

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for, and to direct construction of, such highway and tunnel between Honolulu and the windward side of the island of Oahu, on a location where it would most advantageously serve the Army and Navy and the civil population; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to award national-defense contracts as rapidly as possible to Michigan concerns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take into consideration and expansion plans of the Michigan Northern Power Co.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a bill providing for the withdrawal of certain Hawaiian home lands required for additions to Hilo and Molokai Airports; to the Committee on the Territories.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 5916. A bill for the relief of Allen F. McLean; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 5917. A bill for the relief of August W. Dietz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 5918. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ethel H. Chaffee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 5919. A bill for the relief of Wilson D. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 5920. A bill for the relief of E. A. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1952. By Mr. HOFFMAN: Petition of 117 citizens of Allegan, Mich., and vicinity, respectfully urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1953. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the executive board of Local 54, United Shoe Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, for national American All Week; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1954. Also, petition of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an increase in salary for navy-yard employees; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1955. Also, petition of the National Association of Life Underwriters, New York City, favoring the Government's program to finance national defense through the sale of defense savings bonds and stamps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1956. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, New York City, favoring House bill 5730, the Sheridan bill, known as the Federal workers minimum wage bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1957. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Machine and Instrument Local No. 475, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the question of the use of labor battalions to replace civilian employees; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1958. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Los Angeles (Calif.) District Council of Painters, No. 36, requesting that defense housing projects should be managed by local housing authorities, and the practice of setting up additional agencies for projects should be abolished; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1959. Also, petition of the Los Angeles (Calif.) District Council of Painters, petitioning the various Federal officials and agencies entrusted with the responsibilities of granting priorities, to grant such priorities to all United States Housing Authority-aided projects in conformity with the needs in the local communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1960. Also, petition of the Los Angeles (Calif.) Lathers Local No. 42A, objecting to the setting up of additional housing organizations for the construction of defense housing projects and to let the local housing authorities, who are acquainted with local conditions, handle defense housing projects in their immediate locality; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1961. Also, petition of the Los Angeles (Calif.) Lathers Local No. 42A, requesting various Federal officials and agencies entrusted with the granting of priorities to grant such priorities to all United States Housing Authority-aided projects in conformity with local community needs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1962. Also, petition of the Los Angeles, Calif., Moving Picture Projectionists, Local No. 150, expressing their disapproval of special organizations being set up for the construction and management of defense housing, and they contend that local organizations, that are acquainted with conditions, should have control of these projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1963. Also, petition of the membership of the Los Angeles, Calif., Smelter and Brass Workers Union, Local No. 468, going on record as being opposed to House bill 3; the Hobbs concentration camp bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1964. Also, petition of the United Rubber Workers of America, Local No. 100, Los Angeles, Calif., unanimously going on record supporting any modification of the Neutrality Act proposed by President Roosevelt or the administration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1965. Also, petition of the Laborers Local Union, No. 300, Los Angeles, Calif., opposing setting up additional organizations for construction of defense housing, and recommending that local housing authorities should handle that work wherever local organizations are operating, because of the knowledge of the country and climate by the local group; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1966. Also, petition of the Laborer's Local Union, No. 300, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning those Federal agencies that have the burden of allotting priorities, to grant such priorities to all United States Housing Authority aided projects in conformity with housing needs of the community in which they are located; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1967. Also, petition of the Civic Leaders Club, of Los Angeles, Calif., expressing their regret in the delay of the repealing of the Neutrality Act, and requesting each Member of the Senate, Republican or Democrat, to act immediately to arm our ships for

defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1968. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 2131, board of supervisors, San Francisco, Calif., memorializing Congress to enact Senate bill 1201, providing for uniform method of payments to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1969. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to enact Senate bill 1201, providing for uniform method of payments to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1970. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan, urging safeguarding of the interests of the American farmer in the event any ceiling is placed upon farm prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1971. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of the Men's Fellowship Class, Inc., Topeka, Kans., requesting the Seventy-seventh Congress to amend title I of the Social Security Act in accordance with House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1972. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Ohio Old-Age Pension Society, Akron, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1973. Also, petition of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, Leather Workers Division, Local 20, Lynn, Mass., urging Congress to enact House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1974. Also, petition of the United Automobile Workers of America, Plymouth Local Union No. 51, Detroit, Mich., urging the defeat of all anti-alien bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1975. Also, petition of the Atlantic District Local No. 2, American Communications Association, Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York, urging defeat of all anti-alien bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1976. Also, petition of the United American Defense Committee, Los Angeles, Calif., refuting the charges made by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE in introducing Senate Resolution 176; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1977. By Mr. MAHON: Petition of the officers of the Floydada National Farm Loan Association, of Floydada, Tex., advocating improvement of the farm program, especially as it relates to small diversified farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, October 27, 1941)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer: Almighty God, Father of all mankind, who in wisdom hath created all things and in whom all things created live: Look now upon us as, at Thy gracious call, we stand at the entering in of the way of another day of service.

Incline Thine ear and hearken unto us as we go about our tasks; give us true repentance for all our sins past; have Thou our spirits with the waters pure and undefiled, proceeding from Thy throne, then pour on us Thy light of faith and

hope, in joy and love, and may this be our prayer of utter consecration—

God be in my head,  
And in my understanding;  
God be in mine eyes,  
And in my looking;  
God be in my mouth,  
And in my speaking;  
God be in my heart,  
And in my thinking;  
God be at mine end,  
And at my departing.

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 the calendar day of Monday, October 27, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on October 27, 1941, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 260) to permit mining within the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument in Arizona.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5903) to amend the United States Housing Act, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. I announce the necessary absence of the following Senators:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

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

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 27th instant,

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on October 27, 1941, he affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5788) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been signed previously by the Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

#### ALLOCATIONS, ETC., BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—DEFENSE SHELTERS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report as of August 31, 1941, of allocations, obligations, and expenditures made from several appropriations by the Farm Security Administration, which was designated by the President to provide temporary defense shelter in certain localities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PETITIONS

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

#### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-first Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii convened in special session (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested to enact a bill in the form hereto annexed, providing for the withdrawal of certain Hawaiian homelands required for additions to Hilo and Molokai Airports; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, further respectfully requested to amend section 207 (1) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 by adding thereto a new paragraph to be numbered '(c)' to read as follows:

"(c) The commission is also authorized, with the approval of the Governor, to grant licenses to the United States for terms not to exceed 5 years, for reservations, roads, and

other rights-of-way, water storage, and distribution facilities and practice target ranges: Provided, That any such license may be extended from time to time by the commission, with the approval of the Governor, for additional terms of 3 years: And provided further, That any such license shall not restrict the areas required by the commission in carrying on its duties, nor interfere in any way with the commission's operation or maintenance activities."

"And be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

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

By Mr. CAPPER:

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

#### SUBSTITUTION OF OLEOMARGARINE FOR BUTTER IN NAVY RATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution unanimously adopted by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture at a special meeting in Kansas City Monday, October 20, 1941. The resolution voices a protest against the passage of Senate bill 1959, which would authorize the Navy to substitute oleomargarine for butter in the daily ration.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will heed this protest and refuse to pass this measure. Oleo, which has its uses, is not a substitute for butter. According to the experts, it does not contain the strength-building qualities of butter. It may be colored and dressed up to look like butter and to taste almost like butter, but it is not butter. Butter from good, rich milk is beyond comparison in nutritive value, and the boys in the Navy are entitled to butter. They should not be forced to eat oleo instead.

I send the resolution and accompanying letter to the desk for printing in the RECORD and ask that the resolution itself be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and, with the accompanying letter, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,  
Topeka, October 24, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: As directed, I am transmitting herewith copy of resolution adopted by this board Monday of this week in opposition to S. 1959, which would authorize the Navy to substitute oleo for butter.

Certainly the Navy hasn't been wrong all these years in insisting upon butter for its men. Most assuredly this is no time to lower dietary standards and there is no occasion for it with record-breaking stocks of butter to draw upon.

Very truly yours,  
J. C. MOHLER, *Secretary.*

Resolution relating to S. 1959 unanimously adopted by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture at its regularly called meeting at Kansas City, Monday, October 20, 1941:

"That important arm of our Military Establishment, the United States Navy, is entitled to and should have the best daily ration it is possible to afford for health, strength, and stamina. Butter, which health authorities universally recognize as superior in nutritive and resistance building qualities, is and has been a most valuable contribution of their ration, a product that has efficiently sustained our armed forces in their glorious victories throughout the history of this Nation. There is no substitute for butter, and as packed under governmental supervision in hermetically sealed tins, it successfully withstands any and all climatic and other conditions.

"We, the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, convened in regular quarterly meeting, wish to express our strongest opposition to Senate bill 1959, which would authorize the Navy to substitute oleomargarine for butter in the daily ration.

"The Secretary is hereby directed to mail copies of this resolution to members of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee and to all Kansas Senators and Representatives."

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. TYDINGS), from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5077. A bill to approve Act No. 112 of the Session Laws of 1941 of the Territory of Hawaii entitled "An act to amend Act 101 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1921, relating to the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of North and South Hilo and Puna, in the county of Hawaii, so as to extend the franchise to the district of Kau and South Kohala in said county, and extend the term thereof as to the town of Hilo"; without amendment (Rept. No. 767).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 5203. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of February 24, 1933, and of the act of June 29, 1940, to proceedings to punish for criminal contempt of court; without amendment (Rept. No. 768).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4226. A bill to provide for the construction of a Coast Guard cutter designed for ice-breaking and assistance work on the Great Lakes; without amendment (Rept. No. 770).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to declare abandoned the title of the city of Marquette, Mich., to certain land in the county of Marquette, and to vest control of such land in the Secretary of the Treasury for Coast Guard purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 771).

#### STUDY OF THE TELEGRAPH INDUSTRY (REPT. NO. 769)

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, pursuant to Senate Resolution 95, Seventy-sixth Congress (extended by S. Res. 268, 76th Cong.), submitted a report of a study of

the telegraph industry in the United States, which was ordered to be printed.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On October 24, 1941:

S. 1713. An act to amend Public Law No. 718, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 25, 1938; and

S. 1772. An act to authorize Army officers designated by the Secretary of War to take final action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property.

On October 27, 1941:

S. 1508. An act to provide for the pay of aviation pilots in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 1701. An act to provide for pay and allowances and mileage or transportation for certain officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve and retired officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; and

S. 1708. An act for the relief of Susannah Sanchez.

#### BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. NYE introduced a bill (S. 2016) relating to the appointment of Members of or Delegates to Congress or of Resident Commissioners to any office in the judicial branch of the Government, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5903) to amend the United States Housing Act, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 184), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 293, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, is hereby increased by \$25,000.

#### NAVY DAY ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President on October 27, 1941, at the dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., in celebration of Navy Day, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NAVY DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Navy Day celebration on Boston Common, Mass., October 27, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NAVY DAY ADDRESS BY SECRETARY KNOX

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Knox, at the Naval and Total Defense Day luncheon held at the Hotel Statler, Detroit, Mich., October 27, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NAVY DAY ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL STARK

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Admiral Harold R. Stark, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, at the Navy Day dinner held in Chicago, Ill., October 27, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE SHOW-DOWN HAS COME—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of today, entitled "The Show-down Has Come," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### A JOB LAW THREAT—EDITORIAL FROM MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of October 25, 1941, entitled "A Job Law Threat," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DR. CHARLES E. FAIRMAN

[Mr. ALLEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem addressed to Dr. Charles E. Fairman by Horace C. Carlisle, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF J. JOSEPH SMITH

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I respectfully ask that, as in executive session, the Senate consider the pending nomination of Representative J. JOSEPH SMITH to be United States district judge for the district of Connecticut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination as in executive session?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in executive session, proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I respectfully ask for the confirmation of the nomination. The urgency of the situation in Connecticut requires that action be taken at once, and that whatever can be done properly to expedite the execution of the commission be done today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, so that there will be no question as to assurance to other members of the Judiciary Committee who may not have been present at the time, let me say that the Judiciary Committee unanimously reported favorable action on the nomination of Representative SMITH of Connecticut, who is an especially qualified and capable man.

I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

#### STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, to me no more disgraceful or humiliating episode has ever occurred in our history than the determination of John Lewis to close the coal mines, on which are dependent for their coal supply the steel-manufacturing plants having vital defense contracts. To me this was disgraceful, in that an arrogant labor leader defied the Government in time of great crisis; and it was

humiliating because the President of the United States wrote three humble and pleading letters, with the result that his requests were refused.

It is, of course, true that the administration is merely reaping today the rewards of its own policies. From the very beginning of strikes in defense industries the administration has refused to deal firmly with this serious threat to our preparedness program. Halfway measures have been adopted, which have been ineffective to prevent these strikes, until the culmination of strike after strike has resulted in a menacing delay in our entire program of preparedness and aid to Great Britain.

Strike after strike continues to occur, and there has never been a time for more than a year when many major strikes were not in existence, sabotaging our defense production.

The report of the Secretary of Labor, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, shows that in August 1941 there were twice as many man-days idle, including all strikes, as in November 1940.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Virginia is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

November monthly labor review

Year and month	Number of strikes			Workers involved in strikes			Man-days idle during month or year
	Beginning in month or year	In progress during month	Ending in month	Beginning in month or year	In progress during month	Ending in month	
1940							
Nov.....	207	373	243	62,399	101,532	82,571	739,807
Dec.....	147	277	168	42,615	61,576	43,605	458,314
1941							
Jan.....	231	340	216	91,512	109,453	53,834	660,275
Feb.....	252	376	229	69,752	125,401	64,905	1,130,355
Mar.....	334	481	304	116,241	176,737	123,603	1,552,979
Apr.....	378	555	374	110,482	253,616	468,328	7,096,228
May.....	440	621	428	139,457	420,345	339,613	2,180,315
June.....	324	517	352	139,848	220,580	142,835	1,458,765
July.....	400	565	370	137,853	215,398	129,707	1,290,039
Aug.....	460			190,000			1,825,000

<sup>1</sup> Succeeding reports may show slightly different figures for the various months due to corrections and additions made as later information is received.

Mr. BYRD. Constructive legislation to prevent strikes in defense industries is now pending in both the House and the Senate. This legislation is lying dormant because it has not received the approval of the administration, nor has any other constructive legislation been recommended by the President. With the control the President now exercises over Congress, it must be obvious to all that nothing can be accomplished without Executive approval and support.

The present machinery to settle strikes has been shown to be ineffective, as the National Defense Mediation Board has no power to initiate investigations without first obtaining the consent of the Secretary of Labor, and then has no power to enforce its decisions. It can neither begin nor conclude.

Taking over strike-bound plants for Government operation is not a solution of the strike problem, and can be done only in extreme instances.

On June 9 I introduced in the Senate a resolution providing that strikes that affect the national-defense effort should be declared "contrary to sound public policy and are hereby condemned." This resolution passed the Senate by 46 to 25, but has not as yet been acted upon in the House of Representatives.

Legislation to control defense strikes is already pending in both branches of Congress, and has been lying dormant in both Houses. It can be given life only by the approval of the President.

The experience of the past few months in connection with the efforts of individual representatives in both branches of Congress to enact immediate legislation is conclusive evidence that under the conditions now existing, nothing can be done until the President of the United States is willing to meet this issue with firm measures, and meet it in such a way as to settle definitely the policy that strikes in defense industries in this hour of emergency are contrary to sound public policy and must be stopped. By taking firm measures President Wilson stopped the defense strikes in his administration. It can be done now.

My views with respect to this arrogant action on the part of Mr. Lewis are expressed in a public statement I issued last night, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The statement is as follows:

I know of no more disgraceful or humiliating episode in American history than John L. Lewis' action closing the coal mines, essential to the operation of the steel plants, all with vital defense contracts. The letter from the President to Mr. Lewis is couched in such polite and diplomatic language as to be almost abject in presenting his plea to Mr. Lewis to keep the mines open.

The mines were still closed, John Lewis knows the power of force and despises weakness. Perhaps Lewis would have responded more quickly to a demand in stronger, more emphatic, and direct language.

I have repeatedly said on the floor of the Senate that John Lewis considers himself stronger and bigger than the Government of the United States.

During the process of the coal strike in April I stated in the Senate that the April strike placed the country, in the future, at the mercy of John Lewis. Coal reserves have been depleted and subsequent events have sustained my April statements. Thirty million tons of coal production were lost in this strike, and it was not certified to the National Defense Mediation Board by Madam Perkins, Secretary of Labor, until nearly 4 weeks after its beginning.

So now it is in the power of Mr. Lewis to close up as tight as a drum every coal-dependent defense industry in America.

Even upon withdrawal of this action by Mr. Lewis, it is still the multiplicity of strike after strike, delay after delay, that has sabotaged our defense efforts for many months. From January 1, until now, more than 7,000,000 man-days have been lost in defense strikes alone, and these man-days lost are equivalent to the time required to build more than 1,000 4-engine heavy bombers, which could have been sent to England to bomb Hitler when he was engaged in Russia. In-

stead, only about 40 have been sent. But the actual man-days lost do not tell the whole story, as the confusion and disorganization incident to strikes and threatened strikes reduce appreciably the production capacity of those plants where strikes have existed or have been threatened.

We must recognize now that for the Government to take charge of the plants is not a solution of the strike problem, as this does not prevent the constant recurrence of other strikes. Today, from information sent me by the Army and Navy, 48 defense strikes are in existence, and this number or more have continued for many months. The afternoon papers report that the giant navy yards in Brooklyn are closed and that the shipyards in the Los Angeles area have been ordered to stop work.

I introduced legislation in the Senate declaring strikes in defense industries to be contrary to public policy and as deserving of the condemnation of Congress. This resolution was adopted by the Senate, after a long and heated debate, by a vote of 46 to 25. Not receiving the support of the administration, it was allowed to die in the House. In this emergency, with greater and greater powers being vested in the Executive, it must be obvious to all that constructive legislation to stop, and stop quickly, strikes in defense industries can only be achieved with the approval and support of the President.

The longer forceful action is delayed, the greater will be our failure to prepare ourselves and to send implements of war to England, when every hour, and in fact every minute, counts.

The present National Defense Mediation Board, established by Executive Order, by the very terms of its power, cannot be effective. It can neither begin nor conclude. It cannot even investigate a strike unless Madam Perkins, the Secretary of Labor, gives it permission, nor can it enforce its decisions after a verdict has been rendered.

No agency can be effective without the power in the original instance and without the power to make operative its decisions. The Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, remains in the face of her proven incompetence and a Nation-wide demand for her removal.

If we cannot meet at home the challenges to our defense effort, this, in itself, demonstrates our incapacity to solve the problems of foreign nations. We have menaces at home today as great or greater than those abroad, and these home menaces must be dealt with before we can hope to cope with the others.

Today the United States Senate is debating legislation which, in my sincere judgment, if and when enacted by the Congress under existing conditions will ultimately make a total and unlimited offensive shooting war on the part of the United States as inevitable as any human prediction can be today—a war that almost certainly will involve America on both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, and ultimately will mean sending millions of American boys in expedition forces to fight on foreign soils.

As a supporter, up to this date, of the President's foreign policies, I serve notice now that I do not intend to consider voting one step closer to war, except in our own defense, so long as sound and constructive measures are not adopted stopping at once all defense industry strikes and removing barriers of incompetency and inefficiency now permeating the defense program.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received, as I take it many other Members of this body have received, a letter from Mr. H. W. Hoover, from which I desire to read, for I think what I am about to read very appropriately follows the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]:

It is my strong feeling that this country needs a working creed at this time. Recently we had occasion to give expression to the creed which we would like to feel permeates our organization. It has turned out to be what we hope may help serve as a rededication of the whole country to the will to work. Because we feel that this message may be helpful in strengthening the purpose and determination of the American people, we are asking that publicity be given to that creed.

I ask that the creed be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### AMERICA'S WILL TO WORK

In 1776 a nation was born,  
Dedicated to the proposition that  
All men are created equal and  
All men have the birthright of work.

We fired shots heard 'round the world.  
We never gave up the ship.  
We held our fire till we saw the whites of  
their eyes.  
Then we went back to the job.

"When in the course of human events";  
"Not one cent for tribute—millions for de-  
fense";  
"One if by land" in that old church steeple;  
"Of the people, by the people, for the peo-  
ple."

Great words, soul-stirring words,  
To echo down the corridors of Time.  
But in between historic moments  
We chopped down trees; drove covered wag-  
ons;  
Laid out roads; bridged rivers;  
Staked out homesteads; built log cabins.

If liberty is worth anything, it is worth  
fighting for.  
If a country is worth fighting for, it is worth  
working for.

From 1776 to now is merely an eyeblink  
In the age of the world.  
Yet the country has come farther and done  
more  
In one-hundred-sixty-odd years  
Than any other nation in ten centuries.  
Courage was part of it;  
Foresight was part of it;  
Ingenuity was part of it;  
But nine-tenths of the job was  
Work—  
Work—

The will to work,  
And then more work.

No tree so big we couldn't chop it;  
No hill so high we couldn't top it;  
No stream so strong we couldn't shackle it;  
No job so tough we wouldn't tackle it.

We have worked harder than the  
Romans or Germans or French;  
We have gone farther;  
We will go farther still—  
If we don't forget how to work.

Our heroes worked—  
Our great men weren't afraid to use their  
hands.

Washington was a stock raiser and surveyor;  
Franklin was a printer;  
Jefferson was a farmer;  
Edison was a telegraph operator;  
Lincoln split rails;  
Paul Revere was a silversmith.

They pushed through the forest primeval,  
Clear through to the western shore;  
They tackled each job as they found it;  
They whipped it, and then asked for more.  
Heavy odds could never unnerve them.  
"Faith and work," the rallying cry.  
Though the day looked dark and the job  
looked tough,  
It was "Roll up your sleeves and try."

Covered-wagon days weren't holidays.  
Teaching prairies to bloom wasn't play.  
Building homes on the range was no picnic  
for wives and mothers.  
Bringing in a thousand head of cattle isn't a  
lazy man's job.

Ribbons of steel from east to west,  
Bridges and smokestacks and bustle;  
Work started them off; work saw them  
through—  
Just work and American muscle.

"Oh, beautiful for spacious skies \* \* \*";  
Oh, beautiful for clean, light factories;  
Oh, beautiful for long, white roads;  
Oh, beautiful for girdered bridges;  
Oh, beautiful for fertile farmlands;  
Oh, beautiful for mines and oil wells;  
Oh, beautiful for men at work—with the will  
to work.

"Heave-ho, my hearties";  
"Put the shoulder to the wheel";  
"Where there's a will there's a way";  
"Spit on your hands and do it."

The Irish came over to work more and fight  
less;  
The Swedes brought over their skill;  
The English expanded in this country;  
The Germans and the Italians,  
The Hungarians and the Letts,  
No matter their former fatherland,  
Joined America in the will to work.

Here men worked harder because  
There was more to work for.  
Here women worked harder because  
The American home was worth it.

We built better cars for us to drive;  
We built better radios for us to hear;  
We raised better foods for us to eat;  
We built better homes for us to live in.

Then came those easy-come, easy-go times.  
We got a little soft; we got a little flabby.  
"The music went round and round;  
"It went in there; it came out here."  
When it came to our will to work,  
It was pretty much "Let George do it"—and  
he didn't.

But when the whistle blew,  
By the dawn's early light,  
That will to work was still there.

Today America is working;  
America is working as it never worked before,  
As it has never wanted to work before—  
Free hands building faster planes;  
Free hands bringing in the sheaves;  
Free hands building stronger tanks;  
Machines turning; production moving; men  
at work;  
Free hands keeping America free.

Here no "Hell" to a foreman—  
No slaving in terror or dread—  
Of our own free will and volition  
We work for our daily bread.

Work, work, work, work,  
Work with a will—for we're free.  
Work, work, work, work,  
"From sea to shining sea."  
Work, work, work, work,  
"Our country, 'tis of thee."  
Work, work, work, work,  
"Sweet land of liberty."

#### MODIFICATION OF NEUTRALITY ACT

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

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment to the pending joint resolution, and I request that the amendment be read from the desk. It is brief, and undertakes to define sabotage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, and the clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend House Joint Resolution 237 by adding a new section, as follows:

#### SABOTAGE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

SEC. 3. (1) Whoever shall direct, order, or encourage any employee or employer of a plant or factory, or corporation engaged in the production of materials or articles ordered by any Department or Bureau or Cabinet official for the national defense, to do any act or omit to do any act or to stop work with intent to retard, hinder, or delay the production of any material or article ordered for the national defense, shall be guilty of the crime of sabotage against the defense of the United States of America, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or be imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both, as the trial court shall determine.

(2) Whenever two or more persons engaged in or employed in the production of materials or articles ordered by any department or bureau or Cabinet official of the United States for the national defense shall agree to do or omit to do any act with intent to retard, hinder, or delay the production of such materials or articles, such persons shall be guilty of conspiracy to sabotage the national defense of the United States and upon conviction shall be fined not exceeding \$10,000 or imprisoned not exceeding 5 years, or both, in the discretion of the trial court.

(3) Whoever by threat, insult, bribe, or force attempts to prevent any person from doing any work or duty in the production of materials or articles ordered by the executive department of the Government for the national defense shall be guilty of sabotage of the national defense of the United States and upon conviction shall be fined not exceeding \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, in the discretion of the trial court.

(4) This section shall be in force until the President or the Congress shall declare the national emergency, heretofore declared, to be at an end.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from North Carolina will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the amendment I have just proposed.

Of course, I am reluctant to offer an amendment to the pending joint resolution. I would not have done so had I not been convinced that the time has come, at the moment when we are framing an issue with foreign nations, also to frame an issue with people in this country who, under color of law and under claim of right, are doing more to retard, hinder, delay, and destroy the defense of this Republic than all the dictators, than all the foreign nations. So my amendment frames an issue.

The responsibility is not upon the President of the United States. The responsibility is upon the Congress of the United States. I intend to shoulder my share of the responsibility. I have undertaken to define sabotage against the defense of the United States in terms of action, of conspiracy, individual or collective, intended to retard, hinder, or delay the preparation of our defense.

I feel sure that the country, and I hope the Senate and the Congress as a whole will give a very great deal of attention to this subject at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the adoption of the joint resolution now before

the Senate would be direct authority from the Congress to the President to carry on an undeclared war against Germany, Italy, and Japan on all the oceans of the world and in all the ports into which seagoing ships may sail. If the Members of the Senate intend to keep their pledges to the people of the United States, pledges made by themselves, by their leaders, and by their parties, they can only vote "No" on the pending measure.

I intend today to present only one proposition, that the adoption of the resolution is equivalent to authorizing war. I recognize that there are many who feel that war is justified. There is every reason why they should support the resolution is equivalent to authorizing war. I recognize that there are many who feel that war is justified. There is myself am convinced that the entry of the United States into the present war would be unwise and useless and destructive in the end to our own people and our own Government.

The time given to the opponents of the pending measure, particularly those not on the Committee on Foreign Relations, has been so short that I have been unable to prepare my remarks on the general question, which is the real issue before us today, whether we should go to war; but there still seem to remain some remnants of the argument which was advanced when the lease-lend bill was before Congress, that this is in fact a move for peace. There are still in the President's statement, the message proposing the legislation, these words:

The revisions which I suggest do not call for a declaration of war any more than the Lend-Lease Act called for a declaration of war.

Technically, the President is correct. They do not call for a declaration of war. But the suggestion given to the people that we may remain at peace and still adopt this resolution is one which apparently has impressed some members of the public, and apparently is going to be a reason given by some of those who vote for the pending resolution for their support of it.

Mr. President, I cannot understand the position of those Senators. Those who have read the President's speeches, and those who heard his speech last night, can hardly doubt that he is proposing that the United States carry on an undeclared naval war, and that in the passage of this resolution he is asking Congress for authority for him to carry on such a war.

The repeal of sections 2 and 3 of the Neutrality Act would mean the dispatch of American ships into British ports through the submarine blockade of the Germans. It cannot be doubted that many of those ships would be sunk, and that many Americans would be drowned. It cannot be doubted that that would be the first result of our vote here to repeal the Neutrality Act, and authorize Americans and American ships, not only authorize them, but perhaps order them, to proceed into the battlefields of Europe.

It was just such sinkings and such deaths which took us into the World War. It is an almost inevitable cause of complete war. It is probably more likely to be so now than it was in the World

War, because now these ships would be invariably carrying contraband manufactured by the United States and shipped by us to the British in order to enable them to carry on war against Germany. There could hardly be any doubt in the mind of any German commander as to any such ship that it would be carrying contraband.

It is only because of the provisions of the Neutrality Act which we are asked to repeal that we are not at war today.

As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] pointed out, that is not really a neutrality act but an act to keep the United States out of war, and it has up to this time accomplished its purpose. If it had been carried out in good faith, there would be little danger of war today, instead of great danger of war.

After all, it is common sense. Regardless of international law, regardless of history, two great nations today are at war, and the actual battlefields of that war are the waters which surround Great Britain. There is no other battlefield between the English and the Germans except that battlefield into which we now are going to send our ships and our men. No neutral can venture into a battlefield without danger to its property and its citizens, and danger of becoming involved in war. Human nature being what it is, incidents involving American ships and American citizens are likely to lead to war, and because of the death of 11 men, or of 100 men, millions may be sent to slaughter.

It seems common sense to say that in the interest of all of us, Americans shall keep away from battlefields far from our own land. But more than anything else, the actual experience of the World War, the inevitable result of shipping contraband to a belligerent nation through such a zone, is conclusive proof of what will happen if we repeal this law.

#### 1. THE ARMS EMBARGO POLICY

Mr. President, I wish to review briefly the various foreign policies that this country has adopted since I have been a Member of the Senate. When I came here in 1939 the arms embargo was in effect. It prohibited the shipment of munitions of any kind to any belligerent nation. It was an extreme measure. Personally I did not favor it, and I voted for its repeal, because I felt that a policy of arms embargo—absolute refusal to permit anybody to come here and buy arms—was for the benefit of the strong nation, the nation which built up a great war-like force, and against the weak nation. But I voted for repeal of the measure principally because it was accompanied by provisions which reinstated in the law the cash-and-carry provisions of the former act which had then expired, and which were no longer in effect. If we had not enacted that law American ships could have gone through the war zone to Great Britain, unless they were actually carrying contraband.

#### 2. THE CASH-AND-CARRY POLICY UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED 2 YEARS AGO

We adopted then the policy No. 2, the cash-and-carry policy. That was just 2 years ago, and there are few Senators here who did not vote for that measure,

or at least of the Senators who are likely to vote for the pending measure there are very few who did not vote for the establishment of that cash-and-carry policy. I myself believe it was a sound policy. I believe it was the policy which has kept us out of war. I believe that the policy of saying that any persons may come here if they please and purchase goods, provided the title is transferred to them before the goods leave here, provided they pay for the goods, and provided they carry them away in their own ships, is the policy which is sound, and is the only policy which ever will keep the United States out of European wars.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that by the pending joint resolution nearly all the Senators are being asked to reverse the position which they took at that time, for those who voted for the repeal of the arms embargo and those who voted against it were unanimous in the belief that the establishment of the cash-and-carry policy was the best method of keeping the United States out of war. The record is full of statements which bear out that conclusion.

I should like to read what the President himself said in the campaign of 1940 about the neutrality law, in which he took credit for setting up this cash-and-carry system. He said at Madison Square Garden:

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps: We made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right? We made it clear that American investors who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right?

The President went on:

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent, and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right?

In all these ways—

The President said:

we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid becoming entangled through some episode beyond our borders. These were measures to keep us at peace. And through all the years of war since 1935, there has been no entanglement, and there will be no entanglement.

That was the statement of the President of the United States just about a year ago. That certainly was a pledge to the people of the United States that he intended to pursue the policy for which he was claiming credit.

The President today, by asking for the repeal of this law, is repudiating his promise made to the American people, and no future historian will question my statement.

There are plenty of Senators here who took very much the same position in favor of the establishment of the cash-and-carry policy, and I think it only fair to remind them what they said at that time. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] said this during the debate 2 years ago on the arms embargo:

I will say that the chief motive that induced me to give my allegiance to the cause of supporting the pending joint resolution

was precisely the proposition to withdraw from the waters of the earth our ships, where-by there might be incidents that would arouse our people and change them from their blessed state of desire for peace into a state of contention as to our rights, and finally, into a possible disposition to assert them, go forth in our strength, and pay the price.

This is still the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] speaking:

We are not going to get into this war. It is a European war. It is not our war. \* \* \* If we were to get into it I should think we were the greatest pack of fools history ever recorded.

Today, Senators, we are that pack of fools.

The majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], said:

The law which we are now proposing would have prevented these attacks upon, and losses of, property and lives, because both property and lives would have been withheld from the regions of danger resulting in their destruction or attack on them. The law we are proposing will keep American ships and American cargoes and American sailors and American travelers out of present regions of danger.

The majority leader said that if this law had been in effect during the World War we would not have become involved in the World War.

The present junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], then speaking in the House, said this:

How to keep America out of war is the fundamental issue. There is general agreement that we were drawn into the last war by three primary causes. War passions were inflamed by the sinking of American ships carrying supplies to belligerents, and by the drowning of American passengers on belligerent ships. Our self-interest was aroused by large credits to the Allies and the possibility of their loss. Each of these causes is removed by the pending legislation.

America can keep out of this war and the restriction on shipping and credits will be most helpful to this end we all alike desire.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] said this:

If I thought that repeal of the embargo would lead us into war, I certainly would not vote for it. But I believe, with the restriction the President's bill carries on American shipping to war zones and the cash-and-carry provisions on all shipments to belligerents, that it, if anything, will keep us out of war.

There are a few others. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who has now introduced an amendment to repeal sections 2 and 3 of the neutrality law, said this:

Yet we must make such sacrifices—

That is, by giving up the right to ship to Great Britain—

if we are to give to our citizens the larger degree of security which they demand, a security which we attain only by preventing the occasions which might incite public war feeling.

The result of the passage of the pending measure would obviously be to restore those incidents which might incite public war feeling.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] said:

What we want to do is to keep American ships out of the danger zones, so they will not be subject to seizure or any interference

or action by Britain or Germany or any other country.

I do not want to repeat the instances, but I do want to bring home as forcibly as I can that Members of the Senate are absolutely reversing every argument they made 2 years ago, and absolutely repudiating the reasons which actuated them at that time, unless they have come to the conclusion that they are voting for war, and that the time has come to vote for war.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] said:

I do not believe our boys will participate in this war, or that they will ever engage in any war across the seas, except by direction of the vote of the American public. On that I shall say "No."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] said:

In conclusion, I wish to say that I shall never again vote to send our boys into any European war. I so voted in 1917, but I shall never again vote that way. I shall never vote for any war except when another nation attacks us; and a man or a nation that will not fight when attacked is not much of a man and not much of a nation.

Mr. President, we are asked to repudiate the reasons which we then gave. I think there is only one argument to be made in answer to the arguments I have quoted from Senators who spoke at that time. That is the argument that now the time has come to go to war. Any Senator who wishes to go to war may well vote for the joint resolution. Otherwise I cannot see how Senators can explain their votes or in any way make them consistent with what they said 2 years ago, and what they necessarily pledged themselves to support when they ran for reelection—if they did—in 1940, and what their parties pledged for them at that time.

### 3. AID TO BRITAIN—SHORT OF WAR

Cash-and-carry was policy No. 2. Then we gradually adopted a third policy—perhaps only a modification of the second. For purposes of convenience I shall call it policy No. 3. After the downfall of France and the disaster at Dunkerque we added to the cash-and-carry policy the theory of aid to Britain short of war. That was the policy that prevailed during the entire election campaign of 1940. I do not know exactly what that aid to Britain implied. It was necessarily vague; but at the time it seemed to me very clearly to imply that we would organize our industry so that we could build tanks, airplanes, and every other kind of war material and make it available to be bought by the British.

Let me say that we could have done nothing at that time or since that would have been of more aid to the British than that one thing. That was the thing which Mr. Willkie emphasized in his campaign. That the thing to help the British was production of materials. Yet during that whole period we took practically no steps toward efficient organization of American industry. There was a Council of National Defense, made up of seven men, each one independent, without a chairman, each one reporting to the President. The machinery was so

cumbersome that the moment the election was over it was changed and another form of organization was attempted. Production of materials was the meaning of aid to Britain; and I think it is fairly clear that that is what aid to Britain meant to the candidates and to the parties.

The Democratic platform said this about aid to Britain:

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.

"Consistent with law," I suppose, meant the neutrality law. There was not the slightest suggestion that that law was to be repealed, and presumably the pledge meant that aid must be consistent with the neutrality law.

The Republican platform was approximately the same. With respect to aid to Britain it said:

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.

There never was a suggestion at any time during that campaign that the policy of aid to Britain short of war meant anything but what it said—aid to Britain short of war. There was nothing that indicated or in any way implied an intention to repeal the neutrality law. In fact, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie went far to make it clear that they were going to keep away from Europe altogether. Those were the pledges they gave to the American people. Those pledges have been frequently quoted here. President Roosevelt said:

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.

Mr. Willkie went a little further. At Cleveland on October 2, 1940, he said:

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

Policy No. 3 was the policy of aid to Britain short of war. If either of those gentlemen had advocated the repeal of the Neutrality Act he would have signed his own political death warrant. The other man would have won in that election, because the people wanted the pledge of peace. They would have repudiated any man who had said, "We will repeal the Neutrality Act and take our chance of war." I am afraid they would even have repudiated any man who had said, "In

this aid to Britain I intend to remove the cash provisions of the Neutrality Act and give Britain \$13,000,000,000." I do not think any candidate could have made such a statement and carried the suffrage of the American people. Such action was not part of that policy.

If that policy had been administered with fairness and in good faith and if we had in fact tried to aid Britain short of war, the policy would have worked. We could have kept out of the difficulty in which we now find ourselves. We could have built up our production much faster. We could have gone on. We certainly could have been 6 months or perhaps a year ahead of where we are now, and Britain and Russia might have had the material which they need and which they do not now have. That kind of aid to Britain would have been more effective than the repeal of the Neutrality Act and the substitution of American ship going to Britain for British ships going to Britain.

#### 4. THE LEASE-LEND POLICY DID NOT AUTHORIZE DELIVERY

That policy was an effective and reasonable policy and one that could have been successfully carried out. But the President was determined to go on, and so he came to foreign policy No. 4. Each policy was a step closer to war. He proposed the lease-lend bill. The lease-lend bill, of course, repealed the cash provisions of the Neutrality Act. It had not been mentioned before the campaign or during the campaign. There was not even a proposal to extend credits to Britain. I do not say that we should not have changed our policy and extended credits to Britain; but the lease-lend policy was still a policy that might have been administered without taking us into war. When that bill passed I said—and I now believe—that we gave authority to the President to take us into war if he should see fit to do so. But it was a policy that did not necessarily involve us in war.

There has been much talk to the effect that we must pass the pending measure to carry out the policy of the Lease-Lend Act, but the policy of the Lease-Lend Act never involved the idea of delivery of materials to England.

It is true that the Lease-Lend Act repealed the "cash" end of the cash-and-carry policy, but it did not repeal the "carry" end of that policy; and, after all, it was the "carry" end of the policy that was primarily dangerous in respect to involving us in war. That was the point on which practically every one spoke. That was the thing which practically got us into the World War, and that was the important end of the cash-and-carry policy.

The President himself, even in his message asking for the passage of the lease-lend bill, simply said:

I also ask this Congress for authority and for funds sufficient to manufacture additional munitions and war supplies of many kinds, to be turned over to those nations which are now in actual war with aggressor nations.

I recommend that we make it possible for those nations to continue to obtain war materials in the United States, \* \* \*

He did not say anything about delivering materials.

The lease-lend policy is a perfectly understandable policy. It is a policy of standing on the line of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, of defending ourselves, of building up a defense sufficiently strong so that no one will attack us, and then saying to the rest of the world, "We are not going to be concerned with your problems; but if any man is attacked unjustly, if any man is attacked by an aggressor, he may come here and get all the arms he needs with which to defend himself against that aggression."

That is the essence of the lease-lend policy. Of course, we remember the debates on the floor of the Senate as to whether that policy in any way involved a delivery policy. The distinguished Senator who was then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE], who certainly spoke for the administration in that regard, said this:

I do not think the word "transfer" means anything else in the family and group of words here used except the transfer of title, or the right of possession, or the right of use. I cannot conceive of it meaning anything else. Now, if there is anything else in the bill that gives rise to the worry that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has that deliveries might be made in danger areas, war zones, in places where we have forbidden our own ships to go, where the President has proclaimed they should not go, I should like to have the benefit of the Senator's statement about it. But if it arises out of the word "transfer," I frankly must say that we can give it no construction except the one that I think every one should give it as a realist. As found in the family of words it partakes of kinship to all of them. When you say "sell or lease," you are talking about titles, and the right of possession, and the right of use, and nothing else, so far as I can see.

But if there is some other provision in the bill that seems to give rise to a fear that the President of the United States will undertake to deliver defense articles in a zone of great danger—

Just exactly what he himself has done since that time, I may say—

where even our own merchant ships cannot go, then, as a realist, I do not understand it. I do not understand it any more, may I say to the Senator from Wyoming, than the argument that has been heard here that somebody has a design upon all the social legislation that labor and the workers of America now enjoy under a President who brought those social benefits; who has stood and constantly fought for those social benefits.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, said the same thing:

The chief criticism of this paragraph seems to arise from an alleged doubt as to the meaning of the word "transfer." Some see in this word an authorization to "transport" defense articles in American vessels in disregard of the present Neutrality Act. I see no merit in this criticism. It is not the intent of the legislation.

Of course, the word "transfer" was amended by inserting the word "title," so that it became clear that it could not possibly mean delivery; and there was contained in the policy written into the bill in so many words the provision that it should not be taken to authorize convoys of lease-lend material or otherwise—a policy which apparently is now being

pursued without legislative authority. There was written into the bill the provision that section 3, regarding merchant ships in war zones, should not be in any way repealed—a provision which it is now proposed to repeal, with the Lease-Lend Act urged as justification. It was expressly provided that American troops should not be sent out of this country; but they have been sent out of this country, into Iceland—out of the Western Hemisphere and into the war zones of Europe.

Mr. President, that was the lease-lend policy. That was the policy upon which the President has tried to justify all his more recent warlike acts. That was the policy which does not in fact justify in any way any of those warlike acts. The Lease-Lend Act stepped beyond neutrality. We did abandon real neutrality when we passed the lease-lend bill; but we still avoided any physical contact with Germany. The important part of the Lease-Lend Act was that while it extended credit in this country, it did not in any way authorize sending American vessels or anything else into the war zones of Europe, and it continued in effect the existing prohibitions.

If that policy had been administered in good faith, we would not today be in danger of war. It could have been so administered. It gave cause for war; but under the circumstances that exist in the world there is no reason to suppose that what we are doing under the Lease-Lend Act could finally have involved us in the European war unless the President chose to exercise to a greater extent than he actually has the powers contained in that act.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say a few moments ago that under the Lease-Lend Act the President really has power to take us into the European war?

Mr. TAFT. I think under the Lease-Lend Act he has power to do a good many things. I always thought he could have sent the whole fleet over to Gibraltar, for instance, and could have combined it with the British Fleet. There are various things that I think he could have done that would have involved us in the World War for which he would have had authority. The particular things he has done relating to the war zones of Europe I do not think he had any power to do under the Lease-Lend Act.

Mr. LUCAS. But there is no question in the Senator's mind that under the Lease-Lend Act the President of the United States would have had the right, had he wanted to do so, to send the American Fleet into Singapore or Gibraltar or any other place, to join it with the British Fleet, and thereby have America involved in the present European war?

Mr. TAFT. I so stated at the time the lease-lend bill was passed and I think that is true. I was most hopeful that the President would not exercise those powers. He has chosen to exercise other powers that I do not think he had.



Mr. LUCAS. And the truth of the matter is that the President of the United States has not followed the theory that the Senator from Ohio has stated he could have followed. He has been overly cautious in doing just the opposite.

Mr. TAFT. On the contrary, he has pursued a policy which is leading directly and necessarily to war, and he is justifying that policy on the basis of the Lease-Lend Act. I do not happen to think that the particular things he has done, like sending troops to Iceland, which inevitably involves us in the probability of war, like his convoying of vessels, like his orders to "shoot at sight," are in any way justified by the Lease-Lend Act; but they are acts which he justifies on the basis of the Lease-Lend Act and which inevitably are leading rapidly to war.

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

Mr. TAFT. I further yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. With all due deference to the able Senator from Ohio, it is difficult for me to follow his argument, in view of the statement he made that under the Lease-Lend Act the President of the United States has all the authority that is necessary to involve this country in war, and yet, on the other hand, he does not pursue that policy; but the Senator from Ohio says, on the other hand, he is gradually leading us to war, step by step. If he has the power, and if he is the type of warmonger that many persons in this country say he is, it seems to me, under the Senator's own statement and under his construction of the Lend-Lease Act, that he would have had us in this war a long, long time ago.

Mr. TAFT. I have not said he is a warmonger, but I have said he is leading us steadily toward war and that he intends us to get into war; that that is his purpose; but he is in no hurry about it. We are not ready for war; but I say that every step he has taken has been a step toward war.

5. THE POLICY OF UNDECLARED NAVAL WAR, BEGUN BY THE PRESIDENT WITHOUT AUTHORITY, WOULD BE RATIFIED BY THE REPEAL OF THE NEUTRALITY ACT

Mr. President, the next step, policy No. 5, is that of undeclared naval war. That is a step beyond the Lease-Lend Act. It is a step which we have partially taken. I think we have taken it without authority of law, but the President has certainly moved toward an undeclared naval war. The incident of the *Kearny* is to some extent war. Today, however, we have the opportunity of passing on the question whether we are going to step from the lease-lend policy, under which other nations come to this country, to a policy of undeclared naval war on the two oceans of the world and in every port into which a seagoing ship may go. If we refuse to repeal the Neutrality Act, there is a probability that the President will withdraw from that policy, but if we pass the pending measure, if we repeal the neutrality law, we confirm, ratify, and approve everything the President has done and everything he has said. We approve the occupation of Iceland; we approve the orders to shoot on sight; we ap-

prove the patrolling and convoying American vessels, not only in the somewhat restricted areas where they have been patrolling and convoying, but all the way to the ports of Great Britain; for the only reason that the convoy has not extended to the ports of Great Britain is the fact that the American merchant ships, even if convoyed, cannot go into the war zones of Europe. We do not know that that step itself has not been taken.

The policy of undeclared naval war, it seems to me, is not a very effective policy of aiding Britain. There has not been any destruction of any great percentage of lease-lend goods or any other goods; there is not any evidence that the British have not got enough ships of their own. They have something like, so far as I can figure, three times as many ships as the Americans have; and there is plenty of neutral shipping. It is a little difficult to see how they are going to be benefited by American merchant ships sailing to England instead of neutral or British merchant ships sailing to England.

The Senator from Michigan yesterday pointed out that arming ships is of no great assistance to the ships. It is very doubtful, indeed, whether it will save any merchant ships or whether it will do any good to the British.

But there is not any question that the adoption of policy No. 5 is a policy of war, a policy of war which every party in this country has denied that it wishes to adopt, and which every Senator has denied that he wishes to adopt. It cannot be long, in my opinion, after that policy is adopted before we have policy No. 6, the policy of complete war, including the sending of troops to Europe or to Africa or to Asia. It is almost impossible to engage in a partial war. If there is actual shooting; if every day there are engagements between American war vessels and German war vessels; if American sailors are killed day by day, certainly the American people are going to feel that they are fully at war; that it is our war.

They had thought up to now that it was a question of aiding Britain, but once it is our own war there is no stopping short of anything which may be necessary to defeat the enemy; and that necessarily includes an A. E. F. It happened in the World War. The record of President Wilson shows without question that when we went into that war he expected to fight a naval war; he did not intend to send any troops to Europe. It was about 3 months before he was persuaded to change his mind; before he saw, as we can now see, that a nation cannot engage in an undeclared naval war unless it is prepared to do everything in the world to win that war. That means necessarily the sending of an A. E. F. to Europe. We are getting there. In the World War we first sent a detachment of engineers. They were the first units. Just as President Wilson was persuaded to send a token unit to Europe, and they were reviewed by the King, so this week we read that the King and Queen reviewed 100 Americans who are in the C. T. C., and about 12 naval lieutenants, officers of the American Navy, who were stand-

ing up in parade before the King of England.

We have seen this week a demand for doubling the tank program and doubling the airplane program. What possible use is that going to have except for an American expeditionary force? We have the demand now from the British generals for such a force. Such a force probably is not contemplated for a year or more, but what else can be the purpose of this tank program? We have ordered tanks for 3,000,000 men already. Why double the tank program unless we are looking forward to an A. E. F.? If we pass this joint resolution, we should look forward to an A. E. F., and will have to prepare to win the war which we would vote if we adopted this resolution.

If we go ahead now and abandon the policy of cash and carry, if we proceed to vote to authorize American vessels to carry on this war all the way over to the shores of Germany, then I say that the next step, which is the last step of complete war, is on our threshold.

A naval war is bound to be indecisive. It may be that the President hopes that we may win the war against Hitler without sending our troops; but even he cannot feel confident of any such result, and when for 6 months or 12 months there has been a completely indecisive result, the cry will grow louder and louder that we must finish this war; and the way the war can be finished is by sending perhaps a million men to Africa and later on two or three million men to Europe. There is no other way by which Hitler can be crushed.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. As the Senator points out, the inevitable time when Americans will cry for a decisive participation in the war, does he not have at hand at this very moment an illustration in Great Britain of a similar cry by the British that a bridgehead be established in Europe in order that invasion of the Continent may be effected?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; a demand which, in spite of its apparent futility at the present time, is putting tremendous pressure on the British Government to force such an expeditionary force into Europe before it is properly prepared, before it is sufficiently large to be effective in accomplishing the purpose.

6. EVERY POLICY HAS BEEN ADMINISTERED WITH AN EVIDENT DESIRE TO TAKE THIS COUNTRY INTO WAR

Mr. President, I would feel less confident of the inevitable result if it had not been true that all the steps which have been taken seem to have tended so steadily toward war that any reasonable man must conclude that they were intended to tend toward war. I have pointed out how one policy after another could have been administered without taking us into war, without taking the next step. There was no popular pressure for any such step, and yet every step was followed by one more step, by one more evidence that the administration itself is really desiring a policy of complete war with Germany. Otherwise, how could

the President permit the remarks which have been made by members of his Cabinet? We have had Mr. Knox declaring war not only on Hitler but also on Japan, we have had Mr. Stimson declaring war, and Mr. Ickes declaring war. Certainly no responsible President could permit members of his Cabinet to make speeches advocating war unless he was, at least, contemplating such a policy or unless, at least, that policy was agreeable to him. To my mind, if he does not repudiate those statements, it is impossible for him to avoid the just charge that he himself is stimulating the policy of war. We had an 8-point declaration by which the United States and Great Britain, or at least, the President of the United States and His Majesty's Government in Great Britain, entered into an agreement which was somewhat vague in its terms but which was interpreted by Mr. Churchill shortly afterwards; and the President has never in any way modified or repudiated the statement of Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Churchill said this in his speech:

You will, perhaps, have noticed that the President of the United States and the British representative, in what is aptly called the Atlantic charter, have jointly pledged their countries to the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny. That is a solemn and grave undertaking. It must be made good. It will be made good. And, of course, many practical arrangements to fulfill that purpose have been and are being organized and set in motion.

Mr. Churchill says that the President has pledged his country "to the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny." No reasonable man can interpret those words to mean anything except an intention to go to war. There is no other way to crush the Nazi tyranny.

Mr. Churchill further said:

The United States and Great Britain do not now assume that there will never be any more war again. On the contrary, we—

That is, the United States and Great Britain—

intend to take ample precaution to prevent its renewal in any period we can foresee, by effectively disarming the guilty nations while remaining suitably protected ourselves.

"While effectively disarming the guilty nations"—Germany, Italy, and Japan. I do not see how those words can be interpreted in any way except as an intention to go to war.

Mr. Willkie, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and others advocate in effect a war policy, and they are the persons who have forced the consideration of this amendment here. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] in effect proposed the pending amendment. Every one of them is for war. They admit the logical conclusion from their acts. They admit that this policy must necessarily lead to war.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I propose to address myself to the subject shortly after the able Senator from Ohio shall have concluded his address; but I wonder if the

able Senator from Ohio really intended to say that the Senator from Florida has ever made the statement anywhere that he favored this country going to war.

Mr. TAFT. I withdraw the statement that the Senator made that statement, but I say that is my conclusion from what the Senator said; and I think my conclusion was a reasonable conclusion from the words he used, because the things he advocates necessarily involve war. I shall be glad to discuss the matter with the Senator at any time. The Senator may be right. He may never have said, "I desire the United States to declare war on Germany."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was comforted to know that the statement of the able Senator from Ohio was based upon his powers of deduction and inference, and not upon the facts.

Mr. TAFT. I remember one speech which the Senator from Florida made, in which, as I remember—my memory may be faulty—he advocated sending airplanes to make a shambles out of Tokyo. I think that is war. I may be mistaken, but that is my recollection of the Senator's speech.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I had a great deal of confidence in the Senator's memory until he made the last statement.

Mr. TAFT. I may be mistaken, but I think that is what the Senator from Florida said. I still think so.

Mr. President, the whole approach of the administration today seems to be one of war. I think it is fair to say—at least, the impression given from the newspapers is—that the administration welcomes every incident which may possibly lead to war. Those incidents are not reported in the usual way. They are announced by the President at a press conference. They are sent out to the world as something by which, on the whole, the Government is delighted. The story of the *Greer* was told by the President, it seems to me, in such a way as deliberately to incite more feeling than was justified by the actual event which occurred. He said, for instance:

Our destroyer at the time was in waters which the Government of the United States had declared to be waters of self-defense, surrounding outposts of American protection in the Atlantic. The United States destroyer, when attacked, was proceeding on a legitimate mission.

As a matter of fact, the facts which came out much later before a committee, when the public had forgotten the *Greer*, show that it was in the neighborhood of a submarine of which it was told by a British destroyer which was also there; that after it had located the submarine a British plane came and dropped four depth bombs; and that the *Greer* then turned off its course and chased the submarine for 3 hours and 20 minutes, zig-zagging in the way that a vessel would zigzag if it were going to attack a submarine. Whether or not the submarine was justified in finally shooting a torpedo, whether or not it thought this was a joint British-American attack, certainly the President's report of the incident was made in such a way as deliberately to incite the American people. No man

who sincerely desired peace would have failed to state the actual circumstances.

I do not know what happened to the *Kearny*. We still do not know for certain; but it seems almost certain that the *Kearny* was engaged in convoying, not American ships, but British and neutral ships, from this country. But the President did not so advise the American people.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I was not here during the time the hearings were conducted before the Committee on Foreign Relations; but I should like to ask some member of the committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] or some other member, whether Admiral Stark did not definitely testify that the *Kearny* was convoying ships.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He did.

Mr. TOBEY. Further, when he was asked, as I read the testimony in the New York Times, what was the nationality of those ships, whether American or British, he could not remember, or he declined to answer. Which was it?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The story went off the record at that point; but we had sufficient on the record to establish that the *Kearny* was convoying ships then.

Mr. TOBEY. And certainly, beyond peradventure, Admiral Stark knew whether it was convoying American ships or British ships, did he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, certainly; certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may say that convoying was proposed last spring, but there was so much opposition to convoys that authority to convoy never was specifically presented to Congress. Apparently without such presentation we now have the United States engaged in convoying. But the point I wanted to make is that the whole intention of the administration, every indication that a reasonable man can draw from its acts, is that it intends to go into war; and certainly, if we pass this resolution, and the administration has such an intention, we are going very shortly to become involved in war.

7. WE ARE NOT ALREADY SO FAR AT WAR THAT WE CANNOT EASILY WITHDRAW IF CONGRESS REFUSES TO REPEAL NEUTRALITY

There is no argument made today that, after all, we are already at war, and therefore we should not hesitate to go on and vote authority to conduct war. The power to declare war rests solely in the United States Congress. If the President can declare or create an undeclared naval war beyond our power to act upon, the Constitution might just as well be abolished. The Constitution deliberately gave to the representatives of the people the power to declare war, to pass on the question of war and peace, because that was something which kings had always done, which they had done against the interests of the people themselves, and which the founders of the Constitution thought the people ought to determine. It is true there have been one or two acts

of war; but if Congress will refuse to repeal the Neutrality Act, I do not believe those acts of war can be continued. I do not believe the President is prepared to defy the express action of the Congress. Up to date he has not purported to do so. He has only claimed a power which I do not think he has. I stated on the floor of the Senate that I did not think he had the power to send American troops to Iceland, because Iceland was not in the Western Hemisphere, and it was already in the war zone. There was already there a British garrison. We have undertaken a joint defense of Iceland together with the British, who are actually at war with Germany. We can withdraw from Iceland. If we are sending convoys—as we are sending them—we can stop the policy of conveying vessels to Great Britain.

I do not think we are at war. I think the people who say we are at war now will find that when war actually comes it will be something very different. There will be long casualty lists, a constant series of battles, constant incitement of the people to war, gradually building up a bigger and bigger Army, until it is big enough to undertake a trip to Europe.

**8. THE PRESIDENT IS ATTEMPTING TO DECLARE WAR WITHOUT AUTHORITY FROM CONGRESS**

Mr. President, the speech of the President last night seems to me an extraordinary speech, because in effect it makes it plain that he has personally declared war on Germany. That certainly is a power which he does not have.

It seems to me that he has admitted publicly that he has tricked the American people. While talking of peace, even while Senate leaders here talk of amending the Neutrality Act as a measure of defense, President Roosevelt announces that he has already done what he could to plunge the Nation into a shooting war. He has given unqualified corroboration to those who have sought to convince the American people by methods which are leading them down the road to war. While constantly repeating pledges of peace, he now informs us, "The shooting has started." He says, "Very simply and very bluntly we are pledged to pull our own oar in the destruction of Hitler."

By what authority does the President make that statement? Who gave the pledge? Unless the President is willing to admit that he has assumed final unconstitutional and dictatorial powers, then his statement that such a pledge has been given is not worth the paper it is written on, for only Congress can give such a pledge.

Mr. Roosevelt says that our Navy has been instructed to shoot on sight. There is no stated limitation on those orders. By what authority does Mr. Roosevelt send American youths to war—and that is what he is doing with the boys in the Navy—to prowl the ocean in quest of offensive warfare? Only Congress can constitutionally order our ships and our boys into an offensive war. Does Mr. Roosevelt contend, then, that he has assumed Hitlerian authority over the United States?

We have the President in effect admitting every charge made against him, that

he was working toward war while promising peace, that he did intend to disregard Congress and the Constitution, and follow the course of dictatorship to an undeclared war.

There is just a shadow of substance to the claim that he can conduct war in defense of the United States. But defense has been stretched so thin that it cannot much longer be called anything like defense. We had first the defense of the United States. When we undertook a defense program, that is what everyone thought it meant, defense of continental United States, and the islands around it on this side of the Atlantic Ocean.

The next thing proposed was defense by seizing Iceland, and Dakar, and points in Europe. It used to be said in the British Government of the nineteenth century that if they would permit the British Navy to establish a base on the moon to defend themselves against the sun, they would certainly do so—a policy which England has pursued for many years, but which our Nation has never seen fit to consider.

Certainly the seizure of Iceland and Dakar is not defense of the United States. It is an aggressive policy of defending the sea lanes to Great Britain. It is the defense of Great Britain, not of the United States.

The next position of the President was that we would shoot at any place where we found a German vessel in our defense waters. What our defense waters are he did not say. Apparently our defense waters extend to Iceland and well beyond. If we enact the pending measure, of course, our defense waters are going to be every ocean and every port in the entire world, in Asia, Africa, Europe, or Australia.

The message on this measure finally contains the statement that we must fight in defense of American rights. Although we have seen fit to say that one of those rights, like the sending of our ships into belligerent ports, is a right we desire to give up, now the President says we should stand on that right, and precipitate the very kind of a conflict which brought on the World War.

**9. CONCLUSION**

Mr. President, we have to consider here the question whether we will approve a policy of undeclared naval war, whether we will give approval to the President, who has shown his desire to forward that war, who has constantly worked toward developing the war spirit in the United States, who apparently, under every reasonable conclusion from his speeches, is in favor of outright war—whether we shall vote here to authorize such a war.

If we do vote to authorize war, then I say that Congress will never again debate the question of war. By the time we come to a formal declaration of war, so much actual warfare will have taken place that while I should vote against such a declaration for the purpose of the record, I certainly would not seriously attempt to combat the effort to take us into a declared war at that time.

Do we wish to keep our pledges to the people of the United States, pledges which practically every Senator here has

made? There is no difference between the conditions today and the conditions during the campaign of 1940. If anything, conditions today do not justify war as much as did conditions at that time. At that time Great Britain was being nightly bombarded, the general feeling was that it might be successfully invaded at any moment. France had fallen. Hitler had spread over a great part of Europe, and it was obvious that he could spread over all the rest of Europe. There is no substantial difference between the conditions now and what the conditions were in 1940, when we gave our pledge. Possibly public opinion has changed, possibly it has not, but in the Senate we must decide this question on the basis of our own principles, and I say that no man who gave his pledge that we should keep out of war, who gave his pledge to do everything he could to keep the United States out of war, in November 1940 can today vote for the pending resolution without repudiating that pledge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair.) The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think that those who have spoken of the gravity of this debate have spoken well. The searchlight of history will be turned upon this time to see what we did and what we thought.

I agree that the issue involved is no less solemn than peace or war for this Nation; but I do not agree that the opponents of this proposal are the friends of peace. On the contrary, time will tell that those who are the advocates of this measure are those who have closest at heart the peace of their country.

Mr. President, it sounds strange to have anyone say that an affirmative policy is the policy of defense. That difficulty grows out of an easy misunderstanding of the character of strategy and tactics. I suppose there is no Senator who is not devoted, to the very limit of his capacity

for affection, to the American flag and his own land. I believe every Senator except the illustrious Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is a native-born American citizen; and none of us would claim to love America better than does he. So the issue involved is not one of patriotism. I would not for a moment even cast suspicion upon the fidelity of any Senator to America, her flag, and her security.

The essential difference between us—and the line of demarcation is unhappily a sharp one—is, How may the interests of America best be preserved? There are some who say, and who conscientiously believe, that in a policy of negation, a policy of standing still, America may best be defended. Others of us, opposing that view, think the contrary. We adhere to the belief that the best way to defend America is by an affirmative policy—not an affirmative strategy, but an affirmative tactic.

If I may, in my peculiar layman's infirmity, distinguish between the two, strategy relates to a general purpose or policy—a policy to defend America, to keep it secure and safe against the violation of its soil, and to preserve its standard of living and its institutions in their pristine vigor and virility. But tactics mean the method by which that policy is accomplished, the means by which those ends are attained.

For example, recently we have sent our soldiers beyond the 3-mile limit in the occupation of certain bases which we have acquired from Great Britain. The opponents of this measure have not contended that that was aggression for aggression's sake, or that such action indicated our purpose to violate another nation's soil or deprive another power of what it has. But we had learned the lesson that in modern times we could not stand at America's water line and defend America.

Likewise we have sent American soldiers to the occupation of Iceland. Would anybody contend that the purpose of this Government in that policy was to deprive the ancient state of Denmark of sovereignty over that territory, or that we ourselves were imitating Hitler and becoming conquerors, hungry for loot? On the contrary, I believe that even the opponents of this measure do not deny that the purpose of that policy was to defend America against the growing encroachment of a foreign tyrant.

I distinctly remember the testimony of Secretary of War Stimson when he appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee at the time the lend-lease bill was being considered. Secretary Stimson very graphically pointed out how in the early days New York was defended by guns placed at the Battery for it was thought that surely the community could be defended by guns so far advanced down the harbor as the Battery. Then weapons increased in range, and it was seen that the only way adequately to defend the New York community was to push the guns out to the Narrows, and later on out to Sandy Hook. And recently, he might have added, we have carried them to the bases with respect to the acquisition of which I believe all America

is united, favoring it as a policy. Now, at last, that frontier—not of aggression, but of defense—has been extended even to the remote territories of Greenland and Iceland.

That is what we are talking about, Mr. President, when we talk about affirmative action in order to preserve and to execute a defensive strategy. Throughout the history of this violent struggle our country has been called upon to make first one and then another decision; and, therefore, our people have had to acquaint themselves with the concept of how we can do something in order that no one can do anything harmful against us. So, as I say, the essential difference between the two sides to this controversy is, Shall we do something to defend America, or shall we do nothing, relying upon resisting assault when it actually reaches America's territory?

We know, of course, that the methods of modern warfare are dissimilar to those which have existed in any period of history. We know that today planes travel at speeds of 300 and 400 miles an hour, and soon will travel at a speed of 500 miles an hour. We know, therefore, that it is only a question of seconds or of minutes before a plane starting at a point hundreds of miles distant may actually be dropping bombs upon our own soil. We know that every day bombing planes are leaving the Western Hemisphere and are flying, usually in the space of 8 hours, across the Atlantic, to the Eastern Hemisphere.

So, Mr. President, if we are to preserve inviolate our soil from the assault of a bomb, the place at which to do so is not at the point in the air at which the plane hovers over its objective, but the place from which it leaps like a vulture to seize its prey.

Therefore, we who propose something affirmative are not seeking to change this country's policy, which inevitably must be, in every administration, in every year, and in every century, to assure the integrity of America and of American interests.

But to show how well drawn is the line, let me indicate a few of the votes which have been cast by Senators.

Today and yesterday we heard two very distinguished opponents of this measure, the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDEBERG]. Let us see how that same line of demarcation between a policy of doing something to defend America and a policy of doing nothing to defend America has persisted in these different votes.

For example, when the bill to equip and maintain the Air Corps and to increase the number of airplanes to 6,000 appeared before the United States Senate—House bill 3791—on March 6, 1939, the vote was 54 yeas and 28 nays. Among the Senators voting "yea" were the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and most of us who are the sponsors of the pending joint resolution. Among the Senators voting "nay" were, for example, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Montana

[Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and other Senators who will be pronounced opponents of the pending measure.

That was a bill by which we proposed to add 6,000 planes to America's own air force; and these gentlemen did not even favor an affirmative policy on that subject, on the 6th of March 1939.

On the 11th of August 1937, there came before the Senate a measure designed to safeguard the United States against the export of helium for use for military purposes by other nations, a measure designed to restrain the shipment of helium from this country to Germany, which all of us knew was the country seeking to acquire it, for the purpose of using it in dirigibles. The RECORD discloses that when that measure was voted upon, among the proponents, those Senators favoring keeping helium here, at home, were most of us who are the proponents of the pending measure; and among the opposition were the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and many other Senators who are spirited opponents of the joint resolution presently under consideration by the Senate.

Again, when the question of the expansion of the naval program came before this body, on May 3, 1938—a program designed to enlarge America's Navy to defend America and America's interests—the final vote was 56 yeas and 28 nays. Among the Senators voting "yea" were—almost without exception—the Senators who are the proponents of the measure under consideration here today; and among the Senators voting "nay" were the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and other Senators who have vigorously opposed the measure now before the Senate, and who propose to continue their resistance to legislation of this kind.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Florida elaborate just a little more upon the main features of the naval bill to which he has just referred, if he has the facts before him?

Mr. PEPPER. That bill was House bill 9218. It proposed a very large increase in the tonnage of the United States Navy. It was the first really big naval-expansion program that the United States had launched; it was the beginning of the building of a greater Navy by the United States of America, a two-ocean Navy for our country, an enlarged Navy which, at that time, in May of 1938, I assume no one was urging to be sent anywhere else or to be used for any purpose other than to defend the waters and the shores of the United States of America and her interests.

A bit later came the question of the amendment of the Neutrality Act of 1939. The vote on that measure occurred on November 3, 1939. The purpose of that proposal was to strike down the Embargo Act, which prohibited by law the United

States of America, directly or through any national, sending instruments of war to any belligerent powers.

Remember, Mr. President, that proposal had been recommended by the President in the spring of 1939, at a time when it was apparent to the earth that Hitler was bent upon a policy of worldwide aggression, at a time when Hitler knew it was within the range of his power to conquer Europe, perhaps to have the storehouses of Europe at his immediate disposal for the manufacture of arms and implements of war, and when it was also apparent to Hitler in his calculations, in the sinister but far-reaching plans of the Nazi general staff, that if Europe were occupied by his armies, Britain and the other nations resisting him would be cut off from access to the land areas of the Eastern Hemisphere within any proximate range of Britain herself.

When that measure came before the Congress of the United States, with the President's recommendation, what did we do? Nothing. I shall believe, to the last day of my life, and I am confident history will record, that those who defeated that measure gave Hitler the degree of assurance which he wanted before launching his soldiers upon their aims and aspirations of conquest across the face of the earth.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Before the Senator proceeds along the line of thought he is pursuing, would he care to express any opinion as to what the result would have been had we followed the policy of doing nothing with respect to the increase in our Navy, with respect to the increase in our airplanes, and with respect to the increase in our Army prior to the time when war was declared in Europe in September 1939?

Mr. PEPPER. The question of the Senator is, What would have been the result of our having done nothing?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; prior to that time. In other words, had we followed the policy of those in the Senate and in the House of Representatives who voted consistently against every conceivable appropriation in order to build up the Army and Navy and Air Corps of this country, what position would America have been in had we followed that course when the war broke out in 1939?

Mr. PEPPER. In nothing less than a position of weakness so tragic, Mr. President, that it perhaps would have affected the ultimate destiny of this as a free country. Happily, the negative votes to which I have been referring did not prevail, and our country did not have to depend for its leadership or its security upon those negative defenders. Had it been forced to that reliance, Mr. President, we know how far short we are of where we ought to be, and, God knows, what would have been our condition had we not prevailed against our opponents in those days in 1937 and 1938. I said, therefore, the issue was the lifting of the arms embargo, and that the President recommended that it be lifted in the spring of 1939. We held him off for 6 months, and, in the interim, Hitler sent

his minions into Poland on the 1st of September and started the second World War, which will not end, Mr. President, until it shall be ended by a combination of superior forces against him. In respect to that struggle, as the President movingly said last night, America must pull its own oar.

So let our friends of the opposition, Mr. President, remember that Hitler started this second World War in the interim between the President's recommendation that the Embargo Act be repealed and our eventual action repealing it when we were called here by the President into special session in the fall of 1939, after Hitler's war had been begun. How did they vote even then?

On the 3d of November 1939 the vote was taken. Among the "yeas," which numbered 55, there were to be found most of the Senators who are supporting the pending measure today, without naming them. Among the "nays" are to be found the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and others who represent the other view about this great question. So they did not favor that measure, either; and, had their counsel prevailed, had the American people permitted them to lead, had we relied upon their leadership for our security, not one single gun, not one ounce of power, not one single shell, not a single airplane, not an instrument of war could, in the whole interim from that day to this, have been sold by the American Government or any American national to any of Hitler's enemies.

I shall refer somewhat later, Mr. President, to the testimony of none other than Mr. Cudahy, which is carried in the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, unequivocally stating that had it not been for the aid which America, through the initiative and daring of President Roosevelt, and later with the assistance of the Congress and the approval of the country, has given to Britain, today Great Britain, like tragic France, would be writhing as a victim under Hitler's cruel heel.

Who denies that? When mention is made of the accomplishments of our policy, the assets and liabilities, it should be remembered that we are not at war today, and Mr. Cudahy says, we saved Britain.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Following the thought expressed by the Senator from Florida, and corroborated by Mr. Cudahy, who, I understand testified before the Foreign Relations Committee as an adverse witness to the modification of the Neutrality Act—

Mr. PEPPER. Strongly so.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that had England fallen following the Dunkerque debacle the United States would have been at war with Germany?

Mr. PEPPER. It would have depended on one of three things, I will say to the Senator from Illinois; first, on whether Hitler would have preferred a

little more time to consolidate his conquests before hurling himself at us; whether for some reason of his own he preferred to wait until he was a little stronger, having all the resources of the Eastern Hemisphere practically at his disposal in such a case, or whether the United States was willing to yield to him without a struggle.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, if that should happen, there would be no struggle. But does the Senator agree with me that inevitably had England fallen or if England should fall tomorrow, Hitler would claim all the Dutch and British and French possessions that lie in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and in the boundaries of the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. PEPPER. Unquestionably so, and I might as well advert to that now, since the Senator has raised the question. I am willing to take Hitler's word, Mr. President, for one thing. Hitler in clear language has told the world of the nature of this conflict. He has said "two words are in conflict; one must fall asunder." Hitler did not say there was a compromise possible; he did not say there was any halfway between dictatorship and democracy, between totalitarianism and freedom. He said the world must be one or the other.

Not only that, Mr. President, but the whole nature and character of Hitler's movement indicates that it is a dynamic, revolutionary movement; that the nature of Hitler's mind and the nature of the spirit moving him can let him stop nowhere short of an eventual abyss or a seat upon the apex of supreme world power. Hitler is not a man of halfway measures; he is not a man who stops halfway. Hitler will die, like Napoleon, in exile or crucified by the just retribution of an indignant world, as he should be and eventually may be, or he will die the master of the earth.

I can think of no one who has seen that man, no one who has read what he says, no one who has watched the growth of his movement from the day of its inception coming to any other conclusion.

Mr. President, I have referred to it here before, but I sat as close to Hitler as I am to the able Senator from Illinois for over half an hour one afternoon at the house of German art at Munich, which was the day following the conclusion of the Nuremberg Congress, the day following Hitler's speech of the night before, in which he had said, "There are two men—Benes and I. One must fall." History records which one fell.

I looked in that man's blue eyes—for they are blue, and not brown or black. I looked at the cruel cut of his face, as insensible of moral suasion as the face of a brute. It is an unmoral face. He is a fanatic like those who directed the inquisitions of an earlier day. In the name of religious fervor they committed crimes the enormity of which is not describable in language; yet in their hearts they were not conscious of wrongdoing. Their ends so justified their means that they were insensible of having done wrong.

Hitler is that kind of a man. He is a fanatic, but a genius, moved by impulses that can be found only in the restless

minds of a few perverted figures whom God or devil has created to destroy the race to which they belong.

I do not know why Nature throws off those things, but it does. It has made them from time immemorial, and our time happens to be cursed with a Hitler.

So, Mr. President, see how like a pebble being dropped in placid water and causing the little waves to spread from the center to the circumference of a larger and larger area has been Hitler's growth since he began his career.

He is without any education, without any peculiar background. He lived 3 years in a vagabond's camp, where he was thrown in daily contact with the flotsam and the jetsam of Europe. He served as a soldier and as a corporal in the German Army, and then was sent by the German Army to ferret out the various movements that were originating in Germany at one place and another, the character of which indicated a desire to seize power. One day he heard a man speak, and was so persuaded with that man's eloquence and power and policy that he became the seventh member of the German Workers' Party. There was a man without money, without background, without prestige, without education. He joined that movement. I heard Ambassador Schurman, who formerly represented this country in Germany, in 1938 tell how one day Hitler, who had been the secretary of the group, was called upon to speak because the regular speaker did not show up; and for the first time, noting the marvelous effect of his oratory upon the audience, he became conscious of the vast power of eloquence which he possesses to sway the German people. Then he started that party toward the accomplishment of the purposes and policies which he had harbored in his heart. In 1923 and 1926 he wrote *Mein Kampf*. There has been nothing like it in the history of the world. There never has been a man like Hitler, in my humble opinion, and the devil is deserving of the due of his genius.

On one occasion, we are told in some of the books, these various parties had planned an uprising to put on the throne of Bavaria the crown prince of Bavaria. The time came, the zero hour. Hitler's party was ready to march. The rest of them did not have the courage and the effort was not made. Then this author describes how for hours Hitler strode up and down the floor, going through the agony of determining that thenceforth he would go alone if nobody else followed him.

Then the relentless, ruthless, irresistible, unshakable will of that remarkable man set empire as his goal, and he determined that he would achieve it if he had to wade over mountains of bones and through oceans of blood to get there. He has pursued that policy, as directly as a martin to his gourd, ever since its inception.

Then, Mr. President, he started breaking the bounds of his party and taking in others. Being stronger than the rest of the leaders, he soon came to dominate them. He was willing to assassinate, to shoot down in cold blood, everyone in his own party who opposed him; and so Roehm and some of the other men who

started with him in the inception of his movement were shot down in cold blood when they resisted the principle of complete leadership and dictatorship of the party by Hitler himself. He started then to giving utterance to a philosophy which presents the exact antithesis of the democratic sentiment. That is, where we believe in the will of the people he scorns the people, and believes only in the will and responsibility of the leader.

I heard him say at Nuremberg, "The state is everything; the individual, nothing."

So we see how that movement, dynamic in character, necessarily and inevitably spread against its weaker neighbors, because they had no such clear purpose, they had no such determined will as he possessed. They were but putty before his machinations. And so in every area of the earth he has affirmatively manifested that determination for world power. Into every country he sent his spies and his saboteurs. He has bought newspapers. He has taken advantage of the credulity even of public men. He has perverted every credulous person whose ear he could get. He has stirred up dissension and confusion and disunity everywhere his genius could reach. He has weakened every nation and every people on the whole earth in order that they might be softened against his eventual encroachment.

Here in America, in the course of the past 2 years, we have just become aware of how intimately he has infiltrated those agencies into our own economic and social order. Finally, without the protest of a Senator on this floor to my knowledge, it was necessary for the President and the State Department to drive the consuls of Germany and Italy out of this country because they were just nesting-places for spies who were trying to break down our resistance and our own defense here at home. If he has done that here, what has he done in other areas less resistant to his encroachment than are we?

We know how, in country after country in South America, he has sent his citizens, after giving them 6 months' training in the German system, to meet the competition of Britain and America, for example; made them go far into the interior, to marry the native people, establish themselves, take the citizenship of the country, and appear to be people who had come to live with the local people in friendship and in patriotism.

Not only that, Mr. President, but the education of the German youth has left no doubt in anybody's mind that he expects them to realize his purpose that for a thousand years the Reich shall dominate the earth. You know that in the public school system, for example, by the time a child gets up to the end of grammar school he goes to one of the Hitler high schools. He is a member of the Hitler youth movement, so that his whole thinking, his feeling, becomes Nazi in character and sentiment, the whole purpose of which is to squeeze out of him those sentiments of sympathy and kindness and fairness and justice and cultural and spiritual values which distinguish civilization from the jungle and the barbarian.

Then perhaps one out of twenty, when he gets a little older, has the privilege of joining the Nazi party, which is a little monopolistic group chosen by Hitler to be his instrument for the domination of Germany and the world. Then Hitler has four peculiar colleges in four remote corners of Germany where the elect of the youth, after they finish high school, after they, beginning at 18½ years of age, have served their 6 months in the labor battalion, and after they have served 2 years as conscripts in the army, and after they are married, preferably, may then go for further training to become the élite of Hitler's choice, missionaries to carry his doctrines and his conquest and his rule to the ends of the earth.

They spend 4 years in these schools, 1 year in each of them, in a beautiful atmosphere, where they are taught riding and swimming and skiing, and to be airplane pilots and skilled horsemen. They have inculcated in them the sentiments of daring, and the virtues which really they ape from the British aristocracy. Those are the elect, with whom Hitler proposes to carry on this Reich which he says is destined to last for a thousand years. So Mr. Goebbels can say to the youth of Germany, "The whole world invites you to adventurous conquest."

Mr. President, that is just suggestive of the dynamic revolutionary nature of this man and his movement. They have not stopped at anything. In the field of international trade, for instance, they have no regard for the ordinary commercial processes. They force their commodities into the markets of foreign states in order that they might drive out competitors and subordinate the economies of those countries to their own will and purposes. So profit and loss have meant nothing to them. They would give Brazil, for example, a large quantity of machinery, and take some of Brazil's agricultural commodities. Whereas an American businessman selling machinery would have to consider profit and loss, they do not care what the difference between the selling price and the purchase price might be. They expected to get their goods going into that country and to take agricultural commodities and use them for the purpose of acquiring foreign exchange so that they could continue to build up their strategic and critical material stores against the inevitable day of their designed war.

I have not finished, and I shall advert a little bit more, if the Senate will permit me to, the recital of some of the acts which came before the Congress, and how sharp the line of demarcation between those who favored doing something, and those who favored doing nothing, to defend America was.

I mentioned the Neutrality Act. Incidentally, we had before us the question of the revision of the Panama treaty, the question being whether or not we would recognize the sovereignty of Panama as a nation which was of some dignity and prestige in the family of nations in the Western Hemisphere.

This involved the good-neighbor policy in America, not with respect to Germany, but with respect to our own hemisphere. The bill then before us was advocated by the State Department, recommended by the President, as a means of building up and making stronger the good-neighbor policy, which was a part of our national defense.

The vote was had on the 25th of July 1939. The yeas were 65, the nays were 16, and among those voting "nay" were the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and others who are vigorous opponents of the measure pending here today.

A little later there came the question of sending America's sons to the training camps, a policy predicated upon the traditional defense of America, to have an army here in case it were needed to defend our shores and our interests. This came to a vote on September 14, 1940. The yeas were 47 and the nays were 25. Amongst those voting "yea" were the proponents of the pending measure, but amongst those voting "nay" were the able Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and others who share the views of those able Senators upon America's domestic and foreign policy as to the best way to defend America.

Then there came the question of the purchase of strategic and critical materials essential to the defense of this country. Surely no one would say that that was intended to make America an aggressor, that we proposed to use the guns we acquired in an invasion of some other country's soil. The far-sighted and able distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], taking the lead in that undertaking, doing Herculean work in it, proposed that we purchase, with American money, great stores of strategic materials, from the ends of the earth, and build them up here to defend America against any assault.

Certainly I do not see anything warlike in that, I do not see anything interventionist in that, I do not see anything that looks like aggression in that. But when the vote was had, the result was 56 yeas and 13 nays, and amongst those opposing it were the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]; and other Senators who are opponents of the pending measure. I notice that there were 27 who were not voting at that time, but the nays were Borah, Burke, Capper, Danaher, Davis, Frazier, Holman, Lodge, McNary, Townsend, Vandenberg, White, and Wiley.

Mr. President, I am not saying that those Senators were wrong and that the proponents were right, but I am using that as an illustration to show how sharp the line of demarcation is, and how persistent and continuous it is between those who believe in an affirmative defense for America and those who believe in a pol-

icy of doing nothing. Today America would be vastly stronger, I need not add, had the appropriation which finally passed for such strategic materials not been cut from \$100,000,000, if my memory serves me correctly, to \$40,000,000, and if I am not in error, upon the efforts of the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The ship that was sunk off the coast of Africa, the *Lehigh*, which was going to pick up a load of strategic materials for America, might not have had to be there had we built up storehouses in this country earlier and in greater quantity than we did.

Mr. President, we all know how a little later there came before us the lend-lease bill. It is not ordinarily said in the discussions of this subject before the country by the opponents of our position that it was testified by Secretary Morgenthau before the Committee on Foreign Relations that Britain had used up all its dollar exchange that was available, other than two or three hundred million dollars which had to be kept in a revolving fund before the lend-lease bill was proposed by the President.

Not only that, Britain had committed herself for the purchase of manufactured and farm commodities in this country to an amount equivalent in dollar value to every dollar that every British national had invested in continental United States. I assert today a fact which the public does not ordinarily recall, that every dollar's worth of real estate, every share in a soap company, or an insurance company, or any other property of any kind or character which any British subject, or the British Government, has in the United States, is to be sold eventually at the time when the best and fairest price can be obtained on the market and the returns from those sales are to be devoted to paying for goods which are sold from factory and farm in the United States to the British Empire during this crucial time.

Mr. President, when the lend-lease bill came before the country and the Congress the question was whether or not we were going to let Hitler crush his enemies while we stood by idly because they did not have money with which to pay for goods essential in prosecuting the war, whether we held America's peace and America's blood higher than America's money.

There are critics who say that we were led into the first World War for money. I never believed that. History of a responsible character will refute that to the last day of time. But certainly we chose the contrary this time, to spend America's money until it hurts, America's materials until it hurts, until it closes down factories and throws men out of employment, until it dislocates our whole economy, in the hope that by American money and American materials we can crush this conqueror, or stave him off American soil and interests and at the same time not shed the blood of a single American soldier. And so far, Mr. President, we have the testimony of not only Mr. Cudahy, who was in favor of a negotiated peace with Hitler, and a definite and very persuasive opponent of this measure, but we have the knowledge of the whole earth that only the flood of materials

from America, only America's determination, have kept Hitler's enemies on their feet and fighting against him until the day when he shall eventually be throttled.

We know it was testified before the Foreign Relations Committee when the lease-lend bill was under consideration, that the President, taking the bull by the horns, immediately after Dunkerque sent nearly a million rifles out of America's storehouses to defend the British. A year ago, as was said the other day by Anthony Eden in the House of Commons, they did not have equipment enough for Britain to equip two divisions.

Mr. President, what have we done but a wise thing to save Britain? And so far, had it not been for Hitler's dastardly assaults upon the sea, not a single American life would have been lost. I say I think we are entitled, Mr. President, to add up the assets and the liabilities of the policy that we have pursued, and it has had a glorious success.

But I started to say that when the vote came upon the lease-lend bill, in connection with which we did not advocate anything but materials and money—just put them ahead of America's blood, just realistically faced the realistic menace—when that vote came on in the Senate on the 8th of March 1941, after Hitler had conquered all Europe, after every vicious purpose he entertained had been disclosed to every ear in the earth, the vote was 60 yeas to 31 nays. Amongst those voting "no" was the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and others opposing this measure to make up a total of 31.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator will remember that at that time I proposed an amendment, supported by some Senators, proposing that instead of the lease-lend policy giving all kinds of power to the President, that we loan \$2,000,000,000 to Great Britain. I supported that as a method of aid to Britain that would not involve us in war—would not give the President powers which would take us further toward war. I supported it in good faith, and represented in my opinion the reasonable development of the positions of the political parties before the last election.

I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if that had been done at that time, it would have provided all the aid to England that England has received up to this time, and I want to suggest further that if that purchasing had been left in the hands of the British themselves, I believe they would have gotten more aid than they have under the present program.

The other day we had presented to us the method by which this lease-lend aid is given to England. Those who seek it first go to Mr. Hopkins' department. They are referred upstairs to the Army, and the Army must go to the President.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. TAFT. There are three to whom they must go.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall gladly yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. TAFT. I only want to ask the Senator if the method I proposed, which I voted for, would not have been just as effective, and perhaps more effective, than the present bureaucratic management of this lease-lend program?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the able Senator from Ohio gets any consolation from being a "yes-but" Senator, he can derive such satisfaction as he chooses.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that in my opinion the only kind of Senator that is any good is a "yes-but" Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. TAFT. The "yes, yes" Senator seems to me to be of no value to the Nation. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. I say, Mr. President, the issue came up again when the question of extending the Selective Service Act was before the Senate on the 7th of August. I do not know what kind of a substitute proposal the able and meritorious "yes-but" Senator from Ohio proposed to that. I suppose he had some other kind of a substitute. He may have been willing to put the men in some other kind of an army, or some other kind of camps, or under some other kind of circumstances, but, to say the least of it, when the question came on the issue of whether or not the men should be retained in service for an additional period, the able Senator from Ohio was 1 of the 30 voting "no." And he was in the company of his colleague the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the other able and distinguished Senators who have chosen the do-nothing course of defending America.

So what disturbs me, Mr. President, is, what kind of defense would America have today if those Senators' counsel had prevailed before their country? What have they proposed except "no" to every substantial proposal that has been offered since this menace has threatened us? Men may conscientiously and do conscientiously differ about methods by which policies may be best attained, but when you find such continuity, Mr. President, such persistence, such clear lines of demarcation, it must reflect clear lines of division in sentiment and thought as to how a policy may best be achieved.

So here today we find ourselves having gone contrary to the advice of our able colleagues, and at every stage in the struggle they wave the flag of war. They have shouted from the housetops, from the Senate floor, over the radio, and through the columns of a friendly press that the danger to America lay not from the wiles and the sinister aggressions of Hitler but from Roosevelt. I have heard Senators on this floor engage in joint debate, speak for half an hour, and at the end of that time never mentioned the name of Adolf Hitler. A visitor from another land, from another planet, hearing it, would get only the impression that the liberties of this land were being bitterly assaulted and viciously undermined by a man who had no purpose save to enslave his own people.

I heard a witness, whose testimony is recorded in the committee hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, last week actually have the front and the face to tell the Senate committee and the country that the only reason Roosevelt was trying to drag this country into war was to flee from the social disturbance and the economic problems confronting him here at home. Even Senators have seriously made such a contention to the country and to their colleagues.

Mr. President, I remember very well that in 1936 the President did make his speech at Chautauqua in New York. I know he said then, "I hate war." I believe no man can honestly say that he has changed his mind, and that he has become a lover of the horrors of war, that he is anxious to see blood spilled upon the battlefield, and men driven to the watery graves of the oceans.

Yet, Mr. President, he was charged with the destinies and the security of his country. He was a sentinel on the tower, from a peculiar position of advantage able to see the enemy as he approached. And so in the able Senator from Illinois' great city of Chicago in 1937 the President made a statement which provoked the same challenge, the same controversy and accusation which we have heard with respect to almost everything he has said on the subject. He said that these aggressor nations must be quarantined. That was an active defense. That was an affirmative defense. Why did he seek to quarantine them? So he could take their soil, enslave their population, take their resources? No, so that there could be built around them a wall of quarantine which would keep their infectious diseases from contaminating the world community.

What happened? In the press, on the radio, and in the Senate there came the clamor of accusation that Roosevelt was a warmonger, an interventionist meddling in Europe. I was immensely gratified to have more than one of the witnesses of the opposition before the committee last week come out unequivocally and say that a part of the responsibility for the present bloodshed and chaos rests upon the heads of those who made this Nation after the World War repudiate its obligation to every dead American soldier.

There are Senators today sitting in the Senate opposing this measure as they opposed America's foreign policy a generation ago, and if their counsels were allowed to prevail, the same tragic result would follow now as then.

So the policy of doing something on the one hand, and the policy of doing nothing on the other, are not a new line of distinction between Members of the Senate.

When the President saw that this danger was creeping closer and closer, this menace growing more and more threatening, he said, "Very well; let us try the philosophy of the opposition." They say that the reason why we got into the first World War was because Wall Street wanted to make money and munitions manufacturers wanted trade, and that we had loaned money to those countries, which got us so interwoven with their destiny that we had to go to war.

The President said, "All right; let us try staying out of the war and see if the war will stay away from us. Let us try staying away from Europe and see if Europe's dictators will stay away from us."

So this Congress performed the noble experiment—and I am glad it did—of trying that principle and following that philosophy. We said that no American ship may sail, and no American citizen may travel, to a belligerent port or through a combat zone, no American citizen may lend money to a belligerent power, no American citizen may send munitions or implements of war to any belligerent power, and laid down certain other restrictions in the Neutrality Act.

Did it have a fair trial? Until a relatively short time ago, we did not send any ships over there that even came near the danger area.

What happened? Did that policy work? Everybody knows the tragic contrary, Mr. President. It did not work. We discovered the necessity of changing our method of defense from one of negation to one of affirmation. Hence, I say today that probably the issue of this contest is peace or war; but peace is on the side of an all-out effort to save Hitler's victims and America at the same time, with money and materials. Let those who would stop our production or interfere with its delivery think and ponder what they do, because, if this desperate attempt to save America's peace fails, God help us. There is nothing else that I know of, other than a naval war, to which we may resort.

But Senators say that if we are to do anything we must do everything. Because we are willing to sell materials and to lend money to a belligerent power, that does not mean that we are willing to send an expeditionary force. Perhaps my name has been as much associated with an affirmative policy as the name of any other Senator. A moment ago I endeavored to correct the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in his statement. I have never favored war, but I have done everything I could to keep war on the other side of the Atlantic, or at least away from American shores.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have before me a statement by the Senator from Florida which seems to me so contrary to the statement that he has never favored war that I should like to read it to the Senator and ask for his interpretation of it.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. TAFT. This is a statement made in the Senate on August 6:

There have been some of us too little heard and too infrequently believed, who have ventured to point out that there was a chance that that horrible alternative could be avoided. We said, "Strike Hitler now, when he is most beset. Strike him when others are clutching and grasping at his evil hands. Help those who try to snatch his



bloody sword from his swinging arm. Clutch him from behind. Seize him on the side. Throw obstacles in his path."

Does the Senator claim that such a course is not a course of war?

Mr. PEPPER. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me obvious that there is no possible way of clutching Hitler from behind, seizing him on the side, and throwing obstacles in his path except by going to war with him. How can we seize the German Army or Hitler unless we go to war with them?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in discussing this matter the opposition has persistently resorted to the trickery of a catchword. It has always said that everything we did of an affirmative character was war. When we did the first thing it said that that was war because it was in violation of international law. It said that the Lend-Lease Act was war. It said that changing the Embargo Act after the war had started was an unneutral act and an act of war.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to read to the Senator another statement, because earlier we had some controversy as to what the Senator had said about Tokyo. On May 6 the Senator said:

I venture to suggest that, of course, there are many easier ways of solving the problem. If we will just modify the law which now prohibits the recruiting of American aviators in the United States for service with the Chinese Army, and let Chiang Kai-shek, one of the big men of his time, have the advantage of some gallant American boys at the controls of some first-class American bombing planes, 50 of them, in my opinion, can make a shambles out of Tokyo.

Can the United States send 50 American boys and 50 American planes, even under the name of Chiang Kai-shek, to make a shambles out of Tokyo without engaging in war?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is now misquoting what he has just read. I suggested that the restrictions against voluntary enlistment in the Chinese air force be stricken down. I did not suggest that the Government send American boys over there. I suggested removing the legal obstacles to their volunteering if they wanted to volunteer. Then I said that if America should sell to Chiang Kai-shek some first-class American bombing planes, his aviators, be they Americans or those of other nationalities, could use those bombing planes against some of the fragile Japanese cities, which would probably prevent a Japanese assault upon American interests and might save us a war with Japan.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read what preceded that statement of the Senator:

Let us demand and receive certain safeguards against this assassin lurking behind the door to stick a stiletto in our backs as soon as we become more engaged in the Atlantic. Like another Mussolini with his dagger poised on France when a moment of crisis came from Germany, stands Japan ready to assassinate us at the first possible opportunity.

Then followed what I have just read.

I think the Senator is quibbling when he says that he is not for war. There are other statements which I should be glad to read to the Senator. As I understand the Senator's statement, nothing the United States does is ever war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, again I say that the Senator is willing to shield himself behind the deceptive shroud of the word "war." Again I remind the Senator that he has been one of the loudest of those who, from the inception of this controversy, have said that everything we have already done is war. He has said that the President has already carried us to war, and that we are already in a war.

Mr. TAFT. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator says that we are now at war, I do not agree with the Senator's definition of war.

Mr. TAFT. I said that the *Kearny* incident was war, but that it was only a preliminary skirmish, so to speak, and that we could back out. I do not think that everything the President has done is war. That is the only thing I know of that was actually war.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to have the able Senator tell me whether or not we are now at war, in the opinion of the Senator. Are we at war now, in the opinion of the able Senator?

Mr. TAFT. Well, we have had some—

Mr. PEPPER. Well, are we at war—yes or no? [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. No; we are not at war, of course—

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. So we are not at war; and yet the events of shooting—

Mr. TAFT. But we have today engaged in a warlike act which, unless the policy is brought to an end by the action of this Congress will constitute war. It is war today. But I say it is, so to speak, a preliminary skirmish from which we may still withdraw—and, incidentally, something from which we can withdraw, because the President was not authorized in any way to undertake the conveying of British ships to Britain.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President; a war is something, too, I take it, from which you can withdraw; so that is not the criterion, of course.

Mr. President, the people know what war is. The people know when we are in a war. The Congress knows when we are in a war, and the whole world will know when we are in a war.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I will gladly yield for any question or any statement of reasonable length, but I do not want the Senator to make his own speech in my time. I will gladly yield for anything that is a reasonable question.

Mr. WHEELER. Apparently the Senator is suspicious that I want to make a speech.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; from experience. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. I can assure him that I am not going to make a speech. I wish to say to the Senator that I have seen articles in magazines and I have seen editorials in newspapers from one end of the country to the other saying that we are in the war and, consequently, since we are in the war, we should stop speaking against participation in the war, and everything of that kind. In every speech

I have made from one end of the country to the other I have said that we are not in the war, and I feel that we are not in the war.

The speech the President made last night was a speech which, to me, indicated very clearly that he feels we are in the war and also that we should get further into the war. I cannot put any other construction upon that speech; and I must confess that while I felt that the steps we were taking were steps which ultimately would lead us into the war, I have felt that the President really did not want to take us into the war, but that he was being pushed into the war by the Willkies, the Dorothy Thompsons, the Knoxes, and many other persons. But after hearing the speech last night I am afraid I am going to have to change my opinion and come to the conclusion that as a matter of fact the President himself wants to go to war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad the able Senator suggested that point. I realize, as I said in the beginning, that there is a sharp difference of opinion among patriotic Americans as to the best way to defend America. I do not believe the able Senator from Montana would question the patriotism of the American President who was elected by the American people. I do not believe the able Senator from Montana would honestly attribute to him any sinister design or scheme or purpose other than to the best of his ability, as God gives him wisdom in this tragic time, to do what is best for his country.

Mr. WHEELER. I will say—

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to finish the answer, then he can comment a little later if he desires to do so.

Mr. President, I am not the spokesman for the President; but from his public utterances I have gained the impression that he feels—and speaking for myself, and I can speak only for myself, I favor an unequivocal declaration and assertion to that effect—that Hitler shall be crushed, that Hitler shall be defeated. I say that without any hesitation or reluctance, and I said it for the first time in this Senate in 1940, on the 21st of May, when I introduced the first resolution proposing that, at the discretion of the President, the United States be allowed to sell to the Allies airplanes belonging to our own Army and Navy.

Mr. WHEELER rose.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Montana will indulge me—at that time, when I introduced the resolution, I said:

Mr. President, in contact a few moments ago with the Associated Press, I received very startling news that the German forces have captured the town of Abbeville, which is within 15 miles of the English Channel, and that the Ninth French Army, with General Giraud of that Army, have been captured, and that there is considered to be something approaching disorder in the armies of the Allied Powers.

In view of that situation, which may be the turning point in the history of our civilization, we know how low must be the morale of the powers who are fighting the battle of liberty and freedom in Europe today. We all know that they have been out-manuevered and have had to face a superior air power.

We know that under the law of this country they have been permitted to purchase airplanes here, which have been produced relatively as rapidly as our factory facilities would allow, but I feel, and I think there are many other Senators in this body who feel that the next few hours, or certainly the next few days, may determine what kind of a world this is going to be.

I think that the case which presents itself to the United States is one of stopping the danger at its source, more than that of distributing our energies over a wide territory against the danger which does emanate from a specific source. We are interested in our national defense, but the best way to assure our national defense is to see to it that Hitlerism does not dominate the world by force.

The war must be kept over there.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Pardon me, please. Then a little later, Mr. President, I made one statement, and it is the only reference I shall make of that character. It was quoted in the column of Mr. Raymond Clapper.

Mr. WHEELER. When was the quotation made?

Mr. PEPPER. The quotation was made on the 25th of May 1940.

Mr. WHEELER. Was that when he was registered with the State Department as a British agent, or was it before that time?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know about that. I am simply referring to Mr. Clapper's article because it is the handiest source from which to obtain the remarks of the Senator from Florida. I have a very high opinion of Mr. Clapper; but if the Senator from Montana does not, that is his business.

Mr. WHEELER. I am simply saying that apparently Mr. Clapper did have a change of heart; because after he was registered at the State Department as a British agent, the tenor of his articles was changed completely.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well, I am quoting the sentence I uttered on this floor, Mr. President; that is my purpose in quoting this article of Mr. Clapper's:

I am not going to let a day pass when I do not raise my voice against the folly of sitting back wishfully hoping that the enemy will not attack us or may not attack us, and not doing something while it will be effective and before it is too late. \* \* \* Now, we can turn the scales of battle by goods and by money and by airplanes, and perhaps even more, by a straightforward, manly declaration that we have enough of self-respect and enough affection for the institutions of democracy to tell Hitler that we are his eternal and mortal enemy, and that it is our will that as a political power he shall be destroyed from the face of the earth, and that every item of our strength and every bit of our courage and all of our resources we dedicate to the honorable cause of his destruction as the arch foe of decent men.

Mr. WHEELER. Now will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. PEPPER. I will, gladly.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to say to the Senator from Florida that, as he knows, I have previously complimented the Senator from Florida because of the fact that he has either known in advance what the administration was going to do and had expounded the administration's

philosophy with reference to the situation, on the floor of the Senate, or else the administration has followed him. Because the Senator from Florida has from the very beginning urged the very steps from time to time which the administration has subsequently taken; and the Senator from Florida has stood on this floor, day after day and time after time, urging these steps, while almost every other Member of the Senate, except possibly the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], has disagreed with the Senator from Florida, and has said that we were not going to take such and such a step and that we were not going to do so and so; and they have had completely to eat their words, day after day, and in speech after speech.

With reference to the President, I say to the Senator from Florida quite frankly—and I am not one of those who objects to American citizens or American Senators disagreeing with me as to what is the best way to stop Mr. Hitler; I want to stop him just the same as the Senator from Florida does, and the same as everyone else in this body does. But I resent, and I think the administration and every Member on the floor of the Senate ought to resent, British and other royal refugees coming to the United States and trying to tell the people of the United States of America that they ought to go into the war to save democracy, in Europe, when they themselves left Europe and brought their gold with them to the United States or took it to England. Now, almost from one end of this country to the other, they are carrying on propaganda to get the American people into Europe's war. I resent Englishmen and royal refugees coming here and doing that at a time when we were supposed to be neutral.

Of course, I cannot believe, and will not believe, that the President of the United States has any ulterior motive, that he wants to take this country into war. I think he is mistaken in the steps he is taking today, just as I think the Senator from Florida is mistaken in his views with reference to the matter, but I also think the Senator from Florida is honest in his convictions, and I hope that he gives me credit for being honest in the convictions which I myself shall express and have expressed upon the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for his comment. I advert to it not because it is necessary, but I certainly never questioned in any sense of the word the patriotism or the right of the able Senator from Montana or any other Senator to follow the course which he thinks is best in order to defend America. I started by saying that all of us are patriotic, all of us want to save America, and the question is, What is the best way to do it?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I will gladly yield, but I admonished my able friend from Montana, whose persistence when he begins to speak is even beyond his own control, that I did not want to do more than answer a question. If the Senator wants to ask a question, I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I merely want to ask the Senator if a constitutional declaration of war is necessary to defeat Hitler, would the Senator from Florida favor such a declaration of war?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, sir; and I am glad the Senator has given me an opportunity to refer to that, although I was going to make my position very clear. Mr. President, I am not in controversy here, or in issue; but I want to say that, within my recollection, the President of the United States has never yet told me or intimated to me that I should say one thing about foreign policy or anything else, but I have the privilege of representing, in part, a sovereign State in the American Union, and, so long as I do, I am going to give utterance to such sentiments about local or foreign issues as are a part of my convictions.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Does the Senator think that Hitler could be defeated short of a declaration of war by the United States?

Mr. PEPPER. I answer, "Yes."

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Will the Senator from Florida amplify his statement?

Mr. PEPPER. I will be delighted to do so in a moment. The question raises the crucial issue that is presented by the pending legislation. I say that the purpose of the President and the purpose of those who have supported the same policy which he favors has been to accomplish just that—the defeat of Hitler without America going to war. I say that perhaps without intending it, the able Senators from Montana and Idaho and some of the other Senators on their side, with the utmost sincerity, have shackled wherever they could that policy; in other words, that policy has not yet had a fair chance.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I have never advocated anything except what the President himself advocated when he was a candidate for election in 1936 and 1940. I stand today on the same platform the President stood on, and I am advocating exactly what he advocated with reference to the Neutrality Act, as I shall point out later. He used some very eloquent words in 1940. I believed his words then when he used them with reference to the Neutrality Act; I have not changed my opinion; apparently he has. I do not see any reason for changing my opinion, because, as a matter of fact, if the Senator will examine the record, he will find, I think, that today Hitler is in a much weaker position than he was when the President made his speeches in the campaign of 1940.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator, and, if he will forgive me, unless he wants to ask a question, I shall respectfully decline further to yield, because I desire to terminate my remarks.

Mr. President, today the Senate is faced with the issue of whether methods other than war shall be given a fair trial. We

have known all along that if we saved our country from war and at the same time from Hitler it would take the utmost of exertion in money and in materials. Suppose an appropriation were proposed for lend-lease aid and Senators cut the appropriation half in two; then would it be fair to say that Roosevelt had failed in his policy?

If today by strikes or employers' greed or public indifference or anything else the flood of materials from potential factories and products from the farms of the country is reduced or production is prevented, the alternative to war has not been given a fair chance.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LEE. If certain responsible officers of the Government go about over the country assuring strikers and laborers that there is no emergency, regardless of what the President has said, does not the Senator from Florida think that such action encourages the workmen to stop production?

Mr. PEPPER. I have said, from the beginning, that, while legislation to enable the Government to deal adequately with the necessities of the situation is, I think, desirable, and I have at times voted for some of it and am ready to vote for more, there is just one thing that will cause America to do its best, and that is an aroused and indignant public opinion. We vote every day in this body according to the reflection of public opinion from the country, and in the last analysis, we will probably vote on the pending measure according to the way the country reacts to the recommendations of the committee. I say that when America becomes of one will and one mind, determined to crush Hitler, and to throw our whole soul into an effort to crush Hitler, and save our peace at the same time, we will see the factories begin to operate with a new energy, and the wheels to whirl with a speed which they never had, and Americans cheerfully to accept the sacrifice that is entailed by the defense effort. Then men will quit thinking about profit and labor unions of wages or hours or anything else for the time being, and think about crushing Hitler and saving the blood of their sons from being spilled upon the battlefields of South America or somewhere else where we will eventually have to meet a conquering Hitler if this Nation is to live.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LEE. But if the public are drugged into an unnatural sleep by the doctrine of false security which the isolationists have preached, does the Senator think then the public will become aroused to such a pitch as will give us the maximum in production which is so necessary for the success of our short-of-war program?

Mr. PEPPER. Obviously not.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. The Senator was exceedingly candid in answering my first question, that is, whether if a constitutional declaration of war were necessary to defeat Hitler he would favor it. He said he would favor it.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. May I follow that up by asking the Senator if an American expeditionary force to Europe in defense of a declaration of war is necessary to defeat Hitler, would the Senator favor that?

Mr. PEPPER. Remembering now the exact language of the Senator's question—which I beg not to be misquoted—the answer to that is "yes."

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I stop at no sacrifice on the part of this country to defeat Hitler if all other measures fail after fair trial; but the Senator from Idaho is one of those who have not been willing to give the alternative a fair trial, and are not willing today. You would rather say, "I will risk war with Hitler a year or 2 years or 5 years from now. I will risk meeting him in the ultimate future. I will risk his dominating the Eastern Hemisphere rather than risk sending a few ships to a belligerent port, or conveying some American merchant material on the way to get the tools into the hands of those who stand against his bloody assault today."

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Plus an expeditionary force of American boys.

Mr. PEPPER. Nobody has said anything about an expeditionary force except the opposition. They are always the ones who have referred to that.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. The Senator from Florida said he would send an expeditionary force if it was necessary to defeat Hitler.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. I will ask the Senator from Idaho a question. Would he prefer to be the victim of Hitler rather than to send an expeditionary force?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Well, now—

Mr. PEPPER. Answer the question "Yes" or "No" as I did. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The occupants of the galleries will preserve order.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Now that the Senator has asked me a question, will he permit me to reply?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not want to send an expeditionary force to Europe. I would vote against a declaration of war. I do not want to send an expeditionary force to South America or to Canada. I do not want to send one anywhere, Mr. President; and just as the the policy of the President and the majority, to which the able Senator from Idaho has not been able to subscribe, just as, in the language of Mr. Cudahy and many others, the policy we followed in the past has saved our peace and kept Hitler from the conquest of Britain to this day. I believe as I live that we can still, by giving the alternative to war a fair chance, eventually accomplish the double purpose of crushing Hitler and keeping out of war.

Now I am going to address myself to the method of crushing Hitler and saving us from ever having to send an expeditionary force.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Does the Senator think that can be done?

Mr. PEPPER. I do, and I shall address myself right now to how I think it can be done.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. The Senator from Florida is going to address himself, as I understand, to how we can defeat Hitler without sending an expeditionary force to Europe.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall gladly do so.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I shall be very happy to listen.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not propose—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield before he proceeds further?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the Senator from Idaho answer the question of the Senator from Florida before the Senator from Florida starts on another line of thought.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I was about to attempt to answer the question of the Senator from Florida when, I think, he ran into another subject. Will the Senator from Florida repeat his question? I shall be happy to try to answer it.

Mr. PEPPER. The question was, Would the Senator from Idaho prefer that this country become the victim of Hitler rather than to send an expeditionary force?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. In answer to the Senator's question—

Mr. PEPPER. "Yes" or "no."

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Oh, well, of course "no." All right; "no"; but let me amplify. The Senator from Florida amplified, did he not? Let me say that the Senator from Florida has assumed that we will become a victim of Hitler.

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, no!

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Let me ask the Senator a further question. What possible ground has he for assuming that this country will become a victim of Hitler, which is the premise of his question?

Mr. PEPPER. I will answer that, and I will say that the Senator from Idaho also assumes the necessity of sending an expeditionary force; does he not?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Yes, but I asked the question on that assumption.

Mr. PEPPER. May I not be permitted to cherish a little assumption to my breast also?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. The Senator usually does without permission.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator asked that question, because it is the crux of this whole matter.

It has been said by certain British generals—and I know the opposition will quote them and has quoted them—that to defeat Hitler it was necessary that we send an expeditionary force to Europe. Remember, Mr. President, that we are yet the masters of our own course. We decide what we shall do to defend America. Everything we have done from the beginning has had in the policy of this

country but one purpose, and that was to defend America. I am sorry the phrase "aid to Britain" ever found utterance in a single mouth. I have never voted a dollar to aid Britain. I have no right to do so, unless there is a catastrophe in that country like the earthquake in Japan. I would vote to aid Japan, as much as I detest the Japanese, as we did vote to give them money from the Federal Treasury if they were devastated by an earthquake.

But lend-lease money, these policies that we have pursued, were not intended to aid Britain. They were as much intended to aid Russia, or China, or Yugoslavia, or Greece, or any other opponent of Hitler as they were to aid Britain.

But Britain happened to be the strongest of the opposition. She happened to have exhibited heroic courage when she was disarmed and assaulted, her homes battered down by villainous bombs, her children mangled, and her altars profaned. That heroic, calm courage perhaps stemmed the tide of an aggressor's conquest of the world. So, of course, it is only natural that we thought primarily in terms of helping the most vigorous of the opposition.

But the day Hitler assaulted Russia, I will say to my able friend, I gave to the Associated Press a statement in which I said that I thought Russia was as much entitled to the benefits of the Lend-Lease Act as Britain was; and I apply the same principle to any and every opponent of Hitler.

So, Mr. President, we are not going to let British generals or anybody else tell us how we shall defend America. That is the first point. Pershing did not let the British or the French tell him how to use the American Army. Thank God! With the support of an American President he kept it an independent force, without which, in my opinion, the other struggle would not have been decided against the Hitler of 1914-18.

So, Mr. President, it is not men that the enemies of Hitler need. It is tanks and guns and airplanes. I read here last Thursday afternoon, from the Evening Star, what Lord Beaverbrook had said in the House of Lords when he came back from Russia. He said that Stalin said, "The one who can make the most motors is going to win this war," which, he added, gave much satisfaction to Mr. Harriman, because his country was making more motors than any other nation in the world. Nobody, so far as I know, questioned that statement. Stalin said certain other things that Lord Beaverbrook reported to the British House of Lords; that is, that when they achieved a proper quantity and coordination of tanks and airplanes they could stop Hitler. At least, that course has not failed yet. We have not given them an adequate supply to see whether they could stop him with them or not.

Russia has 160,000,000 people. That was her population. I did not see the Senators of the opposition jumping to the front here when Russia was assaulted, trying to preserve Russia's manpower. They let them be crucified every passing day and night. They did not seem very much interested to save Russia's men

with American materials that would stand as a bar to Hitler's eastern assault.

Britain has 40,000,000 people in the British Isles. We hear Senators every day tell us how populous is the British Empire. Although Canadian soldiers abroad are volunteers, and Senators have criticized Canada because she did not have conscription to send her men overseas, Canada has already sent abroad a number of volunteers which, compared to our population, would have been like sending 3,000,000 men abroad from the United States of America. Australia, New Zealand, the whole British family, is splendidly loyal—even India. If anybody wants to make a claim about that, I have seen the stimulating figures on how many men from India have come into this contest on the side of Britain, although I am not going to digress to discuss what should be the future of India, because I want to see them have the freedom which every other people in the world should enjoy when this struggle is eventually over. So it is not manpower that the enemies of Hitler need: it is material and machines.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What does the Senator, then, understand to be the basis of the publicly expressed opinion of Gen. Sir Archibald Wavell and General Auchinleck, the two leading British soldiers of the present day, that it will be absolutely necessary to have an American expeditionary force, and that the war cannot be won without it?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I said a moment ago that I assume that those British generals were stating their honest convictions; but I also said, as the able Senator from Missouri—who served gallantly in the world War—knows, that some British generals said that if we did not infiltrate the American Army into the British and French Armies in the World War, the Allies would lose that war, too. Pershing did not do it, and we did not lose the war. So the British generals are no more infallible than are other people on earth.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that this member of Parliament who was an aide of Lord Beaverbrook, who called upon me a couple of weeks ago, said to me definitely that they needed 3,000,000 men from the United States. He stated that England would match man for man with the 3,000,000 men, and that that was the only way in which they could eventually defeat Hitler.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the statement given to the Senator in private conversation, and no doubt correctly reported by the Senator to the Senate, might have represented the honest opinion of the speaker. I am not going into whether he thought that or not; I am going into the question of whether those are the facts.

Germany never had more than seventy or eighty million population, not over

80,000,000 even after they took in Sude-teland and some other territory. They have certainly lost millions of men through disability, if not death, during the course of this struggle.

But even beyond that, this has become a war of economies, a struggle between economic systems, between nations in morale and material, and not only as to men on the firing line.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. I have not been able to understand why an empire with 400,000,000 men could not get enough of an army to Africa to continue the Libyan defensive, or even to hold the line they had obtained, and why they had to send a rather limited force to Greece. If they are not short of men, why could not England, the year after the war began, have placed a million men in Africa, instead of three or four hundred thousand?

Mr. PEPPER. Because they have not the materials for those men. That is the reason. There was a time when the Libyan defensive was almost devoid of tanks. They had two contingents of tanks which they were using to resist the attack. They sent one-half of them back to Alexandria, or thereabouts, to be repaired, and they lost nearly all the others in some unexpected and unfavorable assault which the Germans—reinforced by Italians and supplies which had been sent across the Mediterranean—made. There was a time when the British Army was relatively without tanks in its defense of Libya. The Senator knows that some of the vessels which have gone from the United States around through the Red Sea have taken the hazards they have taken in an effort to get equipment into the hands of the British Libyan Army.

Mr. TAFT. The army itself was never bigger than about 150,000, according to all reports, with the British having power to draw on the entire British Empire, with 400,000,000 people, outside of the English themselves.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what good would a million men do without modern equipment with which to resist an army equipped with that kind of machines? It is not a question, I repeat, of men, but of materials, and that is what is involved in the pending measure today, the getting of materials to those men who are fighting against Hitler.

Mr. TAFT. If there had been a sufficient number of men there, with even a limited amount of materials, they could have at least held the Libyan line which they captured.

Mr. PEPPER. I am giving the Senator the benefit of my information, and he is entitled to the benefit of his belief.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. As I understand, the Senator from Florida is still

of the opinion that only by an uninterrupted supply of materials can Hitler be defeated.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator draws me back to that question. I had not finished the discussion of it.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I am trying to put a fair interpretation on what the Senator has said.

Mr. PEPPER. Will not the Senator permit me to finish the answer to his earlier question? He might sit down and be more comfortable; it will take me a little time.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. May I ask the Senator another question first? Then he will be able to answer two questions at once.

Mr. PEPPER. Gladly.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. If the Neutrality Act shall be repealed, and we undertake to do what the Senator thinks and hopes, as we all do—will be the solution—that is, furnish the necessary materials—does the Senator think that if our ships are sent over to English ports with these necessary materials, they will be sunk?

Mr. PEPPER. It depends on the effectiveness of the American Navy and the skill of those American ships. Possibly some of them will be sunk. Probably the vast majority of them, with adequate protection from the Navy and with proper armament—I mean arms upon those ships which are merchantmen—will deliver the goods.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I think the Senator's answer is a very fair one. If some of those ships are sunk, then will the Senator be willing to vote, we will say, for a constitutional declaration of war?

Mr. PEPPER. The answer is "No."

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. The answer is "No"?

Mr. PEPPER. That is right.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I am sorry to have intruded on the Senator, but I thank him for his very able address.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to suggest to the Senator that there are American ships being fired upon and American ships going down at the present time in the defensive waters of the United States, in the Western Hemisphere, and every United States Senator upon three different occasions since I have been in the Senate, in the last 3 years, has solemnly proclaimed that we would defend rights with our ingenuity, our money, and our manpower, if necessary. So it is not a question of whether or not these ships are going to be sunk as they sail into British ports. They have already been fired upon, they have already been going down, far, far away from any zone which has ever been outlined by Adolf Hitler as a combat zone, where our ships could not go.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. May I intrude just for the purpose of asking the Senator from Illinois a question?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will excuse me, I should like to conclude my remarks, and answer the Senator's other two questions.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I think the Senator is entirely within his rights, and without intruding on the Senator's time, may I say that not a single ship flying the American flag has been fired upon with a torpedo in the Western Hemisphere, outside of the *Robin Moor*.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall advert to that.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Florida will yield, I shall be glad to answer. The Senator from Idaho either does not know where the Western Hemisphere is, or the Senator from Illinois does not know.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Will the Senator from Illinois name another ship which has been sunk in the Western Hemisphere, flying the American flag, even according to the interpretation by the Senator from Illinois of the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall gladly go into the question of ship sinkings within a short time.

I stated in the first place that it was not men, but equipment; that the enemies of Hitler needed.

In the second place, I said that Hitler's supply of men is not inexhaustible. I have read reports to the effect that on the Russian front men far below the ordinary standards of the German soldier have been pressed into service there. So even Hitler's men will sometime be no more for him to hurl in his purposes of conquest.

In the third place, this is a war of raw materials as much as of men. This country itself is dependent upon strategic and critical materials from abroad for ability to defend itself with its own armament. I will show a little later that those materials are coming from remote areas on the other side of the earth.

Hitler had stored up food, we are informed by the testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations, for about a year. I do not know from what date that year was figured, but even if he stored it up a minute ago, that would mean he has stored up food for only a year hence. I think that had to do with the beginning of the war, or a period at least half way through the war up to date.

In addition to that, we know that Hitler used agricultural commodities and raw materials, which he has gotten from South America and other areas of the earth, for the purpose of buying critical and strategic materials with which to build up his stores in Germany before the war started.

We know that he was spending at least half the national income of Germany to build up a war supply before the war started. He started in 1933, and has kept that up ever since. But we know that Germany is a poor country, that she does not have vast quantities of war materials of the kind necessary to make modern implements of war. We know that one of the reasons why Hitler assailed Russia, and why he took the Balkans, and why he is trying to get the Black Sea and northern Africa and the Near East, is his desire to get his hands on the oil and the chromium ore and the

other supplies without which his war machine will stall of its own inertia.

So if we can keep Hitler in Europe; if we can keep the Russians across his path to the Near East and to Africa and Asia, and out of the control of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea; if we can keep the British Navy around him as he is confined to Europe; if we can keep the Royal Air Force continuing to bruise his evil head and to batter down the morale of his people, as well as his storehouses and his factories; if we can keep raw materials away from him, from the Near East, the Far East, and from the eastern part of Russia and Asia and Africa, there will come an eventual day when Hitler will fall of his own inability to go ahead. Particularly, Mr. President, when he shall be met by the armies of Russia, and the armies of the British Empire, and the disturbed and agitating populations that today writhe under his evil heel.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LEE. Is it not true that a dictator is like a top which, when it stops going, falls down?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

So, Mr. President, I say that if we will get materials from this country to those defenders against Hitler, they can hold him somewhere. He may, if he breaks the Russian line, take the Near East, because the British and the Russians do not have these strategic materials and implements of war which they ought to have from us. He may spill over into the area around the Mediterranean, which is going to be the purpose of his winter campaign. He may even drive the British out of the Mediterranean—God forbid that he shall! But, Mr. President, somewhere there will be a line. Somewhere there will be an enemy drawn up against him. Wherever that enemy is, I want to give it tanks and airplanes and guns and powder and cannon. I want to give it, Mr. President, the materials with which it may continue to resist Hitler's assaults.

If Hitler's line of supplies, therefore, is lengthened by yet more miles, and tens of miles, and hundreds of miles; if the front is in Africa, and in Asia, in India, that means he has that much farther to carry his men and his supplies, and some day the retribution of the earth will fall like an avenging sword upon his neck.

Mr. President, I believe if we will give this method of saving America by money and materials a fair chance, that it can eventually—not tomorrow, not next week, perhaps not the next year or the year after—but it can eventually choke Hitler back into impotence in his own dark Teutonic forests.

But, Mr. President, I know that if he had conquered England, as these witnesses said he would have done within the last year if we had not helped England, and he today had England under his heel, if he had the mastery of the British Navy the way he has the control of the French Navy today, if there were no British Empire to rally against him,

whose hundreds of millions of men and hundreds of millions of money could not be thrown into the battle against him—if that heroic British courage were not today standing in his path wherever he turned, I would not feel as I do today, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] would not feel as he does today, about the security and the integrity of the United States of America and the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Did I understand the Senator to say that some of the witnesses who testified in these hearings said that Hitler would have conquered England had we not sent aid?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, sir. Ex-Ambassador Cudahy said it in the testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, a copy of which I have in my hand.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Did he suggest how that would have been done, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. I did not ask him. He just said that. [Laughter.] He was certainly on the ground and had an opportunity to know more about it than I do.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did not the Senator himself make a statement a few days ago on the floor of the Senate in which he advised the Senate that some man high in public life in England made the same sort of contention?

Mr. PEPPER. The statement has repeatedly been made in England, Mr. President, that we have saved them by coming to their aid.

Mr. LUCAS. And it was so stated by Mr. Cordell Hull before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, was it not?

Mr. PEPPER. That is exactly correct. And yet everyone of those methods, Mr. President, by which we saved them, has been opposed by our friends of the opposition.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I may refresh the Senator's memory with respect to the testimony of Mr. Cudahy, and I should like the attention of the Senator from Idaho. Did not Mr. Cudahy, after describing the materials of war which the English left on the shores at Dunkerque, state that if it had not been for the rifles which the United States sent to Britain, that Britain would have gone down?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; he made that statement, and it is contained in the testimony.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Of course, if Mr. Cudahy made that statement he made it. But I have never yet heard it made by a competent military or naval authority. It is inconceivable to me that Hitler had any way of getting his armies over to England in order to effect a conquest. It may be that the Senator from

Florida [Mr. PEPPER] or the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] have some explanation of how that might be done. If so I should like to hear it.

Mr. PEPPER. I will have to leave the Senator to form his own opinion about that matter. He can argue with Mr. Cudahy about that if he wants to. I was quoting Mr. Cudahy on the subject.

Mr. President, was it the United States which started the shooting in respect to this war? We occupied Iceland, yes. Why? To defend America and because Hitler had already ruthlessly captured the country to which the allegiance of Iceland ran. It was for purposes of defense of this hemisphere, and not for offensive purposes. We were supplying that territory with food and shelter and mail and the other necessities for its comfort and subsistence when our ships were attacked.

Not only that, Mr. President, but I have before me a map showing Hitler's restricted zone in which he forbade the ships of other nations to come upon the penalty of being sunk. Suppose we had taken Mr. Hitler at his word. There has not been any American ship—I mean ship flying the American flag—sunk in that area. Where have they been sunk? I have here a map which shows where they were sunk. They were sunk in the southern Atlantic, more than a thousand miles, two thousand miles, from Hitler's restricted zone. Were they carrying contraband? No. The *Lehigh* was empty, bound to a port on the western coast of Africa to get materials for the United States of America, and not for Britain.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator realizes, I suppose, of course, that Hitler has two restricted zones, one on a map and another in his mind.

Mr. PEPPER. Well, that is a good way of putting it. In his mind, Mr. President, we are forbidden every area upon the high seas where he thinks anything we do will be inimical to his purpose of conquering the world.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. How does the Senator know that?

Mr. PEPPER. Well, men manifest the inclination of their minds by what they do and what they say, I will say to the Senator; and a fool, though a wayfaring man, could not think anything else of Hitler from what he has said and what he has done.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. That is a perfectly logical answer. Would not the Senator advocate making America an armed camp in order to prevent any such possibility as that?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall show in a moment that in my humble opinion we cannot successfully defend ourselves against Hitler merely by building defenses inside continental United States.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I shall be most interested in that discussion.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be delighted to come to that point later if the Senator will allow me to finish this other thought.

So, Mr. President, not in the restricted zone drawn off by Hitler, but far away in the South Atlantic; not carrying contraband, but empty; not bound to a belligerent port, but to a nonbelligerent port; not to get materials for Britain, but for America; and flying the American flag, the *Lehigh* was sunk on October 19, 1941. The same was true of the *Robin Moor* and of the *City of Rayville*, which was sunk by a mine. Mr. President, anybody who relies upon the word of Hitler commits an absolute folly. One of the ships recently sunk was a ship called the *Bold Venture*. It happened to be flying the flag of Panama, although it was American-owned and operated. It was sunk on the 16th of October, 1941. I thought it might be appropriate to read to the Senate some lines which were written on that event by a great American who prefers to remain anonymous:

"BOLD VENTURE"

They sank the *Bold Venture* and Senators said:

"She should have been riding at anchor instead.

If only she'd stayed in a port of her own The Nazi command would have left her alone."

"Who? The *Bold Venture*?" the Captain replied.

They sank the *Bold Venture* and Senators said:

"If sailors would only lie quiet in bed And shipping could only be tied to a rope The Nazi command wouldn't hurt us—we hope."

"Who? The *Bold Venture*?" the Captain replied.

They sank the *Bold Venture* and Senators said:

"There's nothing to fight for. They may not be dead.

If only we'll keep all our ships off the seas The Nazis will leave us a place for our knees." "Whose? The *Bold Venture's*?" the people replied.

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

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will excuse me, I am anxious to conclude my remarks, and I shall do so as rapidly as I can.

Mr. President, it does not make any difference where the ships are. It does not make any difference what they carry. It does not make any difference whether they are loaded or unloaded. It does not make any difference whose flag they fly. It does not make any difference what their destination is. Hitler has decreed the seas for his own, and, in his satanic opinion, everybody who goes into them is an interloper.

Mr. President, can America live and defend herself and allow Hitler to win mastery over the Eastern Hemisphere and the Far East? A moment ago I said that if Hitler should succeed in his purpose of mastering the Near East, if he should drive the British out of the Mediterranean and gain mastery over Africa and Asia, he would have dominion over a land area twice as large as all the rest of the land area on the earth. If he should achieve domination of the Eastern Hemisphere, he would have seven-eighths of

the world's total population as his slaves. He would have the vastest storehouse of critical and strategic materials to be found anywhere on earth. If he should do nothing more than control those stores of materials he could dominate the earth.

No later than this afternoon I talked to a prominent official of the Maritime Commission, who stated that without the critical and strategic materials which come to us from India, Africa, the Philippines, and the Netherlands Indies, American economy and defense cannot be carried forward at satisfactory level. Today America is dependent upon those areas for the very materials to forge the weapons of our own security. Whoever dominates those strategic areas, therefore, dominates this modern, mechanized world. Hitler could keep us from adequately arming to defend ourselves if he could dominate those storehouses of materials. The best source of chromium ore is in the Black Sea area, around which today he is trying to place his boa-constrictor-like coils.

So, from one area and another he is trying to exclude us, because he knows that if he can do so he will have the power eventually to bring even great America to her knees.

What would Senators say if the very means of our existence were thus being cut away? Would it be self-defense for us to try to keep back the aggressor from those possessions? If rubber, tin, chromium, and all the other materials about which we have heard so much are cut off our great economy will be stalled, because we do not have those materials in this hemisphere in sufficient abundance to sustain our enlarged economy.

Mr. President, I am talking about the America of the future. If Hitler should come to dominate the Eastern Hemisphere he would have mastery of the major part of the people, the principal resources, territory, and markets of the earth, as opposed to a population of 230,000,000 in the whole Western Hemisphere. As the able Senator from Oklahoma pointed out the other day, across the narrow south Atlantic his submarines and bombers would ply until it would become almost untenable for any other power.

Then, with the possibility of interrupting traffic through the Panama Canal, he would have the power to keep our own Pacific Fleet from coming to the aid of the Atlantic coast, or vice versa. Then we should be encircled. One giant arm would be extended from Europe and Africa while the other arm of his gigantic power would be extended toward Alaska, across the Bering Straits. Then he would have Japan as his ally, to be used against us at his will.

Mr. President, across the Atlantic—not the North Atlantic so much as the South Atlantic—his evil sway would reach into the heart of every South American country. We had testimony which we had to exclude from this Record, and which, no doubt, motivated the members of the Foreign Relations Committee in the recommendation it made to the Senate, as to the Hitler menace to the security of South America. We

must think not only about his external assault in the old-fashioned way, but also about the kind of attack he made upon Norway, where he infiltrated by propaganda and influence into the interior of the country and crushed it from within.

If the South American countries should become Nazi-dominated states, with their armies, navies, and air forces in Hitler's control, and we should say, "Let us send an expeditionary force to clean out these evil nests," what would be said by the opposition? Distinguished colleagues of the opposition would cry, "Warmonger! Interventionist!" even though we should then, as now, be thinking only of the Monroe Doctrine and the legitimate defense of our land.

Mr. President, Senators differ about the destiny of America. There are perhaps some who think that we had no higher purpose in our creation than to disseminate across the face of the earth the marvels of modern science—the refrigerator, the radio, the automobile, and the gadgets which have had so much to do with making America a paradise of magic.

Mr. President, I am an old-fashioned believer in an old-fashioned God. I believe that God rose in His Heaven to create certain great things; and I know that one of them was this fabled land, the Atlantis of ancient Greek legend. I think He had the high purpose of sending forth from these shores the impulse to make a better world. I know that when America has been America it has been a crusading America, and not a shriveling, timid, retreating people who dared not say their sentiments to the whole world. During every crisis in our history when we thought only of ourselves, in the narrow sense we paid a terrible price. We profaned our temples and wrecked our homes, and morality fled even from the American family altar in the days when certain Senators made this Nation repudiate the possibility of a better world through the best instrument yet found by the human race—the League of Nations.

So, Mr. President, I contemplate not an America that shall be an armed camp, as my able friend says, against the ultimate "Der Tag," when Hitler will assault this continent. I do not want America's boys to be reared for conscript armies. I do not want America's income to be turned to the purposes of war. I want to have done with priorities and conscription. Let the boys go home and let the priority restrictions be removed. Let America throb again with the great purposes of peace. But in the name of God, who can foresee peace for America so long as Hitler dominates the rest of the world?

So I say, Mr. President—yes; at any cost—Hitler must and shall die.

But that does not mean that I do not want the cost to be as little as possible. That does not mean that I want to be profligate with sacred blood. That does not mean that I will not spend oceans of treasure and rivers of materials to save one humble son's life.

But, Mr. President, when I look, if ever I do, on the other side of the river, into the pale face of a dead friend, I do not

want him to reproach me with an accusation that I sacrificed him to materials or to money; and I do not want him to say I was cowardly in the directness of my assault upon this enemy, or that I was content with measly and halfway measures.

Yes; at one time I said that there might be a choice as to how many men we might have to pay for America's liberty. Eleven heroes already have had their names inscribed upon America's eternal tablet of honor. The President called their States of residence last night. They died for American liberty as much as did any Revolutionary hero, any man who died in the War of 1812, or any man who died in any other struggle in which America has participated. I would rather risk a few ships being sunk—if, God forsaking them, they should be sunk—than to dare to gamble with the terrors of a Hitler victory.

Senators, there may come the solemn day when we shall sit in these seats, while the heartstrings are clutched in grief and agonizing anguish, and vote "yes" or "no" on the question of war. But for God's sake let us postpone it as long as there is any alternative. So long as there is any hope of making some other policy effective, let us try it.

I start with the premise that Hitler must die or America cannot live. I want Hitler to be stemmed off and kept away. At the same time, I want America's peace to be preserved.

So, Mr. President, when the future looks back upon this sad and tragic present I do not want it to be said that we have spared any effort to save America's men or America's glorious destiny.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, it has been a great pleasure for me to listen to the eloquent addresses which have been made by able Senators, especially the one just concluded by the Senator from Florida. But it seems to me that we are largely missing the mark at which we should be shooting.

The circumstances surrounding the case remind me of the time when I was a boy on the ranch. Some of the older folks used to tell us children that the wild coyotes that were howling across the plains were about to come in and devour all our chickens and cattle. They excited our curiosity and caused us to listen to the noise so much that a few of us boys went out across the fields to see what was making the loud noise. We sneaked up on the coyotes which were making so much noise. We expected to see a million or more of them, but we found only two. But while we were out there trying to find all the coyotes that we thought were going to devour all our chickens, turkeys, and calves, the skunks got our chickens back home.

It seems to me that that is the situation we now face. For days Senators have been talking of the danger far across the ocean, and they have centered the attention of 130,000,000 people on the serious condition existing across the ocean; and while our 130,000,000 people are looking across the ocean at the great danger that has been very ably pointed out by Senators, radical labor leaders right here at home are calling strikes

which will deprive us of the very things which are essential to the defeat of Mr. Hitler.

I refer to the radical, wild-eyed labor leaders who are shutting down factories in the United States. We have come to the point where the President of the United States is being told by one of the labor union leaders just where the United States should head in.

I think these strikes which are so seriously handicapping our national-defense program is the burning issue of the hour. I think that is the question which should be receiving the immediate consideration of this august body. It has been pointed out by the Senator from Florida during his remarks that the war will not be won and Hitler will not be whipped by men but by tanks, ammunition, airplanes, bombers, ships, and submarines. How in the world are we to get tanks, ships, submarines, and bombers unless our factories are kept busy 24 hours a day, unless we stop the terrible strikes that are being called in the great industries of the United States, and unless every citizen is guaranteed freedom to work, without fear of being molested by means of force and violence?

It is not only the strike situation that is causing the let-down in production. It is the slow-down in production that is causing much loss. We are not producing 100 percent of every man's capacity, as we should be doing. Yet we sit idly by, not coming to the aid of our President when he is being told by one of the labor leaders that his men—53,000 men—will not go back to work. It seems to me that this question requires our attention.

Mr. President, when I refer to wild-eyed labor leaders I do not refer to the rank and file of the laboring men and women of this Nation. In fact, we know that many patriotic men and women are engaged in the production of arms and equipment at the present time; and we are thankful that we have thousands and thousands who are at their benches and at their tools, working to produce these things. But in the twinkling of an eye, one labor leader can, against the will of the rank and file of laboring people, call them away from their tools and their benches, and can cause factories to be shut down.

In my opinion, there is one way this can be stopped. I would not resort to any radical legislation that would deprive labor of any of the great gains it has made during the past 50 years. I would not deprive labor of the right to organize, the right of collective bargaining, the right to strike, and even the right to picket; but I would give to every American laborer the freedom to work, the right to pick up the tools when another man has laid them down, and proceed with the job of building the machines which America needs in order to fulfill our obligations to the democracies of the world and to the citizens of this country. I would give our people the right to pick up those tools without fear of being hit over the head with a club, or being shot or injured in any way because they want to work. Thousands of American citizens want to get behind the great program of national defense.

LXXXVII—524

They want to get behind it with all their power; but they are prevented from doing so simply because they fear that they may be injured if they walk up to the line and take hold of the tools and start to work.

It appears to me, Mr. President, that, especially at this time when we are considering the very important pending measure which will permit the arming of merchant ships and otherwise modify the Neutrality Act, we should give consideration to the question of stopping slow-downs and shut-downs in defense factories. If some workers desire to strike, let them strike. But let other workers pick up the tools and keep the wheels turning, without fear of force or violence being used to prevent them from working at jobs of their own choice.

I have introduced into the Senate an anti-violence strike bill, which is still in the committee. I also offered it as an amendment to a bill which was pending, but it was rejected. I propose to offer it as an amendment to the pending measure, either now by consent of the Senate or at an appropriate time. The proposed amendment would in no way deprive labor of any of its rights. It would simply provide that no force or violence shall be used in any labor dispute to prevent an American citizen who wants to work from working.

So at this time I desire to serve notice on the Senate that now or at some appropriate time I will offer the bill as an amendment. It provides in part as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any person from seeking or accepting employment with a company which is engaged in the performance of a national-defense contract.

Then it goes on to make the necessary definitions.

Mr. President, at this time I offer the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if no Senator present desires to address the Senate on the joint resolution, I wish to make a brief statement about it.

It is not the disposition of the Senator from Kentucky, I am sure, and it is not the disposition of the Senator from Texas to cut off any Senator who desires to address the Senate on the merits of the pending measure; I favor ample, legitimate debate; but I do wish to say that, in the interest of time, I shall try to urge Senators to be ready to go ahead, so that we will not be in the position of having to adjourn at 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Unless Senators are ready to speak when the joint resolution is before the Senate, I shall, at some appropriate opportunity within a reasonable time, ask that the Senate proceed to vote. It will not be necessary to make such a motion, for, in the absence of further debate, the question would automatically come before the Senate. So, in all fairness, I wish to urge that Senators who purpose speaking prepare their addresses and be

ready, in order that we may proceed diligently with debate on the measure.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the observation of the Senator from Texas is a very fair one. I presume it means that the Senate will not go forward further this afternoon. I desire to cooperate with the able Senator from Kentucky and the able Senator from Texas in the matter of expediting the consideration and final disposal of the joint resolution. I think that was made manifest when consent was given to file the report on Saturday so that the joint resolution might come up automatically on Monday; otherwise, it would not have come up until today.

The hearings were placed on our desk only yesterday. Last week the hearings were in process. The debate has gone on now for 2 days, and four excellent speeches have been made. I think we have done very well and progressed rapidly, under the circumstances. I shall continue to cooperate with the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Texas to the end that we may reach a vote as soon as legitimate discussion is ended, but I think, in fairness, this afternoon, inasmuch as no Senator seems to be prepared to go forward, that at this time a recess should be taken until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LEE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I know what the Senator has in mind, and we will come to that in a short time.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield to me on the point of the suggestion which has been made?

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish first to make an observation, if the Senator will permit me.

I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Oregon. He is always cooperative in trying to expedite the business of the Senate. I realize, as we all do, that yesterday we could not have expected much more than we had in the way of debate, for the hearings had just been printed and laid on our desks. Today, at this hour, I realize how much of a disadvantage Senators think they suffer by beginning to speak at 4 o'clock, but, in view of the fact that we confront a tremendously important problem, and that time may play some part in the situation, I do not think we ought to determine when we are ready to speak on the basis of the notice our speeches may receive in the newspapers the next morning. I realize that we all desire to get as much publicity as possible from what we say; I share that ambition myself; but, at the same time, we ought to do a full day's work. I appreciate what the Senator from Texas has said, and what the Senator from Oregon has said, but, from now on I hope that we may not be in such a situation that we will have to close the session earlier than 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

It is not contemplated that the Senate shall continue any longer this afternoon, unless some Senator desires to make a



speech, and if any Senator is desirous of making a speech I guarantee that I will be one of the audience to listen. I had assumed that no one else desired to make a speech this afternoon, and we would, after a little "chicken feed," adjourn until tomorrow. I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I wish to second the statement of the Senator from Texas, and to suggest to both majority and minority leaders that it is my hope that the Senate may meet at 11 o'clock and run until at least 5:30 in the afternoon. We have before us a measure which may determine whether slavery or freedom shall exist for humanity, and time is of the essence. How can the Members of the Senate expect the rest of the country not to go on with business as usual when they go on with business as usual? I hope we can step up the proceedings even beyond the suggestion of the floor leader. I certainly will support such a movement.

Mr. BARKLEY. While it is true that the Senate has been considering the bill theoretically since the House passed it, as a matter of fact, the committee occupied last week in hearings. We did not seek to drive hard in the hearings, and although some of our friends were not entirely satisfied with the length of time accorded them, on the whole, I think the arrangement was pretty fair to both sides. I have detected nowhere, either in public statements or in conversation with Senators on both sides of this question, any disposition to delay a vote. It had been my hope that we might conclude consideration of the joint resolution this week; I am not certain we can do so. Even if it becomes necessary that it go over for a day or two next week—I presume we cannot expect anything else than that, although I still entertain the hope that we may conclude the consideration of the proposed legislation within a very few days and, from the conversations I have had with Members of the Senate on the other side of the question, I have no doubt that we can do that.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LEE. Could not we finish this week if we start meeting at 11 o'clock a. m.?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not certain of that, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma, although I am perfectly willing to meet at 10 o'clock, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LEE. There are no committee meetings.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a psychology that enters into a situation such as this that one has to consider. I doubt whether at this juncture I would be justified in undertaking to ask the Senate to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. beginning tomorrow. The future may determine that matter, depending upon the length of time which may be taken. I think we are making pretty good progress, though I hope that we shall take more time tomorrow, and that Senators will be ready to speak.

I know how hard it is for Senators to go through the drudgery of preparing

written speeches. It is one of the most grueling tasks that ever faced me. I do not mind making a speech after I have got it ready, but I despise having to go through the drudgery of getting it ready. Other Senators, I suppose, are actuated by the same feeling; yet I think we are not justified in delaying the preparation of our speeches. We all know what Senators will speak. Every Senator knows whether he intends to make a speech. While the hearings have been placed before us for only 2 days, it is not necessary to read the hearings in order to make a speech on this question. We all know what our views are; and I hope Senators will get down to "brass tacks" between now and tomorrow, and have their speeches ready, so that if they are called upon, or the opportunity is appropriate, they will be ready to respond.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a word supplementing what the Senator from Kentucky says.

The motive which caused me to mention this subject was that in talking to a number of Senators today about when they should speak if they wanted to speak, a number of them said, yes, they wanted to speak, but they did not want to speak until Friday, or they did not want to speak until Thursday, or probably some other time. That would be all right if we knew that Friday was going to be open to all the Senators; but it will not be.

I desire again to urge that Senators who desire to speak take the advice of the leader and have their speeches ready. They do not need to memorize them. They may read them if they desire. I hope they will have them ready, so that when the opportunity comes we may proceed with the debate, because it is unseemly to have the Senate adjourning because no Senator wants to speak when the country thinks we all want to speak.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the suggestion of the Senator from Texas reminds me of a story which I will inflict on the Senate.

A very distinguished educator was invited to deliver an address at a college celebration. He took great pains in preparing it. He spent about 6 weeks on it. When he came to deliver the speech he had a great audience and proceeded to read the speech. He went home with the chairman of the committee, who had invited him to lunch. He waited an appropriate length of time for the usual compliments on his address, and they were not forthcoming. Finally he said to his host, "What did you think of my speech today?" The host replied, "I have three criticisms, and I hope you will accept them in the spirit in which they are intended. In the first place, you read the speech. In the second place, you read it poorly. In the third place, it was not worth reading." [Laughter.]

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] have two routine matters which they desire to have considered at this time.

#### CANTON EXCHANGE BANK AND FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF CANTON, MISS.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 4411, Calendar No. 770.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the title of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4411) for the relief of the Canton Exchange Bank and the First National Bank of Canton, Miss.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with this bill. Where did it originate?

Mr. BILBO. I will state to the Senator from Oregon that this is a House bill which has been favorably reported by the Senate committee. I would not ask for its consideration at this time but for the fact that it is an emergency matter. It involves only \$1,100.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### REFUNDING OF UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY BONDS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Education and Labor I report back favorably, without amendment, House bill 5903, to amend the United States Housing Act, as amended. I desire to say that I have taken up the matter with the majority and minority leaders, and there seems to be no objection to the immediate consideration of the bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the title of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5903) to amend the United States Housing Act, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have conferred with the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], a member of the committee, and I am advised that there is no objection to the bill. I think, however, a brief statement of its nature should be made for the RECORD, at least.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under the present law the Housing Authority has the right to issue \$800,000,000 of obligations in the form of notes, bonds, or otherwise. Since the adoption of the law there have been issued five-hundred-and-some-odd million dollars of bonds by the Authority. Some of these bonds will fall due on November 1, 1941, and it will become necessary for the Treasury Department to refund them.

When the original law was enacted no provision was made for refunding such bonds, so that the amendment refers solely to the refunding of existing bonds of the Housing Authority. The

amendment is designed to make it clear that the \$800,000,000 limitation will not apply to obligations that may hereafter be issued by the Authority for refunding purposes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether there is any increase in the authorization to incur indebtedness?

Mr. ELLENDER. None whatever. It remains at \$800,000,000.

Mr. ADAMS. The provisions of the bill are limited to refunding operations?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. And the passage of the bill will not change the substantial character of the bonds?

Mr. ELLENDER. Absolutely not. The only wording that is added to section 20 (a) of the act is found in the second sentence of the section. Let me read the entire sentence:

The Authority may issue such obligations in an amount not to exceed \$800,000,000—

Then the following words are added: exclusive of any obligations which may be issued for refunding purposes.

As will be observed, the authority to issue obligations remains at \$800,000,000, and the added language gives the Treasury the right to refund such bonds as may have been previously issued and—

Mr. ADAMS. But, if I correctly understand the language, it means \$800,000,000 in addition to the amount that may be issued for refunding purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; the Senator is in error. There cannot be outstanding at any time more than \$800,000,000 of bonds. In issuing refunding bonds the limitation contained in the original act is not to apply to such refunding bonds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think that matter ought to be made clear for the RECORD, also. As I understand, the existing law has been so interpreted that when the Housing Authority has issued \$800,000,000 of bonds, and perhaps there has been one refunding, both the original issue and the refunded issue are counted.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The Treasury has so ruled.

Mr. TAFT. Therefore, they are limited to less than \$800,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is entirely correct, and that is why the Treasury is proposing the pending amendment.

Mr. TAFT. But, as I understand, if bonds are regularly retired through the sinking fund and the various methods that are provided in the law, they cannot be reissued.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. TAFT. This bill only permits the refunding of bonds which have already been lawfully issued.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has well stated the case.

Mr. TAFT. And the original bonds count in the \$800,000,000; so all the bill provides is that the refunding bonds shall not also be counted in the \$800,000,000. As I understand, that is the only purpose of the bill. I may say that I was so

advised by Mr. Bell, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who had to do with drafting the bill; and I was assured that that was the Treasury's interpretation of it.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, this is the wording:

The Authority is authorized to issue obligations in the form of notes, bonds, or otherwise, which it may sell to obtain funds for the purposes of this Act. The Authority may issue such obligations in an amount not to exceed \$800,000,000—

There is \$800,000,000—

exclusive of any obligations which may be issued for refunding purposes.

Mr. TAFT. But they still count in the \$800,000,000 the bonds which were originally issued; so that those refunding bonds are counted in the form of the original issue. It does not say that they shall have only \$800,000,000 outstanding at one time. The law says they shall not issue more than \$800,000,000; and when they count that, they count what they originally issued. So it is proper, if they do that, to exclude the refunding bonds.

That, I take it, is the purpose of the bill. I think it ought to be made clear on the RECORD, however, that that is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I intended to ask to have included in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which thoroughly explains the purpose of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (No. 1312) is as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5903) to amend the United States Housing Act, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to clarify section 20 (a) of the United States Housing Act, as amended, which authorizes the United States Housing Authority to issue obligations, so as to make it clear that the \$800,000,000 limitation contained therein with respect to such issue does not apply to obligations issued for refunding purposes.

This clarifying amendment would not, in any way, expand the total lending power of the United States Housing Authority or the size of its program. It would merely eliminate problems regarding the refunding of its outstanding short-term obligations, and would make it clear that the Authority can continue borrowings for whatever periods the Treasury may deem desirable as a matter of fiscal policy.

Under the provisions of section 20 (a) of the United States Housing Act, as amended, the United States Housing Authority is authorized to issue obligations in an amount not to exceed \$800,000,000, in the form of notes, bonds, or otherwise, which it may sell to obtain funds for the purposes of that act, such obligations to be in such forms and denominations, mature within such periods not exceeding 60 years from date of issue, bear such rates of interest not exceeding 4 percent per annum, be subject to such terms and conditions, and be issued in such manner and sold at such prices as may be

prescribed by the Authority, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Pursuant to this authorization the United States Housing Authority has issued obligations aggregating approximately \$511,000,000, of which about \$226,000,000 have been sold to the public and \$285,000,000 have been sold to the Treasury. The obligations sold to the Treasury were for the purpose generally of meeting temporary short-term requirements and \$177,000,000 of such obligations sold to the Treasury have been repaid. On September 30, 1941, there were \$226,000,000 of the Authority's obligations outstanding in the hands of the public, of which \$112,000,000 mature on November 1, 1941, and must be redeemed or refunded on that date. In addition, on September 30, 1941, the Treasury held \$108,000,000 of the Authority's obligations, which obligations will mature on December 31, 1941.

The effect of this procedure under the present law is as follows: The Authority has issued \$511,000,000 in obligations but has received only \$334,000,000 net in cash, the difference being refunding. It can issue only \$289,000,000 of additional obligations to meet either in cash or by refunding the outstanding securities amounting to \$334,000,000, and its unliquidated contract obligations of \$420,000,000. In other words, at the present time it has, including maturity of November 1, a total of \$754,000,000 to meet and it only has \$289,000,000 of borrowing authority. It is necessary therefore that there should be authority to issue obligations under the \$800,000,000 limitation in such a manner that refunding issues will not exhaust such authority.

In view of the situation described above, the committee recommend the enactment of the bill.

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"Sec. 602. Section 20 (a) of the act as amended is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 20. (a) The Authority is authorized to issue obligations in the form of notes, bonds, or otherwise, which it may sell to obtain funds for the purposes of this act. The Authority may issue such obligations in an amount not to exceed \$800,000,000 *exclusive of any obligations which may be issued for refunding purposes.* Such obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, mature within such periods not exceeding 60 years from date of issue, bear such rates of interest not exceeding 4 percent per annum, be subject to such terms and conditions, and be issued in such manner and sold at such prices as may be prescribed by the Authority with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, to what committee was this bill referred in the Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on Education and Labor, which considered the original Housing Act.

Mr. ADAMS. But it went to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on Education and Labor considered the original United States Housing Act.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the House the Committee on Banking and Currency has handled similar legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5903) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### NATIONAL RICE FESTIVAL, CROWLEY, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there has been addressed to me by Mr. Jerry S. Ashley, general chairman, national rice festival, Crowley, La., a telegram which I should like to read. It is as follows:

We extend to you and the entire United States Senate an invitation to attend the national rice festival at Crowley, La., October 29, 1941. This is the largest 1-day show in this country today. It is entirely dedicated to the development of rice. Would appreciate the attendance of any or all of the Senate.

I hope that some of my colleagues will take advantage of this invitation. I am confident that all who attend will come in contact with real, genuine southern hospitality.

With the kind indulgence of the Senate I will read from a statement sent to me by Mr. Orville E. Priestley, publicity director of the rice festival, giving a short description of the affair:

The National Rice Festival, the fifth to be held since the celebration was inaugurated in October of 1937, will be held in Crowley, La., the "Rice City of America," on Wednesday, October 29, 1941, to celebrate the harvesting of the rice crop.

The event was inaugurated not only as a celebration of the annual harvest, a period of prayer and thanks for the bountiful crop, but as a means of focusing the attention of America on the fact that the United States produces more rice each year than is consumed. And it is hoped that the publicizing of this great food crop, which means much to four States of the Union—Arkansas, California, Louisiana, and Texas—but which is not grown extensively over the Nation, would increase the consumption.

The day's program opens with thanksgiving services in all Crowley churches before the gale prevails. Then following, starting at 9:30 Wednesday morning, October 29, a program of activities which includes the selecting and crowning of two queens (children's and adults'); staging of four parades (parade of rice farm machinery, children's parade, afternoon grand parade of beautiful floats, and night parade of floats); band concerts; free circus acts; rodeo; softball games, determining champion rice eater and rice grader; holding of French hour; and then the grand festival ball, the concluding affair of the day.

The National Rice Festival has become the Nation's greatest one-day agricultural festival. More than 50,000 thronged the city's streets last year, and even a greater attendance is anticipated this year.

State officials from Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana will be present for the event this year, and three princesses from pan-American countries competing for the title of queen, who is to be awarded a Caribbean cruise this year, will be present carrying out President Roosevelt's good-neighbor policy. These will be students from Cuba, Venezuela, and Mexico now enrolled at the Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge, but officially designated by their respective Governments as representatives at the Crowley celebration.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The Vice President laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations of general officers in the Marine Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Clifford J. Durr, of Alabama, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1941, vice Frederick I. Thompson.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Several officers for appointment to temporary rank in the Air Corps, Regular Army; and

Sundry officers for appointment and appointment by transfer in the Regular Army.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment and promotion in the Navy.

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

Samuel John Hughes, to be postmaster at Cashmere, Wash., in place of A. F. Farris, deceased.

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

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Angus I. Ward to be consul general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Saul Haas to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 30.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

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

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be at once notified of the confirmation of all nominations acted on today.

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

#### RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 29, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 28 (legislative day of October 27), 1941:

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

##### MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Charles F. B. Price to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 23d day of October 1941.

Brig. Gen. Philip H. Torrey to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 23d day of October 1941.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 28 (legislative day of October 27), 1941:

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

J. Joseph Smith to be United States district judge for the district of Connecticut.

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Angus I. Ward to be a consul general of the United States of America.

##### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Saul Haas to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 30, with headquarters at Seattle, Wash.

##### APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Summer Wilson Elton to be a captain, Judge Advocate General's Department.

##### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Lt. Col. Myron Joseph Conway, to Adjutant General's Department.

First Lt. Frank Willoughby Moorman, to Signal Corps.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, October 27, 1941)

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

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

O, Thou to whom light and darkness are both alike, come and abide with us through every experience of life, that we may neither weary of the day nor fear what night may bring.

We thank Thee, though betimes we labor under a sense of failure and are burdened with the memory of duties left undone or shamed by yielding to temptation, that Thou dost lift our eyes to the life for which we long and wilt not suffer us to lose our aspirations which are the soul's true wealth, the spring of all existence.

Arm us with that courage by which alone men master self and every circumstance; still Thou the weak complainings of our tongues, and, though we cannot see tomorrow and darkness hangs about our path and mystery at every turn confronts us, fortify our hearts against all fear, and guide us with Thine unseen hand, that, as we joyfully accept the great responsibilities and conditions of our earthly pilgrimage, we may come to possess our souls and achieve under God the purpose of our beloved country.

We ask it all in Thy Son's name and for His own dear sake. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the