent without any voice and without a remedy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield to me, I will give him 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. MOTT. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a distinguished member of the committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that England would much rather have a specific, liberal sum of money with which to purchase things in our country so that she could get those things promptly? The gentleman wants to give aid to Great Britain just as I do, and to give it now.

Mr. MOTT. I am thoroughly convinced of that. I am convinced of it by the statements of witnesses before the Naval Affairs Committee, including the testimony of plane manufacturers. That is the principal thing the British want. They want delivery of planes. They want delivery of tanks. They want delivery of artillery and of munitions and of all the things they need. They are willing to pay for it if they can, and up to now they have paid for it, but their willingness to pay does not speed up production, and certainly nothing in this bill H. R. 1776 will or can speed up production. That is now flatly admitted by the sponsors of this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In other words, they want first things first.

Mr. MOTT. They want first things first and they are willing to pay for it as long as they can. I am willing, and I know that the overwhelming majority in Congress is willing right now, to appropriate enough money so that they can pay for whatever they need when their credit is exhausted, and let me say that

H. R. 1776 does not provide for any such direct and necessary aid to Britain as that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If this bill should pass in its present form, is it not true that the President would virtually be controlling the strategy of the European and Asiatic wars?

Mr. MOTT. There is no doubt about that; and that, as I have said, is the most dangerous part of the bill. He would have a very important part in the conduct of a foreign war; and when the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States has a vital or controlling part in the conduct of a foreign war, then I do not see how it would be possible for us to keep out.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOOM. I would like to know who has charge of the time?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am willing that the gentleman have 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not know the lady had control of the time on the minority side.

Mr. MOTT. Does the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee desire to yield me some additional time?

Mr. BLOOM. I would like to know who has charge of the time on that side?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield the gentleman from Oregon 2 minutes from the time assigned to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not this bill also, if passed in its present form, give the President authority to take over all agricultural products in the country? Cotton, for instance, is a war commodity.

Mr. MOTT. It does, most certainly; because they are listed as "defense articles," and as "defense articles" the President may do anything he pleases with them. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] such time as he desires.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, we usually credit man with being the most intelligent animal on earth. He can easily master animals many times larger than himself. This power we attribute to his superior mental ability. He is supposed to learn faster, retain his knowledge longer, and at all times profit by his mistakes.

I well remember dad's mule once came near a sinkhole and the ground caved in with him. Twenty-five years later he had become an old mule, but he still would not go near that sinkhole. But remember that he, being a mule, had only half horse sense. Yet experience meant a lot to that old mule. Perhaps profiting by experience made him an old mule.

Less than 25 years ago we stubbed our toe when we set out to make the world safe for democracy. The man who has half horse sense should be able to recall

that World War No. 1 cost us the lives of 122,160 men, 52,779 of whom were killed on the battlefields and now lie under European dirt. It cost us up to 1938 approximately \$48,000,000,000, or about \$400 per man, woman, and child. To a family of 10 the cost was \$4,000 just in money, to say nothing of other costs.

Now, some say that the purpose of this bill is to stall off Hitler that we may have time to arm. This is a poor argument when we consider that Hitler has been arming for 7 years and has not yet invaded England across 20 miles of water, and that we have been sending away practically all of our new defense equipment as fast as we have been able to produce it.

I have listened rather patiently for several days to the hearings and to the debate on the lend-lease bill. I also have followed closely the workings of the New Deal throughout its existence. I firmly believe that this bill has as its hidden purpose direct involvement of the United States in a foreign war.

This bill before us in Congress today involves far more than aid to Britain; war in support of British policy in Europe or around the world, or the complete abrogation of congressional powers. The fundamental domestic issue raised is a question of whether we American representatives are to award dictatorial powers of policing the world to the President.

There is no doubt in my mind that our brief war-prosperity boom will bust into a depression that will make the 1930's seem like boom days. Then we will find ourselves and generations to come in a condition of poverty and bankruptcy unknown to any people of this great country of ours.

Must we now take this drastic step of underwriting a British victory, a step after which there is no alternative, but perhaps to eventually place millions of our best men up for cannon fodder, after which again we will have not thousands but millions of widows, orphans, and disabled veterans.

Our cherished American institutions and traditions may experience the revolutionary changes which the ardent New Deal left-wingers have reconciled themselves to since the President entered the White House. Make no mistake about it, if we vote to pass this dictatorship bill, we Representatives vote ourselves into the powerless status of an electoral college or the present German Reichstag.

As Thomas Jefferson once said:

For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality, and a respect for the equal rights of nations, would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

Europe's fighting never ceases. Their quarrels are never settled, and for us to become entangled on one side, to pay their bills and fight their battles, means disaster.

In this fight against aggressors let us not ourselves become aggressors. And in our aim to save democracy let us not, in the course of battle, destroy the very thing we are fighting to preserve.

If you like this prospect, go ahead. I do not like it and, therefore, to save America—to say nothing of the world—I

will struggle to the end to keep this country out of war.

As Thomas Jefferson has said:

I am not for linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe; entering that field of slaughter to preserve their balance * * *. The first object of my heart is my own country.

An American boy, on American soil, under any and all conditions, is better than an American boy under European dirt. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to register my protest, and the protests of large numbers of my constituents, against the passage of H. R. 1776, a bill which has been labeled "An act to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes."

My able colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], in her inspiring speech of last Monday, commented at some length on the hidden meaning of the routine phrase, "for other purposes." She pointed out, and rightly, that the danger in this bill lies in its unwarranted delegation of vast war-making powers to an Executive who has clearly demonstrated, by his past actions, that he will not hesitate to use them.

Let us now, before proceeding to a vote, investigate a little further into the "other purposes" of this bill. And after determining their exact nature, let us examine the methods by which it is proposed that we accomplish these purposes.

The proponents of this bill state that its principal purpose is to provide aid to Great Britain in her life-and-death struggle with the totalitarian powers. They assert that we must pass this bill now, without further amendment, in order that we may immediately throw our great productive capacity behind the British Empire.

My sympathies naturally lie with Great Britain, for I am a native of the British Isles and even now bombs may be blasting away my ancestral home. If I felt that this bill actually would bring immediate aid to Britain, without weakening our own inadequate defenses or robbing Congress of its constitutional powers, I would be the first to vote for it. In fact the bill would command almost universal support.

But will it do this? The answer, according to military experts, is in the negative. Only yesterday the able minority leader of the Naval Affairs Committee pointed out that this bill will not get a single extra airplane to England. It will not make available a single tank, a single gun, a single ship—unless we strip our own defenses to provide them.

What, then, is the purpose of this bill? If it is simply to provide financial aid to Britain, why is it necessary to grant these dictatorial powers to the President? Why cannot Congress, retaining control of the purse and the sword, appropriate a fixed sum to be spent in the financing of British purchases in this country? Would this not be the constitutional, sensible way to proceed? Would this not be the American way?

I have followed the hearings and the debate on this measure very closely and I have yet to hear a single, convincing answer to the question of why it is necessary for Congress to abdicate in order to provide aid to Great Britain.

Supporters of the bill argue that the emergency demands it. But is there not always an emergency? Hardly a week has gone by during the past 8 years that the President has not demanded additional powers in the name of one emergency or another.

I contend that there is no emergency here that Congress cannot properly deal with in its own way. There is nothing that the President can do to aid Britain, within the limits of the Constitution and without weakening American defenses, that Congress cannot also do. The President is using aid to Britain as a smoke screen behind which he hopes to wrest from Congress complete blank-check control over the destinies of a great people.

It is not my intention to enter into an extended discussion of H. R. 1776 and its many dangerous implications. There are other speakers who no doubt will do so. Before concluding, however, I do intend to voice my conviction—and the apparent conviction of a majority of my constituents—that passage of this bill would be another step in our steady progress toward active participation in this war.

It should not be necessary to remind Members of this body that they were elected only 3 short months ago on pledges to keep America out of foreign wars. These pledges were made in the platforms of both political parties and were repeatedly enunciated in the campaign speeches of the Presidential candidates. They should constitute a solemn covenant between the people and their elected representatives.

As for me, I made that pledge to the citizens of the Fourth Indiana District in 1938 and 1940. I renew it now in this Chamber, which houses the greatest law-making body in the world. I intend to keep it. I shall vote against H. R. 1776 because serious study of its provisions has convinced me beyond question that its passage would lead to one-man Government and war.

If we are to preserve democracy at home and prevent American participation in a disastrous war abroad, we must do it now by defeating this dangerous, un-American proposal. If we fall in this solemn hour, "tomorrow may be forever too late." [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, all during the hearings in the House and Senate committees I have wanted to hear the whole evidence available on the bill H. R. 1776, whether in accord with my own views or not.

I recall a statement in the press about 5 weeks ago, I believe by Senator WHEELER, that William R. Davis would appear before some committee and testify regarding the peace proposal he is reported to have brought back from Berlin and to have submitted to the State Department in October 1939.

Why has William R. Davis not yet appeared as a witness in any hearing on this matter? I do not have any purpose in asking this question except to advocate the presentation of all known evidence possible on so important a measure as this.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who will be the last speaker on this side.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate that the most important question that has confronted the people of the United States since the declaration of war in 1917 is being kept from the American people by a maze of confusion, probably not purposely done by some people but certainly this confusion results from a conspiracy to becloud the real issues involved in the proposed legislation and the real implications involved throughout the promulgation of the present prowar policy which we have been pursuing since May 16, 1940, when the President launched the present blitzkrieg against the peace and freedom of the American people from the rostrum of this chamber. If the American people were made to realize by a clear presentation of the facts on the part of the press and on the part of the radio that the policy of armaments as an arsenal for one side of the belligerents as against the other side necessarily and inexorably leads to participation by actual conflict, and if the American people were made to realize the war implications involved in the policy of aid to Britain by means of converting the United States into an arsenal for so-called democracy, I am certain that these selfsame American people who are definitely opposed to war would likewise be opposed to this policy of aid to Britain and its corollary policy of making the United States an arsenal for alleged democracy.

Mr. Chairman, everything has been done since the President addressed the Congress of the United States on the 16th day of May to keep from the masses of America the course involved in this policy, to wit, the inexorable course toward war which this policy sets forth. We first sold this war program to the American people in the month of May 1940 by calling it national defense. We were told that the country was in imminent danger of invasion and that it was necessary to pursue an armament program. Subsequently we were told that since we had the armament we must provide the men. So we adopted a policy of militarizing the American youth by conscription. Then slowly we began to drop the national-defense angle a little bit and we permitted to creep out in public something which was a little more bold.

This was the program of aid to Britain short of war. Of course all of the papers, all of the radios, and all of the instrumentalities of propaganda in this country, which incidentally are controlled by monopoly capital, the same forces that were responsible for the last European war and the same forces that are responsible for this war, naturally

did not bring out to the American people the implications that were involved in aid short of war; namely, that aid short of war simply shortened the distance between peace and war for the people of the United States.

So they sold that idea and they sold it very cleverly by means of bringing about a sort of political false national unity in the last campaign, and I refer to the strangest political campaign that we have ever seen, the Presidential election of 1940, where both candidates had no difference whatsoever on this question of aid to Britain short of war. In fact, they both agreed on a program of armaments, conscription, and war, not for democracy but for imperialism. However, they did not let the people know their real intentions. They used weasel words of keeping America out of foreign wars; but were actually agreed on an imperialist war program. This incidentally has been borne out by the conduct of the defeated candidate for President of the United States during the last 3 weeks.

This utility barefoot boy went over to England and strolled along the streets of London in Horatio Alger's hero style. You know, the man who came up the hard way, with his locks over his forehead and his tie askew. The husky-voiced crusader for the commonwealth people of America came upon the debris and the wreckage caused by the Nazi bombs and when he looked upon this wreckage he made a great contribution to world literature. He said, "Gee, it's awful." That contribution is going to go down in the history of world literature alongside the Sermon on the Mount and the Gettysburg Address. [Laughter.]

His conduct there and his attitude on this bill are an effort to carry out the purposes of that queer campaign—namely, to take over the 22,000,000 who voted against his opponent to the side of the President's war policy. This conduct proves what I charged during the political campaign—that there was no difference between these two candidates. Essentially they were both pro-war candidates, and Mr. Willkie, in particular, reminded me of a prize fighter who had been sent into the ring under agreement to take a dive. His attitude proves conclusively that he carried a towel in his trunks, and I am sorry for his managers, because they must have had an awful job keeping him from throwing in that towel in the first round. [Applause.]

So we find the tired, husky-voiced crusader of the common "wealth" [laughter] people now confusing the 22,000,000 people who voted for him and who supported him because they did not want war. We also find an awful lot of confusion created by some of the opposition to this bill, because I maintain that in all honesty anybody who advocates aid to England, who believes in all-out aid to England, cannot very well criticize the basic features of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because I am opposed to converting this country into an arsenal, not an arsenal for democracy, if you please, but an arsenal in pursuance of a policy which

would catapult the American people into a war which is not a war for democracy but a war for the maintenance of the present British imperialist interests, a war between two gangs of imperialistic bandits, one gang who stole yesterday and one gang who is trying to steal today. This war, which we are told is a war for democracy in order to force us into it, should be analyzed from every aspect. Of course, it is now also being sold to the American people as a war for Christianity, as Lord Halifax said in a radio speech some time ago.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does the gentleman know of any war that has ever succeeded in increasing Christianity?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have never known of any imperialistic war that has ever succeeded in increasing Christianity or democracy. One thing I also know is that this war is just as imperialistic in character as the last war, and I shall develop that point as I go along in my speech. They are trying to sell this as a war for Christianity, as a war for democracy. I think the best evidence of the character of this war is the representative that this so-called democracy has sent here.

Lord Halifax, or, as the British workers who are now living in the subways of London while his friends live in exclusive underground hotels call him "Lord Holy Fox" [laughter], despite his cadaverous appearance of an unwrapped Egyptian mummy, he is the one who is sent here to tell us that he and his fellow rulers of Britain and the British Empire are the champions of democracy, that they are fighting this war for democracy. It is the same Lord Halifax who has betrayed democracy on every occasion he has had contact with it; the same Halifax who betrayed the people of Spain when they were fighting for their democracy; the same Halifax who betrayed democracy at Munich and sold it down the river and made a deal with Hitler; the same Halifax who is part of that Cliveden group in England that gave money to Hitler, that built up this frankenstein in the hope that Hitler would march eastward toward Russia; the same Lord Halifax who as Viceroy of India sent 47,000 Indians to jail because they asked for the independence and freedom of their country. This same Lord Halifax, who has been the spokesman for the appeasement faction in England for many, many years, was unfortunately greeted right up here by the President of the United States. I cannot help but remember my history, that the last time a British battleship came this near to Washington was when the British redcoats burned the White House and the Capitol of the United States.

He is supposed to be a spokesman of democracy. Is not the very presence of this man as a representative of the British interests indicative of the character of the war that is being waged today, not for democracy but for the preservation of empire?

If that does not convince you, let me point out something else as to the character of the war that is now being waged. This will come as a surprise to many of my colleagues, and I now present unquestionable and irrefutable evidence that today British financiers and German financiers, the representatives of Adolf Hitler, are still doing business. They are still conducting business for profit among themselves, yet we are told that they are fighting to destroy Hitlerism. Let us see whether they are fighting Hitlerism or are seeking to protect their financial and other imperialist interests.

I refer to the report of the Bank for International Settlements which was issued on May 27, 1940. On the list of the board of this bank you will find the names of the following gentlemen: Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, and Dr. Funk, director of Hitler's economic policy, as joint directors; Van Zeeland, as manager of the bank; with two other German bankers, three Frenchmen, two Italians, a Dutchman, a Swiss, and a Swede as the other directors.

The bank makes the interesting commentary: it "undertakes only such operations as are irreproachable from the point of view of both the belligerent and other countries. In December 1939 certain rules of conduct which the bank had as a matter of fact observed since the month of September were codified and brought to the knowledge of its clients."

You who are asking us to follow a policy which will inevitably plunge us into actual conflict, not plunge us in war, because we are in that war from the standpoint of armaments—from the standpoint of having put our country on a war-economy basis we are actually in war—you are asking us to go further into that war, and inevitably, for now that you have become this arsenal and this military reservoir, you are bound to engage in actual conflict. You are asking us to do that for what? For democracy? Are you convinced in your hearts that this clash between Great Britain and Hitler is a clash for the preservation of our way of life, that it is a clash for idealism, that it is a clash for democracy and the maintenance of democratic principles throughout the world? Can you be convinced of that in the face of the fact that you have here as Ambassador one of the chief appeasers of Hitlerism, and that you have here concrete proof that the monopoly capitalists of England are still doing business with the monopoly capitalists of Nazi Germany?

Let me also call your attention to something else about this British democracy for which we are asked to fight.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. According to the kind of government they have, if there is no difference, if the gentleman shifted his citizenship tomorrow for life, where would he prefer to live, in Germany or in England, with their known customs, laws, and permits?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is not a fair question, for the simple reason that

I prefer to live in my own country, the United States. The question is so hypothetical that you cannot expect anyone to give a concrete answer. My point, however, is that, while there may be a difference between the ruthless course of British imperialism and that of Nazi Germany, the difference is one of degree, and that degree is so small that it does not warrant us in pursuing an arsenal policy such as this bill provides, which will push us further into war and force us to shed the blood of our youth and spend billions of our dollars.

Mr. CREAL. Will the gentleman yield for one other question, please?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Certainly.

Mr. CREAL. Does the gentleman call it a small matter when one country preserves the 12-man jury system, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion, which one country has and one does not? Does the gentleman call those things small differences?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Oh, but your premise is wrong. Where is this freedom in Britain, which censors and suppresses the antiwar press and conscripts labor; in the Britain which is ruled by Tories who were elected 5 years ago and act toward the people as though they were ruling five centuries ago? I ask you, what freedom of the press, and what freedom is there for 300,000,000 people in India? What freedom does England give to the Indian people? I ask you, what freedom is there that Britain gives to the exploited natives of South Africa; to the Boers down in South Africa? I ask you, what freedom is it that Great Britain gives which is any different from the freedom that the Nazis give Norway; in the exploitation of millions of people in the British West Indies?

Ah, when we talk about freedom, let us not just point to the lack of freedom in Nazi Germany. Let us also realize the lack of freedom that exists in one-fifth of the world that is under the British Empire, and you cannot get away from that.

Let me give you an example of what is going on in India today. We are going to send bombers to the British Government. Today bombers are being employed in dropping bombs on natives in the hills of northern India. Sure, those facts do not come out. You do not think for a minute that the British censors are going to let that out, but Indians are in this country who have recently arrived here, and they have told me personally that Indian people in the northern hills of India are being bombed by British bombers because those people are seeking freedom from the exploitation and enslavement of British imperialism.

Certainly, I say I do not want to see a Hitler victory, but I am likewise opposed to a victory of British imperialism, or, for that matter, even Wall Street imperialism. All imperialism means enslavement of the working class throughout the world, and particularly enslavement of the people in our own country, if we pursue an imperialistic war course.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 5 more minutes.

Mr. CREAL. When the gentleman is speaking of that method of suppression, does he know in all history where any government, when people inside of its sovereign domain rebelled against the government, did not use the necessary force for suppression, even in America at the time of the secession of the Southern States?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. So therefore the gentleman wants us to embark on a policy which will aid those forces that are suppressing people who are rebelling, in order to attain that democracy which you say we are going to fight for by the enactment of this bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows what the British Navy was doing just 100 years ago.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is history.

Mr. WHITE. Smashing the ports of China to force opium down the throats of the Chinese.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am glad the gentleman mentioned opium. Look at the League of Nations' report on this great democracy, this great champion of civilization and Christianity which did nothing less than employ the use of opium in order to demoralize the natives of China so that they could not resist British imperialism in China.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman in declining to state in which country he would prefer to live, but rather preferred to live in America, and in his characterization of this war as imperialism versus imperialism, raised a question in my mind as to what he thought would constitute the greatest threat to America, which he has said he loves, and I sincerely believe he does—

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The greatest threat to America—

Mr. GORE. The greatest threat to America, the overwhelming defeat of Great Britain by the German forces or the defeat of Germany by the British forces?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I say that America's greatest threat lies in three forces: One from Hitlerism, a Hitler victory; two, from a British imperialist victory; and, three, the most imminent danger to the welfare of the American people is by plunging the United States of America into this imperialist war [applause], because we are not going into a war at the termination of which there will be established democracy and justice throughout Europe; but, on the contrary, we are going into a war in pursuance of the imperialist policies not only of Great Britain but of the United States Wall Street imperialist interests as well. I intend to develop the thought that what we are about to accomplish just now, and what we have really accomplished, is the formation of a new axis. In this imperialist world crisis as opposed to the Rome-Tokyo-Berlin Axis, we have formed the Wall Street-Downing Street axis, and the worst thing for America is a triumph of either one of those two axes.

The best thing for the American people is to bring about the defeat of both of these axes, and the most important thing that the American people can do to bring about the defeat of the Wall Street-Downing Street axis, as well as of the Rome-Tokyo-Berlin Axis, is to remain at peace, to build up our democracy, to give work to the unemployed of America, and to preserve civil and constitutional liberties in the greatest democracy in the world. [Applause.]

Now, what kind of government does England have today? Ambassador Kennedy testified, and he said as follows, on page 237 of the hearings:

But, nevertheless, I said very definitely in a speech I made for President Roosevelt, that when the war came on on the 6th day of May last year the British passed a bill in 2 hours debate, and democracy went out of the window.

Of course, you are going to say that this is just temporary, despite the fact that China and Spain were able to continue a war without destroying their own democracy.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Let me complete this thought first. I think what the country ought to have is Ambassador Kennedy's confidential report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes more to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. He filed a confidential report with the State Department and the State Department suppressed it and will not release it. Apologists for the State Department say that these documents are not released until 17 years afterward, but that was not the case when Ambassador Bullitt went on the air and slandered the workers of France, falsely charging them with causing the defeat of France. When Colonel Donovan came back with a report and tried to blame France's collapse on labor legislation, not only was he permitted to release his report, but further than that, Colonel Knox wrote a preface for that report which was published in the press. I have before me a small newspaper entitled "In Fact," gotten out by a gentleman whom I personally know, George Seldes, in whom I have utmost confidence. On January 13, 1941, he printed excerpts from that report. To this day the authenticity of the publication of this report has not been challenged, and I challenge the State Department to refute the authenticity of this report. This report, as we say in my district, is "the McCoy," it is the real goods.

Here are the conclusions that Mr. Seldes derives from that report, which I repeat is reprinted in his paper *In Fact*, dated January 13, 1941. He says that this report was filed by Mr. Johnson, counselor of the Embassy, for the Ambassador, dated London, October 10, 1940. Here are the conclusions derived from that report:

First. That England is proceeding rapidly toward fascism on the Nazi model.

Second. That fascism cannot be sold the British people without the enthusiastic cooperation of the Minister of Labor, Ernest Bevin.

Third. That the people of England—the working people—are paying for the war, while the Government makes great concessions to the industrialists, munitions makers, and big business.

Fourth. That the Government is not able to protect its people against air raids.

I had hoped that the State Department might meet the challenge issued by this publication. If we are going to defend England as a democracy, if England is our first line of defense, and our Ambassador files a report to the effect that England is no longer a democracy, why does not the State Department—the administration—release that information to the American people, so that we can debate this question with our eyes open?

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. In speaking of that very informal and undemocratic method of the British Parliament in passing a bill within an hour without debate, had the same question been up in Germany, I presume the bill would first have been referred to a house committee, and after the house committee reported it would have then gone to the rules committee, with ample debate and full discussion before being agreed to by the Reichstag?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Perhaps they might have taken a half hour less in Germany to pass the bill instead of 2 hours. Is that a reason why we should pursue a policy to get us into war, to defend the government that destroys democracy in 2 hours' time against the government that destroyed its democracy in 1½ hours' time? If the gentleman wants that distinction to justify our going into the war, he is welcome to it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman that the Department of State should give the Congress, particularly the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the most complete information as to what its representatives find is going on in European and Asiatic countries. We are expected to legislate practically in the dark and I am glad the gentleman has brought that matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Since the gentleman has discussed Asiatic countries, bringing in China at this point is very important. China is fighting for her life, putting up a genuine fight for democracy, but what is our policy toward China?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman has used all of the time on the Democratic time, I am glad to yield the gentleman 10 minutes from our side.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The American Labor Party is doing pretty well. [Laughter and applause.] I want to

thank the gentlemen of both parties for the time.

China! What is our policy toward democratic China, which is being used as a bait to get people to support this kind of legislation? We loaned China \$100,000,000. Ask the Chinese representative what they have been able to buy here. They have been unable to buy a single war article of any consequence by which they could prosecute the war of defense against Japanese aggression. This may astound you, but check up this statement at the State Department and you will find it is true. For the past 6 months, instead of our exports to Japan declining, our exports to Japan during the last 6 months have been larger than at any other time during the period commencing with the invasion of China by Japan. We are increasing our exports to Japan. What is our game over there? It is very obvious. We give China just a little bit to keep Japan busy, but never will we give China sufficient to make China win, so as to establish a democratic China, because a genuinely democratic China will be antagonistic to the imperialist interests not only of Japan but of Downing Street or Wall Street as well, and will never permit the exploitation which we, in conjunction with Japan and Downing Street, are conducting in China.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman stated a few moments ago that No. 1 danger was of a Hitler victory. No. 2, I believe, was a British victory.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I did not mean anything by 1, 2, and 3. I say that the three of them are equally dangerous, but the most immediate danger is that of going into this war, thereby destroying our peace and our freedom.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman says that victory by either one constitutes a threat.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Right.

Mr. GORE. Then how does the gentleman justify, since they are now combating each other in a fight to the finish, how does the gentleman justify his vote against all national-defense measures?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman was here when I discussed that the other day.

Mr. GORE. I would like to have the gentleman discuss it now in the light of what he has just said.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will be glad to do so. When I voted against these allegedly national-defense bills I said they were constituting this country into a military reservoir for one side as against the other; that they were not being used strictly for national defense. I said that in June. The press and others called me names in the months following June 1940, but the President came here in January 1941 and said that we had to become an arsenal, and he said an arsenal for democracy. That is where I disagree with him.

We are an arsenal, but not an arsenal for democracy. Therefore I will vote hundreds of millions of dollars for the strict defense of my country, but I will not vote for these appropriations since time and events have demonstrated con-

clusively that we have not been appropriating for the defense of our Nation, but rather we have appropriated in preparation to catapulting this country into an imperialist war, and being opposed to that imperialist war, I refuse to appropriate for anything that catapults us into that war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that all the time there was considerable expression of sympathy for the democracy of China?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And yet we were sending scrap iron and arms to Japan with which to destroy that so-called democracy?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, and we are exporting more to Japan now than we ever exported before.

Now, I would like to tell you what the representatives of monopoly capital say. This is right straight from Wall Street. The National Industrial Conference Board, 247 Park Avenue, New York City, is one of the important research bureaus for the monopoly finance and monopoly business. Mr. Virgil Jordan, its president, made a speech before the Investment Bankers Association at Hollywood, Fla., on December 10th last year.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now let me give the gentleman this speech.

Mr. GORE. I want to get the gentleman off of that straw man.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. He is not a straw man. Mr. Virgil Jordan happens to be one of the spokesmen for the big men who are making many legislators straw men. Now I yield. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. I am still quite interested, since the gentleman has made such great protestations of his love for America and Americanism, and we all attribute the gentleman with sincerity in that, just how he can speak now and name two definite threats to America and American liberty, and yet because he sees some little something or imagines he sees something in the defense program that he does not like, he is unwilling to vote for one dollar to save us and protect us from that threat?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is distorting the position as I have explained it.

Mr. GORE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. That is the position the gentleman took.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Just a moment. I have the floor. Let me answer the question. I said our most immediate danger is our participating in this imperialistic war; that our appropriations have not been for the defense of our country, its shores, and its people.

All these appropriations allegedly for defense are not in pursuance of a peace policy but rather a policy which will mean our participation in this war, and for that reason I have opposed and will continue to oppose appropriations for armaments which are intended for the prosecution of an imperialistic war and not for defense. Now I want to get back to my subject.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I will yield him another minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not want to bargain about it, but I shall need it. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman know out of these hundreds of millions of dollars we have appropriated how many modern airplanes we have in the War Department today?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am afraid to answer that question because at a press conference at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue I may be accused of wanting to give information to Germany. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. FISH. I will answer it for the gentleman, because I am in bad with the President anyhow. I will say to the gentleman that although we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars for airplanes we have not got one single modern airplane with self-sealing tanks, with the proper armament, or with the proper number of guns, not one. They have all been given away. That carries out what the gentleman was talking about.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] a question?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield, but I do hope these gentlemen will let me proceed a little myself.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Does the gentleman not figure the statement he has just made places the United States in bad grace with the republics of South America?

Mr. FISH. I want to tell the gentleman what has happened to this country. Notwithstanding the fact the Congress has appropriated these hundreds of millions of dollars we have not got one modern airplane with self-sealing tanks, with armament, and the number of machine guns required in a modern airplane; and that comes as near being treason to the United States as anything I know. [Applause.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Just a few words as to South America and then I want to get back to Virgil Jordan. We are not fooling the people of South America. We may hear grandiose speeches from certain South American dictators talking about the kind of protection we are giving them. The people of Latin America know that the kind of protection we are giving them is the kind of protection Al Capone gave the Chicago businessmen. [Laughter.] We are exploiting South America, we are following the course of empire with regard to South America, economic and commercial exploitation is our order of the day in South America. And these dictators down in South America, who put them there? Who was responsible for these dictators? Who established the dictators in South America? We may as well answer those questions for the American people because the people of Latin America know the answer.

Our State Department knows the role we have played in the establishment of dictatorships in Latin America. The only

time we shall have real Pan Americanism, the only time the Latin American people will believe our good faith in the good-neighbor policy, will be when we show to the people of South America that not only are we in favor of keeping Hitler out of South America but that we are likewise opposed to keeping all kinds of exploitation and imperialism out of South America, including the Wall Street brand.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not now; I want to get back to Mr. Jordan. This is important. Maybe the gentleman knows about this speech and does not want me to read it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Virgil Jordan said:

Whatever the outcome of the war, America has embarked upon a career of imperialism, both in world affairs and in every other aspect of life, with all the opportunities, responsibilities, and perils which that implies. This war inevitably involves a vast revolution in the balance of political and economic power, not only internationally but internally. Even though, by our aid, England should emerge from this struggle without defeat, she will be so impoverished economically and crippled in prestige that it is improbable she will be able to resume or maintain the dominant position in world affairs which she has occupied so long.

At best, England will become a junior partner in a new Anglo-Saxon imperialism, in which the economic resources and the military and naval strength of the United States will be the center of gravity. Southward in our hemisphere and westward in the Pacific the path of empire takes its way, and in modern terms of economic power as well as political prestige, the scepter passes to the United States.

Whatever the facts about this war may have been or are now, it must be unmistakably clear to any intelligent person that we are engaged in it. Our Government has committed the American community to participation in this war as the economic ally of England, and as her spiritual, if not her political, partner in her struggle with the enemies of the British Empire everywhere in the world, to help prevent, if possible, their destruction of the Empire, and if this should not be possible, to take her place as the heir and residuary legatee or receiver for whatever economic and political assets of the Empire may survive her defeat.

Whereas we are following the course of empire here, my colleagues, we have formed the Wall Street-Downing Street axis, with Great Britain gradually taking the role of junior partner in that axis. I refuse to follow an empire course which will inevitably lead to the shedding of the blood of American people and which will mean the spending of the dollars of American taxpayers. Empire for America means death for American liberty. Let us follow this a little further—and I refer this argument to my colleagues, particularly my New Deal friends who were opposed to the economic royalists, who were opposed to the 60 families, the exploiters of America—and yet we are told that we are fighting this battle for the defense of democracy. But when I look around and see the people who are espousing this cause of defense for this democracy, whom do I find? John Pierpont

Morgan, Thomas W. Lamont, the Chase National Bank, the Du Ponts.

I thought they were the economic royalists. I thought they were the enemies of the people. I believed it then, I believe it now. The difference between the New Dealers and me today is that they believed it then but they deny it now, that these people were, have been, and always will be the enemies of the working people of America, of the common people of America, and of America's democracy. They are the forces alined on the side of war, on the side of this legislation which makes war inevitable, on the side of imperialism. They are now on your side. I am still against them. We find that these forces have always opposed labor legislation, we find that these forces have always opposed the extension of democracy to the farms, to the cities, to the mines, to the mills, and to the factories of this country. You tell me this is a fight for democracy and I yet find them espousing this aid-to-Britain cause, this arsenal policy and this legislation. Would they support all this if this program were really for democracy? These enemies of democracy support this program because they know it to be an imperialist war program, more profits for them and the end of the freedom of the American people. It is historically tragic that they have taken you into their camp.

Remember, Lord Halifax, John Pierpont Morgan, the Chase National Bank, the du Ponts, the utility companies—every bit of monopoly capital and its representatives—are behind this legislation. They, I repeat, are enemies of democracy. Do you still believe this policy one for democracy?

This legislation means the death of peace in America. We will go to war, not for democracy, we will go to war for imperialism; we will go to war for the Wall Street-Downing Street axis—a new axis contending for world control and world empire. I do not want my Nation to be an empire. I want my Nation to remain a free nation, not an empire—a country of a free people breathing the free air of a free nation, collaborating with the democratic people throughout the world for world democracy. By building up our democracy and collaborating with democratic people in the world we will guarantee the end of Hitlerism throughout the world.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GORE. The gentleman took off from Wall Street, he sailed through Great Britain, Europe, and touched India—

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now, you are expecting me to jump on Tennessee? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GORE. The gentleman lighted in India, China, the East Indies, Africa, South America, and then back to Wall Street. He has had a brilliant succession of knock-outs against the strawmen and he has ended with a peroration about freedom here in America, this freedom which we all love; yet in the face of the threats which he has admitted here tonight stare us in the face, the gentleman has not told us anything he has done to

assist in the defense of our liberties. Why?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I fought for the unemployed, for the farmers, and for labor. I voted for every bill that was essentially and strictly a national-defense bill on the floor of this House. I fought for constitutional and civil rights in this House and throughout the country. May I say to the gentleman that if we follow the course advocated by him, which will inevitably plunge us into this imperialistic war, you, not I, will help destroy the freedom that we all love. [Applause.]

In conclusion this lend-lease bill lends America's youth to war and leases America's institutions to the Wall Street-Downing Street imperialist axis. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to an outstanding Democrat, the gentleman from the State of Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, we are here considering plans to help England win the war. In the first place, it must be apparent to the most ardent interventionist that this country is doing everything it can consistent with any reasonable defense policy to furnish food and munitions to the British Empire short of paying for them with Government money. Without going into statistical details, everyone familiar with current events knows of the airplanes, destroyers, tanks, artillery, rifles, and the release of our secret invention turned over to the English in the present conflict. This bill being considered here—H. R. 1776—purporting to be "An act to promote the defense of the United States," is in reality a financing program by which it is proposed that the American people, already staggering under a national debt of \$50,000,000,000, will attempt to finance the war being waged by the British Empire—an empire rich in all the world's resources and so vast that England boasts that the sun never sets on its possessions—possessions that include the Dominion of Canada, Australia, Egypt, the Union of South Africa, the Malay States, and India, with teeming hordes of some 320,000,000 people.

When we consider the extent of the British Empire and its vast resources it is difficult to believe that the Congress of the United States would seriously consider the undertaking proposed in the bill in our present financial situation nor even if our country was free of debt, as it was in Andrew Jackson's time.

Anyone understanding what has been done, or is being done now, in supplying England with food and war munitions must realize that there is no need for this legislation unless we are to gratuitously shoulder the load of financing the present war being waged by the British Empire, with almost a certainty that the youth of this country, composing our military organizations, will be forced into the conflict to bear the burden of the war, to destroy the German Army, wrest the countries of Europe from their control; yea, invade Germany and dismember the German Nation. The American people have no intention of making this sacri-

fice; and if they understand the military and financial resources under English control, they will not undertake this exhausting financial program.

I may explain that the report of the Federal Reserve shows most of the English business to be confined to the purchase of war materials.

Let me present for your consideration a few facts concerning the financial resources of the British Empire. In the January Federal Reserve Bulletin we find this statement:

* * * The Board's estimates of foreign gold and dollar resources at the beginning of the war would be altered as shown in the table on the following page.

The table indicates that gold and dollar resources of every sort held by the British Empire amounted to over \$7,000,000,000 at the outbreak of the war. In the intervening period the Empire has produced \$1,100,000,000 of gold and sold \$1,400,000,000 of goods to the United States. Drafts upon the aggregate of these gold and dollar resources have been made to pay for \$2,600,000,000 of goods already delivered by the United States and to cover substantial withdrawals of capital from England as well as for other purposes.

So we find that, according to the Federal Reserve Board, the British Empire has approximately \$5,500,000,000 remaining available for defense expenditures. It is interesting to note that the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury as to the amount of England's financial resources was limited to the United Kingdom, a small part of the British Empire.

Mr. Herbert Bratter's illuminating article in the January 27 issue of *Barron's Weekly* gives more light on the British financial status, from which I quote:

The President's proposal to take over British orders here to the initial extent of \$3,000,000,000 seems to accept the statement that the bottom of Britain's financial barrel is in sight; and the press, in commenting on the subject, generally seems to adopt this view without question.

The evident fact is that Britain's potential resources here are much more extensive than is commonly supposed, and their full utilization in the war effort is not a matter which we, as potential financiers of the democracies, should overlook.

Means of British payment are already here and have been for years. They are more than ample to cover the \$3,000,000,000 plan of the President.

Britain's dollar resources are not limited to cash in banks here. They are not limited to British holdings of stocks and bonds which can be sold here. They are not limited to British-owned real estate, factories, and similar direct business investments here. Nor are they limited to all these together, plus all the gold and silver held or produced by the British, for which metals we maintain an unlimited market at fixed prices.

When the war began, the British held foreign investments in bank accounts, securities, and businesses everywhere abroad totaling an estimated \$14,750,000,000. Of this, \$11,618,000,000 was located in the New World, as follows:

Empire holdings in the United States.....	\$4,433,000,000
United Kingdom holdings in Canada and Newfoundland, 1937.....	2,685,000,000
Empire holdings in Latin America.....	4,500,000,000
Total.....	11,618,000,000

Add to this:	
British Empire gold holdings, Aug. 31, 1939-----	2,407,000,000
British Empire gold production, Sept. 1, 1939, through Dec. 31, 1940 (estimated)---	1,116,000,000
Canadian silver production during the same period----	11,000,000

Total British Empire resources in the New World during war's first year-----	15,152,000,000
--	----------------

There appears to remain in British hands at the end of 1940 about \$5,282,000,000 worth, which is being replenished by Empire new mine production. From this should be deducted the amount of net decline in British Empire short-term balances here since the start of the war, perhaps \$150,000 of gold at the estimated rate of \$850,000,000 per year.

I wish you would take note of the fact that the English Empire produces 70 percent of the world's gold and is producing gold at the rate of \$850,000,000 a year, \$15,000,000 short of a billion dollars a year.

I wish you would also note the close accord between the statement of the Federal Reserve Board and the article from which I just quoted.

Further quoting:

The \$5,282,000,000 is already here. It doesn't have to be moved here. In short, Britain is not yet broke.

But most important of all in considering Britain's ability to pay is the gold resources of the Empire, the source of which 70 percent of the world's gold supply we have greatly increased in value by raising and fixing the price of gold by law.

Statistical records disclose that Great Britain produced \$850,000,000 in gold last year (1940), an increase of 16 percent in South Africa and 14 percent in Canada. There is no accurate way of measuring and determining the vast gold resources still remaining in the British mines. Back in 1935 John J. Croston, a mining expert, undertook to estimate the world's unmined gold resources and prepared a table from such figures as were obtainable, from which I have taken the schedule of the British resources inserted here:

Estimated unmined gold reserves, British Empire (Croston table) 1936

	Ounces
Rand (Transvaal)-----	50,214,067
Rhodesian-----	1,217,558
Australian-----	5,815,452
Canada-----	13,823,030
	71,070,107

Later, in using his table as a result of vast new gold discoveries, the Bureau of Mines has this to say:

Mr. Croston points out that ore estimates are generally based upon company reports that show only reserves blocked out for a 1- to 4-year period ahead. It can well be understood that these figures represent minimum reserves, as they do not include probable reserves and undeveloped areas, which, if included, would increase the total many times. As an example, reported reserves for the Rand in South Africa in 1934-35 were 50,214,000 fine ounces. Yet, as stated by Croston, "from present operations and developments now in progress (1936), it would appear that the Rand can be counted on to produce over 200,000,000 ounces of gold in

the future without including much of the potentially productive but totally undeveloped areas." He further states, "if, however, the extreme easterly and westerly sections of the Witwatersrand prove up to recent borehole expectations, this district will appear assured of a productive life beyond the present century, and its relative importance in the scale of unmined reserves would be vastly greater than the table would indicate."

I want you to note that from recent investigations the tests in South Africa it has been shown that the reserves of South Africa have been increasing, and anyone who thinks that Britain is broke or unable to pay for its war munitions is laboring under a false impression.

Mr. Chairman, we must not, we cannot permit ourselves to be manipulated into this European war. Every public statement made by our statesmen, the great leaders of the past, caution us against the consequence of following the course proposed in this bill. Wise in his experience of dealing with foreign nations and in creating and establishing this matchless government, George Washington in his Farewell Address tells us:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation: Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

Thomas Jefferson understood the danger of our Nation becoming involved in European disputes. His good advice to President Monroe should guide us in this critical hour. President Jefferson said:

Their (Europe's) mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government, are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal war. All their energies are expended in the destruction of the labor, property, and lives of their people. On our part never had a people so favorable a chance of trying the opposite system, of peace and fraternity with mankind, and the direction of all our means and faculties to the purposes of improvement instead of destruction. * * *

And the system of government which shall keep us afloat amidst the wreck of the world will be immortalized in history.

I am so far from believing that our reputation will be tarnished by our not having mixed in the made contests of the rest of the world that, setting aside the ravings of pepper-pot politicians, of whom there are enough in every age and country, I believe it will place us high in the scale of wisdom to have preserved our country tranquil and prosperous during a contest which prostrated

the honor, power, independence, laws, and property of every country on the other side of the Atlantic.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken seriously the pledge of the Democratic Party to the American people made in our platform adopted by the national convention at Chicago on which the voters of this country have placed their reliance in entrusting our party with administration of our Government when we solemnly declared:

The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America. We shall not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine. The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been and will continue to be the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace. To make America strong, and to keep America free, every American must give his talents and treasure in accordance with his ability and his country's needs. We must have democracy of sacrifice as well as democracy of opportunity. To insure that our armaments shall be implements of peace rather than war, we shall continue our traditional policies of the good neighbor; observe and advocate international respect for the rights of others, and for treaty obligations; cultivate foreign trade through desirable trade agreements; and foster economic collaboration with the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken to heart the advice of our first President and propose to follow the admonition of the great Jefferson which I am sure was in the minds of the members of the Democratic National Convention Resolutions Committee in drafting our national platform on which I stand unalterably and unequivocally. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. JENKS].

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I know it is late, I know the Members are very tired, but I think you realize as I do that the result of the legislation we are considering now may shape the destiny of the world for the next several centuries; so I think we can afford to get tired over the bill now before us.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a plea to the membership of this House to seriously and calmly consider, without taint of partisanship or prejudice, and adopt each and every amendment designed to reserve to the people of the United States their constitutional rights and privileges, under any and all circumstances, which will be offered during the course of the next few days to this so-called lend-lease bill.

The people of the United States are united on the proposition of adequate and proper national defenses for the protection of this country of ours as well as for this entire hemisphere, but they are deeply and rightfully concerned over the prospect of the active participation of this country in another foreign war, and the closer we, the Representatives of the people, permit this country to be brought to the brink of actual warfare

on foreign soil the greater will grow the rift and division among our people.

And so it has occurred to me that if through the adoption of clarifying amendments and safeguards we of this deliberative body could more closely approach harmony and unanimity of opinion and action on this proposed legislation, it would be not only a contribution toward better understanding and clearer thinking among ourselves, but it would serve to eliminate much confusion of thought among the people we represent and solidify their confidence in the Congress of the United States.

Why the confusion?

Mr. Chairman, on October 22, 1940, the President of the United States solemnly made to the American people the following statement:

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

That assurance was given 12 days before the national elections.

Approximately 8 weeks after the election, on January 6, 1941, the President in his message to the Congress said:

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

This despite the fact that the United States had no voice in the making of the present European conflict, has no voice in its conduct, and certainly has no premise on which to build a belief that this country will have any voice in the terms of settlement when military hostilities are brought to a close.

Ten days later, on January 16, 1941, the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, stated before the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

I can well conceive that a portion of the Navy might be transferred (to Great Britain) on conditions very advantageous to us.

The following day, January 17, 1941, Mr. Winston Churchill stated:

We don't require in 1941 large armies from overseas.

That remark raised in the minds of many of our people, as well as editorially in a percentage of the press of this country, the question, When? In 1942?

In the face of such conflicting statements, need we ask why there is confusion of thought, troubled doubts, and widespread alarm among our people? Under such circumstances, certainly now, if ever, the duty devolves on us, the direct representatives of the people, to clear the atmosphere through a concrete demonstration that we know what we are doing and in exactly what direction we are headed.

Considering the rapid drift of this country of ours toward active participation in another foreign war, the confusion, hysteria, and fear with which many of our people are beset and which is reflected so clearly here in our midst, the most that those of us who are still willing to continue the increasingly uphill strug-

gle to keep this Nation from active participation in foreign wars can hope to accomplish now is something approaching adequate restraints and safeguards in this lend-lease bill that will enable the representatives of the people to continue to have a voice in the grim decision as to whether or not the blood of American boys again will be shed on foreign soil in another effort to "save democracy to the world"; and, in addition, this time, if you please, bring to the entire globe "freedom of expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear." Mr. Chairman, all of us will agree that this is a lofty goal, a flight to soaring heights of idealism; but in the cold light of fact and harsh reality, most of us are well aware that progress in human affairs is an evolutionary process, which slowly, and even painfully at times, plods along its oftentimes devious and mysterious course.

Mr. Chairman, I am not among those who believe that Britain is fighting our war; if I believed that, I would be apologetic for the lack of a declaration of war months ago and for our not having entered the conflict at the outbreak of hostilities in support of Britain with our entire resources, including manpower. While I, with every right-thinking American, detest and loathe totalitarianism in any of its wretched forms—be it Nazi, Communist, or Fascist—and, with the vast majority of our people, fervently hope for a British victory, I am first and more profoundly interested in the preservation of American ideals and the continuance of our democratic way of life right here in the United States. No so-called isolationist or so-called interventionist am I—I am just a plain American, interested first, last, and all the time in the welfare of my own country, over and above everything and anything else.

Mr. Chairman, the minority report which accompanied this so-called lend-lease bill to the House sets forth the following:

WHAT THIS BILL DOES NOT DO

This bill does not provide dollar exchange for Britain, and is not needed to procure coordination of our defense efforts.

This bill will not provide any additional war supplies for aid to Britain within the 60 or 90 days of her alleged crisis, unless the President uses the power provided to dispose of part of our arms or our Navy, which he and his Cabinet officers have specifically denied they could spare.

There has been much talk of "restrictive" committee amendments. The amendments adopted do not prohibit our conveying merchantmen; do not require our Army or Navy officers to determine our own defense needs; do not place a constitutional 2-year limitation on the life of the bill.

WHAT THIS BILL DOES

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.

This same minority report quotes the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, as once having said:

This is too much power for a bad man to have or for a good man to want.

I am in agreement with that statement as applied to this so-called lend-lease bill in its present form.

And so I urge the adoption of the necessary amendments and safeguards to this lend-lease bill so as to retain in the Congress its constitutional powers, obligations, and responsibilities, and to preserve for the American people their constitutional rights and privileges.

Let not this Congress abdicate the rights and prerogatives it holds in sacred trust for the people. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts from the platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties in the campaign of 1940, certain statements of the two candidates in conformity with those two platforms, and certain brief statements of the William Allen White Committee to Keep America Out of War, as well as the statement of one other person.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1776 is entitled "A bill further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes."

The great majority of the people have not read this bill. They do not know and realize the unlimited power conferred by it upon the President. They have been led to look upon it as a measure to extend immediate aid to Great Britain in the way of war supplies.

The overwhelming majority of the American people and the overwhelming majority of the Congress favor the fullest measure of aid to the embattled people of Great Britain, to the heroic Greeks, and to the Chinese, consistent with the safety of this nation.

There is a difference of opinion about the form in which this aid may be given. All are agreed that this aid should be expedited by every reasonable, possible means.

The passage of this bill will not expedite the manufacture and delivery of a single ship, tank, airplane, gun, or shell

to Great Britain, Greece, or China. The increase in war supplies to these nations can result only from the speeding up of the output of our war industries. The industries of this country are now loaded down with orders for war supplies. Great Britain is already getting the greater part of the war materials now being produced in this country. For the past eighteen months she has been given preference by this Nation. We have furnished her cannon, rifles, ammunition, airplanes, and fifty destroyers.

The clothing of the President with absolute power over every industry in the land producing munitions of war will work no magic. Such power will not place in his hands an Aladdin's lamp, the rubbing of which will create over night the instrumentalities of war. Rather may such power defeat its ends.

The recent repeated threats to take over the Ford plants are ominous and a warning of what may be expected when once the barriers of the Constitution have been broken down. Sweep away the shield of the fifth amendment—"No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," and the beginning of the end of our liberties and free institutions is at hand.

The great majority of the American people are beginning to awake to the fact that this so-called proposal to aid Britain should not be made an excuse for the abandonment of our free system of representative government. They feel that to fight dictatorships abroad it is not necessary to set up one here at home.

For the first time in the history of our country a well-organized and heavily financed propaganda has been loosed upon the American people to convince them that their safety and national existence is dependent upon the victory of some foreign power. The geographic position of this country is such, her resources in materials and men and in spirit are so great, that with the Navy we now possess, and are building, and with the proper arming and training of our manpower, no nation, or combination of nations, can invade and conquer us. This country will never be invaded by a foreign foe unless two things first occur: First, the breakdown of the morale of our own people through loss of liberty at the hands of our own rulers; second, the dissipation and destruction of our material resources and manpower by repeated participation in other people's wars.

And when I say this, I do not mean that we are not concerned in the survival of the British Empire and in the defeat of Hitler. If epithet, denunciation, a barrage of hard words, would damn him to the deepest hell, I would readily join in the well-nigh universal chorus by which he is consigned to perdition.

All my sympathies are with Great Britain in this war because of the ties of blood, speech, literature, the common law, and the principles of human freedom embodied in the Bill of Rights, to enjoy which we fought and won the Revolution.

Let us now examine the so-called lease-lend bill, this aid to Britain bill, and look inside of the wrapper and be-

yond the caption to its actual provisions.

Section 3 of the so-called lease-lend bill, in effect, repeals and wipes out all provisions of any law now upon the statute books that might be held to interfere with the exercise of the powers granted to the President under the lease-lend bill. Under the terms of this bill the President is given power, first, to manufacture—

any defense article for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States.

Second—

To sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to any such government, any defense article.

Under this provision of the bill the President is authorized to give to any country in the world a part or all of our naval vessels, a part or all of our military equipment, consisting of cannon, machine guns, tanks, armored cars, rifles, ammunition, and part of or all of the entire fighting planes of the Army and Navy.

By section 9 of the bill the President is given the authority to

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.

The effect of this provision of the act is to clothe the President with power to legislate and to promulgate rules and regulations having the force and effect of law.

Under section 3 he is authorized to turn over to any government in the world any defense article owned by this Government, and any of the military or naval secrets of this Government.

It is insisted by the supporters of this bill that it will keep this country out of war. In fact and in law it clothes the President with power to put the country into war. Under its terms the President is authorized to seize alien ships in the harbors of this country and to give or turn them over to any other country of his choice. This would be an act of war.

It has been insisted by supporters of the bill in this debate that the President has the authority under existing law to direct the Navy to convoy our own ships to belligerent ports, and, if he should see fit, to order our Navy to convoy the ships of nations now at war.

Under the terms of the bill he is authorized to repair and equip with munitions of war the naval vessels of belligerent nations. If this were done, a warship of a belligerent nation might be followed into one of our harbors by a submarine of an enemy nation. This, of course, would, in all probability, lead to war.

It has been argued upon the floor of this House by supporters of the bill that it is the duty of Congress "to summon the resources of the land, the power of the Nation, for its defense; to summon the manpower, if necessary; to build up our sea power; to mobilize materials; to mobilize strength." And then it is in-

sisted that when Congress has thus "summoned the resources and the powers there is but one officer of the Government under the Constitution of the United States who may employ these resources and exercise these powers—the President; none other."

This argument goes too far. The effect of this argument is that when Congress has made the necessary appropriations for a Navy, for an air force, for an Army, the Chief Executive, if he sees fit, may give them to any nation in the world, and the Chief Executive, if he sees fit, as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, may take such steps as will inevitably, and beyond recall, involve this country in an undeclared war. It also gives the President the power to sell, lease, lend, or give away, not only our naval vessels, our guns, ammunition, and airplanes, but also, in effect, gives him the power to appropriate, on behalf of any foreign nation he desires to aid, not less than \$40,000,000,000 of the money of the American people, which is now under his control by laws now on the statute books and by virtue of the terms of this act.

Under the Constitution the President is vested with power to enter into treaties with foreign countries, by and with the consent of the Senate. Under this bill he is given the power to enter into treaties of alliance, offensive and defensive, with foreign nations, without the consent of the Senate. Under this bill the President can make war on any nation in the world.

But it is said that this is a day of undeclared wars, and that, therefore, the President of the United States should be put on an equal footing with the warring dictators abroad.

The provision that—

Neither the President nor the head of any department or agency shall, after June 30, 1943, exercise any of the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a), except to carry out a contract or agreement with such a government made before July 1, 1943—

not only does not protect the people against the dangers of the act: it fails to limit what may be done under the act to any period of time. Under the powers conferred by the act, the country may be put in war in 30, 60, or 90 days, as is forcefully stated in the minority report:

We cannot repeal war; we cannot repeal bankruptcy; and we cannot repeal dictatorship.

As the Representative of the Second District of Tennessee, and as a Member of this Congress, I am in favor of total preparedness on the part of this Nation. I am in favor of continuing aid to Great Britain and to Greece, and, above all things, I am in favor of keeping this country out of the present war. Our involvement in it will, in my opinion, cost the lives of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our boys, necessitate the expenditure of virtually all the wealth of this Nation, and result in a dictatorship.

I shall support the amendments sponsored by the minority of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which, in my opinion, is a lawful and democratic program to aid Britain and to keep us out of war:

1. A \$2,000,000,000 credit to Britain, to be used in this country for purchasing arms

when her dollar balance for this purpose is exhausted, requiring reasonable collateral security if available.

2. Permit the sale by our Government of arms to Britain only when our highest Army and Navy officers certify in writing such arms are not necessary for our national defense.

3. A 1-year time limit on all extraordinary powers. Congress meets again next year and can easily extend the time limit if our interests require it.

4. Provide that no vessels of the United States Navy shall be disposed of without the consent of Congress.

5. Prohibit the use of our ports for repair bases for belligerent ships. We must not bring the war to American ports.

6. Prohibit the use of American vessels to transfer exports to belligerents.

7. Prohibit the convoying of merchantmen by our Navy. One sunken ship might plunge us into war.

In the face of the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury and the leaders of this administration in Congress are now asking that the debt limit of this country be raised to the staggering sum of \$65,000,000,000, the above proposals for the aid of Great Britain are generous in the extreme.

The people of this country demanded that Congress remain in session during the entire year of 1940, in order that it might function as a Congress in the event of any crisis, foreign or domestic. The so-called lease-lend bill proposes, by its terms, that Congress, upon the threshold of this new term, surrender its powers to the Chief Executive with respect to entering war, making treaties, the appropriation and expenditure of moneys. I do not believe that you would wish Congress to cease to function and surrender all of its powers in the above particulars. I do not believe a member of either party in Congress, in view of the platform declarations of the two parties, and in view of the repeated promises to American people by President Roosevelt and by Mr. Willkie that they would keep this country out of the present war, would be justified in such a surrender, and I am thoroughly convinced that a Member of Congress, under his oath of office, could not justify himself in surrendering his sworn duty under the Constitution which all of us have sworn to uphold, protect, and defend.

Our first duty is to our own country. All we do must be measured by the one standard: What is best for the United States of America? Self-defense is the first law of nature. And it is true today, as it was of old, that "he who provideth not for his own household hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

Let us now examine this bill and measure it by the standards and provisions of the Constitution.

By section 8, of article I, of the Constitution, it is provided:

The Congress shall have power * * * to declare war; to raise and support armies; but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or office hereof.

By section 2, of article II, it is provided:

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

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

By section 3 of article IV it is provided:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By article VI it is provided:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby.

By section 1 of article II it is provided that—

Before he (the President) enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation: "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

And by article VI it is provided that the Senators and Representatives "shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."

Ours is a government of enumerated, delegated, and limited powers. These powers are enumerated, defined, delegated, and limited by the terms of the Constitution. By it three separate, distinct departments of government are set up. Each is supreme in its respective sphere. Ours is, therefore, a government of checks and balances. It can only continue as such if each branch of the Government continues to function as such. Congress cannot arrogate to itself, it cannot seize and execute the powers vested in the Chief Executive. By the same token, and measured by the same standard of duty on its part, it cannot, without stultifying itself, surrender to the Chief Executive its legislative power. The people, through the Constitution, delegated to the Congress the power to declare war, to raise and support armies, but limited any appropriation made by it for that purpose to a period not longer than 2 years. Through this medium of their will the people delegated to the Congress the right and duty to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested in it as the Nation's supreme legislative counsel, and vested in it the power to enact laws, to carry into execution all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of this Nation. The President, by the supreme law of the land, is given the power, "by and with the consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." The Congress, and not the President, is given power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations

respecting property belonging to the United States.

This bill, 1776, is unprecedented. Nothing like it has ever before been proposed in this country, either in peace or war. Its title, "1776," is a pertinent reminder that on July 4, 1776, the Thirteen Original Colonies, by the Declaration of Independence, "assumed that free and independent state among the nations of the earth to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitled them."

By this bill the Congress surrenders its discretionary war-making powers and gives them to the President. It, in effect, gives to the President the power to enter into treaties of alliance, offensive and defensive, with any nation on earth. It strips Congress of its right to dispose of the property of the United States. It surrenders the control of Congress over the purse strings of the Nation. It is an abdication, a surrender on the part of Congress. It places in the hands of the Chief Executive complete control over the sword and the purse. At one fell swoop, in one abject surrender, it gives to the Chief Executive the power to sell, lease, lend, or give away the Army's guns, ammunition, tanks, and airplanes—the Navy's ships, guns, submarines, destroyers, mosquito fleet, and airplanes—our total military equipment. It gives to the President a blank check, payable in the sweat and the wealth of our people and in the blood of our boys. It is portentous, forbidding, challenging, frightful, and stupefying in its possible and probable effect on the future of this Nation.

In the interpretation and construction that may properly be placed upon this proposed statute, it is our duty and we have the right to look at it in the light of history. Let us examine this challenge to the integrity of our institutions, this threat to the liberties and lives of our people, in the light of the past. Let us measure it by the standards of our constitutional provisions, by the traditions of this House. Let us look at it in the flickering light of the platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties. Let us scrutinize it in the declarations of the two major candidates for the Presidency, and in the cold facts of the present situation, and, if you please, in the light of the present world trend toward totalitarian power—power in the hands of one man.

NOT OUR WAR

This is not our war. This Nation was not consulted before it was declared. It was declared by England and France. The declaration was ostensibly to save Poland. Both England and France knew they could not save Poland. They began it at a time when neither was prepared. It is a repetition of the endless conflicts of the Old World; the age-old conflict between European powers for territory, trade, colonies, and world dominion.

THE STORY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

The story of the British Empire—its rise, its far-flung dominions, colonies, dependencies, its conquered lands, and subject races, surpasses in glamour, in magnitude and power, the rise of any other empire the world has ever known. In

the wake of the Union Jack, along the routes of conquest and trade traversed by it, to the lands dominated and controlled by the British in Asia, Africa, Europe, the Americas, and in the seven seas, there followed upon the heels of conquest and exploitation, if not democracy as we know it, order and a better way of life. These adventures of the world's greatest empire builders have caused the wealth of this far-flung empire to flow in an unending stream into the coffers of the British Isles. The world dominion of this empire is one of the miracles of history. Successful in most of her ventures, she suffered reverses in some. By the mistakes recorded in the Declaration of Independence, she lost the 13 original colonies, the nucleus that grew into the United States of America. By blunders, age-old in their stupidity and brutality, she alienated and lost Ireland.

The spectacular, the beneficent, rule of Britain's world power, for more than 100 years, has been maintained by a diplomacy and intrigue and a statesmanship of surpassing resourcefulness and brilliancy. This capacity for government, for more than a hundred years, has enabled 40,000,000 people, sitting on the doorstep of Europe, to hold their place in the sun. How have 40,000,000 people girdled the earth with their colonies and controlled the sea lanes with their warships, while their merchantmen filled the harbors of the world and brought back its riches to the mother nation? For years they maintained, for want of a better name, the so-called balance of power. Great Britain, by her control of the seas, her vast wealth, her possession of Gibraltar and the Suez Canal, has played one group of European nations off against another. In 1914, and during the World War, she had on her side Belgium, France, Russia, the Balkans—with the exception of Bulgaria—Japan, and Italy. Ranged against her were Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey. And finally, "to end all wars" and "to make the world safe for democracy," the United States of America went in on April 17, 1917.

The futility of that war, its bitter disillusionment to our people and to the world, is about to be forgotten, and today there is another war, world-wide in its scope, and the American people are again confronted, overwhelmed by, and saturated with the best organized and best financed propaganda that has ever plagued, frightened, and bedeviled our long-suffering people. The air, the press, the rostrum, the mails, the movies, the billboards, both by day and by night, are filled with it. These propagandists and their unending output proclaim themselves "the cloud by day" and "the pillar of fire by night," that must be followed by the American people unless they are to be invaded, conquered, and enslaved by Germany, Japan, or Italy. And as a result of the hysteria whipped up by our "war jitterbugs," Americans are ready to take one another by the throat, impugn one another's motives and patriotism, all because, forsooth, Europe is at war again.

Our motives are altogether altruistic. We seek no colonies, we seek no blood-

stained profits to be derived from conquest. We are called upon to forget the historic and traditional way of life and pathway which have led us to the position of the world's richest, strongest, freest, and happiest people. And it is now proposed that this Nation become the world's greatest Santa Claus; that we go out, not for conquest, not in our own necessary self-defense, but to establish freedom of speech everywhere in the world, freedom of worship everywhere in the world, freedom from want and the abolition of poverty everywhere in the world, freedom from fear and the abolition of war everywhere in the world. These are our aims.

The prizes for which the European nations are at war are great—colonies, world trade, world dominion, are in the balance.

We have the greatest industrial system and the greatest natural resources of any people in the world, and we have the greatest reservoir of the finest manpower—cannon fodder—in the world. The balance of power heretofore existing upon the European continent is no longer in existence. I cannot but admire and recognize to the fullest extent the shrewdness, the wisdom and the patriotism of the British statesmen who seek to enlist this Nation on the side of Great Britain in the present World War. We are the only nation left in the world strong enough and rich enough to underwrite British aims in the present war and to finance and fight this war.

"A burnt child dreads the fire," but human memory is short. The voices of those who died in our other venture, and who sleep the long sleep, are forever hushed; the billions we spent, and for which we were repaid by hard looks, and harder words—"Uncle Shylock" and "slackers"—have vanished into the limbo of things forgotten and gone.

This is a new day. There are new British spokesmen, a new audience. Charity, with us, no longer begins at home. We forget our disabled soldiers, their widows, their children. We ignore our old people in dire need of old-age pensions. We are about to raise our debt limit to \$65,000,000,000. The voice of our propagandists, male and female, joins with that of European spokesmen and cries aloud for entry of American soldiers into this war, and for the shedding of American blood that will get us in.

We are the world's greatest democracy, but, strange to say, we have always had a weakness akin to that of the moth "for the fierce white light that beats upon a throne," and for the glamor of the prince and the princess.

And when I read in the daily press that Prince and Princess So-and-So, on a safe vacation from their native lands, have supped with the mighty here in the Nation's Capital, and have crossed the threshold of those in high places, we are led to wonder if there are those among us who are playing an international poker game, in which the wealth, the liberties, and the lives of our people are the pawns. Be not deceived; the stakes are large; the players are shrewd, experienced, and worldly wise. Thrones are in the balance. The kingdoms, the principalities, of

princes, kings, and queens are said to be in our keeping. The crack diplomats of the Old World, in spectacular arrival on mighty battleships, add to the spectacle. And it all boils down to and adds up to this: Give us your money, your planes, your ships, your guns, and in 1942 your boys.

Let us be realistic. The British Empire is yearly producing \$500,000,000 in gold. It is not broke. It is fighting for its life. It has possessions in the Western Hemisphere that are not necessary to its national existence or national defense. They are necessary to the national existence and to the national defense of this Nation. Now that the house of its existence is on fire and that it is asking us not only to lend it a fire hose, but to enter its burning house and to have our boys fight and die alongside of its soldiers, why not let it transfer to this Nation its West Indian possessions, and other military and naval bases in the Western Hemisphere, in fee simple, that is, give us an absolute title to these properties in exchange for the billions it owes us and for the billions we are asked to give it?

In view of the fabulous wealth of the British Empire—its crown jewels, the enormous salaries, perquisites and subsidies it yearly turns over to the members of the royal family—the American mothers whose boys will be called upon to fight and die as a result of our proposed entry into this war well might say: "These are my jewels, they are more precious to me than your gold, your jewels, and your colonies are to you."

Do you know the war aims of Britain? Mr. Churchill has said that she will stop nothing short of an invasion of Europe and a complete victory over Germany. Does anybody believe that she can succeed in this ambitious program without an American expeditionary force, and in a force vastly superior in numbers and armament to that which we sent to France in 1917 and 1918? But it is no longer possible for us to land an expeditionary force in England or in France. What then is to be the theater where our forces are to fight? There is but one possible answer to this—and that is in Africa and thence through the Balkans into Europe.

This bill does not provide for the production of ships, guns, airplanes, shells, and other implements of warfare. The machinery for their production is already set up, and in full blast of operation under the supervision and leadership of some of the ablest industrialists in this Nation. Why then this fevered haste for the concentration of power in the hands of one man? But it is said the President will not use these powers. He himself has said that any intimation that he will use the powers conferred by this bill is in a category with the feat of the cow when she jumped over the moon, and that while the bill does not forbid his use of ships to convoy the ships of belligerents in hostile waters, and while it does not forbid him to give away the Navy, that neither does it forbid him to "stand on his head."

Now, even though the cow jumped over the moon and even if somebody stands on his head, neither performance is any excuse for the granting of the tremendous

powers conferred by this bill. It is said the President will not give away the Navy, that he will not strip our armed forces of the necessary implements of warfare. Then why give him the power? Why give any man the power to do anything we would not do ourselves? What good is a time limit? Why lock the door after the horse is gone? Once we are in the war we are in all over for years to come.

It is my settled opinion that, within the limits of our own safety and self-interest, we can give all aid to Great Britain it is safe for us to extend, and yet escape the war. In the first place, Germany cannot at this time make effective war on us. In the second place, for her to attempt to do so would have a bad effect on the morale of her own people. In the third place, it would adversely affect her in the eyes of the nonbelligerent nations of Europe. In the fourth place, a declaration of war by her on us would mean that the sky would be the limit once the shooting started. It would be an "all out" war on our part.

And this brings us to a consideration of the platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties in the last Presidential campaign, and to a consideration of the repeated statements of President Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie as to their position on our entrance into the World War. Platforms of a political party are not just to get in on. They are more than that. They constitute a solemn compact, a sacred contract, between the candidate and the people. All of us ran on a platform. Most, if not all, of us made commitments on the question of whether we were for entry into or staying out of this world conflict. I am old fashioned enough to consider mine binding. I stated to my people: "I will never vote to make a European policeman out of Uncle Sam or to send our boys to fight and die in the endless brawls of Europe or Asia." That pledge to them I propose to keep.

Upon this subject the national Democratic platform of 1940 pledged the people as follows:

The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America.

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

The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace.

In self-defense and in good conscience, the world's greatest democracy cannot afford heartlessly or in a spirit of appeasement to ignore the peace-loving and liberty-loving peoples wantonly attacked by ruthless aggressors. We pledge to extend to these peoples all the material aid at our command, consistent with law and not inconsistent with the interests of our own national self-defense—all to the end that peace and international good faith may yet emerge triumphant.

In conformity with this platform pledge, President Roosevelt made the following statements to the American peo-

ple on the question of keeping them out of war. We quote:

Our acts must be guided by one single hard-headed thought—keeping America out of this war.—President Roosevelt to Congress, September 21, 1939.

The time is long past when any political party or any particular group can curry and capture public favor by labeling itself the peace party or the peace bloc. That label belongs to the whole United States and to every right-thinking man, woman, and child within it.—President Roosevelt to Congress, January 3, 1940.

We are keeping out of the wars that are going on in Europe and in Asia.—President Roosevelt to the Young Democratic Clubs of America, April 20, 1940.

We will not send our men to take part in European wars.—President Roosevelt to Congress, July 10, 1940.

We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas, except in case of attack.—President Roosevelt to the Teamsters, September 11, 1940.

To every man, woman, and child in the Nation I say this—your President and your Secretary of State are following the road to peace. We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war. We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."—President Roosevelt at Philadelphia, October 23, 1940.

I give to you and to the people of this country this most solemn assurance: There is no secret treaty, no secret obligations, no secret commitment, no secret understanding in any shape or form, direct or indirect, with any other government, or any other nation in any part of the world, to involve—no such secrecy that might or could, in any shape, involve—this nation in any war or for any other purpose. Is that clear?—President Roosevelt at Philadelphia, October 23, 1940.

I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars. President Roosevelt at Brooklyn Academy, November 1, 1940.

The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war.—President Roosevelt at Cleveland, November 2, 1940.

In the platform adopted at Philadelphia in June 1940 the Republicans pledged the people, as follows:

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

We are still suffering from the ill effects of the last World War—a war which cost us a \$24,000,000,000 increase in our national debt, billions of uncollectible foreign debts, and the complete upset of our economic system, in addition to the loss of human life and irreparable damage to the health of thousands of our boys.

Our sympathies have been profoundly stirred by invasion of unoffending countries and by disaster to nations whose ideals most closely resemble our own. We favor the extension to all peoples fighting for liberty, or whose liberty is threatened, of such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense.

Wendell L. Willkie, the nominee of the Republican Party in 1940, in his campaign for the Presidency, stood squarely on that platform and its promises with respect to our keeping out of the World War, and repeatedly stated to the people:

I will not lead the American people down the path to war; I will never send their boys

to the shambles and butchery of European trenches.

And in that election on November 5 of last year the American people had their only opportunity to express a choice as to whether they wanted to get into this war or not. They had the right to treat the platforms of the Democratic and Republican Parties as a solemn contract between each of said parties and the people of this country that they would not be led down the road to war. They had the solemn and repeated promise of both candidates for the Presidency that they would fight to keep our people out of foreign wars.

But times have changed. William Allen White's Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, in its effort to aid the Allies by getting the United States into war, became so hot that honest Mr. White remembered that he was getting old and had some books to write and some chores to do out in Kansas, and quit. Since then Dr. Henry Noble McCracken, President of Vassar College, and who is one of those friends to England, withdrew his support from the committee on the ground that it was undertaking to lead this Nation into war. The other day, at a dinner in Brooklyn, Dr. McCracken said:

The battle for American entrance into the war has begun and is in full activity. The outline of strategy is fairly clear. The slogans have been devised, the publicity offices are working night and day. The psychologists have selected the emotions. The speakers have their themes selected.

There are those who say "We are in the war already. It is too late." I deny it. Our great electorate of citizens has never authorized this word. We are still outside the battle. We have never agreed that Britain is fighting our war.

And in keeping with the common sense of these two great Americans, Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, on the night of January 23, declared:

I speak tonight because I believe that the American people are about to commit suicide. We are not planning to. We are drifting into suicide. Deafened by martial music, fine language, and large appropriations, we are drifting into war.

And thus it is. The shouting of the captains grows apace. The war drums daily throb louder. They say the President is being pushed by the people along the path to war.

We are told that Britain will quit fighting if we do not pass this bill, and that if she goes down the British Navy will be added to that of Germany, Italy, and Japan, thus greatly outnumbering ours. Well, France went down, but France did not turn over her Navy to Hitler. Just what kind of a poker game is this anyhow? Does anybody expect us to believe that England will quit defending herself if this Congress retains its constitutional functions? Will she surrender if this country requires of Great Britain her colonies and Holland, that they pay to the extent of their ability to pay?

The British Empire and its constituent parts have billions of dollars worth of assets that can be used, or pledged, or transferred to pay for, or secure the price of the armament now on order and to be

ordered and made for Britain in this country. The Dutch Empire is one of the richest countries in the world. It has billions of dollars of assets in this country. It owns the Dutch East Indies, rich in tin, in rubber, and in oil.

The British Empire covers about one-fourth—13,539,113 square miles—of the world's habitable land surface. Its population in the aggregate, according to the latest census and official estimates, is some fifteen millions more than one-fourth of the inhabitants of the world—a total of 504,218,209. According to Moody's Governments and Municipals, 1940, the national wealth and resources of the United Kingdom, as estimated by Sir Josiah Stamp for the year 1930, were as follows: \$72,811,575,000. And this great Empire is so rich that it annually pays to its King and the members of the royal family \$2,376,615 per year.

Have we no obligations pressing and imperative? What of the cost of our armament? What about our millions of unemployed? What about the aged and the needy who are clamoring for old-age pensions? What of our veterans, their widows and orphans?

Shall we pour out the wealth of this Nation like sand and the blood of our boys like water to protect Dutch colonial possessions rich in oil, in tin, and other critical war materials, when the Dutch, though able to do so, do not raise a finger or offer to pledge a dime for the restoration of their country and the throne of its exiled rulers?

This is a time for sanity. Help Britain? Yes. Get in this war. No. Be not deceived. The passage of this measure will be the last fatal step that lands or will shortly land us in this war.

On January 3 of this year our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, on assuming the duties of his great office, said:

The House of Representatives has been my life and my love for this more than a quarter of a century. I love its traditions; I love its precedents; I love its dignity; I glory in the power of the House of Representatives. As your Speaker and presiding officer, it shall be my highest hope and my unswerving aim to preserve, protect, and defend the rights, prerogatives, and the power of the House of Representatives.

He was applauded when he thus spoke, and I again applaud him.

By the plain terms of this bill, if we pass it by our votes, we shall have surrendered the rights, prerogatives, and the power of the House of Representatives. We shall have surrendered our constitutional power over the sword and the purse, the two mightiest instrumentalities of governmental authority; we shall have stripped ourselves of our right and duty as the Representatives of the people to say whether this Nation shall or shall not be plunged into the present European war. The passage of this bill, in my opinion, will sound the death knell of constitutional government in this land. It will lead inevitably to our participation in this war and to an expeditionary force of millions on the soil of Africa and Europe, and such a course on the part of those responsible for it will be a crime

against the American people and a still greater blunder. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, today we are illustrating the difference between representative government and one-man government by the President. At the White House there is no person elected by the minority who can debate with the President the policies meaning life and death to the American people. Here and there today you see vacant seats and some empty heads but the people have ears in the press gallery and they have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Reason has some opportunity to guide the destiny of the American people.

For many years preceding the American Revolution England had been fighting an internal revolution for increased democracy. They have never, that I recall, retreated in that revolution.

Whenever the people wanted more rights they had gone on a tax strike just as the American colonists did when they revolted. By using the tax power as a weapon the British Parliament had, at the time of the American revolt, wrested many powers from the king.

The Constitution apportioned some of the newly acquired sovereign power to the Congress, the rest to the President. But they left the tax weapon for wresting power from the President with the Congress so it is surprising to find opinions of the United States Supreme Court telling the people that while the Congress can grant additional power to the President the Congress cannot take power from the President for instance in foreign policy.

Leading professors of constitutional law in Great Britain regard that view of the American Constitution as ultraconservative and erroneous. I doubt if it was the view of Thomas Jefferson, who was an advocate of the right of the people to grow up through increased responsibility.

After the American Revolution the evolution of increased democracy in England continued until the Parliament had wrested from the King every important right he had.

In America, on the other hand, democracy has in this respect not developed since the writing of the Constitution. Since 1932 the Supreme Court has become virtually royalist, steadily encouraging the President to obtain more power until, when this bill is enacted, it would be difficult to say what policy the President might wish to adopt that he would not have the power to carry through and still be within the law and Constitution.

Yesterday a most distinguished Member, arguing that the bill should be enacted, enumerated various occasions upon which American Presidents have usurped powers hitherto enjoyed by the Congress. He pointed out that in each case the usurpation was deemed necessary to the defense of the country.

His speech reminded me how much like the forming of the character of a person is the forming of the character of

a nation. The steps he mentioned were taken by great men.

Certainly we would forgive such men as Jefferson and Lincoln, the steps they took which beat a primrose path leading to the decline of representative government.

The strength of the British democracy today is that such is their respect for law and tradition that no emergency ever seems to justify a surrender of parliamentary power. They have stuck with stubborn bulldog tenacity to the principles to which they owe all that they are and all that they hope to become.

Who can deny that with the passage of this bill we slip further back down the uncertain path of one-man government. I shall not be surprised if Hitler hails this as another remarkable victory for his ideology. Over and over again in Mein Kampf he has stated, "Democracy is not good enough. The destiny of a nation, especially in time of peril, should be given into the hands of one man."

Can not you just see him mounting his rostrum, pointing to this American retreat from democracy, saying "Ich habe dich gesagt—I told you so."

I hope that history will excuse this unheroic vote on the grounds of duress. I do not believe that even the administration officials really believe that Hitler intends to invade this country, risking what he has won in Europe, stirring up the hornets' nest in America.

Maybe if I were afraid, if bombs were flying over the Capital, I should be the first one to run weeping to the White House and fling my responsibility to the future generations of America upon the lap of the President.

Maybe I would and maybe I would not. It would not be the first time I have been in a tight place. Facing death makes you feel alive, especially if you risk it in a good cause. Every American mother has faced death gladly—knowing she was contributing to the world of tomorrow. And you and I have taken on a responsibility not only to the people who elected us but to the many, many more people who shall live after them.

I know that your generous-hearted constituents are imploring you to do anything and everything that might result in aid to Britain. But have they, have you, stopped to consider how you are binding and gagging those of us who are young enough that we shall still be having to labor for peace and democracy long after Roosevelt has become a doddering old man?

How can we convince the Germans, for instance, that you and the President really believe that they ought to have a democracy, that it will be safer for them to have a democracy, if by this vote you have already proved to them that the more danger there is the less democracy a country ought to have?

The President is being given more power to play with dynamite. If and when it explodes and we shall be in war, have you thought what kind of speeches you can make, after passing this bill, which will inspire American youths to become physically disabled for the representative kind of government in which you believe but for which you do not vote?

I am trying now to think what I shall say 40 years from now, when I am a nice old lady still trying to keep burning the belief in the blessings of representative government, like an ancient vestal virgin. Perhaps I shall have to do my lecturing to young citizens in some secret catacomb.

Shall I tell those youngsters that the citizens of 1941 were prodigal sons of prodigal sons? That they had inherited a democratic tradition which they had not earned and did not thoroughly understand?

That under Washington and his contemporaries the Government was run so well that it enabled the people to thrive and prosper? So they did not perceive the necessity of cleaning out the increasing incompetence and corruption in government? Their Republic brought so much prosperity that they acquired the habit of voting for anybody who sounded like more prosperity without scrutinizing the methods used by those they elected to make sure the methods being used might not prevent future prosperity. So in 1929 they suffered the first consequences of civic laziness.

They were frightened. It was not wholly the fault of the man who became President in 1932 that they gave him so many powers and duties that soon minor clerks in Government offices were making decisions on policies which until then had been the prerogative of the Congress. Not wholly his fault that so much money was granted him to be spent at his discretion that he could not possibly supervise it properly and the elections became filled with fraud and misrepresentation so that it was only luck that the Congress was not filled with political mountebanks performing only political wheelhorse services, mouthing opinions predigested for them at the White House.

Will anybody ever be able to explain the American retreat from democracy which began before the rise of Hitler, except by saying that it is human nature; the more dependent a people or the people that represent them become, the weaker they grow and the more subject to fear, until at length they become such slaves to fear that the only power of choice they have is to decide which is their master's voice, Roosevelt or Hitler, or somebody else.

We have gradually approached the point where the people of America shall have nothing left to fortify them against the tyranny, which history proves, is the inevitable result of one-man government and which is likely to come in America after the death of Roosevelt, if not before. In their fear, Americans have tossed away all the traditions of good government, which enables governments to endure during times when their chief leaders are not up to the usual standard.

To me this bill is a step backward in human progress. I regret that I cannot emphasize the depth of that conviction with martyrdom. [Applause.]

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, a few more minutes and I would have become as sentimental as the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] in the very

able speech made by her and the manner in which she presented her case.

I wonder what Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln and all of our great forefathers would do if they were here in the conditions of today. What would these great leaders do if they were confronted with the situation which our beloved country is confronted with today? Unfortunately, the gentlewoman was not here in the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses. I am sure that if she were a Member of the House at that time, she would be in a better position to analyze and appraise the situation confronting us today. At that time I called the attention of this Congress to Hitler's activities throughout the world, and particularly called attention to the fact that Hitler is not only seeking to destroy the people of Europe but is undermining our form of government by propaganda.

No, I may say to the gentlewoman, who says that Hitler is not going to invade America, that Hitler already has invaded America and has done it for almost 7 years by undermining our people and creating hate and intolerance among those of us who love the flag. Hitler has spent millions of dollars seeking to destroy our people by arraying class against class and race against race.

No; Hitler does not invade countries by an army. He first undermines the government of the country he seeks to destroy, and when he finds that the people are so weak that they would offer no resistance, he comes along with other new-fashioned ideas to destroy the world—and one country after another.

I do not have to recite what he has done in the last year, and I do not have to tell you that every day by the orders of Hitler thousands of people are being slaughtered like cattle in slaughterhouses. Only 3 days ago by order of the Fuehrer and the Nazi government a couple of wagons went along the streets of Bucharest, Rumania, and they picked up Christians and Jews and took them to the slaughterhouse, and actually slaughtered human beings. Then they threw kerosene on them and made a splendid fire of human beings. Talk about Hitler invading—no; he does not invade that way.

After reading and listening to all the fine speeches that have been made by my colleagues, I do not know where I am. The people in my district are not objecting to helping England. The only people who are objecting are members of the Communist Party or Fascist sympathizers.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not just now.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say that many other people are objecting to it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true; I think you are right, but the only protest I got was from the Communists in my section.

I have read carefully the report and I have read the evidence. The whole thing simmers down to one question. You want to help Great Britain; you are all crying for Great Britain; you would give her \$2,000,000,000, \$3,000,000,000, or

\$5,000,000,000, but you do not want to vest the power in the President of the United States. That is practically the whole argument of the last few days.

Who gives the President that power? The Congress. Why cannot Congress take it away if it finds he is abusing that power? To whom else can you give that power? Is there any man or woman in this room who can point out to me to whom they would give the power to administer this program? Who knows better than the President, who receives information from proper sources? Whom else can we under the Constitution designate to carry out the intent and purposes of this act, if and when passed? After all it does not really require an act of Congress to give the President the power to administer the act. You all know very well that the Constitution of the United States has made the President Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and that therefore under the Constitution, it is the President who has the power to direct our Army and Navy and our air force any place, anywhere.

Power must be granted to a particular agency, and it cannot be left in the hands of any committees or groups since unity of command is essential, and the only unity which can be found for such purpose is the power of the President of the United States.

Can you give these broad powers to some department? Would you create a new commission? What would you do? Is there anybody here who can tell me just what he would do? Would you just give Great Britain \$2,000,000,000 to do what it liked to do with it? Do you not think we are interested enough to want to know what they are going to do with it? Do you not think we are entitled to know what is happening throughout the world, and do you not think, as a great democracy, we have some interest in this world and have some interest in humanity and have some interest in the preservation of rights of human beings of this great world? Under present world conditions, does it appear that we ought to just mind our own business and build a fence around this entire country and forget about everything else? I will support any proposition that will keep us out of war. I do not want any war. I had my taste of it in the last war when some of my blood fell on the battlefields of France. No; I do not want any more of it; Roosevelt does not want any more of it; and you do not want any more of it. None of us wants war. It was just hysterical propaganda that has been built up by certain sinister influences in this country that would try to cast aspersion upon the President that he is going to be a dictator and that he is going to drag us into war. My friends, he would be the last man on this earth that would drag us into war, and his pledge is far greater and worth more than all the arguments I have heard on this bill by some of the great statesmen on both sides of this aisle.

So what is all this discussion about? If we eliminate giving the President the power under this bill, you are ready to vote for this bill tomorrow without any further trouble or without any further

amendments. Is there anybody here who can contradict that argument?

So the only thing involved is the question of giving someone some power, and as your friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], well said to you yesterday, under all the precedents, the President is the only person who can dispose of this matter.

Now, what are we going to do? I say that all should be heard. I do not care what the party is, whether it is Democratic or Republican or Communist, every one has his own views, but it seems to me that it is our greatest concern to know whether we are going to have a free government and whether democracy is going to live, and we are entitled to know these things, and I do not see any reason why, in helping England with ships and planes, someone should not be given the power to administer the matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not think it has been touched upon during this debate, but do you know that the Axis Powers are receiving more help from Russia, from Japan, and from other lands because the so-called neutral countries are helping the Axis? No one is complaining about that, and why should they complain about what we are doing under this bill? We are simply helping a nation as a first line of defense to protect us from an invasion by a crazy man who has been crazy now for 7 or 8 years. He has not only destroyed Europe, but he has destroyed faith in God. He has not only destroyed faith in God, but he has destroyed women and children and innocent people, not because they have done something wrong, but because they believe there is a God, and, my dear friends, can we sit here and say that we are not going to help them?

There is an old axiom "that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." In the many years that it was my privilege to fight for the eradication of subversive activities in our midst, I called attention to the fact that liberty is not self-preserving, but that it is necessary at all times to remind the people that if they wish to keep their liberties, they must be prepared to fight for them. Just as human beings are obliged to fight for the maintenance of their individual liberties, so nations must be prepared to defend their liberties lest an unscrupulous tyrant will make an assault upon them and promptly put them into a scrap heap. Nations do not respect other nations unless they know that the nation involved is prepared to fight. It required the destruction of the liberties of Czechoslovakia, Norway, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, Denmark, and France to have the world see what a stranglehold Hitler has upon the entire civilized community, when by the march of his army he can obliterate all states and all nations.

There is only one nation in Europe which has valiantly resisted aggression which may yet preserve the liberties of Europe—and I do not believe there is

one man or woman on this floor or in the gallery who will not do everything in his or her power to help stanch Britain to defend its liberties and the nations of the world.

So that the entire argument before this House resolves itself into this—we are agreed to help Britain, we are agreed upon giving Britain all the aid and assistance it needs in its struggle, but we are apprehensive in granting power to the President. I am prepared to vote for any intelligent amendment which will preserve the power of Congress in this emergency, but I do not want to feel for a moment that we are wasting precious time and losing the battle, simply because someone is afraid of placing the trust in our President which should be given to him.

I warn you, my friends, that unless you act and act promptly it may be too late to help, and then all those who foolishly insisted upon restraining the powers of the President and thereby defeated the bill, will rue the day in which their voices or vote contributed to this ignominious result. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the highest office in the Federal Government, next to that of President, is, in my opinion, that of Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is the fiscal officer of the Treasury of the United States. His is a great responsibility. It is his high duty to jealously guard the credit of our Federal Government and the solvency of our Treasury.

It is my opinion that the nature of the office of Secretary of the Treasury is such as to require the undivided attention of the person occupying it. How is it, then, that the Secretary of our Treasury is concerning himself so much with the treasury of another country?

He appears to be deeply interested in that treasury. He finds it in bad condition, so much so that he testifies it is broke and empty. Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee he engaged strenuously in proving this. The burden of his contention was that somehow the empty treasury of this other country portends immediate and grave military danger to our national security. To meet this threat, he avowed, we must immediately open up our national larder and Treasury to that country. Our Treasury he says is healthy and strong, full up to the brim.

In view of the facts, this to me is a remarkable situation. I do not pretend to know much about the condition of the British Treasury. But I believe it can be proven to any unbiased mind that the condition of our own Federal finances and Treasury are in anything but a healthy state.

Mr. Morgenthau has agreed that our Treasury is our first line of defense. That being so, whether the question be that of providing for our own military defenses, or that of aid to Britain, there is another question which underlies these and is paramount to them: What is the

condition of our first line of defense, the Treasury; just how healthy, how strong, and how full is it?

Upon the answer to this all-embracing question will depend, in the long run, the real and sustaining effectiveness of either our own defenses or of aid to Britain.

Not votes, wishful thinking, or sentiment will be the controlling factor in deciding the fate of our desires and hopes to achieve these objects, but only hard reality.

No nation has ever yet been able to outwit its own treasury, and every one that ever tried it brought ruin and disaster upon itself.

It is true today as ever, if not more so, that, in the long run, wars are won or lost mostly by finance ministers.

Let us inspect our first line of defense. First, let us look at our finances as they are reflected in the banking situation. I might state here that you will find in the last few pages of the hearings on the lend-lease bill a concise statement, accompanied by two charts, which graphically show some of the more important conditions of our Federal finances and Treasury.

As of June 30, 1940, the total amount of deposits in the commercial banks was roundly \$51,000,000,000.

Of this amount only about \$25,000,000,000, or less than 50 percent represents what can generally be considered as noninflation deposits; that is, deposits representing savings and secured by real assets.

The remainder of the deposits, \$26,000,000,000, or more than 50 percent of the total deposits, represent not savings and real assets but what may properly be considered as inflationary deposits.

Thirteen billion dollars, or a little more than 25 percent, represents bond inflation deposits; that is, credit created by the deposit by the Treasury of direct Government obligations in the commercial banking system, checking against those deposits to pay Government operating costs, and then the checks finding their way back into the banking system where they remain as permanent deposits.

This scheme of inflationary financing was first begun during the World War to cover a part of the heavy war deficits. At the end of the war bond inflation deposits in the commercial banks amounted to approximately \$5,000,000,000.

This practice of bond inflationary financing has been resorted to on an increasing scale to meet the heavy deficits since the beginning of the depression. By 1934 the commercial banks were holding about \$10,000,000,000 of this sort of deposits; and by 1940, as stated, they were holding about \$13,000,000,000 of the same.

Another category of inflationary deposits in our banking system is that which is created through the gold-purchase program. It is of the utmost importance to a proper understanding of the true condition of our banking system that we know the real nature of these deposits.

They are created in this way: For every dollar's worth of gold that is imported and taken over by the Treasury a

dollar of credit is set up in the banking system.

The dollar's worth of gold is sent to some Treasury vault. The Treasury prints on a piece of paper a statement which in substance says nothing more than that a certain amount of gold is in storage somewhere in the United States. This little slip of paper is called a gold certificate, which is given to the Federal Reserve bank. Then the Federal Reserve bank enters upon its books a credit of \$1 in favor of the bank with which the foreigner who shipped the dollar's worth of gold into this country does business.

It is supposed these so-called gold certificates are security for the credits set up in the banking system. But these little bits of paper called gold certificates represent nothing. They cannot be converted into gold by the Federal Reserve banks unless the gold is for export. The law is specific on this point. Nor can these bits of paper be converted into anything else, except, perhaps, other bits of paper like themselves.

Therefore the deposit of \$1 in the banking system every time the Treasury accumulates a dollar's worth of gold represents nothing whatever but the arbitrary creation of that much inflation of bank deposits, or fiat check currency.

At bottom, the process of creating these gold credit deposits is merely a matter of diluting the deposits already in the banking system.

By the amount of these deposits the remainder of bank deposits are reduced in value. The \$13,000,000,000 of these gold inflation deposits now in the banks have depreciated the value of the other deposits by about 25 percent.

Is that not a most serious matter?

We have here revealed also the important fact that the bank depositors carry the full cost of all the gold purchased under the gold-purchase program. It is these people who are paying for all this gold at the high price of \$35 per ounce.

Why are bank depositors of the United States being compelled to pay foreigners for billions and billions of dollars' worth of gold at this greatly inflated price?

Why are they compelled to pay for any gold at all? Surely it will not be claimed there is any law compelling them to do this.

Does not the statute in the clearest terms say this gold is to be paid for by the Treasury, and is it not reasonable to assume, therefore, that the cost should be charged to all the people of the United States?

Here is the way the law reads:

GOLD RESERVE ACT OF 1934

SEC. 3700. With the approval of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase gold in any amounts, at home or abroad, with any direct Government obligations, coin, or currency of the United States authorized by law, or with any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, at such rates and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the public interest. * * * All gold so purchased shall be included as an asset of the general fund of the Treasury.

Where is there anything in this section that even remotely suggests that the bank depositors of the United States be

compelled to pay for the gold which the Treasury alone is authorized to purchase, especially since this gold cannot be claimed by them after they have paid for it?

Either the Treasury pays for the gold or the bank depositors pay for it. There is no other alternative. If the Treasury is paying for the gold, what is it using for money, gold certificates? And how does it get gold certificates? It gets them by just printing them. Are these so-called gold certificates therefore anything but fiat currency?

Where is there anything in the law that gives the Secretary of the Treasury authority to buy gold with fiat currency? There is no such provision.

Of course, it is the bank depositors who are paying for the gold. Every person who has really followed through all the entries of this gold purchasing transaction and seen under the magic veil, with which our public officials are shrouding it, knows this is the truth.

Since it is hardly likely anyone will contend that the bank depositors should bear the cost of the gold purchased by the Treasury, we must of necessity charge this cost to the United States Government; at least until such time as the gold is actually given into the possession of the banks and used by them as real assets. Hence, for the present, the cost of the gold which has been purchased must be included in the Federal debt. Likewise, the Federal Reserve notes in circulation, being in the final analysis a direct liability of the Treasury, must also be added to the Federal debt.

The so-called gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve banks approximately equal the gold purchased plus the Federal Reserve notes in circulation.

Therefore adding the gold-certificate liabilities to the officially stated direct Federal, State, and local debts, we find the total public debt has taken the following course: This debt stood at \$7,000,000,000 in 1916; it rose sharply to \$32,000,000,000 in the World War period. From thence it climbed slowly to \$34,000,000,000 in 1930, then began its rapid ascent as the result of the heavy deficit financing, reaching \$51,000,000,000 in 1934. From this point it continued to climb still more rapidly because of the Treasury's gold-purchase policy. It reached \$73,500,000,000 by the end of the fiscal year 1939; \$80,500,000,000 by the end of the fiscal year 1940; and stands at, roundly, \$85,000,000,000 at the present time. With appropriations and authorizations already made by the Congress, and assuming that the regular operating costs of the Government will be about what they have been in the last year or two, I believe it is safe to predict that the total public debt of the United States will reach \$100,000,000,000 by the end of the fiscal year 1942.

Leaving out State and local debts, we find the Federal public debt took a somewhat different course. Starting with \$1,200,000,000 in 1916, it rose to \$25,000,000,000 during the war period, from whence it dropped to \$16,000,000,000 in 1930. From this point it began to climb rapidly to reach the figure of \$32,000,-

000,000 in 1934, \$54,000,000,000 in 1939, \$61,000,000,000 in 1940, and stands at present at about \$65,000,000,000, and will probably reach \$80,000,000,000 by 1942.

But some people will say the Treasury, after all, has the gold as an asset to offset the gold-certificate liabilities, that consequently the officially stated Federal debt is not altered by the fact that the gold certificates are a liability of the Government. So long as the banks and the people of the United States are denied the use of the gold, it is impossible to know its value. Only when we are finally allowed to exchange gold for real values can its worth be determined. Until that time this abnormally large amount of gold, held by our Government, together with the anomalous monetary policies pursued by our public officials, may well prove to be a menace to our economy instead of an asset.

It is interesting to contrast the course of our Federal debt with that of the United Kingdom. From the post World War figure of about £8,000,000,000, the United Kingdom debt dropped somewhat until 1930. In the next 9 years it rose a little more than 9 percent.

During this same 9-year period our Federal debt rose 237 percent. Even leaving out gold-certificate liabilities, our Federal debt rose in that 9-year period by 150 percent.

The British Government up until the beginning of the present war maintained a splendidly balanced budget in comparison with our own.

It is not necessarily the size of the debt which determines the degree of danger. The purposes for which a debt is created and the character of financing of necessity play a large part in determining this.

It is a serious question whether the United States Treasury may not at this moment be in a more distressed condition than that of the United Kingdom.

However that may be, can there be any doubt of the gravity of the disorders in our own banking system and of the weakened condition of our own Treasury, which this study reveals? Here is the foundation of our economy, our way of life, and our very first line of defense crumbling before we have even started to build our military defenses. Is it really thought we can ignore this situation and not ultimately pay a heavy penalty for so doing?

It was a similar financial disorder that caused Russia's break-down in the war in 1917. The same disorder undermined the Austro-Hungarian Empire during the World War so completely as to virtually destroy her fighting ability.

I feel certain when the real story of France's recent military collapse is fully told, it will be shown that the principal cause was a disordered state of her finances and treasury, not unlike that from which our own Nation is now suffering.

No doubt the officials of the Treasury and Federal Reserve System are aware, in some measure at least, of the seriousness of our present financial plight. Statements coming recently from some of those officials to the effect that the Government should make an effort to

sell more of its securities to investors to be paid for out of their savings points in that direction.

But where are there any savings in the United States with which to buy Government securities? In the years 1930 through 1938 business disbursements exceeded receipts by a total of more than \$41,000,000,000. (P. 308, Economic Almanac, 1940.)

During practically this same period, net capital of all enterprises in specified manufacturing industries—total assets less investments—declined roundly \$14,000,000,000. (P. 230, Economic Almanac, 1940.)

The average annual amount of new corporate security flotations from 1932 to 1939, inclusive, was only about 15 percent of that in the years of 1919 to 1931, inclusive. (P. 144, Economic Almanac, 1940.)

Under these circumstances there cannot possibly be any great amount of savings either available or forthcoming that can be used to purchase Government securities. What likely then will be the next move to raise the huge amount of funds necessary to meet the heavy deficits?

Will the administration seek legislation for more effectively controlling bank reserves to prevent run-away inflation and attempt to continue for awhile longer to raise funds under its present policy of creating fiat check money by the deposit of Government bonds in the banks?

WILL IT RESORT TO THE PRINTING PRESS?

Or shall we acknowledge with Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, one of Washington's guiding spirits, the complete breakdown of all our time-honored and traditional principles of Treasury financing? Shall we accept his advice to abandon all hope of maintaining those well-tryed and heretofore never-failing principles and submit ourselves to the totalitarian scheme of financing of Mussolini, Stalin, and Hitler?

INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION

It must be remembered that industrial mobilization is only a part of total defense and is for the purpose, first, of getting what the Army and the Navy need when and as they need it with the least dislocation of the civilian life, which must be freed from profiteering or exploitation. To do this, one must mobilize men, money, materials, maintenance (food).

MOBILIZATION OF CAPITAL

Capital, under the Secretary of the Treasury, will be mobilized like anything else. It will be told for what purpose it can be used and for what purpose it cannot be used, and the rates which it can charge.

In war a man should no more be permitted to use his money as he wishes than he should be permitted to use the production of his mine, mill, or factory, except through a general supervising agency as it should be set up in the general plan. This was being done toward the end of the World War.

What is the use of vain talk of drafting dollars when dollars can be made to serve every purpose of government by the regulation of their use? (Statement by Bernard M. Baruch before the Conference Board's Consulting Committee on Industrial Mobilization Problems, December 19, 1940. Source: Conference Board Reports, January 16, 1941.)

In considering Mr. Baruch's recommendation let us not overlook the cardinal fact that up to now there is no evi-

dence that totalitarian Treasury financing has in the long run shown itself to be superior to democratic financing. Indeed, the evidence at hand is all to the contrary. And if totalitarian Treasury financing, would that not inevitably involve our Nation in a complete dictatorship, with absolute regimentation of all labor, agriculture, and industry?

The retort will come that it is to be only for the duration of what is continually being euphemistically referred to as an emergency, that when this passes we will return to the democratic way.

But it is only with a solvent Treasury that there is any hope of ever returning to the democratic way.

The passage of the lend-lease bill will hasten the Nation into bankruptcy and thus assure the permanency of military dictatorship. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, as we deal with the momentous questions involved in H. R. 1776, I doubt seriously if we will be confronted with any other legislation of its equal in importance at this or any future session of the Congress. I am convinced that the people of our country do not want H. R. 1776 passed in its present form. There has been much confusion in the minds of the people respecting aid to England, and the better policy for our country to pursue in order to keep out of this foreign war, and this confusion still exists. The press of our country has been filled with articles which were calculated to create a war hysteria in the minds of the people, and these have created an unrest throughout our Nation. The people do not want our country to become involved in this war. They want to extend aid to England as we are able to do so—short of actual participation in the war—and so as to not deplete our own national-defense materials and supplies. We are united that we must develop our own national defense. The people vividly recall our very rich experience in a foreign war in 1917-18, and they recall the successive steps which led us into that war. As the people realize that the charted course today is leading us into this foreign war, not of their choosing, they are greatly alarmed; they do not want us to take any step which will lead us into this war. They well remember the very great sacrifices made during the last World War, and they remember, as I remember, the broken bodies and the distorted minds of brave men, all the result of that war. The people want no more of it.

Mr. Chairman, what are some of the implications if this bill is passed as written? The provisions of this proposed law would make an arsenal of the United States of America for all belligerents engaged in hostilities against the Axis Powers. This bill also embraces the plan of giving, leasing, or lending anything we have by way of war munitions and supplies, or anything we may produce, to England, Greece, China, or any other power which may become engaged in this conflict against the Nazis or their allies. Under the provisions of this bill, this legislation extends to the

plan of financing those powers with war materials and supplies, ships, arms, military secrets, tanks, and airplanes. Who can tell how far reaching this plan may extend beyond this scope? It might be construed to extend to the rehabilitation of France, Holland, Norway, Belgium, and Poland. This would be a serious commitment on the part of our country. Does anyone know what this plan will cost our Government? No one has ventured a guess on the cost on the side of the proponents of this bill. Recently I read the guess of one newspaper on the cost to provide England alone with war materials and supplies, and that estimate was from three to ten billions of dollars for the first year. How long will this war last? And, can anyone give me an estimate of the cost to our country if the extension of this plan is made to other countries and allies of England? The people would like to know this answer.

Mr. Chairman, if we had a well-filled Treasury—which is one of the essential factors in every war, and in the defense of a nation—we would be in a far more favorable position respecting this proposed legislation. If we occupied a position which is strong and sound financially, then we could abandon the fear of national bankruptcy and extend great aid to the nations who are fighting the Axis Powers. Unfortunately we do not have a well-filled Treasury; our Treasury is empty, we face a huge debt which is a claim to be asserted throughout the coming years.

This proposed legislation gives the President the unlimited and discretionary power to fix the terms and conditions upon which any foreign power may receive aid from our Government; the language of the bill is as follows:

The terms and conditions 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.

We must remember, too, this bill, if passed, repeals the Johnson Act and the neutrality law.

This provision vests an unlimited and unrestrained power in the President.

If this bill should pass, with the provision above referred to contained therein, the Congress would have abdicated its power and function in that regard to the President of the United States.

Let us follow just a little further this plan of possible payment, or repayment, to our country. Of course, no settlement of any kind would be made until this war is over—if, in fact, any payment or repayment, is made in the future. We have not forgotten that England has never paid us the debt she owes us from the last World War. However, let us assume that England, China, and Greece, or any other nation in that same class, would, after the war is over, elect to repay us in kind, and for that purpose they would start their factories and mills to producing guns, tanks, ships, and airplanes for us; then, after the production, they would start to make deliveries to us. Our own plants would be

largely idle, following the termination of production of war materials and supplies, and during the period of rehabilitation, and they would generally remain idle; our workmen would be generally idle, and they would stand by and watch the foreign countries dump manufactured war materials and supplies upon our docks and piers.

What would we do with these war materials and supplies after the war is over? They become obsolete in a very short space of time. We have not forgotten the guns, tanks, trucks, and other war supplies from the last World War—all of which were stored in large warehouses, and all of which were rendered wholly unfit for use in a very short space of time after the war was over. We wonder why we would want war materials and supplies, guns, tanks, and airplanes after the war is over. Yet that is one of the plans embraced in this bill, with the discretion vesting in the President, and that very plan would operate to close our industries and keep them closed; it would aid in producing unemployment, and it would keep our workers unemployed. That plan would give us some very undesirable war equipment when we have no use for it. My better judgment is that England would neither pay nor repay us, just as she did following the last World War. She owes us that debt today.

These are some of the implications arising out of our great generosity under the provisions of this bill if it should pass as presented.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other serious involvements in this proposed legislation. This bill seeks to extend greater power to the President than has been granted to any man in this Nation heretofore. It grants unlimited power to the President respecting this war and over our Army, Navy, our war supplies, and national-defense materials. This is greater power than any one man should desire, and it is far greater power than any one man should have. By this legislation the voice of the National Defense Commission is forever stilled; the wish and will of the people of this Nation will be nullified, and the voice of the Representatives of the people will be without force or effect; the War Department and the Navy Department will be relegated to a secondary position; and the ships, the destroyers, and the submarines will be subject to the order of the President.

We wonder who would know best as to what ships, or how many, we could spare to some foreign country—the President, or the Navy Department? The question comes to us as to whether the President, or the War Department, would be better qualified to determine what guns, tanks, trucks, and other war supplies could be spared, and at the same time maintain our own defense of our country in case of attack? This bill is a "cover-all," with its grant of unlimited power to the President respecting the question of this war, our national defense and the extension of credit in war materials and supplies to other nations. This legislation is a "blank check" to the President—the man who has rushed us into our present depleted financial state—giving him the

unheard of and unlimited power to go onward and forward, without limitation, to further involve the generations now, and those to come.

Mr. Chairman, because of these very serious involvements I cannot lend my voice or my vote in favor of this proposed legislation. This is highly dangerous legislation for our country at this moment. My fear is that very grave consequences will follow, if this measure is passed. This plan and this policy is not consonant with American principles, because it portrays the passion of the dictator. This unwholesome plan, if carried out in its fullness and if war materials and supplies are sent to England, and other countries, in our ships, and convoyed by our vessels, through the war zones, those overt acts will certainly cause our involvement in this war. Such a highly dangerous policy must not be pursued. We must keep out of active participation in this war.

This war is in a sense a very peculiar one. In my service during the last World War, and since that time, I have learned that in order to conquer an enemy it is first necessary to invade and occupy the enemy's territory, and then to organize and hold that occupied territory. This can only be accomplished with infantry, properly supported. Germany has tried to invade England, but she has been unable to accomplish that objective. Recently I learned that England has approximately 1,500,000 men under arms, while Germany has some 6,000,000 men who are equipped and armed. With those respective forces may I ask if your judgment decrees that England can easily invade and occupy Germany, and the territory which she now holds, and if she could so invade and occupy that vast territory would she be able to organize and hold it?

By every rule of the game of war, England would have to increase her manpower. Then let us think just a few steps further, and if we supply guns, planes, tanks, and ships, and all kinds of war munitions, and give aid to England as we now contemplate, what will be our position when England calls for manpower? Will we then decline to go further, or will we submit and send the flower of our American manhood across the ocean, again, to help fight that war? By the passage of this bill I fear we will be rushed into this war. Our people do not want our Nation to become involved in this war; they want to keep out of it.

I apprehend, Mr. Chairman, that former Ambassador Kennedy has a superior knowledge respecting the matters involved in this bill. He has been in England, and he knows and understands their situation perfectly. He is entirely familiar with all conditions in our country. He is well qualified to speak upon this highly important subject. What does Mr. Kennedy say? He stated that he was convinced that the great power sought to be conferred upon the President of the United States as provided in this bill is entirely unnecessary. In other words, we have been able to extend all of the aid to England, and her allies, which we have been able to give, which is short of active participation in this

war, without the extension of the unlimited power to the President which is provided in this measure. If there is any other aid which we could extend to England, and her allies, which is short of war, which we are not now extending, I would like for some proponent of this bill to stand in his place and state to the Members what that additional aid would be?

Mr. Chairman, there is a very serious question respecting the constitutionality of this proposed legislation. Section 8, article I, of our Constitution provides:

The Congress shall have the power to declare war; to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years; to provide and maintain a navy.

This power is vested exclusively in the Congress.

The question now presents itself: Can that power be delegated by the Congress to any other person?

The tenth amendment to our Constitution makes the further provision, which reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The case of *Schechter Bros. v. United States* (295 U. S. 495) and *Carter Co. v. Coal Commission* (298 U. S. 238) are directly in point on the question of the unconstitutional delegation of authority. The very power which is sought to be delegated by the Congress to the President in H. R. 1776 is that power which was granted to the Congress by the people. The Congress cannot delegate that power to any other.

Justice Frankfurter, while a private citizen, once stated respecting a similar plan that it was "the delegation of power running riot."

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the House have serious duties to perform; we represent the people. I will not vote to abdicate that duty which rests upon me; I will not delegate that power and that duty to any other man; I will not delegate that power to any President.

These are serious days. We must think of the United States of America first; we must develop our own national defense; we must remain firm and sane; and we should not permit our very great generosity to impoverish our own Nation in our preparation for our own defense. Under the guise of the "emergency," or our national defense, however important, we must not permit the loss of our form of government. Liberty and freedom, gained throughout the years at a tragic cost, is too sacred to be frittered away even under the threat of war. The representatives of the people must stand steadfast for the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the debate on this bill, and I, for one, have profited from getting the views of the different Members of the House on it. I have read the propaganda in the newspapers and listened to it over the radio. As I now look back in retro-

spect, I shudder at the similarity of the debates now and those back in 1916 and 1917 before we entered into the first World War to save the democracies of the world. How many of us at that time ever thought that in less than 25 years we would again be called upon to save the democracies of the world? Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that we again saved them. Just how long would it be until we would be called upon again to save them?

In speaking today, I do so with a heavy heart. Every drop of blood in the veins of my body comes from Welsh, English, Irish, and French ancestry. The only child I possess in the world telephoned me last week that he had enlisted in the Royal Air Force and would go into training very soon. So today, I have reached the crossroads of my life. I sympathize with England and her Allies. I abhor the things that Hitler and the other totalitarian rulers stand for. But America was not responsible for creating any of them, unless it was our participation in the first World War.

Today, in my opinion, 95 percent of the people would favor aiding England. The only question is in what degree and in what way. The same percentage of the people want Congress to say in what degree and how much. They do not want it left to any one man to decide. That statement is made without any reservations and without any reflections on the President of the United States. He is no superman; he is human, and has made many mistakes during his administration. He is not to be criticized for that. Perhaps someone else would have made the same mistakes, but the fact remains that he made them. Our economic and social problems still remain unsolved in this country after 8 years. The question remains to be answered: If he cannot solve our own problems, no matter how honest and sincere he may be, can he solve the problems of the rest of the world?

If we were permitted under this bill to say whether we would give aid to England and her allies, and if so, how much, and upon what security, if any, and these things were left to the Congress to decide, the American people would be satisfied. But when aid to England and her allies is tied up with a proposition to let one man say what, when, and how much shall be loaned, leased, or given away, and upon what security, if any, then the people rebel against such a procedure, and rightly so. If this bill is passed in its present form, Congress may just as well vote funds to run the Government, adjourn and go home, await the amount of the war bill to be created, and then return and vote the amount in order to save the honor of the Nation.

To ask the people of the United States to finance this war and to assist in policing the world is the height of folly. Even though we should not get into this war any further and peace should come tomorrow, the standard of living will be lowered in this country for years. We have never fully recovered from our participation in the last World War. In 1916, just before we entered the first World War, the appropriation to run our Government was \$1,114,490,704.09. The

interest on our obligations for the present fiscal year will be more than it took to run our Government in 1916. Our public debt in 1916, just before we entered the last World War, was \$1,225,145,568. The interest item in the budget for the fiscal year ending in 1942 is \$1,225,000,000, within \$145,000 of the amount of our public debt in 1916. Our public debt at the close of business on January 28 was over \$45,000,000,000. To this, add the guaranteed obligations of the Government. We must raise our debt limit now in peacetime. What will it be when we start fighting? We are already in the war. We have become the munitions arsenal for the world.

With a picture of this kind staring us in the face, it does not seem to me that we are in a position to give much aid to anyone except ourselves. We must remember that with a debt 45 times larger than it was before the last World War, and the tremendous burden to carry it, it will not be as easy to get money from the people for loans as it was then. Many of them will recall that they were promised that loans made to the Allies at that time would be paid back. They have not forgotten that they were not, and that their tax burden has constantly increased since that time. They are also familiar with the amount we are now borrowing from the American people for every dollar we have been paying out. The limit of their patience may be reached much sooner than we anticipate.

This bill gives the President extraordinary powers. It is said, however, that we will limit these powers to 2 years. If it is safe to give him that power for 2 years, it would be just as safe for 4. Moreover, I do not believe there is any present Member of Congress who has served here during the past session of Congress who can remember of the President asking to be relieved of any of the great powers given him during the past 8 years. Whenever one of these bills comes up for consideration there is always an emergency existing requiring the extension of the power given under some heretofore enacted law. The safest way is not to grant such power to any one individual. Aid to England and her allies? Yes; but with a limitation as to the amount and with proper security. The British Empire boasts that the sun never sets on its possessions. That statement is literally true. If we were to ask England or any other country for a loan, I am sure that country would want security, and that would be especially true if we were in default to it on obligations heretofore incurred.

Section 3 (b) of this bill gives the President power to enter into such agreements for the giving away of the taxpayers' money as he sees fit. He can sell, lease, or give it away if he sees fit. Any consideration is sufficient. That is what the bill provides, and the American people should know it; and the people should not be led to believe that we are going to sell or lease something to someone.

Under this bill, the President, if he felt like doing so, could give away the entire Navy and also our airplanes in both the Army and the Navy. Not that the Presi-

dent would use this power, but he could if he wanted to do so. If he does not intend to use the power, then why give it to him?

There is nothing in the bill that would require the President to give to the public, or even to Congress, a report of what he is doing unless he so desires, the countries with whom he is dealing, or the terms of such agreements as he enters into. The public, and especially Congress, ought to know about these things.

This bill carries no appropriations so the only thing the President has to deal with at the present time is the material we have for our own national defense. Just how much of it will he give, lease, or lend to other nations and just what defense will they give us should we need it? If we are in the grave danger from invasion that some people say we are, then this becomes very important.

There is plenty to give, lease, or lend from money already appropriated. Congress, in 1940, appropriated \$8,625,000,000 for national defense and authorized an additional \$3,800,000,000 in contract authorizations. Congress is asked to appropriate about \$10,800,000,000 at this session for national defense. All of this, under this bill, could be given, loaned, or leased away, if the President saw fit. In other words, the President will have the handling of a fund of about twenty-eight and one-half billion dollars.

The people of the United States, without question, are for representative government, which means their duly-elected Congressmen must make decisions, and not any one man. In view of the uncertainty of life and the changes of time, to repose all this power in one man leaves the question open as to who that official may be in the future; how he may be influenced; and again, it is too much responsibility for any human being who has been or may be created, irrespective of in how much esteem he may be held.

It might be well to reflect on just how many men, dollars, and years it may be necessary to appropriate to accomplish the purpose of again making the world safe for democracy, and should we accomplish our objective, whether it would be worth the cost.

In its long history as a republic, the United States has been engaged in several wars. It has never lost one. War-time has too often brought curbs on the civil liberties of our people and our institutions and restricted their freedom of speech and action. In times of peace we have had time to look back on these restrictions and always with regret that they should have been invoked at all and frequently with shame at their excessive severity. But with all their restrictions they were not comparable to the proposal in this bill to do away with constitutional guaranties.

Heretofore, when we have waged war, it has been only after full debate of the Congress, who are the people's representatives. Heretofore we have maintained, through all the stresses and strains of a war period, our constitutional form of government. The conclusion of peace has found the authority of Congress intact and the American people free to govern themselves through

our American institutions. But now, in peacetime, we are asked to give up all of this.

Twenty-four years ago we went into the first World War to save democracy for the world, but especially for Europe, as we had it here. Here are some of the results: A treaty which insured another war; we succeeded in the destruction of constitutional or democratic government on the continent of Europe; established communism in Russia, Nazi-ism in Germany, and fascism in Italy; we helped to make possible the spread of atheism and communism throughout the world; casualties of some 500,000 American soldiers, the loss of more than \$30,000,000,000 to our own country and the resulting war debts, depression, financial, and economic disaster, suffering, and misery to the American people, from which we have not as yet recovered. Can we expect to accomplish in a second World War what we failed to accomplish in the first?

Thomas Jefferson once said:

For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

History shows that European fighting has never ceased. Their quarrels have never been settled and never will be, and for us to become entangled on one side and pay their bills and fight their battles seems to be most absurd.

To my mind, there has never been a just war nor an honorable one. To me, this rule has never changed.

I have watched with interest the development of the present war hysteria. It will gradually grow until objectors to our entrance into the war will cease. Soon the whole Nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry, and then it will be too late.

If this bill is passed by the Congress, or any similar amended bill, our Constitution will become one more scrap of paper. We will soon be fighting on the side of the Allies. Civilization may survive, but in an entirely new form.

To offset this, we must depend upon a public who are tolerant and serene in their judgments, who have sympathies which are generous and broad, and who are willing that their representatives in Congress shall exercise the powers of sovereignty for ends loftier than the achievement of temporary advantage.

I am for anything that will eventually bring about peace. Above all, I am for America—first, last, and all the time. I am for preparing our own national defense before building one for someone else. I am for aid to England or her Allies with proper security to protect our own people from the sad experiences they suffered from the last World War.

I agree with what the present occupant of the White House said in his address at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, when he stated:

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.

This bill should be overwhelmingly defeated, and I again use as the best argument for its defeat the words of the President himself, in the same address heretofore referred to, when he said:

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 prayers, and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

Let us defeat this bill on that statement alone and continue constitutional government, and let Congress function as the Constitution intended it should and as the people expect that it will. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] 7 minutes.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, the limited time allotted for debate renders it impossible for each individual Member of the House to present his views on this important piece of legislation. Fortunately, the members of the great committee that have reported this bill to the House have given us the benefit of their analysis and conclusions after careful consideration and study of the measure.

I have heard scarcely a word during the discussion regarding our presumed neutrality. We still have a Neutrality Act on the statute books. Of course, it was materially emasculated by the passage of the act which repealed the embargo on arms. Crippled as it is, it is still the law. In my humble opinion, the adoption of the so-called lease-lend bill renders our claim of neutrality null and void.

WHAT ABOUT NEUTRAL PORTS?

Why is so little being said about that provision in the lend-lease bill which would permit belligerent vessels to be outfitted, repaired, or reconditioned in our own bases? That is the provision, remarks the World-Telegram, which Alf. M. Landon said might result in importing war to our shores.

If units of the British Fleet—or of the fleet of any other nation the President decides to favor—are permitted to put in at the navy yards of Brooklyn, Norfolk, or Charleston, or at our Guantanamo base in Cuba, how long will it be before they are doing their fighting from our yards and bases? And how short of war would we be if some German raider followed a British vessel into an American base and fired upon both the British ship and the base?

And how can we square that provision with the solemn declaration of the Panama Conference? You remember that convention of foreign ministers of American republics in the fall of 1939, called at the suggestion of our Government, that that Convention wherein the American republics solemnly proclaimed the existence of a security zone around the American Continents, extending in some places as far as 500 miles out to sea, and notified the belligerents not to carry on hostilities within that zone.

To enforce the Western Hemisphere neutrality, the American republics agreed to take such action as would be necessary, specifically stipulating that they—

Shall prevent their respective terrestrial, maritime, and aerial territories from being utilized as bases of belligerent operations.

The proponents of this bill charge that the opposition is endeavoring to spread the gospel of fear as to the dire results of giving the President the unusual powers so clearly indicated by the language of the bill. After bitterly assailing those who stress the danger of granting such powers, they then attempt to do a little frightening themselves by picturing the horrors of an invasion by the Nazis and the complete obliteration of the last great democracy, the United States. Such a presentation is, as it is intended to be, rather dramatic but not particularly convincing. I am not disturbed as to an immediate invasion by the Axis forces. Such a development is a possibility but not a probability. Of greater concern to me is the economic invasion that will follow the ending of the war regardless of who wins. We shall be faced with and come immediately in competition with a new type of economy, a totalitarian economy resulting from the necessity of millions of workers producing commodities not for wages but for a food card that will barely provide for subsistence. In face of such competition what is going to become of our boasted standard of living, our short workweek, and high wages?

It is high time that some post-war planning was being formulated in order that we may face such a situation with some degree of preparation.

Much has been said relating to the tremendous powers that are given the President in this proposed legislation. It may be well for us to remember that in speaking of other powers granted him that he warned us that "these powers might be dangerous in lesser hands." A long train of unfulfilled promises over a long, long period of 8 years has made a vast number of our people somewhat skeptical. The proponents of this bill assure us, aye, more than that, they ridicule us, for even suggesting that the President would avail himself of the wide-open provisions of this bill and sell, lease, lend, or trade such munitions and equipment as would strip our own defense. In view of past performances of the administration it seems to me that its defenders "protest too much."

If, as the supporters of the President say, he will never use the totalitarian powers granted in this measure, why include them in the text?

Patrick Henry said:

Is it consistent with any principle of prudence or good policy to grant unlimited, unbounded authority which is so totally unnecessary that it never will be exercised?

For 8 long years we have seen the gradual encroachment of the executive department upon the legislative division. If we are not careful, our great Republic will be destroyed, and we shall suffer the indignation of living in a land where the executive decree is the last word.

The plea, or rather, a demand has been made by the party in power for unity. How hollow that plea sounds coming from those who have by word and action created a degree of class consciousness and class hatred that we never dreamed possible in this great Republic. What they want is not unity. They want submission not only by the minority but by the Members on their side who have the courage to manifest independence in thought and action. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House of Representatives, I arise to discuss H. R. 1776. I assure you that I do not discuss it as a partisan, not as a Republican, not as a Democrat, but solely from the American point of view. To me the bill deals directly or indirectly with three subdivisions:

First, the constitutional guaranties to the people of the United States;

Second, the economic resources of the United States; and

Third, the most precious of all—the very lives of the people of this United States.

I fully appreciate that any legislation affecting any one of these all-important problems should cause each of us sleepless nights, and therefore I say that if we are sensible to our responsibilities we must give deep and sincere consideration to this bill with all of these tremendously important problems.

I have read and reread the Constitution of the United States, and it is my view that Congress alone is vested solely with those powers to provide for the common defense and general welfare, to declare war, raise and support armies and provide and maintain a navy and to furnish the rules of government and regulations of these land and naval forces. If we convey those powers to one man, the President, I believe we would be clearly guilty of abdicating those powers given to us by the Constitution, and it would amount to an abdication. If we convey those sacred responsibilities, then I suggest, as it has been suggested to me, that there is no further need of the Congress. Are we so incompetent as to not be entitled to discharge our duties, or are we so sluggish that we are incapable of performing the duties to which we are elected? Are we the ones to extinguish the last remnants of democracy?

Each of you has received a tremendous number of letters, not only from your own districts, but, as I have, from States from California to New York. Practically every letter that I have received has urged the defeat of this bill. Some of the writers have referred to it as a dictator bill, and you, as I am, are opposed to a dictator form of government.

We are told that this is a bill to give all-out aid to Britain. We are told through propaganda that this bill is vital to our national defense. Yet, in these days of debate, I have not heard a single convincing argument on any need of legislation for aid to Britain. We have been giving aid to Britain under present legislation. I have not heard a single convincing argument that the bill is

necessary for national defense. National-defense legislation has been provided for in the last previous Congress. I am more concerned whether that national-defense program has reached the stage of advancement to which it should be by this time in defense of the United States.

I hope it will not be charged that my viewpoint is provincial. During the last World War I spent some 27 months in the service of this country. A part of that time was spent in France, and part in England. I have no prejudice against England. I have great admiration for the ideals and courage of the English people. Is there any one here who does not admire many fine qualities of the people of the Germany that was and the France that was. But I am not British, or German, or French. I remind you that today Germany has a dictatorship, France was ruined by the so-called politicians, England is still a part of a great empire. I am proud to be an American, and I hope I have a deep appreciation of the American way of life, and my feeling as an American transcends any admiration or feeling for any foreign country and my single hope is that we preserve our American form of government and continue the American way of life.

At such a time, with the whole economic, political, and social structure of our country hanging in the balance, with the fact that only so recently by the Draft Act, thousands of the youth and the young men of our country have been taken from their homes and from their way of life, and placed in training camps, and the fact that thousands and hundreds of thousands more are to follow. With this transition, I hope that we can get along without propaganda, and when we are dealing with matters of national defense I hope that we can deal in these and the other problems which are ours without hypocrisy and with honesty, without passion or prejudice, and most of all, without partisanship.

I do not approach this problem with any idea that one side of this debate, or the other has a monopoly on patriotism. I know that sitting in this Congress on both sides of the House, are men who have served in the wars in which this country has been involved. I know that sitting on both sides of the House are men who have received the Distinguished Service Cross for their services. Surely you are as deeply concerned with what is best for this country as am I.

I come fresh from the people whom I have the distinguished honor to represent. In becoming a Member of Congress I was deeply impressed with the oath which I took only a few short weeks ago to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. The problems which we have here have caused me many sleepless nights. To me the problem of how to fulfill this oath is to follow the dictates of my conscience to do what is right.

I distinctly remember the pledges I made when I sought this high office, namely, I was opposed to our becoming involved in a European war, and I was opposed to sending the youth of our country to die on foreign battlefields.

I believe that most of you made those same pledges. I do not know of anyone who was elected on an "all out" platform. I intend to keep that pledge because I believe sincerely that the passage of this bill will mean involvement of this country in the tragedies of the European war, and that involvement means the death of many of the youth of our country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You recall, of course, that Candidate Roosevelt promised to keep us out of war and the Republican nominee, you will recall, ran on that kind of a promise?

Mr. O'HARA. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you know of any Member of this House who did not make a similar promise?

Mr. O'HARA. I will say that I do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you know of any reason now why we should violate those promises?

Mr. O'HARA. No reason whatsoever. My first duty is to this Government, to my people, to my country. "To thine own self be true, and it must follow as the night the day that thou canst not then be false to any man." National defense? Yes. Increase it, extend it, and preserve it, but conserve our own lives, save our own republican form of government, and in so doing we will still be to the tragic peoples of distressed nations the candlelight still burning in the shrine of democracy—a sustaining light to which the eyes of Europe and Asia will look for guidance and reassurance that freedom has not perished from the earth and democracy is still worth fighting for.

I deny that the British Navy is our first line of defense. [Applause.] The British Navy is the first line of defense for Britain and that Navy will go wherever the dictates of need may be for the preservation of Britain. [Applause.] I am not an isolationist, and I am not a non-interventionist when I say that our concern should be the preservation of our American people and of our own form of government.

In this great debate there are those who have spoken of the dollar sign and what this bill means in money and in war contracts. I insist somebody should speak for those who pay the taxes that would go into the billions that would go for aid to Britain. If this bill passes and if it means war, someone should speak for the parents of sons, the mothers and fathers that have suffered and sacrificed that our great American race should go forward on the feet of youth sound in mind and in limb, and I speak for the youth whom you are calling upon to defend us, in training now, and if there is war—then giving their lives. I want that youth to have the same vision that our forefathers had when they founded this country. That youth who look to you with this question, What are you going to do; are you going to regiment us, or are we to be free? Do not destroy their belief in life, their confidence in our form of government. Do not inculcate fear with propaganda. Keep alive in them the belief in life which is the essence of

youth. Give them confidence in a great national defense, but do not substitute hysteria for that confidence.

Mr. Chairman, I state here and now that it is my sincere belief that H. R. 1776 is a bill that would change our form of government, dissipate our resources, endanger our defenses, and, what is more tragic, may decimate the youth of our land. Are we to shut our eyes to these realities in order to make a quixotic gesture of aid to Britain? Britain has 400,000,000 subjects. Britain is rich in resources—not only rich in her Empire but rich in wealth in this hemisphere. Let us not "sit in" at the poker table of Europe. H. R. 1776 is too high a price to pay for our stack of chips that would enable us to hold a hand in this slimy and crooked game of European intrigue. Our world and our ideology are new. We cannot affect the age-old intrigues of Europe or play the game of the shifting boundary lines that have involved Europe as far back as history itself. I quote from that statesman, Thomas Jefferson:

For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality, and a respect for the equal rights of nations, would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

To have national defense we must have morale, not discord. We must have unity; we must have faith. Our strongest national defense is a united people—people believing in this Government and willing to pay any price in order to defend it.

It has been argued here that an overwhelming majority of our people favor this bill. I presume to doubt the soundness of this argument. It is my unbiased and honest opinion that there is a sharp and dangerous cleavage in the opinion of the people at this time. Who can say that that group—that great inarticulate group who oppose this bill—are not in the majority? What tragic means of expressing that cleavage will they have if this bill passes? Who will say which is the majority? I repeat to you, no candidate for President, no candidate for Congress, ran upon the platform which would have provided the vast group of our electorate to express their sentiments in favor of or against this legislation.

To change or abrogate the Constitution you must do it lawfully, not unlawfully. In behalf of those citizens, taxpayers, the mothers and fathers of our youth, and youth itself, I claim that they are the Government, and we are merely their official spokesmen.

As a Representative I object that we are not policemen of the world, but that our duty is to defend our own lives and liberty and treasure the pursuit of happiness by preserving our form of government. Devoutly I say that I put my trust in God, my faith in the form of government left me by our forefathers. My one concern is that we shall continue that trust and faith as a free people, and with that courage which has been nourished by freedom and independence gird to defend ourselves against any nation or combinations of nations.

Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress, I plead with you for unity and sanity, and for the reasons which I have

given you I urge you to defeat this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THILL].

Mr. THILL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 1776. In my opinion, this measure, if passed, will lead this country down the road to war. The first duty of every American must be to preserve and protect his country. I cannot vote for a measure which, in my opinion, will give the President dictatorial powers. These powers, if injudiciously used, can easily lead the United States into a war which will cost the lives of millions of American boys and bring bankruptcy, hardships, suffering, and ruin to our Nation.

I am unwilling to give any President the power to dispose of our defenses as he sees fit. It was never the intention of the founders of our country that Congress should abdicate practically all of its war-making powers. We must face reality. We must not let emotionalism or partisanship becloud our vision and judgment. Let us not follow the dictators by centralizing power in one man. Our Nation is a republic and must be preserved as such. Our forefathers who fled the tyrannies of Europe have handed to us the torch of freedom. We must keep this fire burning brightly and defend our institutions against all enemies from without as well as from within.

Let me quote the following interesting excerpt from the minority views on H. R. 1776:

WHAT THIS BILL DOES

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.

Many authorities are convinced that H. R. 1776 is unconstitutional in its entirety, because it is a dictatorial and unwarranted demand by the President that the Congress of the United States abdicate its law-making, treaty-making, and money-disbursing power in the field of national defense and hand over such powers to the President for the defense of any foreign nations whom the President, in his own judgment, may wish to defend.

Under section 3 of the bill the President is given power which might result in

political, military, and commercial alliances or treaties with foreign countries without reference to any advice or consent of the Senate.

If the President uses the powers given to him under H. R. 1776, he can force the taxpayers of this country and my constituents to underwrite every foreign war occurring anywhere in the world. I do not believe that the people I represent want this Nation to finance and support foreign wars upon the say-so of one man. The war-making power should be left in the hands of Congress, where the Constitution provides that it belongs.

The following article discusses the laws which may be modified or voided by section 3 of H. R. 1776:

LAWS NULLIFIED BY PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED WAR-POWERS BILL

Section 3 (a) of the President's war-powers bill, as transmitted to Congress from the White House, provides: "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may, * * * when he deems it in the interest of national defense, * * *" etc.

During testimony by Secretary Hull question arose as to what statutes or international commitments this authority might nullify.

Secretary Hull implied the pending measure would in no way affect the Johnson Act, adding:

"This [Johnson] act would not appear to be involved, for the reason that it does not apply to this Government, or to a public corporation created by, or in pursuance of, special authorization of Congress, or to a corporation in which the Government has or exercises a controlling interest, as, for example, the Export-Import Bank."

However, section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 does forbid loans or credits to a belligerent government by the Export-Import Bank, or similar Government-controlled corporations; although section 7 does not prohibit loans directly by the United States Government, Secretary Hull told the committee.

The net effect of the new bill, if enacted in its present form, would be, as regards loans to belligerent nations, to repeal section 7 of the Neutrality Act of 1939. This would make possible direct Government loans or credits to any belligerent at the discretion of the President, through the Export-Import Bank or any other existing agency.

By this device, as Secretary Hull interprets the pending proposal, the Johnson Act would not be nullified as regards private credits to defaulting nations.

Nevertheless the result of the new measure would be to make unlimited Government credits available to any nation, belligerent or defaulter, or both, in the discretion of the President.

Moreover, this authority would not be encumbered by any specifications regarding collateral security, rate of interest, or maximum period of repayment. Under this authority, as proposed, the President would be authorized to lend the entire resources of the United States Government, in both money and materials, to any nation or group of nations, without reference to Congress concerning terms or conditions of the loan. No limitation upon this authority is found in the White House text, as regards either time or amount of the proposed loans.

ASSISTANCE TO WAR VESSELS

Secretary Hull also testified that three sections of title 18, U. S. C., would be nullified by the proposed executive authority, as follows:

"Section 23 makes it unlawful to fit out or arm in the United States a vessel with intent that it shall be employed in the service of a foreign belligerent against a power or people with which the United States are at peace.

"Section 24 makes it unlawful to increase or augment in our ports the force of a ship of war or other armed vessel belonging to a belligerent power.

"Section 33 makes it unlawful during a war in which the United States is neutral to send out of our jurisdiction any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war for delivery to a belligerent nation."

In summary, Secretary Hull said: "These provisions would be superseded by the new act."

INTERNATIONAL LAW NULLIFIED

Secretary Hull added that three sections of The Hague Convention of 1907 also would be nullified by the proposed new powers. Article VI of the convention forbids the supply of war materials of any kind by a neutral to a belligerent power. Article XVII limits repairs of belligerent war vessels in neutral ports to the minimum necessary for resumption of voyage in a seaworthy condition. Article XVIII forbids increasing the power or armament of a belligerent war vessel in a neutral port.

Secretary Hull added that the Hague Convention was not applicable to the present European war, since article XXVIII provides it shall apply only when all belligerents are parties to the convention. "England and Italy are not parties to the convention."

From this point Secretary Hull outlined the new United States policy in these words:

"It may be urged that the provisions of the United States Code and the quoted provisions of the Hague Convention are declaratory of international law on the subjects mentioned and that to do the things contemplated by the proposed act would render us unneutral. This would be largely true under ordinary circumstances, but we are not here dealing with an ordinary war situation. Rather, we are confronted with a situation that is extraordinary in character."

This statement appears to summarize faithfully the ultimate significance of section 3 (a) of the proposed bill. Regardless of both domestic and international law, United States foreign policy would be fixed from day to day by Executive decree—the powers of totalitarian dictatorship.

Secretary Hull enumerates four domestic laws and three long-accepted principles of international law which would be at once nullified by "the things contemplated" under this single section of the proposed act.

Doubtless there are many other domestic laws which would be at once nullified. At one point in the committee hearings, for example, the question was raised whether the language of section 3 (a) would not, in fact, authorize the President to issue new Government obligations without regard to the debt limits fixed by Congress under existing law.

Mr. Chairman, we who represent the people of the United States must do everything in our power to sustain Americanism. In no other nation on the face of this globe do the people enjoy all of those liberties given to us by the founders of our Republic. Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of press must be maintained, and that is a particularly hard task during times such as these, when hysteria and emotionalism can readily sweep the land. We cannot retain our freedoms and our form of government if we vest vast dictatorial powers in one man. Congress must save unto itself the rights granted to it under the Constitution. Not only must Congress lead the way toward preservation of our Republic but every American must act with wisdom, courage, and cool-headedness to protect the American way of life.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor indeed to follow the very capable gentleman from Minnesota, whom we all know and recognize in the few weeks he has been here as a man of such abilities that he will soon become one of the most able Members of this body. [Applause.] Likewise, Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to come this far down the line toward the end in this debate. I hope the remarks I have to make will not prove the least valuable.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on this bill in the last 3 days. This bill unquestionably is one of the most important measures ever to come before the Congress of the United States. Let us go back through history. We recall that in the year 1776 we came into being as a Nation.

In that year we were engaged in a war with Great Britain which sought to continue to rule us under a colonial status. We wrested from England our independence and became a great nation. Washington and Jefferson warned us repeatedly against further involvement in the power politics of Europe, in their constant turmoil and strife. Throughout all the years up to the World War we followed their mandate and became perhaps the greatest Nation on earth. During this debate, Mr. Chairman, some of the historians in the House have recalled to our minds the fact that the Monroe Doctrine was brought into being against whom? Against the dangers of encroachment by the British Empire in this hemisphere.

We were told that during the Civil War Great Britain sought to tear our nation asunder; and we were told that in the World War, after England had spent some \$100,000,000 or more on propaganda, they got us involved in that war on their side in order to have the world for democracy. At the end of that war who wrote the peace terms? England; and we became known as Uncle Shylock. That was the kind of gratitude we got. That was a war to end all wars, the war to make the world safe for democracy, but we have seen on the continent of Europe the rising of the dictators, the overrunning of democracy after democracy. No one in America has any faith, or any love, or any admiration for the dictators of Europe. We are all opposed to them. For that reason our sympathies unquestionably are at this time with the British people and the brave fight they are putting up.

This is not our war, the American people had no word in the start of it, and we shall have nothing to say when it is over. You can bet your life on that. Still some of us are concerned by reports that our leaders did perhaps make certain now embarrassing commitments before the start of this war. But we are in the middle of the stream, we are committed to aid to England, and we must carry that out, but let us not do it to the detriment of ourselves.

Last fall, in case some of you have forgotten, there was a political campaign in this country. Under our form of gov-

ernment we are governed by what are commonly known as politicians, and every so often we have a political campaign; we make speeches to the people and tell them what we will try to do for them, what we will stand for if elected. Some of us have very short memories, apparently. I do not know of a single man in this country, certainly neither of the leading Presidential candidates, who had the effrontery to run on any platform of "all out" aid for England—or any other nation.

If he had he would have gone down to the most ignominious defeat in the political history of this country. For myself, I campaigned on four definite pledges, among others: First of all, that I would not vote for any measure which I thought was a step leading to war. In my opinion, this bill is another step toward war, hence I am opposed to it. I intend to keep that pledge and keep faith with the people who sent me down here. [Applause.] Second, I said I would vote for no measure that had for its purpose the granting to the President of the United States or to the office of the President of the United States, regardless of who the occupant may be, now or in the future, any additional powers which were guaranteed by the Constitution to the Congress of the United States. This bill unquestionably does grant those powers, hence I am opposed to it. Let us do our job. It is not fair or fearless to pass the buck to somebody else. Point 3, aid to England? Yes; in view of the fact that we are in the middle of the stream, but not to the extent of sacrificing our own defense.

We have heard said on the floor of this House that General Marshall has testified that we have today in the United States Air Corps not one single modern fighting aircraft. We are shipping them all overseas; we are denuding our defenses; and now it seems we are going to go even further. My fourth pledge was that we should build our defense and make it impregnable. We cannot do that by shipping everything overseas as fast as it comes off the line. We must give our own boys something modern with which to train and with which to fight. We have heard it said in the well of this House that if Hitler wins this war we shall come next. There are those who would make you believe he would do so in the next 30 days; but what are we going to be doing in the meantime? If we build our defenses as we should and make our own shores impregnable, neither Hitler, Mussolini, the Japanese, nor the whole world could land a soldier on the shores of the United States and push us back from that shore line.

With respect to the bill before us, I want to ask a few questions. Last summer the membership will recall the Congress refused to go home when it was told to go home, told there was no more legislation to come up. We stayed here and we voted some \$10,000,000,000 and upward for national defense. We stayed here in Washington through all the heat and on into the fall. Many of us did not have time to get home to campaign sufficiently, and some Members are missing as a result. I ask you: Why

was not this bill or a similar one introduced in Congress at that time?

Oh, you may say it was not politically expedient to do so at that time. All right. We know that Hitler failed in his attempt to cross the English Channel, a little body of 22 miles of water, last fall. Is there anybody in this country today who doubted that he would make the attempt again this spring? Yet we are told today that we must rush this bill through in order to help England in a crisis which is coming up in 60 to 90 days. We knew last fall that this crisis was coming. Why was not this bill introduced at that time? Congress was in session within a week after the election. The same President had been reelected. There was no change in the administration. Why was not the measure brought out on the floor at that time?

Before our Foreign Affairs Committee each Cabinet member was asked just what change in the British emergency situation had come about since the election of last fall to make prompt action on this bill so imperative now. The answer was invariably, "Nothing."

We are now told that England's dollar assets are gone. Did anybody in the Government not know that last fall? Did Secretary Morgenthau not know last fall that England's dollar assets were becoming depleted? If so, why did he not bring the bill out then? The testimony before the committee is unmistakably to the effect that Secretary Morgenthau wrote this measure. Why did he not bring it out last fall? Why wait until January? Why come along to Christmas week and find the President with his usual suave delivery over the radio, alarm a peace-loving American people about the danger of an immediate invasion, and then state that we must become the arsenal for the democracies of the world? I ask again, why was not that speech not made months before Christmas?

A new Congress comes into being, and the Chief Executive comes down here to the Congress, and he tells us we must pass this bill right now to save England. Yet we asked the defense production chief, Mr. Knudsen, whether this bill will in any way speed up the defense of America or speed up aid to England, and the answer was unmistakably "No."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is the same old stall. We are asked to rush this bill through. We are asked to grant more power in the hands of the Executive which belongs to the Congress of the United States. We are told, yes, the Congress can control this power because it still has the power of the purse strings.

Mr. Chairman, it has been proven on the floor of this House unmistakably by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] that under this bill he would have control right now of \$40,000,000,000 worth of American arms and ammunition, either now in existence in our Army, Navy, Marine Corps and air force or in the process of manufacture at this time. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr.

JONKMAN], a member of the committee, stated that was a most conservative estimate. All of this can be turned over not only to England but to China, Greece, or to Russia or any other nation that the President deems is acting in the defense of the United States.

Why is this so serious? Simply because under this bill we are actually asked to create in the office of the President of the United States the office of quartermaster general of the armies now or hereafter in opposition to the Axis Powers. When we delegate this power, when we attempt to place in the hands of the Chief Executive of this Nation the quartermaster generalship of all the armies fighting the war in opposition to the Axis Powers, this Government, the President, and the people of the United States assume the strategy of the war, and we guarantee that the war must go through to a successful conclusion. It must follow that we underwrite the success of the war. We underwrite the cost of war, in munitions, money, and, finally, of necessity, manpower.

It is said that we are keeping the war away from our shores. Possibly we will, and we hope to God we will, but I want to ask just one final question. For the past year and a half Germany, with the greatest army on the face of the earth today, aside from the American people, with 6,000,000 men under arms, has found it impossible to cross 22 miles of the English Channel against a Britain that has only one and one-half million men under arms.

Now, then, if this war is to be brought to a successful conclusion, the Germans must be driven back to Berlin as they should have been in 1918. We have cast the die, or the President did in his fire-side chat. Hitler must be completely smashed in order to win this war—for England. If this is to be done, who else but ourselves can supply the four and one-half million men required to balance Hitler's manpower—who will logically be expected to furnish it—"Uncle Shylock," of course. No, Mr. Chairman, talk all you will, and I do not doubt the sincerity of any Member of this House when he says his sole interest is to keep our boys out of foreign wars, but, I repeat, I see no possible ultimate alternative but that there will, of necessity, be another A. E. F. To many of your memories these hallowed letters of the alphabet mean another American Expeditionary Force, but this time, having carefully watched propaganda get in its deadly work, to me they mean After England Failed to finish her own war—without American boys. It will not come soon. Today we learn that England does not need men. Very obviously, where could she use them? But watch out; before long will come the awaited blitzkrieg. England may then become short of pilots, where will she get them? Our flying fortresses are going over; we are supposed to have the only trained crews in the world who can efficiently fight them—and we are presumed to have some good fighters in our air force as well—though our policy has not permitted them to fly the modern ships now going to Britain. Who will soon be called upon to convoy ships? You guess.

But some day, Mr. Chairman, there will be a peace come to Europe again—we all pray that day be not far off—but I ask this question: Will England again write the peace terms? And will we again be called "Uncle Shylock" when, if ever, we have the temerity to ask for payment—in kind or equivalent—for our aid in the form of first, munitions; secondly, our money; and thirdly, our manpower if that comes to pass? Will "Uncle Shylock" again apply to American Gold Star Mothers and widows? Will "Uncle Shylock" again be applied to widowed expectant mothers, to fatherless boys and girls, of our land? Oh, I pray not and I think not.

Mr. Chairman, in the year 1776 we got rid of our colonial status; I pray that we guard well lest House Resolution 1776 now result in our being graciously granted Dominion status by Great Britain.

After all, let us face this issue as Americans and let us remember our oath as Representatives of the American people who sent us down here. Our duty is clear. It is to save America for Americans, let the chips fall where they may. Let us be and remain Americans. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, we have no more requests for time on this side.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GORE] having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I have just made in the Committee of the Whole certain excerpts from the Republican and Democratic platforms of last fall, as well as certain remarks made by the principal candidates during the campaign.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made while we were in Committee of the Whole by adding certain excerpts from the Senate Naval Affairs Committee report and from other documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short letter from the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Springfield, Mo., relative to the pending bill, also a brief Associated Press dispatch from the Washington Post of today relative to the

shipment of English and Canadian gold to the United States.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 6, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARING

The Committee on Agriculture will hold a hearing on Tuesday, February 11, 1941, at 10 a. m., on H. J. Res. 15 in Room 1324, New House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

172. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed bill for the relief of Mrs. Addie Myers, widow of L. A. Myers; to the Committee on Claims.

173. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting descriptive lists of all records authorized for disposition by him since the adjournment of the Seventy-sixth Congress, third session; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

174. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1941 (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

175. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of State, for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to \$11,500, and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation, "Salaries, ambassadors and ministers," of the Department (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 562. A bill to provide for the establishment, administration, and maintenance of a Coast Guard Auxiliary and a Coast Guard Reserve; with amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KING: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 591. A bill to permit alien wives of American citizens who were

married prior to the approval of the Immigration Act of 1924 to enter the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the Union Calendar.

Mr. KING: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 590. A bill to extend further time for naturalization of alien veterans of ineligible race who served in the armed forces of the United States during the World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MOSER: Committee on the Census. H. R. 2665. A bill to provide for apportioning Representatives in Congress among the several States by the equal-proportions method; without amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MOSER: Committee on the Census. H. R. 1619. A bill to provide for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Sixteenth Census; without amendment (Rept. No. 31). 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. KING: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 727. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wilhelm Wolfgang Krauss; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 724. A bill for the relief of Gloria D. Downing and George Cornfield; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2199) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hurry; 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. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3093. A bill to provide for the appointment of a bailiff by each district judge in a United States district court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3094. A bill granting pensions and other benefits to veterans and former service men, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3095. A bill authorizing the construction of a highway to Alaska; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD:

H. R. 3096. A bill to prohibit discrimination against persons employed or seeking employment on national defense or other Government contracts because of the age, sex, race, or color of such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3097. A 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.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 3098. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to amend the Schedule of Disability Ratings, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3099. A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto a new section 247e, relating to the interception of wire or radio communications by persons employed in the investigation, detection, or prevention of offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3100. A bill to establish uniform procedure relative to the proof of age, place of birth, or of death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 3101. A bill providing for equalization of taxes in counties where there are Government-owned lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 3102. A bill to restore the 2-cent postage rate on first-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3103. A bill making eligible, under the Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, for admission to the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, or for any other governmental work, veterans otherwise qualified but whose names do not appear on the relief rolls; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3104. A bill granting pensions to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, and the World War, their widows, and dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3105. A bill to promote peace and the national defense through a more equal distribution of burdens of war by drafting the use of money according to ability to lend to the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3106. A bill to provide that World War veterans who are totally and permanently disabled from nonservice causes shall be entitled to pension without regard to the length of service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3107. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3108. A bill for the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3109. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide annuities for individuals who are totally and permanently disabled and have completed 15 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 3124. A bill to provide for the retirement, rank, and pay of chiefs of branches or arms of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3125. A bill to grant pensions and increases of pensions to widows and children and other dependents of veterans who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service in the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 3126. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on the Arkansas River at Tulsa and West Tulsa, Okla., for flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 3127. A bill relating to mileage tables for the United States Army and other Government agencies and to mileage allowances for persons employed in the offices of members of the House and Senate; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3128. A bill making oppression by Federal officers a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEITER:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution for the relief of the distressed and starving men, women, and children of Poland and other similarly afflicted areas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution defining and classifying gratuity expenditures or disbursements allowable as offsets in favor of the United States and against claims of Indian nations, tribes, or bands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution providing for the payment of war debts by the acquisition of funds in the United States and certain possessions in the Western Hemisphere of countries in default in the payment of such war debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 96. Resolution providing for the salary of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 3110. A bill for the relief of Thomas Green Wiggins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 3111. A bill for the relief of Andrew Kovacs; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURGIN:

H. R. 3112. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Boyd, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 3113. A bill for the relief of Cecil Higginbotham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of the Pas-saic Valley Sewerage Commissioners; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3115. A bill for the relief of Elmer Edward Mynatt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNS:

H. R. 3116. A bill for the relief of Ernest Melotte and Mary Melotte; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3117. A bill for the relief of Jacques (Giacomo) Medvedeff; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 3118. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund of California; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3119. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund of California; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3120. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Policeman William F. Fey and his resultant dismissal and to reinstate William F. Fey to his former position as a member of the Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 3121. A bill for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 3122. A bill awarding the Distinguished Service Medal to Joseph Ernest Shafer, ex-seaman, second class, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 3123. A bill granting a pension to Alice Laureine Jones; 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:

204. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., on January 21, 1941, opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

205. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in the San Joaquin Valley, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

206. Also, 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 Military Affairs.

207. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 6, relating to the construction of necessary roads required by the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

208. Also, 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.

209. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, memorializing Congress to amend the Social Security Act with reference to the exempt income rights accorded persons receiving old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

210. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 8, relating to excess-profits-tax legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

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

213. Also, 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 Military Affairs.

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

215. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of Governor Nicholas Cocks Chapter, D. A. R., on the subject of national defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

217. Also, petition of Mrs. G. N. Yagle, Red Lion, Pa., and other citizens of that community, urging proper protection of the young men in the various training camps throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

218. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of W. H. Jacob, president, Dallas City Townsend Club, and 375 other members concerning old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

219. By Mr. MCINTYRE. Memorial of the the House of Representatives, Twenty-sixth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Reclamation Act and the Case-Wheeler Act (Public, No. 848, 76th Cong.) relating to water rights for supplemental water supply; to the Committee on Immigration and Reclamation.

220. By Mr. RICH: Resolution adopted by the Olkosky-Jessop Post, No. 194, American Legion, of Emporium, Pa.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

221. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of the Vermont State Chamber of Commerce, urging further increase and the speeding up of material aid to Great Britain and, if deemed needful for the protection of the United States and the Americas and Great Britain, the extension of financial aid to Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

222. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Polish Falcons, Z. B. No. 1, of South Bend, Ind., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to safety and security of this Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

223. Also, petition of Adequate National Defense Association, Norfolk, Va., and Old Dominion Post, No. 158, Jewish War Veterans, Norfolk, Va., urging consideration of their resolutions with reference to national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1941

Rev. Roy Ewing Vale, D. D., minister of the Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, Indianapolis, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our gracious and loving Heavenly Father: We pray Thee to bless this day the Senate of the United States. As these Thy servants seek to do that which is wise and right for the Nation, wilt Thou by Thy wisdom guide in all thought and decision?

We beseech Thy merciful favor upon all the people of our land; and as those in places of government, both national and local, from the President and the Senate to the humblest magistrate, carry forward their responsibilities, may they by the power of Thy Spirit lead us in the ways of a nation whose God is the Lord.

We speak our prayer that these days of agony in the world may be shortened, and that upon the earth there may come a tranquility wherein shall be established justice and peace for all men. To this high purpose, guide all our deeds, Almighty God.

These things we ask in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 3, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Calloway, one of its