

(Rept. No. 2383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5040. A bill for the relief of John J. Reiber, Ada Bell Reiber, his wife, and Arthur Joseph Reiber, their minor son; with amendment (Rept. No. 2384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5400. A bill for the relief of Evelyne Vaughn; with amendment (Rept. No. 2385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6103. A bill for the relief of Regina Howell; with amendment (Rept. No. 2386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6456. A bill for the relief of John Toepel, Robert Scott, Widmer Smith, and Louis Knowlton; with amendment (Rept. No. 2387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FENTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7910. A bill for the relief of Betty Jane Bear Robe; with amendment (Rept. No. 2388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8028. A bill for the relief of Zoe Hoyt Wagner and Io F. Hoyt; with amendment (Rept. No. 2389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8214. A bill for the relief of Morris Mensch; with amendment (Rept. No. 2390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 3647. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Paul Sanford, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 2391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland; Committee on Claims. S. 3978. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the National Reemployment Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 2392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland; Committee on Claims. S. 1376. An act for the relief of Cothran Motors, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 9932. A bill for the relief of Anne Howard Lay; without amendment (Rept. No. 2398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 9999. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for the use of the bridge across the Missouri River at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in order to provide funds for the maintenance and operation of that bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 10000. A bill extending for the taxable year 1939 the time within which employer contributions to State unemployment funds may be paid for the purpose of the credit provided by section 1601 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 10001. A bill to authorize cancelation of deportation in the case of Wasil Boyko; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 558. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 559. Joint resolution authorizing a reduction in the rate of interest to be paid on certain loans and advances made to the District of Columbia by the United States of America through the Public Works Administration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEA:

H. J. Res. 560. Joint resolution providing for the acquisition of necessary governmental records; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 561. Joint resolution to authorize the postponement of payment of amounts payable to the United States by the Republic of Finland on its indebtedness under agreements between that Republic and the United States dated May 1, 1923, and May 23, 1932; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the proceedings at the unveiling of the painting depicting the signing of the Constitution of the United States as a document; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 10002. A bill for the relief of J. K. Love; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 10003. A bill for the relief of the L. & W. Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. CLARA G. McMILLAN:

H. R. 10004. A bill to provide for the transfer of the duplicates of certain books in the Library of Congress to the Beaufort Library of Beaufort, S. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10005. A bill for the relief of Bessie Pearlman and George Roth; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 10006. A bill for the relief of Joseph Salvatore Monticello; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 10007. A bill for the relief of Sylvester Lauby; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. R. 10008. A bill for the relief of William A. Roberts, father of David Ernest Roberts, deceased; 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:

8594. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of sundry citizens of Monticello, Monroe, and Janesville, Wis., supporting House bill 1, the Federal chain-store tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8595. By Mr. KEE: Petition of the members of Local 85 of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Huntington Shops, Huntington, W. Va., to amend the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8596. By the Speaker: Petition of the Alabama Federation of Post Office Clerks, Bessemer, Ala., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to special-delivery messengers; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

8597. Also, petition of the American Petroleum Institute, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1940

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 28, 1940)

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:

God of all grace and love, have mercy upon us after Thy great goodness, and keep us this day from all indolence and sloth, from hasty words, harsh judgments, unkind thoughts,

from self-indulgence and from all impurity in thought and word and deed; so shall we be meet to do Thy will.

In these times so fraught with peril may we not dream or drift, but face the struggle bravely in God's name; no matter, then, how long the day nor yet how deep entrenched the wrong, give to us a surer faithfulness to Thee and all Thy ways and we shall be made strong.

And when we see in common pain and sorrow the blossoming in starry flowers of holy pride, reveal to us once more the sacred truth, so needful to our world, that only through the Christ, Love's might, all might transcending, can draw the poison fangs of hate, that only through Him can life's red wounds be healed. In His holy name we ask it. 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 Wednesday, June 5, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. 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	Connally	La Follette	Schwartz
Andrews	Danaher	Lee	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Davis	Lodge	Sheppard
Austin	Downey	Lucas	Shipstead
Bailey	Ellender	Lundeen	Slattery
Bankhead	George	McKellar	Smith
Barbour	Gibson	McNary	Stewart
Barkley	Gillette	Mead	Taft
Bilbo	Green	Miller	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Hale	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Harrison	Neely	Tobey
Bulow	Hatch	Norris	Townsend
Burke	Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Byrd	Herring	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hill	Overton	Van Nuys
Capper	Holman	Pepper	Wagner
Caraway	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chandler	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	White
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	King	Russell	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is absent from the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1964) to amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize charitable contributions by national banking associations.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2464. An act to amend the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 505), as amended (49 Stat. 1926; 34 U. S. C., Supp. IV, 496; sec. 14 of Public, No. 18, 76th Cong.), to adjust the limitations on the profits of certain contractors with the United States; and

S. 4026. An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect information as to amount and value of all goods produced in State and Federal prisons, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2301. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926;

H. R. 6381. An act for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917;

H. R. 7731. An act to provide for the burial and funeral expenses of deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment who were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability;

H. R. 8243. An act to provide increases of pension payable to dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9149. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes"; and

H. R. 9774. An act to provide for the prompt deportation of aliens engaging in espionage or sabotage, alien criminals, and other undesirable aliens.

REPORT ON LABOR IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report on labor conditions in the Territory of Hawaii, prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics under a special appropriation of the Seventy-fifth Congress, being one of a series of such reports called for in the organic law of Hawaii of 1900, as amended April 8, 1904, which, with the accompanying report, in two volumes, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate 12 letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, 3; of Justice, 2; of Agriculture and of Labor; Federal Works Agency; Work Projects Administration, 3; Federal Loan Agency; and United States Food Administration, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. GIBSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from Earl S. Baily, Post No. 430, American Legion, Odessa, Tex., endorsing the national-defense program of the President of the United States and also the imposition of necessary additional taxes, and stating "it is imperative that the Government put some teeth in our laws in regard to 'fifth column' strikes and other organizations that will prevent the tax money from securing us full value on the defense program," which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Mr. and Mrs. Morrill Cody and other citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying that all the available resources of the United

States for war purposes be immediately placed at the disposal of Great Britain and France for use in the present war situation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from Imogen B. Emery, chairman, National Defense Through Patriotic Education Committee, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., praying that Congress remain in session until important national-defense and alien-control legislation can be enacted outlawing the Communist Party, registering international organizations, registering and fingerprinting aliens, the deporting of criminal aliens, and the deportation of Harry Bridges, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from W. R. Boyd, Jr., executive vice president, American Petroleum Institute, New York City, N. Y., stating that the board of directors of that institute at a recent meeting in Fort Worth, Tex., with the subsequent approval of the membership, pledged the full, complete, and voluntary cooperation of the institute with the Government of the United States and all agencies of the Government in the furtherance of national defense and security, and approving in principle the amendment to the National Defense Act submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] authorizing a new special militia under the War Department to be known as the National Defense Corps, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition signed by the chairmen of the American Association of Independent Small Business and the National Advisory Council of Independent Small Business, Washington, D. C., praying that Congress remain in session for the duration of the present international crisis, and that all laws and parts of laws placing a curb on or impeding the speedy production of airplanes, guns, tanks, ammunition, ships, and so forth, be suspended or repealed so that necessary defense production may quickly proceed without any hindrance, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying that the United States may keep out of war and strengthen its neutrality, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, petitioning for the adoption of an adequate agricultural and tariff policy in furtherance of the welfare of the State of Maine

Whereas Maine is primarily an agricultural State and the prosperity of its farms being vital to the prosperity of the State as a whole; and

Whereas reciprocal-trade agreements with foreign nations have been entered into by the Government of the United States under the authority granted to the President by Congress that have conceded tariff reductions on imports of agricultural products produced in Maine; and

Whereas such concessions in tariff reductions have resulted in an influx of agricultural products in competition with such products produced in Maine; and

Whereas thousands of Maine farmers and their families, as well as a substantial portion of business interests in Maine, depend for their livelihood on the production and favorable marketing of agricultural products and must rely upon reasonable protection of their home markets by the adoption of favorable foreign-trade policies and tariffs to retain such markets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Eighty-ninth Legislature of Maine in special session assembled respectfully petition and urge the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to establish and maintain an agricultural and tariff policy that will best safeguard the State of Maine and its people; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the proper officers and committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the President of the United States, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the United States Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8356) for the exchange of lands adjacent to the San Juan National Forest and the Rio Grande National Forest in Colorado, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1773) thereon.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9296) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Springfield, Ill., September 8 to 13, inclusive, 1940, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1774) thereon.

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4037) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Theodore R. Troendle, for the Dawson Springs Construction Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1776) thereon.

Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2171. A bill for the relief of M. Seller & Co. (Rept. No. 1777); and

S. 2880. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of R. Brinskelle and Charlie Melcher (Rept. No. 1778).

Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3003) for the relief of Ralph C. Hardy, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1779) thereon.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8124) to provide funds for cooperation with public-school districts (organized and unorganized) in Mahanomen, Itasca, Pine, St. Louis, Clearwater, Koochiching, and Becker Counties, Minn., in the construction, improvement, and extension of school facilities to be available to both Indian and white children, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1780) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3926. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to provide a license for the construction of a pile dolphin and walkway at Fort Mifflin Military Reservation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1782); and

H. R. 8258. A bill for the marking, care, and maintenance of the Mount of Victory plot in the Cypress Hills Cemetery, in Brooklyn, N. Y. (Rept. No. 1781).

Mr. SHEPPARD also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7611) to provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general of the Regular Army, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1783) thereon.

Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9751) for the creation of the United States De Soto Exposition Commission, to provide for the commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Mississippi River by Hernando De Soto, the commemoration of De Soto's visit to the Chickasaw Territory in northern Mississippi, and other points covered by his expedition, and the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the Battle of Ackia, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 4039) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate and to put into effect charges for electrical energy generated at Boulder Dam, providing for the application of revenues from said project, authorizing the operation of the Boulder Power Plant by the United States directly or through agents, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1784) thereon.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9063) authorizing the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency to transfer certain property in San Francisco, Calif., to the city and county of San Francisco for street purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1785) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

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

On June 4, 1940:

S. 186. An act to amend sections 798 and 800 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to murder in the first degree; and

S. 2132. An act for the relief of Katherine Scott, Mrs. J. H. Scott, Jettie Stewart, and Ruth Mincemeyer.

On June 6, 1940:

S. 1777. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Little Missouri River;

S. 2191. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the Montana School of Mines a patent to a certain tract of land;

S. 2262. An act to provide for a change in the time for holding court at Rock Hill and Spartanburg, S. C.;

S. 2328. An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended;

S. 2639. An act relating to the hours of service of persons employed upon the Government-owned Wiota-Fort Peck Railroad in the State of Montana;

S. 3014. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), so as to provide uniformity in the pay of all civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska;

S. 3042. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended;

S. 3065. An act authorizing the sale of fuel, electric current, ice, and water at isolated naval stations;

S. 3491. An act to provide that fines for failure to pay license taxes in Alaska shall be disposed of as provided for the disposition of such taxes;

S. 3496. An act to prevent retardation in promotion and in pay and allowances of permanent professors of the United States Military Academy appointed by the President from the commissioned officers of the Regular Army;

S. 3642. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior and the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Spokane River, Wash.;

S. 3643. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior and Stevens County, State of Washington, to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across the Kettle River, near Marcus, Wash.;

S. 3644. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Secretary of the Interior and the Great Northern Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate two railroad bridges across the Kettle River near Marcus, Wash.;

S. 3650. An act to require the payment of prevailing rates of wages on Federal public works in Alaska and Hawaii;

S. 3677. An act to donate to the city of Seattle a totem pole carved by the Alaskan native Civilian Conservation Corps; and

S. 3693. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement for pipe lines across public lands reserved for military purposes in the parish of Plaquemines, La.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 4103. A bill for the relief of Eber H. Kempson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 4104 (by request). A bill for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 4105. A bill to create the National Industrial Defense Corps;

S. 4106. A bill to authorize the construction of certain facilities in Marjorie Park, Davis Island, Tampa, Fla., and for other purposes; and

S. 4107. A bill to transfer the jurisdiction of the Arlington Farm, Virginia, to the jurisdictions of the War Department and the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 4108. A bill to provide for the registration and regulation of investment companies and investment advisers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 4109. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1938 (52 Stat. 201), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Miami Beach, Dade County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes"; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. 4110. A bill to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 4111 (by request). A bill granting a pension to Marius R. Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 4112 (by request). A bill to amend the Transportation Act, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 4113. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

S. 4114. A bill to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 2301. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926;

H. R. 7731. An act to provide for the burial and funeral expenses of deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment who were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability;

H. R. 8243. An act to provide increases of pension payable to dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9149. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who

served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 6381. An act for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917; and

H. R. 9774. An act to provide for the prompt deportation of aliens engaging in espionage or sabotage, alien criminals, and other undesirable aliens; to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—INVESTMENT COMPANIES AND ADVISERS

Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 4108) to provide for the registration and regulation of investment companies and investment advisers, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1775) thereon.

RIVER AND HARBOR DEFENSE IMPROVEMENTS—DELAWARE RIVER FROM PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA

Mr. BARBOUR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9972) authorizing the improvement of certain rivers and harbors in the interest of the national defense, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AID ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. NYE (for Mr. FRAZIER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. FRAZIER to the bill (H. R. 9575) to amend the Federal Aid Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD (for himself and Mr. CONNALLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 9575, to amend the Federal Aid Act, 1916, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KING ON FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator KING on the National Grange Hour, on May 18, 1940, on the Logan-Walter bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNEMPLOYMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah before the Interfaith Conference on Unemployment, on June 5, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. WALTER E. EDGE AT NEW JERSEY REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Walter E. Edge at the Republican State Convention, Trenton, N. J., on Tuesday, June 4, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP ON BROADCASTING BUNK

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Frank C. Waldrop entitled "Broadcasting Bunk," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AIR PROGRAM AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Hon. Thomas D. Cooper, of Burlington, N. C., together with an article from the United States News of May 31, 1940, entitled "The Truth About Our Neglected Air Program," which appear in the Appendix.]

AVIATION AND UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the American Legion post of Burlington, N. C., together with a letter from Hon. Thomas D. Cooper, of Burlington, N. C., relating to aviation, and to aliens and un-American activities, which appear in the Appendix.]

COMMENDATION OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT—EDITORIAL FROM EAST SIDE NEWS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the East Side News, of May 25, 1940, entitled "Roosevelt—World Savior," which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Kansas State Bar Association on May 27, 1939, endorsing the Walter-Logan bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

NUMBER OF WARRANT AND COMMISSIONED WARRANT OFFICERS, MARINE CORPS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6044) to regulate the number of warrant and commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. HALE conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMPOSITION OF THE NAVY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8026) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. HALE conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL AIRCRAFT, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9848) to authorize the construction or acquisition of naval aircraft, the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. HALE conferees on the part of the Senate.

REORGANIZATION OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4026) providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. HALE conferees on the part of the Senate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9109) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28, 35, 38, 39, 46, 57, 58, 60, 64, 74, 75, 89, 90, 91, 92, 95, 96, 103, 109, 114, 120, 137, 145, and 146.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 18, 29, 31, 33, 37, 40, 41, 43, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 59, 61, 63, 65, 68, 69, 70, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 83, 87, 88, 99, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111, 113, 116, 117, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 135, 138, 140, 143, and 144; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "including the salary of the poundmaster at \$2,200 per annum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,930"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$196,210"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$95,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase of two motortrucks at \$550 each to replace two motorcycles and package cars"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$12,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$35,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$704,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$981,385"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$16,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$70,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$160,387"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$304,171"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$193,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$581,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,948,505"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$76,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$48,725"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$12,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$409,060"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$23,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$213,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$687,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$292,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$104,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$557,760"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$480,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$107,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$31,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$12,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$582,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "recreation, vocational training, and historical records"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$520,325"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$343,685"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$260,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 24, 34, 36, 53, 93, 133, 134, 136, and 139.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
CARTER GLASS,
ELMER THOMAS,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
WILLIAM H. KING,
GERALD P. NYE,
ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the part of the House.

M. F. CALDWELL,
GEORGE MAHON,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
KARL STEFAN,

(Except as to amendment No. 52),

FRANCIS CASE,

(Except as to amendment No. 52).

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 9109, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

June 5, 1940.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 24, 53, 93, 134, 136, and 139 to the bill (H. R. 9109) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 34 to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$7,334,194";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 36 to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "three" and insert "two"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 133 to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 10 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after "Columbia", insert a comma and "the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Fine Arts Commission."

Mr. OVERTON. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 34, 36, and 133.

The motion was agreed to.

KATHARINE M. DRIER

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, regarding Senate bill 3097, for the relief of Katharine M. Drier, I am about to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD certain material. I wish to make a brief preliminary statement.

In the first place, several different hearings have been held, both in subcommittees of the War Claims Committee of the House and before the whole Committee on War Claims of the House; and, as we are all aware, the bill was also considered by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. In addition to that it was considered somewhat by certain members of the Finance Committee of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an index which is in the nature of a concordance. It shows in what places in the various hearings the same subjects are referred to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The index is as follows:

INDEX

	Pages of hearings before—		
	House War Claims Committee	Subcommittee No. 3	Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Agreements by Germany to pay \$160,000 to claimant:			
Agreement of Mar. 1, 1933, approved by German Foreign Office.	57-60	20-22	41-42.
Agreement of July 1, 1936, to pay \$319,000, including interest.	61	2-3	31.
Condition attached by American Commissioner to award of 1929.	57, 72	25	
American awardholders:			
Number and amount of awards unpaid.	54		
Consent of majority of awardholders to S. 3097.	33, 55	14	
American Awardholders Association, members:	18, 55	5-7	
Statement signed by counsel.		27-36	38, 39.
Telegram signed by Secretary (Congressional Record, vol. 86, p. 4410).			
Communication of counsel (Congressional Record, vol. 86, p. 4405).			
Effect thereon of pending bill.	56, 57, 74	36	
Argument of counsel:			
J. Harry Covington, counsel for Awardholders Association.	18, 63	8-14	
Rogers and Condon, counsel for Z. & F. Assets Realization Corporation.	52	37-39	
Harold G. Aron, counsel for Katharine M. Drier.	51, 71	24, 25	21.
Brief of J. Harry Covington.		27-36	
Memorandum of Rogers and Condon.		37-40	
Reply and summary of Harold G. Aron.	78		
Congress, acts of:			
Declaring terms of peace with Germany.		4	
Settlement of War Claims Act, 1928.	2		

INDEX—continued

	Pages of hearings before—		
	House War Claims Committee	Subcommittee No. 3	Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Debt Funding Agreement, United States and Germany.	74		
Decisions and communications, Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany.	72-73		32-36.
Reference of State Department thereto.			31.
Harrison resolution.		18	
Senate hearings and report on S. 3097.		2	
Spanish Treaty Case.			14.
State Department:			
Report to Senate Foreign Relations Committee.			25-36.
Note of Secretary of State to German Ambassador.			22-23.
Statements and interrogations (official):			
The President of the United States.			24.
The Secretary of State.			26.
The Attorney General of the United States.	48, 49		
Warren R. Austin, U. S. Senator.	33	1	1.
Edward J. Hart, M. C.	1, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 33, 34, 39, 41, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 72, 73, 74, 79.		
Clare C. Hoffman, M. C.	21		
A. F. Maciejewski, M. C.	27, 46, 47, 50, 65, 72, 73.		
W. R. Poage, M. C.	44	1, 4, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26.	
Lawrence J. Connery, M. C.	68		
Joseph J. O'Brien, M. C.	68, 71		
Reuben T. Wood, M. C.	70, 71		
Key Pittman, U. S. Senator.			1, 12, 21.
Theodore Francis Green, U. S. Senator.			2, 3, 4, 7, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21.
Lewis B. Schwellenbach, U. S. Senator.			2, 5, 7, 17.
Joseph F. Guffey, U. S. Senator.			3, 7, 21.
Robert F. Wagner, U. S. Senator.			6, 8, 9, 20, 21.
Bennett Champ Clark, U. S. Senator.			8, 14, 16, 18.
Elbert D. Thomas, U. S. Senator.			13, 20, 21.
Claude Pepper, U. S. Senator.			13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21.
Alben W. Barkley, U. S. Senator.			15, 16.
Supreme Court of the United States:			
Decisions as to power of Congress.	38, 63, 66, 67	25, 26	17.
Treasury Department: Statement of German Special Deposit Account.			40.
Treaty with Germany (1921)		4	
Z. & F. Assets Realization Corporation:			
Communication to chairman, Subcommittee No. 3 ¹ .		37	
Reply by counsel for Katharine M. Drier.	78		

¹ Action at law by this corporation against Secretary of State and Secretary of the Treasury was, on appeal, finally dismissed by the U. S. Court of Appeals for District of Columbia, on June 3, 1940, after the conclusion of the testimony on S. 3097, in a written opinion, from which the following is quoted:

P. 9, footnote: "Compacts which have for their object temporary matters and which have been called agreements, conventions, pactions, protocol, modus vivendi, are essentially international treaties."

P. 10, opinion: "As between the United States and Germany, indeed, as between the United States and American claimants, the money received from Germany was in strict law the property of the United States, and no claimant could assert or enforce any interest in it, so long as the Government legally withheld it from distribution."

P. 11, opinion: "Germany bound herself to pay to the United States, in full, awards made by the Mixed Claims Commission here involved. The fund established in the Treasury, and which is sought to be controlled in the present case, was set up for the purpose of paying awards thereafter to be made. To it Germany made substantial contributions. Into it were deposited amounts seized from German nationals, as well as property belonging to the German Government. If the amount of the fund shall be found insufficient to pay all awards, the German Government is solemnly bound to supply additional funds, necessary for that purpose, and has provided bonds to guarantee such payment. In consideration of Germany's obligation, above recited, the United States returned to German nationals 80 percent of the funds and property seized by the Government and originally held for the purpose of satisfying these claims."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, 3 days ago the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia handed down a unanimous opinion which passed upon some of the most important principles involved in the relief sought by Senate bill 3097 for the relief of Katherine M. Drier. The opinion would seem to put at rest forever some of the questions which have been debated about that bill.

In the opinion the court of appeals here refused to upset the \$50,000,000 award to victims of the Black Tom and Kingsland munitions-dump explosions. The award was made by the German-American Mixed Claims Commission. It had been attacked by the Z. & F. Assets Realization Corporation of New York because it was handed down in the absence of the German member of the Commission, who voluntarily withdrew from the Commission, apparently with a view to blocking action by the Commission.

The case is entitled "Z. & F. Assets Realization Corporation, a Delaware Corporation; American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., Intervener, Appellants, against Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, and Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury; Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Intervener." It is an appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, decided June 3, 1940.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read any part of the opinion, but I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the portions of it which I believe apply directly to some of the questions raised about Senate bill 3097.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

On March 1, 1939, and during the course of the Commission's deliberation upon that question, the German Commissioner retired as a member of the Commission.

Thereafter, personal notice was given to the German agent of a further meeting of the Commission to be held on June 15, 1939. Following this notice, and prior to the date of the meeting, Germany stated, through announcements made both by its agent and its diplomatic representative, that it would ignore the meeting called. These representations and announcements were made a part of the record. On the day of the meeting the Commission rendered a decision, setting aside its earlier decision of October 16, 1930, and reopening the cases. The American agent again moved that awards be granted in favor of the United States. The motion was granted and the Commission found that the liability of Germany, in both the Black Tom and Kingsland cases, had been established. It was ordered that awards be prepared and submitted to the Commission for its consideration at a further meeting to be held on notice.

Prior to October 30, 1939, personal notice was given to the German agent of a meeting of the Commission to be held on that date. At that time a thorough study was made by the Commission—absent the German Commissioner—of the records and proofs on file, and awards were made in favor of the United States in each of the 153 claims which are involved in this case.

Appellants contend here, as they contended below, that (1) the Mixed Claims Commission was without jurisdiction to make the awards of October 30, 1939; (2) if payment is made, by the Secretary of the Treasury, of the amounts specified in the awards of October 30, 1939, it will exhaust the special deposit fund, which is held by the Secretary of the Treasury for the payment of awards made by the Mixed Claims Commission; and (3) thus they will be prevented from receiving payment of amounts to which they are entitled under the prior awards.

Whatever may be the merits of the second and third contentions, the lower court was barred from giving consideration to them; for they, in turn, depend upon the first contention and, as it involves a political and not a judicial question, the court was without jurisdiction to hear or decide it.

The purpose of the Treaty of Berlin was that further negotiations should be carried on between the signatories for the determination and settlement of outstanding claims. The executive agreements was in furtherance of this purpose. Under such circumstances there is no reason or excuse for judicial interference.

As between the United States and Germany, indeed as between the United States and American claimants, the money received from Germany was in strict law the property of the United States, and no claimant could assert or enforce any interest in it so long as the Government legally withheld it from distribution. And it was expressly agreed that any award made should be, as between the two Governments, final and conclusive until set aside by agreement between them.

Although an individual claimant may have a moral right to participate in an award, as a matter of strict legal or equitable right

he has none, and Congress is under no legal or equitable obligation to pay any claim. Therefore, it is only when such a claimant has been permitted by Congress to participate in such an award that he has any standing to invoke judicial relief.

In fact, the situation of the present case is clearly one of a continuing controversy between the United States and Germany although, paradoxically, neither government is a party to the present suit. Germany bound herself to pay to the United States, in full, awards made by the Mixed Claims Commission here involved. The fund established in the Treasury, and which is sought to be controlled in the present case, was set up for the purpose of paying awards thereafter to be made. To it Germany made substantial contributions. Into it were deposited amounts seized from German nationals, as well as property belonging to the German Government. If the amount of the fund shall be found insufficient to pay all awards, the German Government is solemnly bound to supply additional funds necessary for that purpose, and has provided bonds to guarantee such payment. In consideration of Germany's obligation above recited, the United States returned to German nationals 80 percent of the funds and property seized by the Government and originally held for the purpose of satisfying these claims.

The continuing interest of Germany in the controversy cannot well be denied. (1) If appellants are correct in their contention that the retirement of the German Commissioner blocked further action by the Mixed Claims Commission, then—as to all undecided matters—presumably the two countries were right back where they were before the Commission was appointed. (2) If appellants' contention is correct that awards were improperly made then perhaps Germany was not liable for the amount thereof, while if they were properly made presumably she was liable. (3) If it is true, as appellants contend, that the Commission acted outside the scope of its authority then perhaps it acted in an area which the executive agreement did not cover; hence, in an area coverable only by a treaty negotiated, or to be negotiated, by the political departments of the Government.

If there were any doubt as to the continuing interest of Germany in the proceedings or of the political nature of the controversy, it would be dispelled by a reading of the acrimonious protest which was filed following the retirement of the German commissioner, by the German Chargé d'Affaires ad interim, with the Secretary of State. This protest spoke disparagingly of the American umpire; referred to the Mixed Claims Commission as "the rump Commission"; claimed that it "was incompetent to make a decision"; that any awards made by it were void; referred to the proceedings of the Commission as "a litigation between two sovereign governments, in which the uninvestigated claims amount to approximately \$40,000,000"; stated that the "approval of claims of Canadian interested parties in a procedure which the German Government and the United States Government have established for the settlement of claims of American citizens is null and void"; and "to sum up . . . that the 'decision' of the American umpire, which contemplates the issuance of awards, was issued in disregard and violation of essential provisions of the statute of the Commission, essential agreements between the German Government and the United States Government, essential rules of procedure and binding decisions of the full Commission, the observance of which would have been the absolute duty of the American umpire." The communication concluded with the expression of hope "that the United States Government does not approve of the violations of procedure discussed in this note and that it will find some way of quashing them, in order to restore, in collaboration with the German Government, the basis existing before the beginning of these violations of procedure, upon which the proceedings can be brought to a conclusion in an orderly way."

To these protests and accusations the Secretary of State replied: "I have entire confidence in the ability and integrity of the umpire and the Commissioner appointed by the United States despite your severe, and, I believe, entirely unwarranted criticisms, and I am constrained to invite your attention to the fact that the remarkable action of the Commissioner appointed by Germany was apparently designed to frustrate or postpone indefinitely the work of the Commission at a time when, after years of labor on the particular cases involved, it was expected that its functions would be brought to a conclusion." It requires no more than a recital of these exchanges between the Governments of Germany and the United States to show that they bring the case clearly within the realm of political as distinguished from judicial questions.

The present case is clearly distinguishable, also, from the case of Colombia against Cauca Co., relied upon by appellants, in which a foreign government voluntarily submitted to an arbitration between itself and a private citizen of the United States and, thereafter, voluntarily submitted itself to the jurisdiction of a Federal court to secure the determination of a controversy between itself and that private citizen, which arose out of the arbitration proceeding.

In view of our determination, as set forth above, it is not necessary to consider any of the other assignments or questions presented.

Affirmed.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in January 1940 I spoke on the subject Proposed Japanese Embargo. After reading today Walter Lippmann's article Toward a Peace With Peace,

I was reminded of what I said in the opening days of this year.

We have heard much talk about our foreign policy, but no one seems to know just what it is. Mr. Lippmann's article presents America with something to think about. It relates to our policy in the Far East. I shall ask that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There is another subject I should like to call to the attention of the Senate. It is the matter of making a peaceful contribution to the conditions in Europe. We are informed that, because of the tremendous number of refugees, England is planning to send her children to Canada. Only the invaded countries have this refugee problem. Germany knows nothing about it.

Twenty centuries ago the voice of Someone who did not believe in war said:

Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these (children), my brethren, ye have done it unto Me.

In these turbulent times we have a tendency to forget that there are great underlying spiritual laws and principles. The Master expressed one of these in the simple language I have quoted.

Now, I ask, Is there any reason why America should not offer to aid in the transport of these children? We have idle ships. This would be more than a gesture; this would be a candle lighted in a dark world. We could arrange to carry the children across to Canada. Hitler agreed not to disturb the boat which recently carried American tourists out of Ireland. We could get his promise also to refrain in every way from interfering in the transport of these innocents to the Western Hemisphere—God's country.

Mr. President, in these times of stress, wherever the United States can do something that is generous, something that is kind, something that is noble, she will put an end to that which has been cutting her off, and will tend to cut her off, from friendly relationships throughout the world. It seems to me that we now have an opportunity to speak in a way so that there will be no misunderstanding. It will not be an action of war; it will be an action of peace. It will call the attention of all the world to the fact that the United States wants to help in every channel possible consistent with keeping out of war.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Walter Lippmann be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post of June 6, 1940]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—TOWARD A PEACE WITH PEACE
(By Walter Lippmann)

Although the attention of the Americas is fixed upon Europe, they must never forget that the American continents are a great island set amidst the oceans of the world. On the west the ocean washes the coasts of Asia and of the island empires of the east.

The only navy which the American Hemisphere possesses is now in the western ocean. In that same ocean there is the Japanese Navy. As between the United States and Japan, two nations which have never been at war, there has developed in recent years a growing opposition to policies, interests, and diplomatic principle. Their relationship today is obviously unstable. The naval treaty has lapsed. The commercial treaty has been abrogated. In respect to China, the two countries have taken positions which are in theory irreconcilable. In respect to the Netherlands Indies, their public declarations promising respect for the status quo are ambiguous, and in the light of conceivable developments, exceedingly precarious.

To put the matter more plainly, the two countries confront each other across the vast expanses of the Pacific, each having taken a position where untoward circumstances or an uncalculated overt act might plunge both of them into a prolonged and exhausting struggle. In such a struggle neither Japan nor the United States would be serving its vital interests. Both nations would be sacrificing them. The Japanese, already suffering from the Chinese war, would by engaging and exhausting themselves still further make themselves vulnerable to the only great power, namely, Russia, which can strike by land and by sea and by air at the very heart of the Japanese Empire.

The United States, by drifting into such a war, would be engaging the Navy for years to come in a confused and indecisive campaign on the other side of our world; yet at that very moment the security of the American continents may require the use of

the whole Navy to guard those strategic points in the Atlantic Ocean which must be held if this hemisphere is to be defended.

It is now a kind of suicidal madness for the two nations to contemplate even the possibility of letting the existing tension and the existing conflicts of interest and principle develop into a war. For in such a war both would be sacrificing much greater principles than they were upholding and both would be jeopardizing fatally interests which are infinitely more important than those they were defending.

Some, perhaps, will feel that to express this candid view of Japanese-American relations is to display a deplorable weakness at a time when only strength and firmness are good currency in international affairs. I do not think it is weakness to make the plain truth the basis of national policy. The Japanese know their own strength and their own weaknesses and they know our strength and our weaknesses; and we know the same of them and of ourselves. Neither they nor we can afford to bluff. Neither we nor they can afford to provoke the other. This is the truth. And on the truth we shall both do well to found our policies.

Let this opinion be ascribed to a sudden fear engendered by the critical state of Europe, I hope I may be pardoned for saying that many of us have held and expressed this view for a long time, ever since the outbreak of the European war was manifestly inevitable. For it has been clear to us that whatever our sympathies and interests in the Far East, a great European war for the domination of the western world would affect directly and vitally the security and the independence of this hemisphere. We have held that, by comparison, our interests in the Far East would prove to be secondary, however important they might under more normal circumstances appear to be. We have, therefore, held that it was perilous and in the highest degree unstatesmanlike to let develop an irreconcilable conflict with Japan, to conceal from ourselves the immense gravity of such a conflict, to exacerbate the tension by threats and by declarations that are too absolute to be negotiable.

We have held that this provocative attitude was downright folly especially at a time when the country was doped and duped by a notion of neutrality in Europe which might compel it to stand by and risk the collapse of Allied sea power. We have argued that the policy of the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate during the month of July a year ago was a classic example of how misguided men can imperil the security of a nation.

For in that fatal month the committee challenged Japan in the Pacific by supporting, and even by inciting to, the abrogation of the commercial treaty, and by brandishing the threat of an embargo; in the very same weeks when it was proposing to risk war with Japan, the same committee was refusing to lift the embargo on the sale of arms to the Allies on the ground that what happened to them was no concern of ours. It was a most awful case of not letting your right hand know what your left hand is doing, an almost incredible case of being blindly provocative in one ocean and blindly supine in the other ocean. And, unhappily, the administration, which knew better, acquiesced in this utterly unstatesmanlike policy of challenging Japan in Asia while we were forbidden to support the Allies in Europe.

The situation today is, of course, worse than it was then. But still the fundamental interests involved are the same. It is still true that Japan and the United States have nothing to gain and a very great deal to lose by going to war—or even by standing opposed as if they might be going to war. It is still true that our interests in the Far East are secondary to our interests in this hemisphere. Because this is true, it follows that there is no conflict between Japan and the United States which is not reconcilable by diplomacy. We should, therefore, recognize this truth and should, I submit, enter immediately into friendly and conciliatory and candid negotiations with the Japanese for the avowed purpose of preserving peace in the Pacific.

This is not a time for bluffing and this is not a time for indulging that false pride which causes men to cling to an untenable position. We know that we must defend our security and our very independence in this hemisphere and in the Atlantic Ocean. We know that Japan has a greater interest in Asia than we have. Let us recognize the fact. On the other hand, the Japanese position in the Far East is at least as difficult as is our position in the Western Hemisphere. Japan is at war with China. Japan has Soviet Russia for her nearest neighbor. Her commerce with this hemisphere is of critical importance to the standard of life of the Japanese people.

In these considerations there are the essential elements of a negotiation which might lead through a new commercial treaty to a political understanding based on the principle that the European war, which is also a European revolution, is not to be extended to the Pacific. We should aim high and aim far—at a new order of things in the Pacific in which, having adjusted our secondary conflicts, the two navies will cease to confront each other as potential antagonists and will be free to maintain order and stability in their respective spheres of influence.

I have no way of knowing whether the Japanese nation will respond to such a change of American policy. My belief is that they might, that they do not regard themselves as our enemies, that they respect the power we are capable of developing, and that the best of the Japanese leaders and the mass of the Japanese people desire peace with the United States. Even if this is not the fact, we shall never, I believe, regret having tried wholeheartedly to preserve the peace in half the world.

DIVISION OF THE WATERS OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1759) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 1.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, and in lieu thereof, on page 2 of the Senate bill, line 10, after the word "Act", insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That such Act of August 2, 1937, is amended by striking out 'June 1, 1939,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 1, 1943'"; and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

ELMER THOMAS,
BURTON K. WHEELER,
LYNN J. FRAZIER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

COMPTON I. WHITE,
KNUTE HILL,
CHARLES HAWKS, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

EXPEDITION IN STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4025) to expedite the strengthening of the national defense.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand, the question before the Senate is the Austin amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. TAFT. I wish to speak very briefly in behalf of the amendment which the Senator from Vermont offered yesterday.

The amendment provides for the creation of a commission of five, not only to advise the President, but to administer any plan for industrial mobilization. As I read the amendment, that is its purpose. I desire to say a few words in behalf of that proposition, because it seems to me obvious that today there is no plan of industrial mobilization, and I cannot find that anyone has been deputed or appointed to make any such plan.

I hold in my hand the Industrial Mobilization Plan Revision of 1939, approved jointly by Louis Johnson and Charles Edison under the statute. That plan has been before the country for a good many years. It provides peculiarly for the creation of what is called a war-resources administration to plan and develop a definite program for industrial mobilization. I shall read some parts of it, because it shows what has not been done:

It is considered highly desirable that the key superagency for wartime industrial coordination should be the War Resources Administration. In order that, wherever possible, planned measures may anticipate the problems which will inevitably arise to disrupt our national war economy, the War Resources Administration in skeleton form should be set up as early as practicable when an emergency is envisioned. The War Resources Administration should serve not only to facilitate the transition from a peace to a war economy, but, pending the establishment of other suggested superagencies, it would, insofar as possible, perform those functions discussed later in detail under the caption of "Other emergency administrations."

If the creation of the War Resources Administration is delayed, the Army and Navy Munitions Board should assume the responsibility for guidance during the transition period.

It is obvious today that regardless of what we do with the Army and Navy, the field of industrial mobilization is the most important field if we are to have adequate preparedness in this country. As far as I can discover, the power to deal with that subject is scattered between at least six different departments of the Government, including the Army itself, the Navy, and the Procurement Division of the Treasury. There seems to be a doubt as to just exactly

what the function of the Procurement Division is. In addition to that, we have a proposal in a bill now pending before Congress to give the R. F. C. power to go into the question of building plants for industrial mobilization; and in addition to that we have an Advisory Committee with an adviser on industrial mobilization.

Obviously that power should be concentrated in one man. The President himself cannot exercise it. This very bill gives the right to someone to provide for the furnishing of Government-owned facilities to privately owned plants. I am not sure but that the language in section 5 (1) is so broad that we might actually build Government plants, and certainly on page 2 of the bill the Secretary of War is given power to manufacture military equipment, munitions, and supplies, and again on page 2 the War Department is given power to provide for the manufacture of military equipment, munitions, and supplies, at such places and under such conditions as he may deem necessary.

While the bill gives such power to the Secretary of War, there is another bill which will give it to the administrator of the loan agency, Mr. Jesse Jones, which will be before the Senate in a short time.

If there is one thing which must be done, it is to give someone the power at least to make a plan and then it seems to me he should be given power to carry out that plan. That is what the amendment of the Senator from Vermont does, as I see it.

I think the industrial mobilization plan of 1939 contemplates a War Resources Administration with one head, and I should prefer an administration with one head rather than with five heads. But the details can be worked out, if the Senate will approve the general principle of giving someone the power actually to assist the President to administer the operations of an industrial mobilization plan.

There is an interesting article in the Washington Post this morning on that question, showing that there is today a disagreement as to who has that power. The article is by T. W. Wilson, Jr., and appears on page 11 of the Washington Post of this morning. It reads:

On the second point, there is a more-or-less silent agreement between the War and Navy Departments on the one hand and the Treasury Department on the other as to who should supervise the expansion of the aircraft and machine-tool industries. This controversy dates back to late last year when Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau was appointed by President Roosevelt to coordinate foreign and domestic aircraft purchases.

When the question of new and greater expansion of the aircraft and machine-tool industries came up in connection with the national-defense program, however, Mr. Morgenthau again was placed in charge of this work and again certain officials of the War and Navy Departments were nettled. War and Navy officials would go the whole way in meeting the requests of the manufacturers in the fields of labor policies and tax exemptions, while the Treasury would treat all industries alike on tax matters and would adhere strictly to labor- and profit-limitation laws.

The article proceeds to point out that there are other people who seem to be interested in the same thing.

If there is one thing that is essential, it is industrial mobilization. We provided last year for an authorization of 6,000 airplanes; and if someone had planned an airplane capacity which would produce airplanes, then we would today have a production which not only would be of value to us but also of value to the Allies. Our capacity today is apparently 300 airplanes a month, of which about 200 are going abroad and 100 are coming to us.

If we desire to assist in the general situation, we cannot do anything better than develop a definite plan for increased capacity in airplanes, powder, and other munitions. But if we are to do that, it must be in charge of one man, it seems to me, or at least one board, with a definite chairman, who would have power, and I think that could be provided by the President under the pending amendment. That power should be given, and it should not be scattered among half a dozen people. Otherwise, when we get to the end of the next year we will find again that we have not the capacity to manufacture industrial munitions. I think the amendment is a step in the right direction and should be agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, when the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] authorizing the President to create a nonpartisan authority to expedite national defense came before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs it was referred in due course to the President, and the President reported as follows:

I have your letter of May 22, 1940, submitting, by direction of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, a draft of a proposed provision, intended to be offered by Senator AUSTIN, which would authorize the President, in his discretion, to create a nonpartisan authority of five members, at salaries not in excess of \$10,000 each, to advise and assist him in effectuating plans for a more adequate national defense.

You are doubtless aware of the fact that I have already, under authority vested in me by existing law, appointed a nonpartisan advisory commission to assist me and the Council of National Defense in connection with the present emergency program.

I take it that expression covers everything that may be necessary in connection with the proper handling of the emergency program. The President continues:

In addition, I have, within the past few days, transmitted to the Congress a request that \$1,000,000 be appropriated to cover the expenses of these bodies and also a request that during the existence of the present emergency authority be granted the head of any department or independent establishment of the Government to employ any person of outstanding experience and ability at a compensation of \$1 per annum.

In view of the action already taken by me, I feel that the enactment of the legislation proposed by the amendment in question would be unnecessary.

It seems to me, therefore, that the matter suggested by the Senator from Vermont has already been taken care of, and I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, carefully reading the letter from the President, which the Senator from Vermont had inserted in the RECORD yesterday, and which the able Senator from Texas has just read, I find that the commission to which the President refers is only an advisory commission, that it does not therefore take away any of the powers granted to the War Department, or the Navy Department, or the Treasury, or which we may grant to the R. F. C. It still leaves all the powers existing in four or five different places. So it seems to me very clear that the letter does not in any way answer the argument I made or the argument which was made by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well. It is merely a question of opinion of the President that what he has already done will adequately cover the situation.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand it is desired that the amendment be disposed of before the Senator from Florida proceeds; and if that is so, I suggest that the Senator from Florida yield the floor, because if he does not intend to address himself to the amendment he can take the floor later.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two in support of what the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] has said in reference to the amendment, and in doing so I will say that I fully appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] in following up the amendment which he had previously offered in connection with another measure and on a previous occasion.

I always hesitate to disagree with the Senator from Vermont, because I have such great respect for him personally and for his ability and his integrity as a legislator that when I find myself in disagreement with him I begin to question whether I am right. But, at any rate, I feel that the adoption of the amendment is unnecessary and might bring about confusion.

The amendment provides for a five-man commission or board, or authority, I believe it is called, to be appointed by the President, presumably to do precisely—certainly practically—what has already been done, or at least has been begun. The President has appointed a seven-man commission under existing law. If the amendment is intended to

take the place of the action already taken by the President, then it sets up a five-man board as a substitute for the seven-man board already appointed by the President. If the proposed board is to be in addition to the commission or board the President has already appointed, it will result in confusion.

The President has appointed this seven-man board, of which Mr. Stettinius is a member. He is to be the adviser, and, judging from information I have, is to have considerable authority in coordinating all the activities with reference to industrial materials, their production, and getting them to the point where they are to be manufactured into various products.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am particularly interested in the Senator's reference to the extent of Mr. Stettinius' authority. I wonder if the Senator can enlarge upon the information to which he referred. I am very anxious to know whether or not specifically Mr. Stettinius is merely an adviser to the Procurement Department of the Treasury, or whether he is acting directly under the President without intervention by the Procurement Division.

Mr. BARKLEY. He is acting directly under the President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And the Treasury is no longer in it?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Treasury has its own Procurement Division. I do not mean to intimate that there will not be cooperation between Mr. Stettinius and the Director of Procurement of the Treasury, for which position a new man has just been appointed, I believe, and I understand he is a very competent man. However, it is my understanding, and I feel that it is justified, that not only Mr. Stettinius, but Mr. Knudsen and all of the seven men appointed by the President, are directly under the President. He is their boss. They report directly to him, while, of course, they cooperate with all the other officers of departments and agencies of the Government. But all these seven persons in their respective fields are in a sense supreme, subject, of course, to the direction of the President, and, of course, have already been advised, as I am informed, that while it is their duty and they will be expected to cooperate and coordinate and work with all these other agencies, yet in their individual fields they have the obligation to report directly to the President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Kentucky has referred to the specific thing that has created confusion in my mind, namely, the appointment within the last 24 hours of Mr. Nelson, of Chicago, apparently as an assistant secretary in charge of procurement in the Treasury Department; I am inquiring whether the Senator can enlighten me what the relationship now is between Mr. Nelson, in charge of defense procurement in the Treasury, and Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator knows that the duty of the procurement officer in the Treasury is to procure goods which the Government itself is purchasing. That is a different duty, in a sense, from that which Mr. Stettinius will perform in bringing together materials that are to be used in private industry in the production of things the Government will later procure, in the way of airplanes or any other sort of material that is necessary to carry out the program of defense. Mr. Stettinius will not be limited in his activities to procurement of goods which are to be bought by the Government, which is essentially a duty of the Procurement Division of the Treasury itself, but it will be a part of his duty to see that the materials which are produced are speedily and efficiently brought to the point where they are to be turned into the finished products, and then Mr. Knudsen's activities begin with respect to the turning out of the finished products after the materials have been provided. That is the broad division between the authority and

the duties to be performed by those two particular appointees of the President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then it is the Senator's view that Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Knudsen are not subordinate to Mr. Nelson?

Mr. BARKLEY. They are not at all.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have the act of August 29, 1916, before me, Public Law No. 242, Sixty-fourth Congress. When we look at that statute we find set out the provisions for the appointment of this advisory commission, stating that it shall consist of not more than 7 persons, each of whom shall have special knowledge of some industry, public utility, or the development of some natural resources, or be otherwise specially qualified, in the opinion of the council, for the performance of the duties hereinafter provided.

It then proceeds to set forth the duties, and those duties cover everything—industrial mobilization, industrial production, transportation, not only on the railroads but on the waterways, the mobilization of all the resources and all the powers of the Nation. Under the duties of this council, the concluding phrase is:

And the creation of relations which will render possible in time of need the immediate concentration and utilization of the resources of the Nation.

It provides that this council shall report to the President of the United States and shall make rules and regulations for its work, subject to the approval of the President of the United States.

So this council comes directly under the President of the United States and not under the Secretary of the Treasury or some other official of the Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. There can be no doubt about that. As a matter of fact, I sat in at the first meeting of the council a few days ago, and while I am not at liberty to reveal what happened behind closed doors, I think it has already appeared in the press, as the result of that meeting, that the question as to the identity of the officers to whom this board as a whole shall report, and to whom its members shall report as individuals, was brought up, and it was very clearly made to appear that they are directly responsible to the President, while they are expected to work with, coordinate, and, so far as possible, help to iron out difficulties that may occur.

This board is created largely to deal with those things which are not strictly part of the routine of government. For instance, Mr. Stettinius' job is to coordinate the assembling of raw materials. Mr. Knudsen's job is to coordinate their translation into finished products. Mr. Budd takes charge then and undertakes to coordinate their distribution by transportation, not only by rail but by all other means of transportation.

So it seems to me there cannot be any difficulty about the respective authorities and duties of this board of seven, in addition to their duties as a group meeting probably once a week, or oftener if necessary, to ascertain the progress that is being made in all these fields of activity.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I notice that the bill which we are considering provides, however, that the Secretary of War is authorized to provide for building munitions plants. It is proposed to give the Secretary of War that authority. Yesterday, the rules and regulations with respect to the Council were printed in the RECORD. They provide for an advisor on industrial production. Certainly the fact that there is an advisor on industrial production in no way takes away the authority we are giving the Secretary of War, so I do not understand the Senator from Kentucky when he says that Mr. Stettinius has charge of industrial production. Obviously he has not. Under the bill the Secretary of War has charge of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is trying to confuse the erection of a possible plant which might be constructed by the War Department to produce some type of war material with

the general question of production in all the private industrial plants in the United States. There ought not to be any confusion about that. Nobody can tell whether the Government is going to construct a munitions plant. If it is going to construct one for the production of munitions, of course, the Secretary of War ought to be in charge of it. That is one thing. Whether or not it will ever happen, no one can tell. The duty of Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Knudsen is not to deal with production in a navy yard, already owned by the Government, or in any plants which may be constructed by the War Department, but to deal with production in private industry.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mean to say that the members of the Board are anything more than advisory, or that they have any power to issue orders to anybody?

Mr. BARKLEY. They are advisory, but they may exercise such authority as the President may give them, because he is directly over them.

Mr. TAFT. I question the Senator's statement. They may advise the President, and he may make the order; but, as I read the record, there is certainly nothing in any legislation which gives them power to make any orders of any kind.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is largely a matter of cooperation and coordination between various agencies of the Government and the industries and sources of production for materials, finished products, transportation, and all the different things with which they are to deal.

Mr. TAFT. Who would the Senator say would have power to decide whether or not the Government should build an airplane factory for the manufacture of airplanes for war?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should not say that any of the seven would have. I am giving merely a curbstone opinion on that question, because I have not looked into it.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will read the bill—

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me to finish, I should not say that any of the seven would have authority to build an airplane factory, because I do not believe that authority has been conferred upon the Board. However, under the terms of the bill the Secretary of War is authorized to do so, and I assume that in the first place the Secretary of War naturally would confer with the Board to determine whether or not it was necessary, because of any shortage of industrial production from private sources, to build such a plant to furnish the airplanes needed by the Government. Naturally the Secretary would confer with the President, Mr. Stettinius, Mr. Knudsen, and the head of the Air Corps of the Army.

Mr. TAFT. I presume he would have to confer with the Secretary of the Navy to coordinate the thing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I should say so.

Mr. TAFT. And he would have to talk to Mr. Jesse Jones in order to borrow the money.

Mr. BARKLEY. Information would first have to be obtained as to whether or not there was any need for a Government airplane factory; and in order to determine that fact there would have to be a survey of the resources and capacity of all private airplane factories in the country.

Mr. TAFT. Who does the Senator think would perform that duty under existing legislation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should say that the Board which has been appointed by the President would certainly participate in the performance of that duty; and under the terms of the bill, if it remains in the form in which it is now pending, from all other available sources the Secretary of War very likely would reach a conclusion as to whether or not there was any need for a new airplane factory, and would act upon that need when the need was made to appear. I should say that all the agencies concerned would have some part in the preliminary determination as to whether or not an airplane factory should be built by the War Department.

Taking the entire set-up, Mr. President, it seems to me that not only is there no need for the proposed board of five to take the place of the Board of seven already appointed by the President; but if it is intended to have another board of five in addition to the Board of seven, the

result certainly would be confusion, duplication, and no doubt conflict of authority.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Kentucky. As I read the language of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, I do not see that it is anything in the world but a duplication of what is already in the law, except that the Senator from Vermont has not been as specific in his language as is the language in the act of 1916. All the Senator's amendment provides is that the board, if set up, shall advise and assist the President. That is exactly what is provided for in the act of 1916, setting up the National Defense Commission. The only difference, as I say, is that the language in the act of 1916 is more specific, and also more all-inclusive. So all we should have would be two commissions trying to ride the same horse, which would mean confusion and delay, the very things we do not want.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I have already said all I wish to say. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am sorry to interrupt. I think the Senator from Alabama must have overlooked an important word which differentiates my amendment from existing law. I refer to the word "executing." The board would assist in the execution of the plans. That is the important difference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have already said all I wish to say on the matter. Under the circumstances I think the pending amendment should be rejected.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me it makes no difference whether we agree to the amendment or not. Both the existing law and the pending amendment provide for a commission to advise the President. Under the terms of the amendment, even though no such commission were appointed under existing law, the President would not have to make the appointment. It would be discretionary with him.

Frankly, if there were no existing law on the subject I should say it is a very worthy object to carry out the spirit which was so well expressed by the Senator from Vermont yesterday when he offered the amendment. He is anxious to bring about the coordination and unification of all branches and departments of the Government for the purpose of improving the common condition of all our people. The argument of the Senator yesterday shows that the Republicans in the Senate are anxious to work in harmony with the Democrats. That is another very worthy object, but perhaps, from experience, an impossibility. However, it is always good to try, and sometimes it works for a while.

The President has said he does not care for this amendment because, as I understand, he has already appointed a commission under existing law to do practically the same thing. However, under all the circumstances, if any Senator seriously thinks, the amendment ought to be added, I do not see any objection to it.

Of course, the President will not appoint anybody under the terms of the amendment if he prefers the existing law and has a commission satisfactory to himself under existing law. However, the amendment is advocated by Senators on the Republican side of the aisle, one of whom may be in the White House next year, and he might prefer the amendment to existing law. As I look at the matter, that is another argument in favor of the amendment.

In any case, the effort is to please the President, and to cooperate with him. If a Republican should be elected President, he would then prefer the pending amendment to existing law, and he could discharge anybody under the old law and appoint him under the new law. As I look at the matter, it is almost a case of the difference between Tweedledee and Tweedledum. If it will bring about harmony, I do not see any reason why we should not agree to the amendment. Under those circumstances I feel constrained to vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that, if present, he would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], who would vote "yea" if present, and I will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. My colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], is absent on important business. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is absent on account of illness in his family.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—31

Adams	Davis	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Austin	Gibson	Lundeen	Tobey
Barbour	Gillette	McNary	Townsend
Bridges	Gurney	Norris	Tydings
Burke	Hale	Nye	Vandenberg
Byrd	Holman	Reed	White
Capper	Hoit	Shipstead	Wiley
Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Taft	

NAYS—46

Andrews	George	Mead	Sheppard
Ashurst	Green	Miller	Slattery
Barkley	Hayden	Minton	Smith
Bilbo	Herring	Murray	Stewart
Bone	Hill	Neely	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Hughes	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Van Nuys
Eyres	King	Pittman	Wagner
Caraway	La Follette	Reynolds	Walsh
Chandler	Lee	Russell	Wheeler
Connally	Lucas	Schwartz	
Ellender	McKellar	Schwellenbach	

NOT VOTING—19

Bailey	Donahay	Guffey	Overton
Bankhead	Downey	Harrison	Radcliffe
Chavez	Frazier	Hatch	Smathers
Clark, Idaho	Gerry	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Glass	Maloney	

So Mr. AUSTIN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of my offering an amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I offer an amendment to the bill, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. The last sentence of section 2 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "two hundred and eighty thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "not to exceed seven hundred and fifty thousand."

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I send to the desk the conference report on the naval appropriation bill and ask for its consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read. The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8438) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 27, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, and 66.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 51, 52, 53, 53, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 114, 116, 117, 123, 124, 129, 130, 131, and 132, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "eleven thousand four hundred and forty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 84, 89, 105, 112, 113, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 125, 126, 127, 128, and 133.

JAMES F. BYRNES,
CARTER GLASS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
DAVID I. WALSH,
FREDERICK HALE,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. G. SCRUGHAM,
J. O. FERNANDEZ,
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
M. F. CALDWELL,
J. W. DITTER,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,

Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am for the bill and do not desire to impede it, but I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question as to an amendment which was inserted in conference, as I understand, with reference to an item of \$45,000,000 for the acquisition of sites and facilities for naval aviation. What I have in mind is that there has been authorized, and the appropriation, which is a lump-sum appropriation, carries, not by name, though—the authorization is by name, an item for the establishment of a naval air-training base at Corpus Christi, Tex. There is an appropriation, I understand, of \$45,000,000 generally for such sites, and it is understood that the cost of this particular site will come out of that \$45,000,000 appropriation; but I understand, although I have not had an opportunity to read the conference report, that the conferees inserted a condition or limitation that was not in either the House or the Senate bill respecting the expenditure of the appropriation for that item.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that amendment will come up later, because it was acted upon on the floor of the House and must be concurred in by the Senate. It is not in the conference report which is about to be agreed to, but will come up separately on a motion to concur in the House amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then this report does not cover all the amendments in disagreement?

Mr. BYRNES. No; in a few minutes I will move to concur in the House amendment to which the Senator has reference.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is satisfactory.

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

Mr. BYRNES. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Was there any very large increase in the aggregate amount for the acquisition of lands for air bases?

Mr. BYRNES. There has been no change in the bill in that respect since it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. KING. And \$45,000,000 is the amount?

Mr. BYRNES. That is the amount for air bases throughout the country.

Mr. KING. Is that very much of an increase over the original House provision?

Mr. BYRNES. That amount was inserted in the Senate, and, I think, concurred in by the House.

Mr. KING. But as the bill originally passed the House what amount was carried for this purpose?

Mr. BYRNES. I will say to the Senator that amount was inserted as one of the emergency items which were added by the Senate. The bill then went to the House and the House, acting upon it, concurred in the amount for air bases, to which the Senator refers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8438, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 4, 1940.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 84, 89, 113, 115, 118, 121, and 125 to the bill (H. R. 8438) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Restore the amount stricken out by said amendment and in line 8, page 5, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$160,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 6. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used directly or indirectly after May 1, 1941, except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however*, (1) That, notwithstanding the provision in the act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in the above-mentioned positions to citizens of the United States from and after the date of the approval of said act, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the United States so employed, if United States citizens are available in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3) that nothing in this act shall prohibit the continued employment of any person who shall have rendered 15 or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled, technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this act (a) shall normally be employed not more than 40 hours per week; (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in continental United States plus 25 percent; (6) this entire section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory positions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch of the United States Government or by any corporation or company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the United States Government: *Provided further*, That the President may suspend compliance with this section in time of war or national emergency if he should deem such course to be in the public interest."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112 to said bill and concur therein with an

amendment as follows: Before the amount named in said amendment insert "including three additional officers above the rank of captain in a flight-pay status: *Provided*, That no officer of the Navy or Marine Corps who has been adjudged fitted shall be involuntarily retired during the existing limited emergency."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: After the amount named in said amendment insert "*Provided*, That no part of this amount or any other amount in this title for temporary housing shall be available for erecting, including utilities, upon any site however acquired subsequent to the calendar year 1938, married officers' quarters at a unit cost of more than \$8,500, nor bachelor officers' quarters at a unit cost of more than \$1,750, nor student flyers' quarters at a unit cost of more than \$550; nor barracks for enlisted men at a unit cost of more than \$350: *Provided further*, That no part of this amount, nor of any other amount in this title for temporary housing, shall be available for erecting buildings upon any site acquired subsequent to the calendar year 1938 except of a distinctly temporary character unless structures (such as hospitals, hangars, and storage facilities for inflammable or explosive materials) of a more substantial type are essential to the purpose";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"The provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 590-592), shall be applicable to all public works and public utilities projects mentioned in this act regardless of location."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendments: Page 21, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "contracts" insert "and the Secretary of the Navy shall report annually to the Congress on the rental, sale, or disposal of the facilities provided for in this act"; and

Page 21, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "1942" and insert "1941."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 126 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"Armor, armament, and ammunition: For an additional amount toward the armor, armament, and ammunition for vessels and aircraft heretofore authorized (and appropriated for in part), including the necessary machine tools and other equipment and facilities at naval or private establishments required for expediting ship building, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, including the same objects and under the same conditions and limitations prescribed under this head in title I of this act, \$35,000,000: *Provided*, That all parenthetical clauses in title I of this act in which certain amounts are denominated as 'A' and/or 'B' items shall be disregarded for all purposes, together with section 3 of such title."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 127 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendments: Page 23, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 8 and insert: "For additional amounts for 20,000 naval enlisted men."

Page 24, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 13, 14, and 15, and insert:

"Medical Department, \$231,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for the pay of employees assigned to group IV (b), and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department;

"Care of the Dead, \$6,000;

"Salaries, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, \$12,000"; and

Page 24, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "\$26,538,000" and insert "\$26,287,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 128 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"For additional amounts for Marine Corps purposes, including 9,000 additional enlisted men on active duty, arms, artillery, ammunition, equipment, housing, and general expenses, including motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, under headings, and for the same objects as specified under their headings in title I of this act, as follows:

"Marine Corps:

"Pay, Marine Corps, \$3,200,000;

"General expenses, Marine Corps, \$9,327,000;

"Pay of civil employees: Offices of the Major General Commandant and the Adjutant and Inspector, \$54,360; Office of the Paymaster, \$17,820; Office of the Quartermaster, \$127,820; in all, \$200,000;

"Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: Medical Department, \$12,000.

"Bureau of Yards and Docks:

"Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks: For temporary housing, including extensions of existing structures, \$4,500,000;

"Bureau of Ordnance: Ordnance and Ordnance stores, Navy, \$4,899,000.

"Bureau of Engineering:

"Engineering: For radio material, \$100,000."; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 133 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Page 27 of the Senate engrossed amendments, lines 21 and 22 strike out "to be immediately and continuously available until June 30, 1942" and insert "to be immediately available."

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 105, 112, 120, 122, 126, 127, 128, and 133. For the present I omit the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 119, referred to by the Senator from Texas, so that he may have an opportunity to make inquiry regarding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, with reference to the amendment providing a limitation upon the construction of houses at bases—amendment numbered 119—let me say to the Senator from Texas that the language inserted by the House is as follows:

Provided that no part of this amount or any other amount in this title for temporary housing shall be available for erecting, including utilities, upon any site however acquired subsequent to the calendar year 1938, married officers' quarters at a unit cost of more than \$8,500, nor bachelor officers' quarters at a unit cost of more than \$1,750, nor student flyers' quarters at a unit cost of more than \$550; nor barracks for enlisted men at a unit cost of more than \$350: *Provided further*, That no part of this amount, nor of any other amount in this title for temporary housing, shall be available for erecting buildings upon any site acquired subsequent to the calendar year 1938 except of a distinctly temporary character unless structures (such as hospitals, hangars, and storage facilities for inflammable or explosive materials) of a more substantial type are essential to the purpose.

In the conference, when this amendment was proposed, it was stated by the House conferees that upon a hearing it was learned that there was a proposal to construct quarters of a character which would cost \$14,000 in the case of quarters for a married officer. That, according to the information I then secured, is a very high figure. I will say to the Senator that after much discussion in the conference I discussed the matter with Admiral Moreell, in charge of public works; and his thought was at first, making a rough estimate, that the limit should not be placed above \$10,000. There was considerable discussion about it; but it was the opinion of Admiral Moreell, expressed to me—not to the conferees—that if the limitation were placed at the figure at which it is placed here it would be adequate for the temporary housing he would expect to build at the bases. The figures which were submitted by the House conferees were much lower. The conferees had more than an hour's discussion upon the matter, and finally compromised on these figures.

As a matter of fact, the housing at most of these bases in Texas and in Florida will necessarily be of frame construction, and will be cheaper than houses constructed in cities or in some places located in the North, where a different character of houses is necessary.

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

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. While I do not want to delay and do not intend to delay the adoption of the conference report, my concern about this matter was due to the fact that this base is not to be a temporary base at all. It is to be a permanent establishment of the Navy.

The Navy, during a period of years, has given consideration to the establishment of the base on Corpus Christi Bay; and the Hepburn Report—the report of a board of naval officers a year or two ago—recommended the ultimate acquisition of this site for a permanent naval air-training station. A provision was included in the naval bill a year ago, I believe, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept the site which was in part tendered by the people of Corpus Christi.

Last summer a committee from the Naval Affairs Committee of the House visited the site, inspected a great number of other sites, and recommended the adoption of this particular one. Following that up, the Navy has already adopted the project, and it is to be not a temporary estab-

lishment but a permanent establishment. My concern was that there should not be any restrictions or limitations on the Secretary of the Navy to require the construction of mere temporary structures when at this place the structures are to be permanent; but I do not care to delay the matter.

Mr. BYRNES. I will say to the Senator that in this item there is no mention of Corpus Christi.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand; the appropriation is in a lump sum.

Mr. BYRNES. It is a lump-sum appropriation; and under this provision at places where the naval authorities determine to have temporary housing, it shall not cost in excess of the amounts provided. At places where they determine to have permanent housing, I think they have a right to proceed as they think best.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, being very anxious that this conference report shall be promptly acted upon, I make no objection to the adoption of the amendment, as I am extremely anxious that the money available under the \$45,000,000 item shall be applied at the earliest possible date to the construction of all needed naval air bases.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119.

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

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. KING. Is House bill 4024 the measure under consideration?

Mr. BYRNES. No; this is the appropriation bill, an entirely different measure. The bill referred to by the Senator is the legislative bill.

Mr. KING. I was wondering if this bill dealt in any way with the \$80,000,000 item for Guam by way of appropriation.

Mr. BYRNES. Not at all. As a matter of fact, the bill to which the Senator refers passed after this appropriation bill had passed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. How many Senate amendments are not included in the conference report recently agreed to?

Mr. BYRNES. About 10, as I recall; and there was no disagreement as to most of them. They are so-called technical amendments which were offered on the floor of the House; and in the case of the item to which the Senator refers, of course, there was a change of a few words in which we have to concur.

Mr. McNARY. In how many House amendments does the Senator ask that the Senate concur?

Mr. BYRNES. There are 10 amendments in all, but only three items as to which there was a dispute.

Mr. McNARY. Do they materially change the bill from the form in which it passed the Senate?

Mr. BYRNES. They do not. They are what the House likes to call technical amendments, with the exception of three—one with reference to this matter, and another striking out a provision that a contractor under cost-plus contracts should be regarded as the agent of a State. The House struck out that provision, and I moved to concur in the House amendment.

Mr. McNARY. That is a very satisfactory answer. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

INTERFERENCE WITH DISCIPLINE OF ARMY AND NAVY—SUBSTITUTE REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, some few days ago from the Committee on the Judiciary I reported favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 5138) to make unlawful, attempts to interfere with the discipline of the Army, the Navy, and the Coast Guard, to require deportation of cer-

tain classes of aliens, to require the fingerprinting of aliens seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes, and I submitted a report (No. 1721) thereon. Since that time the committee has seen fit to change very substantially the bill to which that report refers. I ask unanimous consent for permission to withdraw that report and to file a substitute report in lieu of the report heretofore filed.

There being no objection, the new report was ordered to be received and be printed, when submitted.

EXPEDITION IN STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4025) to expedite the strengthening of the national defense.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, although I propose to discuss the subject of national defense, I have on the desk a concurrent resolution which at this time I ask unanimous consent to submit, with permission to have it lie upon the table for further consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask to have the resolution read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That it is the sense of the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled that the President of the United States, at his discretion, should use the full authority which he now has under existing laws to sell or transfer airplanes and other war material not at present needed in the national defense to any foreign country, to the end that peace and freedom be preserved and protected and to keep war from the Western Hemisphere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie on the table.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the bill under consideration, as all of us are aware, is a bill to provide substantially for the enlargement of our armed forces. The bill specifically removes the restrictions which heretofore have limited the size of our Army, and confers upon the President and the appropriate authorities of the Government very great power toward the enlargement of our Army and Air Corps.

Mr. President, in the current edition of the Evening Star, of this city, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Marshall, makes a proposal which is embodied in the following headlines:

Marshall proposes Regular Army of 400,000 men.
Offers recruiting plan as substitute for calling guard.

And in the body of the article the statement is attributed to the general that the War Department can more quickly expand the Regular Army than they can mobilize the National Guard. The point is that the Chief of Staff recommends to the country, as he no doubt has recommended to the President, that we increase the Regular Army of the United States to 400,000 men. The Congress will by this bill remove the restrictions which the law has heretofore imposed, and therefore has dedicated itself to a policy of enlarging our Army to such extent as may be necessary to preserve our country and its interests.

That action simply indicates that day by day and step by step we are marching toward a colossal armament for the United States of America. The whole country has been gratified that we have made that progress with almost, if not always, the unanimous consent of the Congress. I know that the Congress will not in any particular be remiss in the obligation it owes to America and America's interests in giving to our country a military establishment as large as its needs may require.

What the limit will be, what it will cost, how long it will take to complete it, what shall be the ramifications of it, what are its implications, are things which are contained in the bosom of an uncertain future.

Mr. President, we know likewise that the Italian press in the last few days has been carrying the statement that the United States is relatively impotent because it would take us 2 years to develop a military strength which would make us

a serious contender in the world controversy. What I propose to speak about is the most effective way of vitalizing the national defense.

The headlines of today's paper carry further chapters of the sad story of what is going on in Europe. In the first column of the Evening Star of today, for instance, we find this headline:

Reich warplanes blast 270-mile sector of coast.

Already the coast of Europe from the northern tip of Norway to Abbeville, France, is completely within German control. Already German forces can easily shoot existing guns across the English channel upon the cities and the towns and the countryside of England herself. We see in every headline evidence of the expanding power of the military machine of Hitlerism. The question which every day recurs to the American people is, How can we most effectively defend America, for everyone knows that the Congress conscientiously wants to know how it can most effectively and efficiently assure this country and this hemisphere that our soil will always be sacred against an invader's foot.

What I have been proposing is not a diminution of our existing establishment but an enlargement of it with every possible speed, the money to be poured into it without stint. In fact, we have almost ceased to inquire how much these various measures we are passing really do cost, for the matter of the cost is inconsequential and immaterial. Cost what it will, we shall do it.

I have had advice recently that a country of the size of Australia, for example, is now spending upon its national defense a sum of money which would be the equivalent of \$10,000,000,000 a year for us, and I venture to say that before this session terminates, before we go home, we shall have appropriated in excess of \$5,000,000,000, and it may run a little later to \$10,000,000,000, and in less than 5 years we shall have approximated \$50,000,000,000, in my humble opinion, as an expenditure upon the defense of the United States and our interests.

I see that burden of the future staring us in the face, inevitably. I know the implications of it, I know what it will do to our economy, I know what it will do to our liberties, I know what restraints it will impose upon our freedom, I know what it will take away from needed social services in this country, I know how much humble men and women and undernourished children will have to bear of that great burden.

Mr. President, statesmanship, it seems to me, commands us to devote every possible scrutiny to any reasonably sane method which might keep that unhappy day from ever coming to the United States. I think the whole world knows that there is a way by which that eventful day can be kept away from our destiny, and that is to make it possible for the Allies to destroy Hitler; to give them the means by which they can fling back his iniquitous forces, strengthen their arms in this moment of crisis; to give them new courage and new hope, with what would amount to but little diminution in our existing armament.

I know that 500 planes, if they were first-class planes, particularly, would go a long way toward turning the tide of battle in France today. I believe that if those 500 planes were to be sent to the Allies tomorrow, it would assure that Mussolini would not enter the war, if he should know that their destructive force might be turned against his own iniquitous hand if he strove to stab France in the back in her moment of greatest trouble.

If those 500 planes were to be available to the Allies upon the western front, we would not see the headline "Reich warplanes blast 270-mile sector of coast." We would not see in a few days what may come to be our unhappy knowledge, Paris in flames and ruins. We would not see the temples of England, the edifices of old London, crumbled masses of charred ruins, for those very planes would, I believe, be the salvation of civilization and civilization's cause.

Not only would they be that, they would be an assured defense of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States

of America. Then we would not have to have 400,000 men in the Regular Army, and two or three hundred thousand more men in the National Guard subject to immediate call if not already in the country's active service. We would not have to have a large reserve waiting for the instant when they, too, might join the armed forces of their country. We would not have to spend these billions in creating an air force of 50,000 planes, or building this great Military Establishment, which is now aborning in Congress, these ships which are being laid down, this Herculean program that is taking the energy of our private enterprise and turning it into the useless enterprise of war. We would not be sapping our whole economy for defense expenditures. We would not need to be raising the debt limit, or imposing additional taxes upon an already-burdened economy.

No, Mr. President, nor would we be under the humiliating shadow, in this time of crisis, of the United States not coming to the fore and saying what is in the heart of every red-blooded American, that it our cause, as well as the cause of the Allies, under attack today in Europe.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to ask the Senator if, in plain language, he is advocating that the Congress declare war on the side of the Allies against Germany.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad my able friend from North Carolina made that inquiry, for if there was any doubt in anyone's mind about my attitude on that subject, I want definitely to clear it up. The answer is unequivocally "No."

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator will permit me, he has just declared that it is our duty manfully—I think I use his word—to intervene. If he can distinguish between intervention and a declaration of war, I should be very glad to hear him. I wish to say to him that it is my judgment—and it is based upon all the definitions of the law of neutrality, and we had a great exposition of it here by the late Senator Borah—that intervention by a neutral is equivalent to a declaration of war. We become a participant. If the Senator can make a distinction to the contrary, I should like to have him do it.

I will take my seat with one remark, that if he intends intervention, and intervention means war, then he must take notice that we cannot have a war of limited liability. There is no such thing. If we make war with money, with airplanes, or with any other means, if we intervene in any way, we must intervene all the way—with money, planes, ships, sons. I should like to have the Senator address himself to those propositions.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. KING. I was interested in the observation of the Senator from North Carolina. Probably there may be some difference of opinion as to the interpretation which he places upon the word "intervention." I did not understand from the observations made by the Senator from Florida that he was urging intervention. I can differentiate between intervention, using the word in the purely legal and militaristic sense, and giving indirect aid by selling food and food supplies to belligerents. It would not be intervention if today we should send to London or to Paris, if the food supplies could reach either of those cities, flour and other food supplies for the people. It would not be intervention, in my interpretation of the word, if we should send to the three or four million people driven from Belgium and northern France food—

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

Mr. KING. The Senator from Florida has the floor, and I am interrupting him.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, that is not the proposition here. The Senator from Florida is not asking us to send food for refugees. He is asking us manfully to take the

responsibility and go to the rescue of the Allies. That, in my judgment, is nothing more or less than asking us to become participants in the war, and, if that is the issue, let us have that the issue, let us debate it, but let us not have any mistake about it or any indirection about it. Men who are in the possession of their senses ought at least to know what they are doing when they go about to do something which may get us into a war.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from North Carolina had waited a moment he probably would have discovered the field which I am trying to reach and the road on which I am traveling. I have tried to indicate by the suggestions made that it was not intervention to send food to Great Britain and France, particularly if they paid for it, or to send food to the starving people of Belgium and France, starving because of the wicked and indefensible course of the Hitler regime. Nor do I believe that it would be intervention if manufacturers of airplanes and munitions of war in the United States should sell such products to other countries. I do not think it would be an act of war, or an act of intervention, if the manufacturers of airplanes in California were to sell to Canada several hundred airplanes for such utilization as might be desired by Canada. If an American citizen has an airplane and sells it to Canada, Germany, France, or Great Britain, I would not regard that as an act of intervention upon the part of that citizen, or, if permitted by the United States, that that would be an act of intervention on the part of the of the United States.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I should like to ask the Senator if that is not precisely what has been going on for months? I certainly have been utterly misled by newspaper stories if that is not exactly what has happened. American airplane manufacturing companies have been selling hundreds of planes to France and England. I take it that that is not the point here. I confess that I believe that if we do what the Senator from Florida suggests, it amounts to a declaration of war.

Mr. President, for one I do not want the United States to declare war until Congress has the guts to stand up here and tackle the question; not do it by indirection, not do it in a half-way manner, not weasel. Congress is accused of weaseling all the time, of fiddling and indulging in obliquities, of never acting directly in doing something, but running around back alleys and arriving in an oblique fashion at an objective. If we are to declare war I want to see Congress stand up and state to the country, "We are going to declare war," and not do it in a half-way fashion. You cannot have a half-way declaration of war. You cannot send military supplies of the United States Government to a belligerent without, in my judgment, committing an act of war.

Mr. President, I shall repeat what I said the other day, at the expense of being tedious. I recall that I had a bill up in the Senate calling for the manufacture of munitions by the United States Government. Objection was registered by a number of very able Senators whose judgment I admire, who said that if Uncle Sam manufactured munitions of war we would make it impossible to sell munitions of war to any nation, even though we wanted to help it, and felt the same impulse stirring in our breasts that are motivating the Senator from Florida, who sincerely wants to aid the Allies. However, the suggestion was made to me that if Uncle Sam manufactured munitions of war, the sale of those to a belligerent power would be an act of war.

Mr. President, I am frank to say that I had the same view myself, and I wanted Uncle Sam to manufacture munitions of war but I did not want Uncle Sam to become an arsenal for the rest of the world. I thought that was not safe. Perhaps I am wrong. I do not invest myself with any vision beyond that enjoyed by my brethren, but I felt that that was perhaps an open pathway to war. I cannot believe other than that the Senator from Florida is suggesting the doing of a thing which goes half way to war, and I never

knew a nation to go half way to war without going the full way.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I shall not detain the Senate but for a moment. I wish to say that I dissent from the suggestion of the able Senator from Washington, that Congress is guilty of weaseling by not acting directly when it should act directly.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I said Congress is charged by many people with weaseling. Whether it weasels or not will have to be settled as the situation develops.

Mr. KING. I think the American people usually speak plainly. Since I have been in the Senate I have reached the conclusion that the Congress of the United States, by and large, acts with courage, it does not weasel, but indicates where it stands upon important questions which are presented for consideration, whether those questions are domestic exclusively, or whether they have foreign implications.

Personally, with respect to the conflagration overseas, I do not hesitate to state that my sympathies are with France and Great Britain in this contest. If France and Great Britain shall be destroyed, if great temples of liberty and justice are ruined, if millions of people are killed, and millions more rendered homeless, it seems to me that the world would suffer a catastrophe never equaled in the past, and which it is to be hoped would never again be equaled.

Mr. President, judging from conditions in Europe, there are those who believe the world has made but little progress along the pathway of civilization and spiritual development. May I say that I would be very much distressed if the great people of Italy, a country containing millions of men and women noted for their ability and achievements in every field of art and science and industry, and members of the great Catholic Church, whose spiritual head is in the immortal city of Rome, should associate themselves with Hitler in his determination to destroy all democratic government, the foundations of human society, and all religious organizations.

It seems to me that the people of Italy, who love liberty and religion, and the finest things of life, should listen to the voice of that great Christian prelate, the head of the Catholic Church, whose voice rings out for peace and justice and world progress. They should listen to him, and not to Hitler, not to the voice of militarists, not to the voice of Stalin. As I have stated, the people of Italy are a Christian people, and they have in many ways evinced their loyalty to truth and their devotion to the highest spiritual ideals. I shall not believe that Mussolini will yield to the temptations or demands or suggestions of Hitler, and plunge Italy into the conflict.

An opportunity is now afforded for Mussolini and for the people of Italy to rise to great heights. They should dissociate themselves from any understanding, agreement, or plan that may have been indicated by Hitler, and declare that Italy stands for liberty and civilization, and is opposed to the evil and monstrous plans of Hitler to destroy civilization. If Mussolini and Italy would pursue such a course the world would applaud them, and Mussolini would emerge from the chaotic conditions now existing in Europe and appear in shining armor as a great leader, to be acclaimed by the people of the world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, not only I, but the Senate and the country, are very deeply grateful to the very able Senator from Utah for those stimulating sentiments which he has expressed today.

Mr. President, to those who are disposed to make this controversy a technical one, I might simply enough say that it has not been considered a technical controversy by either Hitler or those who are the victims of his unprovoked aggression. I could show very easily and readily that the concept of international law, which is the basis of the fear that we will commit some technical breach of it, is a concept utterly foreign to the whole mind and spirit and soul of Adolf Hitler, that the legality of what he does to achieve his success and objective is as far from his thinking as the moon

is from this Senate Chamber. It is totally unrelated to his policy or his plans. One is foolish, Mr. President, to think that the German tanks and the German guns and the German airplanes diving with their loads of death from the heavens above, can effectively be stopped by technicalities of an international law which does not exist.

The unreality of that kind of thinking is what has made the great British lion become a frightened cub in face of the onrushing legions of Adolf Hitler. It was that kind of thinking which caused Winston Churchill to pour out his heart to the British people, and later to lament while England slept. That kind of thinking is the result of believing this kind of statement, delivered by Adolf Hitler on January 30, 1937:

There can be no humanly conceivable object of dispute between Germany and France. The German Government have further assured Belgium and Holland that they are prepared at any time to recognize and guarantee these states as inviolable neutral territories.

That was Hitler speaking. A foolish people believed what he said. Foolish technicians thought that Hitler's guaranty of neutrality inviolate meant something; and upon that faith they waited until the Germans had crossed the Belgian frontier with their invincible machines of war. Then it was too late, Mr. President. They could repent, but they could not restore themselves to their earlier position.

Those who talk about international law must have been asleep for the past few weeks, or must have been living in some other world. Those who talk about international law as related to this conflict must have forgotten about Neville Chamberlain. They must have forgotten about the British boys who now lie dead in Flanders because the people in Great Britain thought that way. Surely they do not recall the French boys who might have been great artists, great thinkers, men who create beauty and good. Their bodies are mingled with the soil, Mr. President, because people thought that way, because they shivered at the prospective punitive damages which might be inflicted upon them if they committed a technical breach of international law.

Some have even mentioned the *Alabama* claims, saying, "Do you not realize that if we were to intervene or make our storehouses available to the Allies Germany could file a claim against the United States and recover from us, as the American Government recovered from Great Britain on account of the *Alabama* case?"

Mr. President, if any court which professed to have a conscience could for one instant—as long as it would take the eye to blink or the sun's rays to manifest themselves through an ion of space—give countenance to a claim of Adolf Hitler against anybody for anything, it would be the most contemptible tribunal that God or man ever created. The counterclaim would be an ocean of tears from mothers whose sons are dead, and from a country whose soil has been profaned by Hitler's bestial foot.

Let him make his claim, and let civilization's torrents of retributive justice drown him in the tears which ought to stifle every breath he draws.

So, Mr. President, I am not afraid of Adolf Hitler recovering on any claim against anyone who might lend an item of aid to the Allies in this controversy, because Hitler wars against the world, and the right of self-defense is the first law of nature. I am speaking about the defense of America, Mr. President, and that is dearer and more precious than any precept or concept about some decadent code which has been destroyed and made antiquated by Hitler.

When we appropriate money and take it out of the pockets of poor people, take it away from hospitals, take it away from agriculture, take it away from public improvements which are necessary, and take it away from education which ought to be bestowed upon boys and girls, I suppose legalists, technicians, and orthodox philosophers, living in an unreal world so far as their orthodoxy is concerned, will say "It is all necessary because we must preserve the technical concept of international law."

Mr. President, what right under international law does a nation have which is ravaged by a conqueror against the

conscience of the world and in violation of his pledge, sacredly and solemnly inscribed in a treaty? To what tribunal may such a nation go for redress, if it be not the conscience of the world? Is there a court where the Belgians may say, "In the name of God and God's law we have been wronged and we seek redress"? If so, show it to them and they will go there on their knees begging for any kind of relief. Is there a tribunal to which Holland may go, or Luxemburg, or France, or Denmark, or Norway, or Poland, or Austria, or Czechoslovakia? If so, in the name of justice outraged, Mr. President, where is that tribunal for which men's hearts have ached and toward which their footsteps have wandered endlessly round the world?

If there be no court to which they can appeal for a redress of wrongs, what can they do? They have no forum left this side of the Divine Power, Mr. President; and I suppose if the Lord should withhold his bright face from Hitler's arms, some Senators would say that He had committed a technical breach of His impartial attitude toward men.

Mr. President, if they cannot turn toward a tribunal for redress, and they rely upon human aid, where can they go save to the court of man's conscience? If the court of man's conscience listens to the evidence, hears the plaintive appeal of the wronged one, reviews the history of the case, and applies to it the principles of conscience, justice, law, and decency, and everything civilized man has come to believe in his soul and, having applied those principles, renders a judgment that outrageous wrong has been done, and that the petitioners are entitled, in a court of conscience, to the help of conscience's civilization, would the Senator from North Carolina deny relief in any form because it would be a breach of international law? I hope the Senator would not, and I believe he would not. I hope my country will never be so craven as to take the advice of those who even go so far as to say, "Let us reserve judgment in this controversy. Let us not make up our minds. Let us not take sides. Let us not attitudinize ourselves lest in so doing we may either give expression to an irresponsible hysteria or commit a mental trespass upon inviolable international law."

Mr. President, if I did not pass judgment on this controversy, if I did not express my sentiment on what is going on in Europe now, I feel in my heart that I should be unworthy of my generation and my civilization, let alone my God, for our cause is as holy as the First and Second Commandments—the reverence of God and the brotherhood of man. So I am not afraid to take sides in this controversy. I am not afraid to say, "Let us do what we can, short of war, to lend aid."

Of course, the logician always tries to trap his inquirer with some extreme application of the proposal. He would say, in substance, "If you take a slice of bread you must eat a loaf; if you drink a swallow of water you must consume a bucketful." He imagines that there are no restraints whatever in man's conduct. He says that if we do anything at all to help the Allies or anything intended to help the Allies, that is intervention.

Mr. President, the able Senator from North Carolina voted for the neutrality law in the last session of Congress, which removed the arms embargo and made it possible for the United States, through its private citizens, to lend aid to the Allies. The Senator did not yield to the great Senator on the other side of the Chamber, who argued that that was a breach of international law and a disturbance of our position of neutrality and therefore was wrong. The able Senator from North Carolina did not then quote him or yield to his argument.

Mr. President, I say, as I have said before, that so far as the practicalities of the world are concerned there is no difference between a factory in Baltimore, Md., manufacturing an airplane and sending it to the Allies and the United States Government selling to the Allies one of its airplanes which it feels it can spare, to be used in the same battle with the other plane. I have said before that if international law had any application—

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In the Senator's last example he states that in his judgment there is no difference between an airplane manufacturer sending a plane to the Allied governments and the United States Government sending a plane. Pursuing that argument, is there any difference between a citizen of the United States seeking to enlist with the Allied armies and the United States Government seeking to send its soldiers to participate in the conflict?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, Mr. Justice Holmes at one time said in a legal case that everything from the 12 tables down to the present day was a question of degree.

There is a distinction in the case my friend from Illinois puts and the one that is being discussed. In the case he surmised he contemplated that the Government itself might send the soldier to the front. That, of course, would be a direct intervention by the Government through its own instrumentality at the battle front. All I proposed, at the most, in the original resolution which I introduced—and the proposal now pending, does not go even that far—was that the Government sell to the Allies or any other party or parties to the Kellogg Pact who were victims of unprovoked aggression any airplanes or war equipment which we felt we could spare for cash, making delivery upon our shores. I would not consider such action to be a breach of international law, insofar as that has anything to do with the case.

But, Mr. President, leaving that question temporarily aside, leaving aside whether or not Hitler could claim the benefit of it, leaving aside what right a nation that is a party to the Kellogg Pact, for example, or a nonaggression pact may have to defend its fellow signers of that pact, by which I imply that each nation has the right to decide its own course, there is no international law that prescribes what one power shall do in aiding another power that is the victim of an unprovoked aggression in violation of a treaty.

So I claim that we have the right to decide what it is reasonable to do, just as I say that, in dealing with Japan, if we thought that the revocation of our commercial relations was the proper way of enforcing the treaty which we thought that country had violated, we would have a perfect right to exercise that authority as our way of making it undesirable for the other party to that treaty to commit a breach thereof.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reason for making the inquiry is because, primarily, of what the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] said a few moments ago with respect to intervention and the reply of the Senator from Florida. It may be that the Senator from Florida will agree with me, but it occurred to me that if the Government had the right, under either one of the three resolutions which have been offered by the Senator from Florida, to sell to the Allies, we will say, a thousand airplanes, or sell to them a half dozen destroyers, and that would not be a breach of international law so far as we were concerned, then the Government would have the right to send, we will say, a regiment of men to Canada to protect the home forces in Canada, knowing that those men would not become involved ultimately in the conflict overseas.

I will say frankly to the Senator I cannot make the distinction between sending a thousand airplanes by this Government itself to the front for the purpose of participation in the war and sending 500 men to England or Canada to protect the home front over there. I may be wrong in that but I merely rose for the purpose of attempting to clarify what seemed to me a most extremely important issue.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator contemplates, apparently, that the Government, in the case he put, would be taking one of its own men in its own uniform and sending him upon its own mission, which would have the effect of making him an opponent of the German Government in war, in one way or

another. As I say, the difference may be one of degree, but I think it is an essential and satisfactory difference. In the case I contemplated in the original resolution which I introduced the Government would merely say to the Allies, "If you will come here to my shores and bring cash with you, I will sell you certain equipment which I own. You can do what you want with it." For that matter, what use the purchaser would make of it is, of course, his own affair. We would commit no act except to sell on our own soil, at a fair price, for cash, to the purchasers, some equipment of this kind. They could take it and use it for civil and peaceful purposes if they wanted to; they could sink it in the Atlantic Ocean if they wanted to; they could send it to the front in France, if they desired to do that. In that way, Mr. President, I say we would essentially be doing nothing different from what we do when we pass a law through the Congress revoking a prohibition that would not have permitted our individual manufacturers to do the same thing. So, in substance, both cases amount to the use of stores in this country to a degree in a transaction which is consistent with commercial usages involving certain commodities.

But, Mr. President, I go a great deal further than that. In the first place I say that is not a violation of international law; and, in the second place, I say that Hitler could not claim against us as a party to the Kellogg Pact that in aiding another power, party to the same pact—not by going on his territory but to resist his own unprovoked aggression—he could not claim the protection of international law against us or anybody else in that case.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the Senator has said about the inconsistencies and the unreliability of Mr. Hitler. Obviously, his word is an empty gesture and we know that he has absolutely forgotten everything about international law insofar as the present war is concerned. But let me place this question before the Senator: Assuming that we should do what the Senator says we should do by selling a thousand airplanes to France or a half dozen battleships or destroyers to foreign countries, after having divested ourselves of all right, title, and interest in and to the property, but knowing that they were to be used for the purpose of aiding the Allies—and assuming further that Hitler, under such a procedure, would issue a declaration of war against this country because of intervention, irrespective of whether it was proper to do so—what would our position be?

Mr. PEPPER. Well, Mr. President, our position would be the same as that of all the other countries against whom Hitler has entered a declaration of war in fact, if not by formal action, without justification whatever. In other words, what I have been trying to say all along is that what we do legally has no relationship to what Hitler does. If he wanted to declare war on us, he would do it whether we gave him any legal justification or not. If he did not want to declare war on us he would not do it, whether we gave him any legal justification or not. Legality is totally unrelated to the subject. That is the point I wanted to emphasize.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I understand the point the Senator has been emphasizing all through the various speeches he has made here from day to day upon this question, that legality, from the standpoint of Hitler, does not amount to anything at all; but I am still asking the Senator what he believes our position would be under the circumstances I have described, if Germany should declare war upon us after we made disposition of war materials to the Allies, which action, according to the argument of the able Senator from North Carolina, who is a great lawyer, would be intervention upon our part and would be the occasion for a war declaration upon the part of Hitler against us. What would be our position if Hitler should take that course of action?

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean what would be our legal position?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not mean what our legal position would be, but what would we do if Germany made a declaration of war under such conditions?

Mr. PEPPER. We would do as we should do in every case—whatever we think is best for our own defense.

Mr. LUCAS. It would mean that we would be at war, would it not, if Germany declared war on us?

Mr. PEPPER. Is Belgium at war? Is Holland or France or Great Britain at war?

Mr. LUCAS. I think they are.

Mr. PEPPER. That depends upon the way one regards it. I will state what our situation would be, Mr. President. Hitler's declaring war would not change the situation a particle. He is already at war with us; he is at war with the world already; he is at war with South America; he has already sent his "fifth columns" there; he has his "fifth column" right here in the United States of America now. That is intervention; that is interference; that is a violation of international law.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want the Senator to misunderstand me and to think that in this debate I am defending Adolf Hitler at all.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand the Senator's position.

Mr. LUCAS. I have the same purpose, the same objectives, as has the brilliant Senator from Florida, and that is the defense of this country. The Senator may see it a little differently; the approach may be somewhat different, but I am only attempting to bring out a point which has been worrying me somewhat. The Senator has been debating this subject for several days, very few questions have been asked him on this very important issue, and, I think, perhaps, the country has obtained a wrong impression of what the resolutions of the Senator actually propose to do.

I say that because of some telegrams I have received as a result of the debates and the speeches which the Senator has made in the course of the past week.

I should like to ask the Senator another question or two, now that I am on my feet, in regard to his last resolution, which I believe was submitted today. Am I correct in understanding that it was submitted today?

Mr. PEPPER. It was; and is lying on the table.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe that the resolution submitted today is as broad as the resolution which was discussed on yesterday?

Mr. PEPPER. No; I think not.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator briefly make a distinction between the two resolutions?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to do so. If the Senator will, while the inquiry is fresh, let me answer the first part of the question, then I will answer the second; and I am very grateful to my friend the very able Senator from Illinois for the inquiry, because I want an opportunity to clarify the discussion.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the last statement is very important. It is well enough to discuss what is going on in France and England, and all about the humiliation and the despair and the suffering over there, but we have before us these resolutions which if they became the law would vitally affect this country; and I should like to have just a brief discussion of that matter.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator a moment ago inquired what this country would do if we were to do any of the things I have proposed and Hitler were to declare war upon us. I started to say, in the first place, that he has already declared war upon us, because he sent his "fifth column" into the United States and into South America. He has already definitely indicated designs upon our continent. He has definitely indicated that his plan will not be achieved until he becomes the master of the world, and until his people become the dominant race in the world. Not only that, but he has very definitely set up restrictions upon our own activities which, in substance, amount to closing the doors of great areas of the world to our trade which, if normally done, would itself constitute a breach of international law

and a violation of neutrality, and certainly a violation of the comity of nations.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the Chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PEPPER. Not for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I desire first to answer this inquiry.

I say that is what Hitler has already done. I say, in the second place, that the legality of what we do has no relationship whatever to what he does as a matter of fact. That is proved by everything he has so far done. Not one of the countries which he invaded gave him any legal justification for attack, and yet he attacked them.

Almost every one of them had a solemn treaty with him that he would not attack it, as, for example, Poland, Holland, and Belgium. At least, every one of them had his solemn assurance that he would not attack it, as sacred an assurance as the head of a government could possibly give. In addition to that, all of the publications, all of the propaganda, all of the public announcements positively stated, even until the day he invaded the various countries, that he was not going to invade them, and yet he did invade them, from which I can only come to the conclusion that the legality of their course had nothing whatever to do with the reality of his course.

So, then, whether we act legally or illegally is not going to affect Hitler's attitude toward us. That would be affected by one thing alone, and that is his idea of what is best for Hitler and Hitler's cause. If he thought it best to make peace with us, he would try to make peace with us. If he thought it best to make war upon us, he would make war upon us. If he thought it best to try to deceive us, to lull us into security so that he could strike us later when we were not expecting his attack, he would do that. So what we would depend entirely upon the same principle—what was for our own best interest. If he merely declared war in Europe, but sent no fleet, no air force, no soldiery, then we would decide whether we would wait for him to come here or whether we would go over there, depending entirely on which course we thought was better for our own protection and our own interest.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator let me finish answering this question? Then I shall be very glad to yield.

So, Mr. President, the situation actually would not be changed from what it is right now. If you ask me what we would do if Hitler sent ships, that is a military question. If you ask me what we would do if he sent airships, that is a military question. If you ask me what we would do if he sent soldiers, that is a military question; but I tell my friend now that Hitler has not only come to be at war with us, but he has been at war with us, with everything we believe in, with everything we live by, and with everything we die by. From the time he came to power—yea, before that, Mr. President; from the time he conceived this iniquitous world dream of his—he has been at war with us.

I have here a newspaper clipping reading in part as follows:

To the Italians the Germans say that America is a negligible factor, not to be feared in the event of intervention and swiftly to be destroyed in the event of German victory in Europe. A trustworthy Italian, who has seen much of the German missions that come constantly to Rome, reports the German argument as having convinced him as well as thousands of highly placed Italians.

SCOFFS AT UNITED STATES STRENGTH

"You Americans have neither a historical nor military tradition," said this Italian. "You are spending \$3,000,000,000 on armaments, but to what purpose? Do you think you can build an army as good as the French Army, or a navy better than Great Britain's? Do you think that you can overtake German supremacy in the air just because you have vast factories?"

"The Germans can destroy you militarily, even with your 3,000 miles of Atlantic, but they will have new techniques. They tell us they know already how to apply them to America—new techniques in economic warfare, in propaganda, in sabotage, in civil war."

"How do you mean?" I asked this Italian.

"They will strip you of trade first, they say. Britain has been your best customer.

Let me interpolate here that in 1937 we sold 20 percent of our agricultural products to the United Kingdom alone. In 1939 we sold 16 percent of our total exports to the United Kingdom.

Continuing:

Conquered, she will be your customer no longer. In fact, nowhere in Europe will you find a market. Just as quickly, moreover—in a couple of months, they say—you will find South America and the Far East closed to you.

CIVIL WAR, THEN INVASION

"What can you do when this comes? Can you maintain your famous standard of living without foreign trade? Can you spend billions on armaments and billions on social welfare? Without markets, your armaments and welfare programs will destroy you, for you cannot find these billions as your national income declines.

"Your unemployment will mount. Your social unrest will mount. You will be ready for propaganda and sabotage to bring strife between capital and labor, between Jew and gentile, between Tory and liberal. It will end in collapse and civil war.

"In your moment of turmoil Germany will take over Mexico and Canada. Then you will be partitioned, cut into three or four sectional and divided groups, ruled by national socialist governments recognizing the supremacy of Hitler. You do not think Germany would leave you in peace as the one great democracy opposed to Nazi ideology, do you? They will destroy you.

"This is what the Germans say, and I believe they are right. They say they can do this within 12 months of their victory over France and Britain. They say they can do it whether the British Fleet comes into their hands intact or whether most of the ships are scuttled."

DEPEND ON JAPANESE NAVY

"All this is easier said than done," I demurred.

"Oh, you people of the plutocracies are all alike," said my friend. "You are talking and thinking as the British and French were talking and thinking a year ago.

"We in Italy see things differently. That is why we are going in on the German side. And Germany will have the Japanese Navy as well as our own. And don't think for a moment that Russia will betray Hitler. Any move in that direction removes Stalin's last hope of remaining in power. Stalin will carry out Hitler's orders no matter how much he hates them, because betrayal would mean extension, within 6 weeks, of the German flag through the Ural Mountains."

FINDS AMERICA SLIPPING

The Italian concluded somewhat grimly:

"This is a century of power revolutions—fascism and national socialism. We are already destroying your own confidence in your democratic system. You cannot make up your minds and act. You cannot transform your economy against loss of foreign trade. You cannot organize defense against the mighty forces of two revolutions. That is Hitler's secret weapon—the decadence of the 'business as usual' mentality of the plutocracies. You people missed the autobus—not us."

Your correspondent reports these two conversations because they reflect the arguments and the confidence of Fascists as well as Nazis in this moment when Europe is waiting for the success or failure of the possible French counterattack.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PEPPER. Not for the time being. Just a minute and I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. So, Mr. President, the Germans do not have to declare war against us; they have declared war against us. Look at the German Bund, which had its organized legions in this country. Go to the files of the Government, or search the knowledge of almost any citizen in the country, and you will find the slimy, serpentine course of the "fifth columnists" trying in some way or other to find a foothold in this country to sabotage what we have. They have not just begun to turn a greedy eye upon us. It has been upon us for a decade. We are just waking up to it, when it is almost time for them to strike.

Mr. President, talking about Hitler making up his mind to do something to us would be like determining whether

or not a serpent had anything against you after it had already planted its fangs in your flesh and started to emit its venomous poison.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Just a moment. I am speaking about Hitler, not about Great Britain, or France, or others of the decent nations of the earth; not about any country which has an agreement with us which we should not violate.

I am saying that the best way to stifle the "fifth column," the best way to destroy the Trojan horse, the best way to defend our country against Hitler's airplanes and ships and soldiers, the best way to protect our hemisphere, the best way to save our citizens' money, and the best way to save the sacred cause of freedom and civilization's hopes is to do what effectively and reasonably we can do, short of war—and by that I mean short of sending our own ships, our own soldiers, our own airplanes, our own fighting weapons, under our own control, to take part as a belligerent in the war—that is what I mean—short of that—to help the Allies crush Hitler.

I say, Mr. President, that if we do not do that, there will be some day a book called *While America Slept* that someone will be writing; it will be *The Lament of America's Destruction*, perhaps, that someone will be telling about in the ages yet unborn. That will be the tragedy of this era in world history, that democracies were so impotent, as this correspondent says, that they could not act in time to be effective.

My God, what a price we paid in the World War, and what a price we have paid in every war, because we could not or would not get ready for it, although we saw it coming. We waited until 3 weeks ago to start building a larger army and a larger navy and a larger air force—3 weeks ago. Where had we been all the time since 1933?

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

Mr. PEPPER. Not for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, where were our ears, where were our eyes? Could we not hear or see or feel what was going on in the world? Yet we waited until 3 weeks ago to start to build up a real air fleet, to build up a real Navy, to set up a real Army. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs told us that it would take 5 years at least to build anything like the fleet needs we will have to provide.

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

Mr. PEPPER. In just one moment. It will take a year or two at least to build a part of the airplanes we will have to have, to build the Army, for the enlargement of which we are just providing today.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator advise me when he will yield, so that I can ask him a question?

Mr. PEPPER. Just one second, and I will yield.

The Senator from Illinois asked me to state the difference between the resolution I previously submitted and the one I have submitted today. The original resolution, which was defeated twice by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, provided that the President was authorized, in his discretion, to sell any airplanes or other war equipment, which he thought could be sold without imperiling our own national defense, to any of the Allies, or any of the nations which were the victims of Hitler's unprovoked aggression, or were parties to the Kellogg Pact; provided delivery of those materials took place in this country, and provided the purchasers paid cash for them when they bought them, and paid a fair price for them. The resolution also gave the President the power, if he thought it desirable, to recoup any of those materials which we might have sold out of our existing establishment, out of any goods of that kind which might be in process of manufacture or might be manufactured in the factories of this country for the account of the powers abroad.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Because the resolutions of the Senator have intrigued me quite a little, and I have studied them from time

to time, I should like to ask the Senator with respect to the second resolution he presented, which he is just now discussing, as to whether or not, if the resolution were adopted by the Congress of the United States, we would not as a Congress divest ourselves of practically all authority to provide for an adequate national defense, and place the authority solely in the President of the United States to make the determination?

Mr. PEPPER. I answer "No," Mr. President, for clear reasons. In the first place, we would impose a limitation in the law, that is, a limitation that the President must not act to the point where he would imperil our national defense.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point exactly; in other words, we would lodge the sole discretion and authority with the President of the United States to say what was an adequate national defense, in the event the resolution were enacted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I turn it around a little, and state that we would lodge in the President the discretion to determine what might be disposed of without imperiling the national defense.

Mr. LUCAS. It is a distinction without a difference—

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. In the opinion of the Senator from Illinois we cannot pass the resolution the Senator has in mind, and which we are discussing now, without Congress divesting itself of all authority it has in respect to a national-defense program.

It seems to me, as I read the resolution, that we would be leaving to the President of the United States to say what our national defense should be. In other words, in a colloquy with the able Senator from Florida I said that in the event this resolution should pass, if the President of the United States wanted to sell a thousand airplanes under the terms of the resolution to the Allies, he could do it. If, following that, it was found the thousand planes were not sufficient to terminate the war, if 500 planes were not sufficient to terminate the war—as the writer said yesterday they would be sufficient to terminate it in favor of the Allies—and the military authorities on the other side and on this side gathered around the President and said:

Now, if we will sell them 24 destroyers, we believe that that will be sufficient to turn the tide of the war for the Allies.

Under the resolution the President would have the power to do that. Is not that true?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If the 24 destroyers failed to turn the tide, and the same military authorities across the water and on this side again sat in conference with the President and said, "Mr. President, we think that if you send 10 battleships across the water they will turn the tide and win a victory for the Allies and democracy," would not the President under the resolution, have the right to do that, provided he believed that our national defense was not impaired in so doing?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, he could send everything, under the resolution, if he thought it would win the victory for the Allies, because a victory for the Allies would be protecting our national defense, and our national defense, under the argument of the able Senator, will never be impaired if Hitler is defeated.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, there are potential dangers to our national defense aside from Hitler; so I would not say that a fair construction of the resolution would include the power to send everything. It would include the power to send a little, indeed a very great deal. Remember, the power would be conferred upon the Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States, so designated by the Constitution itself.

Let me make another inquiry that is equally pertinent. Suppose war were going on, and suppose the Commander in Chief felt that the best way to win the war was to send a certain number of destroyers or a certain number of battleships into battle. He would have authority to do that, and Congress would not have a check on it, either.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a different proposition.

Mr. PEPPER. That would be a military decision, made by the Executive branch of the Government, and not by the legislative. I say that, in substance, we are already at war with Hitler. If the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy in whom our people have confidence, aided and advised by the best brains in the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps, thought that the thing to do for the defense of our country was to allow 10 planes, or 50, or 500, to be sold for cash, delivered here to the Allies, and used by the Allies to crush Hitler in Europe, I believe that the American people would applaud the decision he made.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The last remark of the Senator brings up a question which has been turning over in my mind. I know how sincere and how devoted the Senator is to the resolution he is now discussing, and the various other resolutions he has offered, but I have never heard anyone yet on the floor of the Senate, not even the Senator himself, say whether or not the State Department, for instance, has peculiar knowledge of what is going on across the water, interested in the resolution, or whether the President of the United States supports his position. I have not heard the able leader on our side at any time say in this debate whether or not the President, or Mr. Hull, the Secretary of State, thought that this was the thing to do. With all due deference to the ability and the powers of persuasion of the Senator from Florida, and his unusual interest in this subject, in which we are all concerned, I cannot follow some of the things he would like to do. I am just as strong in my desires to see the democracies win as is the able Senator from Florida. I have thought that someone somewhere, sooner or later, would advise the Senate and the country whether or not the President of the United States, and whether or not the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, are in accord with the views of the Senator from Florida upon this far-reaching resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think there are two answers to that question, and I am glad to have the opportunity to make them.

The first answer is that the President does not have to do anything under that resolution unless he wants to. The Congress imposes upon him no duty. It merely gives him freedom of action, and tears away from his hands the shackles that might restrain him if he did want to act.

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

Mr. PEPPER. In just a moment.

The second is, Mr. President, that it seems to me it is time for the Congress of the United States to share a little of the responsibility in this matter with the President. The President for 3 years has been imploring the Congress to help him try to stave off this tragedy that now envelopes the world. He came here and entreated the Congress long ago to remove the discriminatory arms embargo which made us an ally to the German Government. But what did we do? We waited. We listened to the legalists and the constitutionalists who said, "No. In the first place that is illegal. In the second place, it might make Hitler mad, and we cannot venture to do that. In the third place there will not be any war if Roosevelt does not cause it. If Roosevelt will just quit jingoing around over the world, and not stick his nose in Europe's affairs, and quit talking about making democracies work, and quit stirring up things, there will not be any war, and everything will be well with the world." And we know what happened.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me right there on that point?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very happy that the Senator made that last suggestion about the President of the United States. In other words, he has been so uncannily right, in my humble opinion, upon this foreign question that I take off my hat to him. I thought he made a mistake in his "quarantine" speech in Chicago. I thought he made a mis-

take in the speech which he made at the opening session of Congress in 1939, when he talked of measures short of war. But in view of subsequent events I know that he was 100 percent right with respect to the foreign situation then, and that is the reason why I am anxious now to know what the President thinks about this important proposition, for great Senators, such as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and others here believe that if the Senator's resolution were adopted it would be tantamount to a declaration of war. I am interested in knowing what the Commander in Chief of our Army and the President of our country thinks about the Senator's resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question in turn?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to answer if I can.

Mr. PEPPER. If the President were to come and solemnly ask Congress for this power, can the Senator from Illinois assure him that he would receive it?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot speak for the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Or would he be humiliated and weakened in dealing with foreign powers if he made such a request and the request were turned down?

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say in answer to that question, that I do not think the President has been humiliated in one iota in this national-defense program which has been started, of course, since the invasion of the Low Countries by Germany, because the Senate of the United States has demonstrated a unanimity of thought on both sides of the aisle in adopting and in helping with this national-defense program. I agree with the Senator that the President of the United States has been far ahead of the Congress and of the people of the country generally, with respect to foreign affairs, and it took something like the invasion of Denmark and Norway, it took something like the rape of Holland by Hitler in order to awaken the people of America generally, as well as Senators and Representatives, from their lethargy with respect to what is going on in the world.

Let me say further in defense of the President: The Senator a moment ago suggested that we had been doing absolutely nothing in this country up to a few weeks ago so far as defense is concerned, and to some extent that is true. But I ask the Senator from Florida: Who is responsible for that apathy upon the part of Congress or upon the part of the people of the country? This country is guided by the sentiment of public opinion. Had the President of the United States made the same speech 60 days ago that he made to the joint meeting of the Congress a couple of weeks ago, after the invasion of the Low Countries, when he boldly declared his position to strengthen our defense, he would have been hooted and jeered and condemned by some Senators, as well as by a Republican press throughout the country, because they would have said that he was making that type of an appeal only in order to take us into war. And now, Mr. President, practically every move that he makes in the White House in connection with this great program of adequate national defense is construed upon the part of some individuals as well as a portion of the press as a barometer for our participation in the present war. And I charge now, at a time when all ought to be solidly behind the President and this program that the taint of politics is still fringing around the edges; at a time when we are attempting to give this country the type of defense that is so necessary if America is to continue on the road of progress and the road of peace and freedom which it has been experiencing for the last 150 years; some individuals and a part of the press are constantly inveighing against the program.

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

Mr. PEPPER. First I wish to say that I subscribe to every word that the able Senator from Illinois has said about the situation.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Florida that so far it seems to me his answer to the question of the Senator from Illinois is extremely unfair to the President of the United States. The Senator from Illinois asked the direct and definite question whether or not the position which the Senator from Florida takes has the approval of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. The only answer that the Senator from Florida gave was in the form of a question propounded to the Senator from Illinois as to whether or not, if the President of the United States came before the Congress and took that position, he would receive favorable consideration from the Congress. No construction can be made of that sort of an answer to a direct question, other than to imply that possibly the President of the United States does approve of the position which the Senator from Florida takes.

I know nothing about the attitude of the President of the United States upon this particular question. I do know, however, that in all of his utterances, public so far as I know and private so far as I know, the President has taken the position that the United States Government should be honest and should conform to the rules of international morality. The position which the Senator from Florida takes is that just because of the fact that there is in the world a great militarist who does not believe in the principles of international morality, who does not believe in the principles of international law, we are justified in being immoral; that we are justified in disregarding international law in our own actions.

I have heard nothing either publicly or privately from the President of the United States to indicate to me that that was his position. I know that probably what I say the Senator from Florida may consider mere simpering sentimentality, but it seems to me that if the Senator from Florida is logical in his position, that if Germany has declared war upon us, the logical thing for us to do is to come out openly and honestly and say that we are at war with Germany, and go the whole limit in trying to fight her.

The Senator made the statement that the Germans were trying to destroy everything in which we believe, everything for which we fought, and everything which we loved. It seems to me the most important thing in which we believe, the most important thing for which we have fought, and the most important thing which we love is the principle of simple common decency and honesty. For us to try to go around through the back door and participate in the war in Europe on the basis that somebody over there does not believe in international honesty, and therefore we should disregard international honesty, would be the first step to the destruction of all the things for which we have fought and all the things which we love in this country.

If we want to fight Hitler, if we want to give up our honesty, if we want to give up our democracy, let us just make a dictatorship out of the United States, and get into the war, and go ahead and do it openly.

Mr. President, why do we want the Western Hemisphere to be protected against Hitler?

Why do we want the United States to be protected against Hitler? Because of the fact that we want to have maintained in this world, as a part of the world, some place in which the principles of democracy and the principles of honesty and morality are recognized. If under the guise of taking steps short of war, in direct violation of every principle of international law, we are going through the back door to participate in a war in Europe, I say that the logical thing for us to do is to go the whole way, have a dictatorship for ourselves, forget about democracy, and go into the matter of world power politics. I am not willing to do that. So far as our Nation is concerned, I think that the most important thing to do is to be honest with ourselves and with our people and honest with the world.

Some day the time will come when the peoples of the world will once more recognize the principles of international morality. We may scoff at international law; we may say that it has been disregarded; we may say that this dictator or that dictator does not pay any attention to it.

I remember that a few years ago out in the city of Chicago—I use Chicago simply because it was the most publicized of all the cities in which the situation existed—gangsters refused to recognize the law. The right-thinking people of the country were very much worried because they thought that possibly our whole principle of law would be destroyed if we did not use a gun on the gangsters.

My personal position is—and I think the position of the United States of America ought to be—that no matter what happens anywhere else we ought to be honest; we ought to preserve our democracy; we ought to preserve the principles of international morality. I do not think that the President has ever said anything which has to the slightest extent deviated from that sort of a position; and when the Senator answers the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] by propounding another question, I think he is extremely unfair to the President of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PEPPER. Not until I have answered the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Washington talks very militantly when he is talking about the Japanese, because he lives on the west coast, but not very militantly when he is talking about Mr. Hitler, who may threaten us on the east coast.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. On the 22d of October I spoke for 4 hours on the floor of the Senate on the Japanese question. I have spoken on the Japanese question several times in national radio broadcasts. It happens that every speech I have ever made on the Japanese question has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I presume the Senator would not care to take the time to read them. I do not ask him to read them. But I defy the Senator to find a single word of militancy in any of the language I have used so far as Japan is concerned. I have only asked that we place a restriction upon our own people, and that we comply with a treaty obligation into which we solemnly entered. I have never made an attack upon the Japanese. I have never used any language against the Japanese which to the slightest extent could be considered militant.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator state whether or not he proposed that we should withhold commercial trade and sales of armament, oil, and the like, from the Japanese?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Yes; because of the fact that clearly under the provisions of the Nine Power Pact it is our treaty responsibility, in accordance with the provisions of international law and in accordance with international morality, to take that sort of position.

Mr. PEPPER. In the opinion of the able Senator from Washington international morality is all right to invoke against the Japanese, but not very good against Hitler.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. There is just this distinction between the Senator from Florida and myself. I happen to believe in treaty obligations. I happen to believe that it is the responsibility of this Government to respect its treaty obligations, and I do not think we have any more right to violate a treaty obligation in the Far East than Hitler has to violate a treaty obligation in Europe. I do not think we have any more right to violate a treaty obligation in the Far East than to adopt a resolution such as the Senator from Florida proposes, which is in direct violation of all the principles of international law and morality.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, everything the able Senator has said about my resolution, other members of the Foreign Relations Committee said about his resolution with regard to Japan. I will ask him if his resolution has the approval of the State Department?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I never appeared on the floor of the Senate and evaded the question when I was asked whether or not I was representing the position of the State Department or of the President of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida will make that point very clear as soon as he has an opportunity to answer the remainder of the Senator's question. But what does the Senator from Washington propose to the Senate?

There is a Nine-Power Treaty by which nine different countries guaranteed the territorial integrity of China. Japan was one of the signers. The United States was one of the signers. There was a collateral commercial treaty between the United States and Japan. In the course of ordinary commercial relationships the United States was selling supplies to Japan, just as it would sell them to any other nation in the world. What does the Senator from Washington do? He comes in and regales us with accounts of Japanese cruelties, Japanese aggressions, and unprovoked assaults by the Japanese militarists, and he says that in penalty upon the Japanese for their wrong, and to carry out the spirit of the treaty to which Japan is a party, as well as of the Kellogg Pact, we should punish the Japanese by withholding commercial trade relations from them. He says, "Let us quit helping the Japanese conquer the Chinese."

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

Mr. PEPPER. In just a moment.

Yet, Mr. President, when I say "Let us help Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Poland, and the other nations which are the unprotected victims of Hitler's unprovoked aggression," and all I propose is that they be permitted to buy supplies here for cash, I am a breaker of international law; I am trespassing upon international morality; I am a militant warmonger; I am not honest. Why did not the Senator propose to declare war against Japan, if he really wanted to protect China and be honest?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I appreciate the fact that it would impose quite a burden upon the Senator from Florida to read the speeches which I have made with reference to the Japanese question, and I do not expect him to assume that burden. But if he were to assume that burden and read the speeches, or if he had taken the trouble to stay in the Chamber and listen to me while I discussed the question, I am sure the statement which he just made would not be made by him at the present time.

All I ever argued about Japan was that we had a treaty obligation. Apparently the Senator is not familiar with the nine-power agreement, because of the fact that he said that we guaranteed the territorial integrity of China. We never guaranteed the territorial integrity of China. We agreed to respect the territorial integrity of China. All I ever asked was that our Government ask its citizens not to use their rights to violate a treaty. I never proposed that we declare war. I never proposed that we send any arms or ammunition to the Chinese, either directly or indirectly. All I argued for was that we had a treaty obligation. I do not like to impose upon the Senator so much, but if he had taken the time and trouble to read the speeches which I have made upon this question, he would not have made the statement he has just made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have heard the Senator discuss his proposal in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I have heard him discuss it on the floor of the Senate. Moreover, the Senator knows that I have told him that I favor it. I have repeatedly stated publicly in the press that I favor it. Why?

I thought we had a right, as a penalty upon Japan for breaking that treaty, to drop commercial relations with Japan, and to withhold the sale of oil and armaments to Japan. I still say so. But the able Senator is not willing to give me the benefit of that argument when I apply it to Hitler and his conquests.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. The Senator says he thinks we could do it as a penalty. He goes much further than I have ever gone in either public or private statement. I have not said anything about any penalty against Japan. I have merely said that we have a treaty obligation, and that the principles of international morality require that we carry it out. All I ask in dealing with Europe is that we apply the same principles of international morality which I advocate in our dealings in the Far East.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I make the same request relative to the policy of the United States toward Hitler. I say that the German Government is a party to the Kellogg Pact. We are a party to that pact, as are many of the victims of his aggression in Europe. In that pact the signatories said they would not adopt war as an instrument of national policy. Germany has flagrantly violated that solemn treaty. Therefore, we, as a signer of that pact, have a right to lend something more than moral aid and sympathy to the victims of Hitler's aggression in violation of the pact.

I say that international morality and decency demand that the signers of that kind of a solemn obligation be willing to do something about it when it is violated, and not merely sit by with folded hands, indifferent to whatever may be done in its breach.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH and Mr. LUNDEEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I do not like to impose further on the Senator from Florida, but I should like to ask him to read the Kellogg-Briand Pact alongside the Nine-Power Pact. Certainly he cannot claim that there is any comparison between the responsibilities upon the signatories in one pact as compared with the other. As a matter of fact, because of the Monroe Doctrine, we insisted that there be inserted in the Kellogg-Briand Pact the proviso that each nation should have the right to decide for itself whether a war in which it engaged was a war of aggression or a war of defense.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am clear about one thing. At least, Hitler makes no distinction between one pact and the other, because all pacts look alike to him.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am wondering if the Senator from Florida would construe article VI of the Hague Convention of 1907 for the Senate. Germany and the United States were both signatory powers to that convention. Let me read article VI:

The supply, in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever is forbidden.

I wonder how the Senator would construe that.

Mr. PEPPER. I would say that that was a covenant that existed B. H.—before Hitler. [Laughter.]

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to read for the Senator from Florida, not presuming, and for the Senate an extract from the works entitled "International Law, Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States," by Charles Cheney Hyde, professor of law in the Northwestern University, published by Little & Brown, which can be had in the Senate Library. I read from page 698:

SEC. 848. Government abstention from participation—miscellaneous activities: The government of a neutral state is obliged to abstain from all participation in the conflict. Participation is none

the less censurable because impartial. The duty of abstention becomes applicable to all persons in the public service of the neutral, whether in the civil or military branches thereof. Thus members of its diplomatic corps must refrain from furnishing aid. Members of its navy must not pass and make known resolutions of sympathy for the cause of a particular belligerent.

The extent of the duty of abstention is broad. Every possible field of activity is covered. Thus the sale by a neutral government to a belligerent of any form of war material or of public ships may be said to be forbidden. It is urged with force that the mere consent by a neutral to the sale to a belligerent of vessels privately owned, yet constituting a part of the naval reserve and subject to governmental control, is embraced within the general prohibition. Again, the loaning of money or the extension of credit by a neutral government to a belligerent amounts to participation in the war, and constitutes, therefore, unneutral conduct.

There are footnotes, which I will not undertake to read, citing the precedents of our country. This is not a collection of international law on the part of other nations; it is the international law of this Nation.

The Senator from Florida began his speech this morning by saying that he was not in favor of declaring war, but after lunch I came back and heard him say that Mr. Hitler was already making war upon us. Well, of course, if he is, it is our plain duty to declare war upon him. I take it that the Senator from Florida would agree to that. It seems that he has based his whole argument upon the hearsay testimony of an anonymous Italian printed in an unnamed newspaper.

I must protest that when this body begins to consider thrusting our great people into any war we must have something more substantial than that.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall not forget to come back to the relationship of the President of the United States to this question, but before doing that I desire to answer the able Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, when I said that Hitler had already declared war upon us, I did not depend upon hearsay or the statement of some relatively unknown correspondent, although in this case the correspondent happened to be John T. Whitaker, a correspondent for the Chicago Daily News Service.

Mr. BAILEY. Who was the anonymous Italian?

Mr. PEPPER. The anonymous Italian remains anonymous. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. Let him forever be.

Mr. PEPPER. Like many of those in later years who shall obstruct this great program to defend America in the most effective way.

Mr. President, I started to say that it was not hearsay that there is a "fifth column" in the United States, which was hired, sent here, and paid for by Adolf Hitler's government for one purpose, and that not a peaceful purpose but a warlike purpose, not constructive, but destructive.

The American people do not have to rely upon my testimony or be dissuaded by the doubts of the able Senator from North Carolina which now appear. Nor, Mr. President, is it hearsay that Hitler has already sent his Trojan horses and "fifth columns" into Mexico, and, I believe, every other country south of the Rio Grande. The American people are not going to be dissuaded in their consciousness of that knowledge by the doubts of the able Senator from North Carolina that Trojan horses and "fifth columns" are not down there.

Mr. President, the American people know far too well that Hitler has already made war on us and on this hemisphere, not only by Trojan horses and "fifth columns" but in the very commercial practices described in the newspaper article which I have read.

What did he do? He set up an economy and a method of bargaining which was the antithesis of the democratic method of free trade, which contemplates a mutual exchange of goods and services upon the basis of a decent currency and decent commercial practices. Not Hitler. He does not come and ask for an order; he puts the mailed fist behind the demand for it. He dumps in violation of every decent commercial practice the world over. For what purpose? Not only to build up his own but to break down our economy. Every practice and every policy he has adopted has been at war with

the practices and policies of the United States of America. The farmers in the United States may not know what has happened to their market, where it has gone, who took it, who destroyed it; but they do know their market is gone; they know it is not there; they know somebody is responsible.

I say Hitler has already made war not only upon our democracy and institutions, not only upon our religion, but by his spies and plans for sabotage he has made war actually upon our Army bases, our sea bases, our air bases, our citadels, and places of military value in our country. He has made war upon every man that labors in a factory and every man who works upon a farm by the insidious and vicious commercial practices which, along with his propaganda, are as much a part of his war machine as the soldiers and the tanks at the front. That is what these people have not been able to understand—that the "fifth column" and the parachute troops are a part of the Hitler army.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. PEPPER. Not for the time being.

They have not been able to understand that this is a new kind of war. Has Hitler declared war on anybody? I wish the Senator from North Carolina had turned over to the index and found in the book where it must say "Declarations of war are made publicly according to the code of world decency." Does Hitler declare war on anybody? No; he just marches at dawn, after the "fifth column" has already opened the fortresses of the enemy for him, and already destroyed their integrity, after he has already bought off all purchasable traitors. That is the kind of war he wages. I suppose the Senator from North Carolina, if he lived in Holland or Belgium, would still be there standing at the roadside waving a law book at Hitler and saying, "You violated the law of our country. Will you not stop? Stop in the name of the law." [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would wave the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at him.

Mr. PEPPER. It may be that it would have been a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Senator would have been waving.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well. I will let the Senator have it his own way. However, here is the definition of neutrality as determined by the convention of the republics represented at the Sixth International Conference of American States, held at Habana, Cuba, in 1928, to which the United States was a party. Here is the declaration to which we agreed—and I cite the Senator to article 16:

The neutral state is forbidden:

(a) To deliver to the belligerent, directly or indirectly, or for any reason whatever, ships of war, munitions, or any other war material.

(b) To grant it loans, or to open credits for it during the duration of war.

Credits that a neutral state may give to facilitate the sale or exportation of its food products and raw materials are not included in this prohibition.

That is our declaration of our standards of neutrality, entered into with our sister republics in the New World. I wish the Senator to test his resolution in the light of the collection of the law by Mr. Bates which I read just now, and in the light of our formal declaration in this convention with our sister republics in the New World. It is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 28, 1932, at page 2876.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if a man were in a courtroom, arguing a case before a competent court, in a country which respected law, and dealing with other parties who lived under the law, he would, of course, make a legal argument; but if he were out in the field, and he were attacked by a rattlesnake, he would try to cut off its head regardless of whether he might have acted too quickly, or whether his action might perhaps have constituted, in the opinion of

some technician, an unjustifiable attack upon a poor rattlesnake.

Mr. President, when a burglar breaks into your home, he may do so by mistake; but the citizen whose close is being violated has a right to defend it against a marauder, and it is not a legal controversy.

I ask the Senator and I ask the Senate, What does Hitler say about international law?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I will answer that question.

Mr. PEPPER. Just a minute.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the Senator yield? He asked me a question, and I should like to answer it.

Mr. PEPPER. Just 1 minute. I say that Hitler is the best authority on international law in the world today, because he has determined that there is no international law.

Mr. BAILEY. I am sure Mr. Hitler will greatly appreciate the compliment from the Senator from Florida. There is an international law. The fact that it is violated does not destroy its existence. The international law of neutrals is fixed. The United States is a law-abiding nation; it is a treaty-keeping nation; and we do not propose to follow the example of Mr. Hitler or be seduced with arguments that because Mr. Hitler did thus and so we should do thus and so.

I remind the Senator that at the outset of his speech he avowed that he was not for war with Mr. Hitler; but if during the past hour since I have been here he has said anything contrary to a demand for war with Mr. Hitler, then I have failed in my understanding.

The Senator has repeatedly said that Mr. Hitler is at war with us. If the Senator believes that, it is his duty to ask the Congress to declare war at once. If he does not believe it, he may take the course that we take; but he cannot come here and say at the outset of his speech that he is not advocating war, and throughout the whole last portion of it advocate a course which cannot have any meaning other than war, in the light of our historic policy and our formal declaration in the convention of Cuba, from which I read just now.

I should like to have the Senator take his side. If he is for war, let him say so, and I will respect his position.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like first to answer the question of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, during the years when Winston Churchill was pleading with the British people to act, I dare say Sir John Simon many times gave to his colleagues in the cabinet the advice which the able lawyer from North Carolina is now giving to his colleagues in the Senate. The only difference is that Winston Churchill was trying to save the British Empire from the folly of the Chamberlains and the Simons; and some of these days, if the Senator continues that course, some brave men will be trying to defend this country against the Senator from North Carolina and others who take the same point of view.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I have not taken any course here. I have not even said that I was opposed to a declaration of war. I have not asserted the slightest conception of policy here. All I have done is to call to the Senator's attention the historic definition of neutrality gathered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] as a summary of our whole course, and then to support that with article 16 in the Convention of Cuba of 1928.

The Senator cannot charge me with having any course at all, and I should not think he would suggest that he and Winston Churchill are in the same category; but far be it from me to deny it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the one hope that the world has of that law ever again being effective, the one chance the world has of living under law and not force, is for somebody to crush Hitler in Europe. That is the reason why I am saying that what Congress should do is to tell the President of

the United States—our Chief Executive, the constitutional Commander in Chief of our Armies and our Navies—that it is the sense of the Senate—the House of Representatives concurring—

That the President of the United States, at his discretion, should use the full authority which he now has under existing laws to sell or transfer airplanes and other war material not at present needed in the national defense to any foreign country, to the end that peace and freedom be preserved and protected, and to keep war from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. Not until I have made another statement.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator's own interpretation of that language is that the President could send battleships over there.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he will be good enough to repeat the statement. I wanted to make another statement before yielding to him.

Mr. BAILEY. In the colloquy with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Florida stated that under his resolution the President could sell or transfer to a belligerent nation 10 or 12 battleships, and yet the Senator says that is not war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina was so interested in reading about international law that perhaps he did not read the resolution which is lying on the table and under discussion.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon. The first thing I did was to read very carefully the resolution submitted today. I think I understand it, and it refers to the right to sell or to give away anything we have in the way of warlike materials—sell or transfer.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, to the able legalist from North Carolina I will again read the resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled—

It is a concurrent resolution—

that the President of the United States, at his discretion, should use the full authority which he now has under existing laws—

I propose to give him no new authority, to confer upon him no new power. All I propose is that the Congress of the United States tell him he may exercise the power he has without a lot of backbiting from either technicalists or any other person. I merely do not want him, if he should choose to act under existing law, the next day, to have carping critics here in the Senate or in the country denounce him for being a militarist and a violator of the law and a war monger.

Mr. BONE and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Washington; then I will yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, with this somewhat different slant on the resolution, is it the view of the Senator from Florida that under existing law, without any change whatever, the President of the United States could sell our entire fleet to Great Britain, and could do it without consulting Congress? Is that the law as the Senator from Florida understands it?

Mr. PEPPER. Not in any sense of the word.

Mr. BONE. Then what does the resolution accomplish? What is the purpose of the resolution? It merely refers, as the Senator says, to the power the President now has. If he has the power at the present time under the statute to sell our entire fleet to Great Britain, and should sell it, could there be any question raised?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida, of course, has never said or intimated that the President possessed any such power as that under existing law. I was discussing with the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] a few moments ago the resolution which I previously introduced, and I was trying to give a fair construction of that resolution.

Mr. President, because the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations did not like the first resolution, because they did not like the second resolution which proposed to confer upon the President a new power, I respectfully yesterday said, "Will not some other Senator offer some other form of resolution which will achieve the same general purpose, or will not the Senate and the Congress back up the President in the exercise of the power he now has?"

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, what is that power?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and, if so, to whom?

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

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator may have already done what I am about to ask him to do, but I was absent from the Chamber if he did. Will the Senator explain to the Senate the difference between his first resolution and his second resolution so far as concerns the authority they attempt to confer, and the authority now possessed by the President to do what he speaks of?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I called the attention of the Senate yesterday to two statutes which are already upon the statute books of this country. The first one is United States Code, title X, section 1262, reading as follows:

Sale of surplus war materials to States and foreign governments: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell to any State or foreign government with which the United States was at peace on June 5, 1920, upon such terms as he may deem expedient, any matériel, supplies, or equipment pertaining to the Military Establishment, except foodstuffs, as or may be found to be surplus, which are not needed for military purposes and for which there is no adequate domestic market.

That is chapter 240, Forty-first Statutes, 949.

I also called attention to title X, section 1272, reading as follows:

Motor-propelled vehicles, airplanes, engines, and parts thereof may be exchanged in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character, to be used for the same purpose as those proposed to be exchanged.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, under the last statute, the War Department might exchange an old airplane in part payment for a new one, just as one trades in his automobile, but the new airplane must be used for the same purpose for which the old one was used.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that under that law neither the President nor the Secretary of War could, after exchanging an old airplane for a new one, sell it or give it away to any government.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think anyone can give away Government property.

Mr. BARKLEY. The word "gift" has been used here. We will eliminate the idea of giving. Under that section neither the Secretary of War nor the President would be authorized to make this exchange for any purpose except to get a new airplane for the use of the United States. That is a proper interpretation?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that the Senator's resolutions, No. 1 and No. 2, did go further—

Mr. PEPPER. Vastly.

Mr. BARKLEY. They did give authority to the President—not to the Secretary of War, but to the President—to do with these new things, after they had exchanged the old ones for the new ones, if they saw fit to do so, what they could not do under the present law?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in connection with that statement?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Is it clear to the Senator that this power to exchange one bit of machinery for another extends to exchanges with foreign governments? The statute as he reads it does not show that.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think so.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit, in regard to the other section the Senator read, which authorizes the Secretary of War to dispose of surplus war materials to any nation with which we were at peace in 1920, I think it must be apparent that we were disposing of this material to nations at peace and not to those at war, and not in contravention of our own treaty obligations or our own interpretation of international law. Certainly Congress did not authorize the Secretary of War, under that section of the statute, to dispose of surplus property in a way that would violate international law, or violate our own treaties with other nations.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to make a very clear-cut statement as to the various attitudes I have expressed on this subject.

The first thing I did was to introduce a resolution which authorized the President of the United States to sell airplanes or aircraft parts or equipment—only those things—to the allied and associated governments, delivery to be made in this country, cash to be paid by the purchasers, and the price to be fixed by the President; with the proviso that the President could recoup the same kind of materials from any contract the purchasers might have in process of construction, or after construction had been terminated upon their order in this country.

Mr. President, that resolution was defeated in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by a vote of 12 to 1. The second day after that I introduced another resolution, which recited the Kellogg Pact, and that the German Government, the United States Government, the British Government, the French Government, and other governments in Europe, which are the victims now of Hitler's unprovoked aggression, were parties to it.

It recited further that the United States wanted to give aid to these countries which were victims of that unprovoked aggression, victims of the breach of international law, and of the Kellogg Pact, in any way it could short of war, and those last three words are in those resolutions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will excuse me until I finish this statement, I will yield.

The resolution proceeded in the resolving part to invest the President with the power, in his discretion, when he thought it could be done without imperiling the national defense, to sell any kind of armament or equipment we had, delivery to be made in this country, cash to be paid by the purchaser, the price to be reasonable and fixed by the President, with the same power in the President to recapture that kind of equipment from any goods which belonged to the purchasers in this country, and put them back in lieu of those they were allowed to get. The resolution came up before the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday morning, and was defeated by a vote of 19 to 2.

After noon, back on the floor of the Senate, I addressed the Senate and said:

I do not believe that the excuse that these resolutions would be in technical breach of international law is a justifiable and applicable excuse for not doing what the resolution contemplates.

I stated that I believe that Hitler could not make the defense that we were technically violating international law, for he was the aggressor, Germany was a party to the pact, we were a party to the pact, and surely parties to the pact should be able in some way or other to do something more than just give their sympathy to another party which was the victim of a violator of the pact.

I proceeded to go into the realities of the situation, aside from the technicalities, and to speak about the things Hitler had done and was doing, the danger to Europe, and the consequent danger to the integrity of the United States of America.

I went further, and said that Hitler was the exponent of dictatorship, the chief in the world, and that we were the chief exponent of democracy, that there would inevitably come a time of conflict between those two theories of government; moreover, that we had far too many resources

here in this hemisphere for Hitler not to want to get some of them for his own lustful use. Therefore, I said to my fellow citizens and to my colleagues, that the best way to defend the United States, the cheapest way to defend the United States, was to help the Allies crush Hitler in Europe.

But how was that to be done, I said. By all means short of war.

I said to the able Senator from West Virginia a few days ago that if he asked me the question, would I have Congress declare war, I would say unalterably, no.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I did say that that would depend on the circumstances at a future time, that I did not know what they would be, but that I did know that I contemplated that never in my life would I ever vote to send an American boy to European soil; as William Jennings Bryan said, "to march under European battle flags and die on European battlefields."

I am trying to avoid that. I am trying to avoid having them die over here, and I think we should approach our defense not only upon those moral principles to which the able Senator from Washington referred a moment ago, but upon the self-interest principle of crushing the danger in a reasonable way wherever it is.

I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The phrase "short of war" has been used rather indiscriminately in this country recently. So far as I know, there has been no legal definition of the phrase "short of war." What is short of war? What can we do or what can we not do and be certain we are doing something that is short of war? And if we do something innocent in itself, as it might appear on the surface, which would lead to war, is that short of war? How far can we go and still be short of war, and how far must we go in order to be "long of war"?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator will have to excuse me from answering that question until I finish my statement, because every time I have gotten this far in my statement I have never succeeded in completing the statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator used the term only a moment ago.

Mr. PEPPER. And the Senator in a few moments will be glad to refer to it more particularly.

Mr. President, I stated the appeal the Senator from Florida made in the Senate yesterday. I said, in addition to that, that I claimed no pride of authorship in this matter; that I am merely giving expression to a sentiment in which I believe very earnestly. I said that if Senators did not like my resolution they should offer one of their own, and I would support it; or that they should offer to amend my resolution, and that I would aid them. I have asked Senators to propose something as good, and stated that I would assist them in every way possible. But I have said, Mr. President, that there is something we can do. We can back up the President in the exercise of the power he already has, and not violate international law according to anyone's definition.

For the first time it was read on this floor, I believe, I read yesterday this statute:

Title X, section 1272. Motor-propelled vehicles, aeroplanes, engines, and parts thereof may be exchanged in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character, to be used for the same purpose as those proposed to be exchanged.

What does that do, Mr. President? Without any question about international law—and I wish the able Senator from North Carolina would attend to that matter—without any question of international law our Government does have the power to take an old airplane down to an airplane factory and say, "We will turn this old airplane in to you for a new one, delivery to be made within 30 days," for example, just as is done by many people with their automobiles. If you have an old car and a new car is about to come out a month hence, and you take the old car down to the dealer and say, "I want to trade the old car in for a new one, and I will leave the old

car with you and take delivery on the new car when it is ready a month from now," the dealer will say, "Very well."

Under that statute the United States Government can do just that. It can take these old warships or old airplanes of the United States Army or Navy and turn them into an airplane factory. The airplane factory can give the Government a fair allowance for those planes and promise the Government delivery of new planes at an acceptable time, and that bargain can be made without any pretext of violating any international law.

So, Mr. President, I state that all I want to be sure of is that if the President should do that on occasion, that next day some one will not jump up in the Senate and denounce him for getting us into war with Hitler, for violating international law, for violating neutrality and becoming a warmonger, as some persons long ago said he was trying to be. That is the reason I have offered this resolution today, and listen to the reading of it again, Mr. President:

That it is the sense of the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring, that the President of the United States, at his discretion, should use the full authority which he now has—

Whatever it is—

under existing laws—

I propose no change—

to sell or transfer airplanes and other war material not at present needed in the national defense to any foreign country, to the end that peace and freedom be preserved and protected and to keep war from the Western Hemisphere.

It would be a private transaction in this country between Government and citizen. The Government turning in the old, the citizen manufacturer promising to give the Government the new. Then the citizen manufacturer, under the Neutrality Act, under the removed restraints of the old embargo law, can sell that old plane to the Allies for whatever he wants to sell it for—that is for cash, whatever the amount—upon the terms that the neutrality law allows, delivery to be made as the law prescribes in this country, and delivery to the foreign country to be made in their own ships, or the airships to be flown under their own power. So I say to Senators who are standing back on a technicality, the technicality is removed. Now let us see if they will back up the President.

What would Senators say if tomorrow the President turned 10 old bombers back to the factory under this provision? The President is entitled to know, and the country is entitled to know, whether or not the Congress is going to share responsibility for doing something which in our hearts we all want to do, or whether the President has perpetually to be the goat.

I remember very well, and other Senators do also, when the question came up of whether or not we could let the Allies have any of the airplanes that had been contracted for by the United States Government ahead of the United States Government—Senators may remember the storm that swept over this country and over some Senators when that happened. Roosevelt was the goat. He was "warmongering." It was said he was violating neutrality, was violating international law, and helping the Allies. It was said that what he was doing was getting us into the war.

Mr. President, I think the President is entitled to have some assurance from the Congress that the Congress is not going to make him take all the "shootin'," as it were.

Now let us be men enough to say to the President "All right, Mr. President, in our hearts we do want to help the Allies. If you can find any legal and lawful way to do it, go ahead. We are behind you." Just say that and then see what he does.

Mr. President, the English language, and here the President's voice—

Here is what he said, as found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6244, May 16, 1940. I read an excerpt from his message to the joint meeting of the Congress.

For the permanent record, I ask the Congress not to take any action which would in any way hamper or delay the delivery of

American-made planes to foreign nations which have ordered them or seek to purchase more planes. That, from the point of view of our own national defense, would be extremely short-sighted.

I say, Mr. President, that what I have proposed is that the Congress show something like the sentiments which have come from the hearts of the American people. As I left my office this morning I picked up this batch of telegrams which came in before I left my office today from people of almost every State in the Union, expressing the sentiment that we ought to do something in this crisis which would be more than futile sympathy from the American people to those who are so hard pressed in that battle for civilization and civilization's gains.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. My inquiry is rather of the practical kind. The plan which the Senator suggests is, of course, an effort to help the Allies; to help them within the cover of the statutes of this country. I am wondering whether or not the reception on the part of the Germans would be any different if we render aid within the legal rights as distinguished from going outside of them. In other words, war can be declared by one side. It is not like a contract. It does not take two parties to have war. If we deliberately set about within the law to aid one of the parties, will we bring ourselves within the war at the election of the other party in spite of our own declaration?

Mr. PEPPER. That is a fair question and I will try to give the Senator a fair answer. Being a realist about this situation and urging others to be realists, I have said repeatedly, as no doubt the Senator has heard on this floor, that so far as Hitler is concerned, so far as the destructive events on the western front are concerned, it makes no difference whatsoever whether the bombing plane was sold by an American manufacturer as a private citizen under the terms of the neutrality law, or sold by the United States Government from one of its air fields in the United States. It is still an airplane, it is still a destructive agency of war.

But we have our ways of doing things. We have a certain ritualism that we want to follow. We feel better about it if we do it in a certain way. It is said that even a dog can tell the difference between being stepped on and being kicked, but he is hurt just the same. And so we have a feeling that we had better follow the ritualism of the law. Consequently we passed the Neutrality Act in the last session of the Congress, which made it possible for private manufacturers to sell war planes, cannon, ammunition, and any war equipment to anybody.

Now, we knew very well as a matter of fact that the Allies were the ones who were going to get that equipment, and we all understood we wanted them to get it, but it made us feel a little better about it by doing it in just that way. But I say, Mr. President, that if Hitler will not get mad about the airplanes we are now making available to the Allies, because the President says to the Congress, "Do not do anything to stop the Allies getting airplanes"—Hitler must have heard the President's address. It was heard all over the world over the radio. If he did not hear it on the radio he must have read it the next day in the newspapers. He knows about our neutrality law. And if he is not going to get mad about that, this law which I propose is not a bit different in principle—it is in fact the neutrality law under another plan.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The provision which the Senator has in his resolution, is that we shall do what we can short of war. That would be agreeable to me if it could be interpreted this way: "Short of getting us into the war." What I am concerned about is the actual consequence of what we do, and I do not want our country to get into war even though what we do is done legally, and it is not a justification for war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, under the law that I have referred to here we would not be doing anything at all except turning in old planes for new ones to a private manufacturer

in the United States of America. What the manufacturer does with it is his matter. He has the right now to sell planes which he owns, second-hand or new ones, to the Allies. If the Senator owned a private plane and he took it to a manufacturer of airplanes and traded it in for a new one, the manufacturer could sell that plane to the Allies. If the United States Government took a plane which it owned and traded it in for a new one and the manufacturer took the old one and sold it to the Allies, it would be identical with what he is doing now under the Neutrality Act of 1939.

The purpose of the Neutrality Act of 1939 was to make it possible for the Allies to get help in a legal way from us but get it over here on our terms. The purpose of the President, following the terms of this law, would be twofold. First the United States Government would be getting a good price for second-hand machines. Just as I might get a good price for my second-hand automobile when I turned it in for a new automobile.

In the second place the United States Government would be making it possible for the manufacturer perhaps to carry on his business, and therefore develop his facilities to aid in the national defense by the production of airplanes.

The incidental, but nevertheless desirable, effect of it would be that the Allies would get an old war plane, which they imperatively need. So, Mr. President, I hope I have explained to the Senate—to those who may be interested in an explanation—that the resolution which is now on the table is one which does not purport to confer any new power on the President. It merely says to the President, "If you follow the existing law, we will back you up as Members of the Congress in a morally responsible way." He does not need our legal action so much as he needs our moral help and encouragement in this crucial hour.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. A moment ago the Senator from Florida, in discussing the attitude of the President on this subject, read an excerpt from his message of May 16, in which he urged that Congress place no impediment in the way of carrying out contracts between the Allied nations and the industries in this country which are making planes and other war material on their order. The Senator from Florida certainly did not mean to imply that in the President's reference in his message of the 16th to contracts between Allied nations and manufacturers in the United States the President had in mind any war material which the Government of the United States owns, which is in the possession of the War Department or the Navy Department.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the surface the Senator's statement might be interpreted to mean that because the President urged Congress to do nothing to interfere with contracts being made between the Allies and private plants in the United States he thereby meant that we ought to authorize him to sell what the Government owns. I do not think the Senator meant that, because certainly the President did not have that in mind.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida did not mean that, in any sense of the word. The Senator will remember that there are now two statutes on the books. One is the statute which was passed in 1920, which gives the Secretary of War authority to sell to any state or foreign government with which the United States was at peace on June 5, 1920, any surplus war materials. That law is now on the statute books. I think that authority should be exercised. Others may object for one reason or another—principally for technical reasons. So I say, as an alternative, that the President may exercise the authority which he has under the other act, which I read:

Motor-propelled vehicles, airplanes, engines, and parts thereof may be exchanged in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character, to be used for the same purpose as those proposed to be exchanged.

I did say that if the President and the departments of the Government should exchange old airplanes for new, or upon the promise of getting new ones later, of the most modern

design, that would be consistent with what is now being done under the Neutrality Act, and with what the President, in the passage I read, asked us not to interfere with now. I think everyone understands that there are several different ways in which we could do the thing if we will to do it.

I was about to refer to a batch of telegrams which I picked up from my desk. The first one is a little severely critical of the opposition, and I shall not read it. Of course, Senators may honestly differ on these vital matters.

I have a telegram from Atlanta, Ga., from W. L. Stanley, vice president of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., who says:

Congratulations on * * * the righteousness of your position. We had better spend our money now to save civilization than later on to have to shed our blood to do so.

I have a telegram from Hanover, Pa. I do not know any of these persons. This one is from Mr. and Mrs. Harry N. Gitt, II:

Approve giving Allies Army-Navy planes immediately. Urge committee reconsider.

The next one is from Joel Gross, 744 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.:

The people of this country are unquestionably with you. Keep up your persistently good work.

The next one is from J. K. Wells, of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

Great majority of people in Oklahoma favor furnishing England and France their needed munitions requirements, realizing that if they are destroyed in the present conflict our future is hopeless. Isolationists and pacifists are no more.

The next one is from Chester Boothe Blakeman, of Atlanta, Ga.:

Although of another political faith, may I congratulate you on your courageous and seemingly hopeless stand. Are other legislators so blind that they cannot realize that we are helping this country just as much as the Allies by sending planes now? The sentiment among those I contact is overwhelmingly in your favor. More power to you, and God give you the power and strength to carry on until successful.

The next one is from Kenneth Outerbridge, of Saundertown, R. I.:

Congratulations on your stand for immediate help to the Allies. I have wired my Congressman to support you in this move. Keep right at it, and let us hope that the Allies can hold out and public opinion will come across in time.

The next telegram is from Helen C. Arnoult, of New Orleans, La.:

Please continue your fight to help the Allies by selling them all the supplies and arms they may require.

A telegram from Sarah O. Fisk, of St. Louis, Mo., says:

Heartily approve your fight, ship planes and munitions to Allies. Keep on trying.

A telegram from Jessie Lansing, of St. Louis, Mo., says:

I strongly urge immediate action to ship war materials to Allied armies.

I have additional telegrams from Houston, Tex.; Asheville, N. C.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Summit, Ill.; Pasadena, Calif.; Watsonville, Calif.; Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Ill.; Elmira, N. Y.; St. Petersburg, Fla.; Berkeley, Calif.; New York, N. Y.; Charlotte, N. C.; Chicago, Ill.; Brooklyn, N. Y.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Fairfield, Conn.; New York City; Los Angeles, Calif.; Goshen, N. Y.; West Los Angeles, Calif.; Tuckahoe, N. Y.; Asheville, N. C.; Atlanta, Ga.; Montclair, N. J.; Huntington, N. Y.; Dedham, Mass.; New York City; New York City; Asheville, N. C.; Orlando, Fla.; Kansas City, Mo.; St. Louis, Mo.; Arlington, Va.; New York City; New York City; New Haven, Conn.; Deal, N. J.; New York City; Hollis, N. Y.; New York City; New York City; New Bern, N. C.; Larchmont, N. Y.; Auburndale, Fla.; Plainfield, N. J.; Denver, Colo.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Ridgefield, Conn.; Youngstown, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; San Antonio, Tex.; Boston, Mass.; Knoxville, Tenn.; San Antonio, Tex.; Miami, Fla.; Tacoma, Wash.; Nashville, Tenn.; Seattle, Wash.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Jacksonville, Fla.; New York City; Parsons, Kans.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Miami, Fla.; Miami Beach, Fla.; Conago

Park, Calif.; Dallas, Tex.; Alexandria, Va.; Reading, Pa.; Reading, Pa.; San Francisco, Calif.; New York City; Eldorado, Ark.; Sanford, Fla.; Ann Arbor, Mich.; New York City; New York City; Elmira, N. Y.; Chicago, Ill.

Those are just a few, Mr. President. Senators are receiving mail, telegrams, telephone calls, and visitors. The people of America want us to do something in this crucial hour. They believe that our nonaction now affects our destiny, our future, and our glorious opportunity to grow yet greater and greater in this world. They believe that it is our obligation to our race, to democracy, and to our church, whatever it is, to do something. They believe that if we do not do something we shall regret it; that our country will suffer a great sacrifice if we do not do it, something effective. Mr. President, no mortal man can prophesy what may be the consequences of do-nothingness now, to America, to the Western Hemisphere, and to the wide world which loves God and respects man.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask one question, if I may, which seems to me to be of some importance in connection with this debate. The Senator may charge me with having a legalistic mind, and I admit the charge, but I am wondering whether or not the Senator has given any consideration to this question: As I understand the resolution which the Senator now seeks to have the Congress act upon, it is based purely upon a statutory law now in existence, and all he asks for is the moral support of the Senate to carry out those laws if the President so desires. Does the Senator believe that domestic laws passed in time of peace might in anywise conflict with international law when neutrality is involved?

Mr. PEPPER. Well, even if the principle might be so, this cannot be any violation of international law, because the Government is doing nothing but dealing with one of its own citizens, and that is in no possible sense a violation of international law.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that.

Mr. PEPPER. Surely we can trade in an old truck or an old plane to an American manufacturer if we want to, whether war is going on in Europe or not.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator knows his entire argument has been directed toward the selling or making disposition of war materials of this country to the Allies for the sole purpose of saving the democracies of the world, and it is beside the point to say that an old plane here, and an old hull there would be disposed of under his proposal simply because there was a surplus and we were attempting to dispose of it because it is not wanted any more. The whole point of the argument the Senator is making is that in some way we must get to the Allies not merely a small quantity of planes and other articles, but a large quantity, in my humble opinion, in order to stop the onrush of Hitler's legions.

Turning the matter over in my mind, it seems to me we are merely using a subterfuge to accomplish indirectly what we cannot do directly, because the ultimate aim and objective—and we have got to be cold and blunt about it—is to do what the Senator wants to do, and the question which was raised in my mind as I was sitting here was whether or not there might be a difference between a law passed in peacetime and one passed in wartime as relating to a conflict with international law insofar as our neutrality is concerned, and whether or not there was enough in the proposal of the Senator to overlook such a situation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I would answer the Senator by saying, first, ordinarily the case is put a great deal harder than the Senator puts it to me. Senator Borah and other opponents of the Neutrality Act argued last year in the special session on the Neutrality Act that it would have been all right to have had a law like that on the statute books if it had been passed in peacetime, even if it had been used in wartime, but to change the law when the war was going on so that a given effect would ensue from it would be a violation of international law. Senator Borah, as the Senator will

recall, made that argument very strongly and quoted in substantiating it some international-law authorities.

My case is a great deal different from that and a great deal easier. I am saying here that we did not pass this law in wartimes; it was passed away back in 1917. So far as I know, the Government itself has been using it since that time to one degree or another. So to use in wartime in a legitimate way a power conferred in peacetime is certainly no violation of international law. That is one reason I could answer "No" to his inquiry; that is, that the use of this power would not be in violation of international law. The other one is that the use of the power does not affect a third party at all. The use of the power involves only two parties, the Government and the manufacturer. The Government would have a perfect right, if it has some old steel on hand, for example, to sell that steel to an American airplane manufacturer, in spite of the fact that we might know that all the planes he manufactured would be sent to the Allies in Europe. We would be doing a harmless thing and a legal thing. So that if the articles were sold to the Allies, that would be their business, just as if you sell me a pistol and I killed somebody with it, you, of course, are not responsible for the killing, for you had a lawful right to sell me the pistol.

Mr. President, before concluding, at the suggestion of some of my colleagues, I shall take just a few minutes to read a few of these telegrams for I feel that they express the sentiment of the American people, although I merely pick up the batch without any discrimination whatever in the selection of the telegrams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Florida that he recognized the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], who yielded to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], to ask the Senator from Florida a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not realize that the Chair had done so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LUNDEEN. If the Senator from Florida wishes to read telegrams which are not too long, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator. I will read a few of them.

I read the telegram from Chester Booth Blakeman, of Atlanta, Ga., also the one from J. K. Wells, of Oklahoma City, Okla., also the one from Joel Gross, of Newark, N. J., also the one from Mr. and Mrs. Harry N. Gitt, II, of Hanover, Pa. I read the one from W. L. Stanley, of Atlanta, Ga. I will read a telegram from H. L. Hollis, of Chicago, Ill.:

Sentiment here strongly with you in endeavor to furnish immediate aid to Allies. Repeal of Johnson Act would greatly help Allies' morale.

I read another from M. D. Thompson, of Elmira, N. Y.:

Heartily approve sending United States Army planes to Allies now. Keep at it. Public opinion is with you.

I read a telegram from Mr. and Mrs. F. H. Eldridge, of New York City:

Again urge immediate shipment all possible war material to Allies.

Here is a telegram from Goodwin Cooke, of New York City, which reads:

A Yankee Republican heartily endorses your position on aid to the Allies, which must be given if our children are to have a vote or a free life.

I read a telegram from Cary E. Landis, of Ann Arbor, Mich.:

Congratulations on your stand concerning European situation.

I read a telegram from James H. Vanhoy, of Sanford, Fla.:

As a veteran of the World War I am in favor of sending every possible aid to the Allies.

Here is one from a personal friend of mine, who might be prejudiced, and I will not read it.

Here is a telegram from Allene Talmey and Richard L. Plaut, of New York City, which reads:

Emphatically urge reconsideration by Senate Foreign Affairs Committee your resolution authorizing sale United States Army planes and materials to Allies.

I read a telegram from Elizabeth Crow McDonald, attorney at law, San Francisco, Calif.:

Vigorously approve your resolution for selling Army and Navy military equipment to Allies immediately. Thank you for expressing sentiments of many.

Here is a telegram from Reading, Pa., signed by Dr. and Mrs. Jesse L. Wagner, which reads:

Congratulations on your patriotic stand for immediate aid to Allies. Feeling in Berks County, Pa., echoes your sentiments. Hope you will continue to urge this vital cause.

Here is another telegram from Reading, sent by Elizabeth Y. Muhlenberg and Frederick A. Muhlenberg, which reads:

Every right-thinking American applauds, supports, and congratulates you and Senator GUFFEY for your courageous and patriotic efforts in behalf of the Allies. We denounce the action of the Foreign Relations Committee—

I do not like to read this—
as cowardly and unintelligent. Do not give up the fight on any account.

I read next a telegram from Ethel B. Simonson, 405 South Washington Street, Alexandria, Va.

This household endorses 100 percent your bill authorizing planes and munitions to the Allies.

Here is another telegram from Dallas, Tex., sent by John, Kate, and Mary Pirie.

Unbounded admiration your magnificent fight for Allies. Their victory our best defense. Continue fighting. You'll win. Country almost unanimously wants Allies aided immediately. Writing Texas Senators.

I suppose the Senators from Texas have heard from them. I next read a telegram from Conago Park, Calif., signed by Florence Ryerson and Colin Clements, as follows:

Wish we had a man as clear sighted as you representing California.

They make comment, appropriate in their opinion, about the able senior Senator from California not supporting the proposal.

I next read a telegram from Blanche G. Williams, 2008 Alton Road, Miami Beach, Fla.:

Kaltenborn—
He is the great radio commentator—
news analyst, tonight states Foreign Relations Committee 20 to 2 refused Allies aid. Every aid should be given short of war.

This morning's broadcast by Mr. Kaltenborn refers to the thousands of communications he is receiving urging him to aid in cultivating sentiment in Congress for this action.

I will read one from Los Angeles, Calif., which is signed by Helen and Andrew Tombes, 1536 North Stanley, Hollywood:

Heartfelt congratulations for your splendid work. We, as two Americans are backing you 100 percent. Senator, don't let them get you down.

I read one more, from Parsons, Kans., sent by Earle R. Delay, as follows:

Denounce vigorously for me action of committee voting 22 to 2 against selling Army planes to Allies as utterly un-American. Send Allies everything desired.

Mr. PEPPER subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

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

Mr. PEPPER. I shall not do this any more. I ask that the other telegrams which I have here be printed in the RECORD, instead of my having to read them. I will not ask this any more of the Senate, because I do not want to burden the RECORD every day with communications of that sort, but I thought they were typical expressions from various parts of the country.

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

The telegrams are as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Senate Office Building:

A Yankee Republican heartily endorses your position on aid to the Allies which must be given if our children are to have a vote or a free life.

GOODWIN COOKE.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your stand concerning European situation.

CARY E. LANDIS.

SANFORD, FLA., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER:

As a veteran of the World War I am in favor of sending every possible aid to the Allies.

JAMES H. VANHOY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Emphatically urge reconsideration by Senate Foreign Affairs committee your resolution authorizing sale United States Army planes and materials to Allies.

ALLENE TALMEY and RICHARD L. PLAUT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Vigorously approve your resolution for selling Army and Navy military equipment to Allies immediately. Thank you for expressing sentiments of many.

ELIZABETH CROW McDONALD,
Attorney at Law.

READING, PA., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER, of Florida,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your patriotic stand for immediate aid to Allies; feeling in Berks County, Pa., echoes your sentiments. Hope you will continue to urge this vital cause.

DR. and MRS. JESSE L. WAGNER.

READING, PA., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Every right-thinking American applauds, supports, and congratulates you and Senator GUFFEY for our courageous and patriotic efforts in behalf of the Allies. We denounce the action of the Foreign Relations Committee as cowardly and unintelligent. Do not give up the fight on any account.

ELIZABETH Y. MUHLENBERG,
FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG.

ALEXANDRIA, VA., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

This household endorses 100 percent your bill authorizing planes and munitions to the Allies.

ETHEL B. SIMONSON.

DALLAS, TEX., June 5, 1940.

CLAUDE PEPPER,

Member, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Unbounded admiration your magnificent fight for Allies. Their victory our best defense. Continue fighting; you'll win. Country almost unanimously wants Allies aided immediately. Writing Texas Senators.

JOHN, KATE, AND MARY PIRIE.

CONAGO PARK, CALIF., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE VINCENT PEPPER,

Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Wish we had a man as clear-sighted as you representing California. We are ashamed of JOHNSON. The country is with you in your fight to help Allies.

FLORENCE RYERSON and COLIN CLEMENTS.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Kaltenborn, news analyst, tonight states Foreign Relations Committee, 20 to 2, refused Allies aid. Every aid should be given short of war.

BLANCHE G. WILLIAMS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Heartfelt congratulations for your splendid work. We, as two Americans, are backing you 100 percent, Senator. Don't let them get you down.

HELEN AND ANDREW TOMBES.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 6, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Sentiment here strongly with you in endeavor to furnish immediate aid to Allies. Repeal of Johnson Act would greatly help Allies' morale.

H. L. HOLLIS.

ELMIRA, N. Y., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

United States Senate:

Heartily approve sending United States Army planes to Allies now. Keep at it. Public opinion is with you.

M. D. THOMPSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

United States Senate:

Again urge immediate shipment all possible war material to Allies.

Mr. and Mrs. F. H. ELDRIDGE.

PARSONS, KANS., June 6, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Denounce vigorously for me action of committee voting 22 to 2 against selling Army planes to Allies as utterly un-American. Send Allies everything desired.

EARLE R. DELAY.

BOSTON, MASS., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your standard in Foreign Relations Committee. Please go on urging that we help Allies at once with planes, munitions, supplies, money. Nineteen-to-two vote is a disgrace to our democracy. You are on right end of it. Keep it up. Plenty of people are with you.

ELIZABETH and MURRAY FORBES.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 6, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Press your campaign to send every plane, tank, and gun that can be avallably released from Army and Navy supplies for immediate shipment to Great Britain and France. Each plane now will be worth 10 a month hence. This is our best national defense.

John A. Brough, Ezra P. Prentice, Margaret M. Burnet, Arthur M. Mauder, John B. Shaw, William Pellet, Frances Reiners, Anna M. Peterson, Ann G. Blum, Ralph Abercrombie, Thomas E. Stephens, Barclay G. Johnson, Sue L. Johnson, Betty Abercrombie, Ella P. Brough, Charles Farr, Mrs. Charles Farr, Sophia A. Mauder, Carver W. Wolfe, Frieda B. Hatch, Rhea A. Wolfe, Mabel G. Crawford, Eli Ellis, Ruth M. Crawford, Samuel Ellis, George H. Sibley, Alice S. Doyle, Alfred J. Doyle, Henry I. Bernard, Mary Gaynor, Thelma Wolfe, Maude E. Ten Eyck, Lansing V. Ten Eyck, Mary Culver, Margaret Dunne, E. H. Reimers.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are most assuredly right. If we expect to help the Allies with planes, and so forth, now is the time to do it, otherwise it will be too late. And I am voicing the sentiment of majority of people here. Keep up your courage and perseverance and I feel ere long you will have the whole country with you and wholeheartedly we shall be very proud that it was Florida's Senator who suggested and put this bill through. Best regards, and all luck to you.

PLACIDIA EDWARDS.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Never quit. I and many others think you are wholly right.

ROBERT J. SCOTT.

SEATTLE, WASH., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER and COMMITTEE MEMBERS,

Washington, D. C.:

Helping the Allies is our first line of defense. Our best protection is to supply them at once with all war materials possible.

D. S. GRAY.
GRACE GRAY.

NASHVILLE, TENN., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER of Florida,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

I am sorry, Senator, you are not working with men of the Andrew Jackson type. It is hoped by many you keep your effort up.

M. B. FROST.

TACOMA, WASH., June 6, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Our family of five American-born voters heartily approve your plan to help the Allies at once. The democracies must stand united.

E. A. NOBLE
(And Family).

MIAMI, FLA., June 6, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

As strong antineut dealers, permit us to join a staunch new dealer on the high grounds of patriotic duty and humanity and to commend you for your efforts to aid the Allies by every means short of sending men abroad. It is our belief that immediate aid is the best possible American defense and that your proposal meets with overwhelming popular approval.

LEWIS JAMES and MARSHALL G. TWYMAN.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely hope you will succeed in aiding Allies with planes and guns, thereby aiding our country. I wish to God that some of your colleagues had been with myself and others overseas in the last war. If they had, I am sure they would be assisting you today, instead of joining the Lindbergh type of "fifth column."

V. D. ACKERMAN.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.:

You are right. The people of the United States are overwhelmingly in favor of your plan to let the Allies have every article of military equipment we do not actually need, and at once. They are fighting our fight, and the least we can do is furnish material and forget the cost.

W. C. GILLHAM.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand. Please send me administration's idea on national defense for congressional platform. Please rush. Regards.

FRANCES HASKELL EDMONSON.

DALLAS, TEX., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senator from Florida, Washington, D. C.:

Thousands of us thoroughly endorse your proposal to sell surplus war materials to Allies. Am wiring SHEPPARD and CONNALLY and am writing you.

G. G. McDONALD.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, June 6, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Americans demand that Senate committee reconsider and pass your resolution.

NELLIE STRATTON.

RIDGEFIELD, CONN., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

If we do not help Great Britain and France fight now we will have to fight by ourselves alone later with the odds against us.

ESTELLE HOSMER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Dispatch by air 2,000 our planes today. Allied expert states 500 more beats Hitler. Dedicate gift to brave Allies saving our sacred hides.

ARCHIE H. TYRRELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Since we cannot supply present Allied air needs strongly urge immediate sending to France our Army airplanes and make replacements later. Will eventually prove cheaper for us in lives and money.

LUCILLE and THEODORE SCHEMP.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Make German rats crawl—send 2,000 our planes by air now. Dedicate gift to dead Allies. What in h— is money with billions buried.

FRED STEVER.

DENVER, COLO., June 5, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly endorse every move you are making to help Allies.

BENTLEY M. McMULLIN.

PLAINFIELD, N. J., June 5, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Keep up your fight for immediate aid to Allies. A great many Plainfielders have already expressed their approval.

JEAN JEFFERY.
J. R. FLEISCHMAN.

AUBURNDALE, FLA., June 5, 1940.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

You will earn for yourself the grateful thanks of millions of your fellow countrymen and liberty-loving people throughout the world if you will immediately introduce a resolution in the Senate calling for prompt and unlimited aid to the Allies in the way of thousands of planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and funds, and the promise of a limitless continuing supply. It will be a cheap price to pay that civilization with the splendid values built up over the centuries might be preserved. Introduce that resolution and you and your stout-hearted colleagues aided by the organized public spirit of all America can force its prompt passage. Do it now, today, and you can immediately send a ringing message to that soulless, merciless, Godless madman who seeks to impose his inhumane rule upon the world that a united America will no longer stand idly by permitting him to continue his fiendish slaughter of innocent men and women and children. To mobilize public opinion without one moment's delay suggest you request the President to appoint at once Committee of Public Information with Col. Frank Knox as chairman assisted by Walter Lippmann and Henry Luce. These appointments of three eminent publicists, students of history and loyal, courageous Americans, will win instant and Nation-wide approval. They can and will immediately enlist the support of the entire American press and so insistent will be the demand for action that a few willful politically minded pseudostatesmen in your midst will not even attempt to resist the tide. The time for debate is past. The time for action is now.

Sincerely and confidently yours,

ALAN FREEMAN.

LARCHMONT, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

We highly commend your stand on immediate aid to Allies and urge continue your good work with all energy.

MARIAN AND OTTO RICHTER.

NEWBERN, N. C., June 5, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand for Allied aid. Please tell Senator BAILEY and Representative BARDEN that many North Carolinians agree with you. Immediate aid is necessary.

LOUISE BELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge immediate material aid to Allies, including release of all existing airplanes our armed forces can spare without endangering our immediate needs for defense.

MILTON ZUCKER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. We are with you. Have telegraphed our Senators and Congressman to support your views.

Mr. and Mrs. N. Mac D. WILDER,
Goshen, N. Y.

HOLLIS, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. God save America. Planes for the Allies.

ROGERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you keep trying put over immediate aid to Allies. Why not use William Allen White's million names for support. Feel Senate reaction purely political, think it outrageous when issue is matter of life and death for so many innocent people.

B. F. MACDONALD.

DEAL, N. J., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,
Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.:

In hearty accord with your efforts to aid Allies at once. Am sure continued efforts will be successful.

ANNA AND FRANK GREENWALD.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Admire and firmly approve your far-sighted resolution.

G. J. CONKLING.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your strenuous efforts to get immediate aid to Allies. Wholeheartedly behind you.

GEORGE O. BAER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Send planes to Allies immediately before it is too late. Stop exports to Japan, Russia, and Italy.

R. FRENCH.

ST. LOUIS, MO., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Florida Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations your fight to help the Allies with war supplies. Hitler must be defeated to protect our freedom.

ISABEL S. JENKIN.

KANSAS CITY, MO., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Thanks for your stand on aiding the Allies. I urge Congress to act for immediate and effective aid to the Allies. For their sake and ours.

MRS. GLORIA BOEHR.

ORLANDO, FLA., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Heartily endorse complete aid to Allies every way except manpower.

Dr. and Mrs. Louis Orr, Dr. and Mrs. Palmer Kundert, Dr. and Mrs. Aubrey Stabler, Mr. and Mrs. William Roumillat, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Neff, Luella and Florence Neff, Mr. and Mrs. Whidden, Mr. and Mrs. George, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Goodwin.

ASHEVILLE, N. C., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Local sentiment favors your efforts to furnish Allies additional arms.

T. M. ISRAEL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As a constituent, I appeal to you to use all your influence toward the repeal of the Neutrality Act and toward giving to the Allies all moral and material aid in our power.

ELEANOR SCOTT TEW.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE DENSON PEPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge Congress immediate declaration supporting Allies immediately sending planes, ammunitions.

Mrs. George F. Dittmann, Arizona; Mrs. G. Thompson Seton, Connecticut; Mrs. Gilmore G. Scranton, Michigan; Mrs. Ruth Kinsey Schmuck, New York; Mrs. Allan B. Thrasher, Ohio.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

America may yet ask (why) of the cowardly 20 whose obstructionist attitude might mean the loss of all it holds dear. Thousands are beginning to think. Stick to it, Senator PEPPER.

RUTH L. REED.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

You are receiving a splendid press in Arkansas. Maybe it would be well to coast for a while and be sure about public reaction. I think you are right in a big way, and everything working in your favor, but there is no need in getting out on too long a limb now. Have been awfully busy past 10 days on sale mentioned in my letter.

— DONALD TRUMBO.

— ELMIRA, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Please don't give up your noble fight to send everything possible to the Allies now. God bless you.

— JOSEPH BERGER.

— CHICAGO, ILL., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We wholeheartedly support your efforts to get our Army planes to Allies instantly. Have wired our Senator LUCAS.

— Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE NAY.

— WASHINGTON, D. C.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Report from Senate Foreign Relations Committee simply awful and disgraceful. Can nothing else be done to bring them to their senses and gravity of situation and their responsibility to their country and civilization?

— JULIEL MORRIS.

— WATSONVILLE, CALIF., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We as American citizens and taxpayers urge you to press forward immediately your resolution to aid the Allies materially.

— DANA M. TOWNSEND
(and family).

— PASADENA, CALIF., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We are with you and Walter Lippmann. Send planes to Allies now. The committee's decision is a disgrace to America.

— M. D. LANE
(and others).

— SUMMIT, ILL., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

As a humane measure and in self-defense we hope that all possible aid will be given the Allies.

— Dr. and Mrs. PAUL RUSH.
Dr. and Mrs. F. L. MANN.
Mr. and Mrs. HARRY STONE.

— LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 5, 1940.

Hon. Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

By all means your resolution to help Allies should be passed. I regard our failure to do so would be calamity and something short of treason.

— FRANK D. MAGGION.

— ASHEVILLE, N. C., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly behind your efforts to send Government-owned arms to Allies. Please push measure.

— C. E. HUDSON.

— HOUSTON, TEX., June 6, 1940.

CLAUDE PEPPER,

United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned voters of Harris County, Tex., and citizens of the United States, advocate all the material aid in planes, guns, and equipment for the Anglo-French alliance. We also advocate authority for the President to call out the National Guard and Organized Reserves if he deems it necessary.

— C. J. Ritchie, Jr., S. L. Austin, W. J. Shawell, Jack Bowman, Clifton Byrd, Emmett A. Shepherd, Rose Janacek, Jos. H. Chew, Mr. and Mrs. W. O. Wilkerson, J. D. Norman, J. A. McDonald, Lamar Noe, W. G. McEnry.

— ST. LOUIS, MO., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Heartily approve your fight ship planes and munitions to Allies. Keep on trying.

— SARAH O. FISK.

ARLINGTON, VA., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Support strongly your resolution empowering President to sell Government-owned airplanes and ammunition to Allies.

— MILDRED TERRETT.

— DEDHAM, MASS., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

Sir: Do not be discouraged by blindness and thoughtlessness about you. Time will justify you and posterity will hold you up as a great American patriot. America and democracy are one and inseparable and their first defenses lie on the river Somme. May God prosper you.

Respectfully,

— HENRY D. SEDGWICK.

— HUNTINGTON, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER, *Washington, D. C.:*

Ninety percent of the people are back of you; fight on; send all help to Allies.

— MARGARET JEVONS.

— MONTCLAIR, N. J., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congress fiddles while Rome burns. Our Army planes should be flying to France right now. Can we do anything to help?

— ADELAIDE CONYNGTON.
— HUGH R. CONYNGTON.
— JOHN CONYNGTON.

— ATLANTA, GA., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I feel strongly the wisdom and justice of sending immediately to aid France and Britain not less than 2,000 warplanes and Army and Navy pilots sufficient to fly them into action. Any present danger to us in this hemisphere is nothing to the future danger if Germany is victor.

— BESSIE KEMPTON CROWELL.

— ASHEVILLE, N. C., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Many people here strongly favor your efforts to furnish Government-owned supplies to allied forces.

— ANTHONY LORD.

— TUCKAHOE, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Favor sending all possible aid to Allies.

— JOHN S. NUGENT.

— WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

I hope you will keep on and finally win over the Foreign Affairs Committee.

— Mrs. T. A. GEISSMAN.

— GOSHEN, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

For God's and this country's sake hammer away on your fellow Senators and the Representatives in Congress until they see the need of immediately sending the Allies all equipment we have. I am planning to send out thousands of reprints of Dorothy Thompson's open letter to Congress.

— JOSEPH S. COATES.

— LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE E. PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

I again earnestly urge that our Government immediately sell to the Allies as much ammunition, planes, and other implements of war that we can possibly spare without seriously weakening our own defense. This is urged primarily in our own interest.

— LOUISE I. ROESSLER.

— NEW YORK, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Senator C. PEPPER,

Washington, D. C.:

Your sentiments as expressed before officials coincide with millions including veterans. Keep up the fight for immediate Allied aid.

— G. R. BEVAN, Veteran.

FAIRFIELD, CONN., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER of Florida,
Washington, D. C.:

Heartily endorse sending Allies planes and all help possible, immediately.

I. M. BRADIN.
P. H. BRADIN.
A. S. ROBERTS.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, June 5, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Continue efforts to send help to Allies.

DR. C. M. GOULEY.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your uphill fight. I hope you will win.

HENRY M. FEINBLATT,
Lieutenant, A. E. F.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your remarks in the Daily News that no protest against releasing the meager military equipment needed for national defense have been received is in error, for I do so protest. Why not use such equipment for training our own armed forces and when repaired then we need not worry about Europe's old quarrels.

J. E. DECKERT.

CHARLOTTE, N. C., June 5, 1940.

Senator PEPPER:

Your attention called to Tom Glasgow letter, Charlotte Observer, June 6. Urge call to attention others of Congress and continue your efforts in that direction.

P. R. MCCAIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 6, 1940.

Senator PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

As an American citizen I applaud your efforts for helping Allies as best means of providing American defense. Why don't you introduce bill permitting sale of excess Army, Navy airplanes and anything else Allies need, including bomb sight, in exchange for agreement of Allies to make available to our Army and Navy the benefit of their experience and any improvement or patents which they may have? It is idle to think that with the rapid development of the science of war any invention or secrets which we may have developed prior to the war will still have a value after the war.

GEO. SHARP.

BERKELEY, CALIF., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your effort to aid the Allies. An allied victory is our best defense.

J. N. and L. B. BRIDGEMAN.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., June 6, 1940.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Heartily indorse your stand on shipping planes and materials to Allies immediately. Feel strongly that this should be coupled with immediate declaration of state of national emergency, with resulting full speed ahead on adequate defense of this country we love and want to preserve. Let's stop burying our American heads in the Chamberlain quicksands, face facts, and meet action with stronger action before it is entirely too late.

DR. ARNOLD ANDERSON.
WALTER C. WICKER.

MIAMI, FLA., June 6, 1940.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand. Can't you get the rest of the committee to inform themselves about Hitler's plans. They evidently do not understand the situation.

E. B. HUMPHREY.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, those telegrams simply indicate the vigor of the feeling of the people. I do not subscribe, of course, to any statement ascribing un-American sentiments or action to Senators who differ from me—far from it—but I do read those telegrams as actual expressions of public opinion. I say to the Senate that the country is agitated over this subject, and it will be but a little while, in my opinion, until the volume of advice to that effect will leave no Senator in any possible doubt about that question.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I merely want to state, as a sort of supplement to the statement made by the Senator from Florida, that I have received a large number of telegrams from various parts of the United States, including perhaps 10 or 15 or 20 from my own State, along the line of the telegrams which the Senator from Florida has called to the attention of the Senate. I agree with him that the country is greatly aroused over the situation in Europe, and there is a very profound feeling that Great Britain and France are fighting not only the cause of civilization but the cause of this Republic.

I shall not ask to have the numerous telegrams I have received inserted in the RECORD; but I desire the RECORD to indicate that I have received a large number of telegrams along the line of those offered by the Senator from Florida.

AMOUNT AND VALUE OF GOODS PRODUCED IN STATE AND FEDERAL PRISONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect information as to amount and value of all goods produced in State and Federal prisons, which was, in line 7, to strike out "amount" and insert "character, kind, type, amount."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3828. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to eliminate the requirement that suitable accommodations for holding the court at Winchester, Tenn., be provided by the local authorities;

H. R. 5584. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 7019. An act to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for the killing or assaulting of Federal officers;

H. R. 8429. An act for the relief of Maj. L. P. Worrall, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9700. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 367. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to assist the governments of American republics to increase their military and naval establishments, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL AID ACT—AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE TO REPORT DURING RECESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the House has passed House bill 9575, to amend the Federal Aid Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes. The Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads proposes to meet tomorrow to consider the bill. In the event the committee should decide to report the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may be authorized to report the bill to the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the committee reporting the bill, and the bill being placed on the calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is all I desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES DE SOTO EXPOSITION COMMISSION

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 9751. It is a sort of emergency matter which we should like to pass this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the title of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9751) for the creation of the United States De Soto Exposition Commission, to provide

for the commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Mississippi River by Hernando De Soto, the commemoration of De Soto's visit to the Chickasaw Territory in northern Mississippi, and other points covered by his expedition, and the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the Battle of Ackia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KING. How much will it cost?

Mr. BILBO. Nothing.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Library with amendments.

The amendments were, in section 3, page 3, after line 23, to insert an additional paragraph, to be lettered "(b)," and to reletter the succeeding paragraphs, so as to make the section read:

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission is authorized to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services and to receive funds from any State, municipal, or private source for the purposes of this act. Any such funds received by the Commission shall be deposited with the United States Treasury and shall be kept in a separate account. Such funds, as well as any funds appropriated for the purposes of this act, shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission or by such person as he shall designate.

(b) Any exposition or celebration to be held pursuant to this act may, if deemed advisable by the Commission and the Secretary of the Interior, take the form of a conservation exposition for the purpose of dramatizing all conservation activities of the Federal and State governments and, for the purposes of this subsection, expositions may be held at such places in the Mississippi Valley as the said Commission shall determine.

(c) The heads of the departments and establishments of the Government are authorized to detail personnel to assist the Commission and to cooperate with the Commission in the procurement, installation, and display of exhibits; to lend to the Commission for exhibit purposes such articles, documents, specimens, or other exhibit materials in the possession of the Government.

(d) The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts with private publishers for such printing and binding as may be deemed advisable in carrying out the purposes of this act. The Commission is authorized to purchase without competitive bidding in quantities not to exceed \$100 in cost.

(e) The Commission is authorized to employ, without regard to civil-service laws and the Classification Act, such persons as may be deemed necessary for the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a request.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMERICAN OCCUPATION OF GREENLAND AND ICELAND

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, for some time past I have sought to call the attention of this great body to the bases along our Atlantic coast which ought to be in the possession of the United States. Of course, we should seek these bases through negotiation with the powers that hold them.

RIDICULE AND BITTER EDITORIALS

When I first proposed this course concerning Greenland, Iceland, Bermuda, and the West Indies—both French and British, Danish and Dutch possessions—I was the subject of much ridicule. Many bitter editorials were written which I could recount and place in the RECORD; but the very newspapers and columnists that were then ridiculing me have apparently seen the light since that day, and are now writing in the reverse. I am glad to note that fact.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask that the various articles to which I am about to refer, and other data and information be inserted in the RECORD. I make that general request at this time so that it will not be necessary to make it specifically in connection with each article.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles and data will be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The first article to which I wish to refer is by Raymond Clapper. It is headed, "United States may be forced to occupy some foreign-held islands," and Mr. Clapper goes so far as to say:

The plain blunt fact is we may have to be using American troops in the Western Hemisphere for protective occupation.

ANDREW JACKSON SAID "SEIZE"

This writer is not the only one who now writes about these islands and who goes a little beyond the position I took. When I mentioned seizure some time ago, I was merely quoting Andrew Jackson, the great Democrat, who threatened the French Government with seizure of the French islands unless the French debt was paid.

The article in part is as follows:

CLAPPER SAYS UNITED STATES MAY BE FORCED TO OCCUPY SOME FOREIGN-HELD ISLANDS

(By Raymond Clapper)

WASHINGTON.—The plain blunt fact is we may have to be using American troops in the Western Hemisphere for protective occupation.

Abrupt changes have taken place and old patterns of thinking and old attitudes have been outmoded. Conditions we could once view with tolerance become, in the new times, dangerous to the security of the Western Hemisphere.

This isn't a matter of hysteria here but is based upon cold calculation, upon recognition of the sharply altered face of affairs.

We might be compelled, upon short notice, to occupy some of these Western Hemisphere islands and mainland possessions of the European powers.

In event of an Allied defeat, we would have to be ready to occupy them promptly, because we will not permit any foreign aggressor power to acquire title to them.

Events have changed the situation not only in Europe but in the Western Hemisphere. What once was of no concern to us is now a matter of defense of this hemisphere.

AMERICAN OCCUPATION OF ISLANDS IMPERATIVE

Mr. President, American occupation of Greenland and Iceland is imperative. I desire to deal particularly today with these two great islands.

The Washington Daily News contains an account of the occupation of Iceland, a Danish possession, by British military forces, after the German occupation of Denmark.

Mr. President, a photograph before me shows the arrest of Dr. Gerlach, German consul general in Iceland, by British troops. Sometime before that Great Britain occupied the Danish Faroe Islands by military force, not far from the British Shetland Islands, and near Iceland.

BRITISH STEPS TO NORTH AMERICA

The British ocean steps to North America now are Scotland, the Orkneys, the Shetlands, the Faroes, Iceland; the next step is Greenland; then Canada. The only step missing under the control of Great Britain is Greenland. Otherwise the British Empire has a complete chain of steps from Europe to North America. None of these steps measures much more than two or three hundred miles. Why are the British occupying Iceland? It is an American island belonging to the Western Hemisphere, and it ought to be under our flag.

PLANES NEED ISLAND BASES

At this point in my remarks I refer to the Washington Daily News again, an article entitled "Poll Shows United States Favors Planes Over Battleships."

Planes need bases for defense and bases for attack. Without bases no ocean fleet or air fleet can attack the United States. Any enemy would have to have bases in the Western American Hemisphere. If we possess these bases, they cannot attack. If we acquire all these possessions and establish naval and plane bases, we will be safe and secure from invasion.

At this point I should like to have the article to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

POLL SHOWS UNITED STATES FAVORS PLANES OVER BATTLESHIPS

That the American public heavily favors the view that warplanes are a stronger weapon than battleships, and accordingly should be concentrated upon in the national-defense program, has been demonstrated by the American Forum poll on the question, Are warplanes stronger than battleships?

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS (D., N. C.), who argued that stress should be placed upon planes, not battleships, received 77.8 percent of all votes cast. Senator DAVID I. WALSH (D., Mass.), who said the emphasis should continue to be placed upon battleships, received 15.5 percent of the votes.

Since each of the debaters admitted that both planes and ships were necessary for adequate defense, 6.7 percent of the voters took no sides, and said that both were right.

The vote was approximately the same in all regions polled. Ballots were received from New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and the District.

Additional returns from Ohio and Illinois on the social-security debate between Dr. Townsend and Senator BYRNES followed the heavily Townsendite pattern of other regions. Dr. Townsend, arguing for large old-age pension, received 98 percent of the vote.

Mr. President, the basic defense of America demands the occupation of Iceland and Greenland—a vital defense which we have overlooked while we appropriate billions for the construction of supernavies. Navies without island bases essential to the protection of our coasts are unable to adequately defend the Western Hemisphere and the American nations.

EXCESSIVE PARTIALITY AND EXCESSIVE DISLIKE

Let us now look to our own welfare and remember that excessive partiality to one group of nations leads us to forget the activities of those nations against our national existence in years past.

Let me read the entire paragraph, and let Senators remember the wisdom of the Father of his Country in times like these. George Washington said:

Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.

I think that statement of the Father of his Country is exceedingly interesting, when we listen to such debates as we have heard today. These little words that are spoken here today in favor of meddling in Europe are like birdshot on the fortress of truth compared with the words of the first President, the Father of his Country.

I need not remind this able body that in 1776 our forefathers gave their lives and fortunes to cut the tie which sought to bind us to European troubles forever. In 1812 we again had to remind Europe, by force of arms, to cease meddling in America.

AMERICA UNITED, NOT BALKANIZED

That was not the end of European encroachment and European efforts to exert control on this Nation. During the Civil War France established Maximilian's empire in Mexico, with a view to bounding us on the South. Great Britain actively supported the rebels during the Civil War. If foreign nations had succeeded in dividing us during that period, we would not be a Union of States today. We would be Balkanized and weak. The Old World would be constantly transporting her troubles to our continent and demanding our subservience. This unfortunate situation our statesmen, our soldiers succeeded in keeping from our shores.

BRITAIN VIOLATES MONROE DOCTRINE

We now witness Britain driving into Iceland, which is, geographically, a part of the Western Hemisphere. We see the occupation of the Dutch West Indies by the British and French. All these islands are essential to our defense, vital to our naval strength, and the protection of our coast line.

Our duty is to guard against foreign encroachment, and the extension of European empires into the Western Hemisphere. We cannot afford to permit the spearhead of European trouble to expand in American waters. The Monroe Doctrine prohibits such encroachment, and it is now time for us to restate the Monroe Doctrine in no uncertain terms. Now is the time to assert the Doctrine in the interests of our own defense.

Greenland and Iceland must be American, and remain American.

ARMED UNITED STATES COAST GUARD CUTTER TO GREENLAND

The press now informs us that the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell*, an armed cutter, has sailed for Greenland.

UNITED STATES CUTTER OFF TO GREENLAND—MYSTERY SHROUDS ARMED VOYAGE

NEW YORK, May 30.—The Coast Guard cutter *Campbell* sailed from Staten Island for Greenland today.

Carrying additional armament, recently installed, the cutter, under Commander Joseph Greenspun, was believed headed for Godthaab, Greenland. It was reported the ship carried food supplies sufficient for 8 months for the crew of 150 men and 10 officers, but some of these were believed destined for Greenland.

Armament of the vessel was believed to include 5-inch guns, 3-inch guns, and a number of machine guns. The new armament was not installed especially for the Greenland voyage, but as the result of orders from Coast Guard headquarters covering all ships of the *Campbell* class, it was understood.

The cutter sailed in considerable secrecy. Newspapermen and photographers were not permitted on the pier. Departure had been delayed several days by unfavorable weather.

Mr. President, is it possible that we are actually waking up, that we are taking some sort of action? Let us hope so, and let this action be followed up until we are secure in Greenland and secure in Iceland.

At this time I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the recent moves of European countries to encroach upon territory of the Western Hemisphere in direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

MONROE DOCTRINE VIOLATED

The Monroe Doctrine is very plain in stating that there shall be no further encroachment upon American territories by foreign powers. The recent move of the British and French troops in the Caribbean in placing Dutch islands under their "protection" is an absolute violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Yet our State Department made no protest. In fact, under a new and peculiar interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, the administration directly aided and encouraged the British in occupying the Dutch islands.

Mr. President, I know the conferences going on around the Senate are very important, but I do believe that it is also very important for us to give a little attention to our bases on the Atlantic coast.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order on the floor of the Senate and in the galleries.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I can assure my fellow countrymen and my colleagues in the Senate that this will not be the last speech made on the Senate floor concerning the acquisition of bases on the Atlantic coast. There will be many speeches made upon the proposition of acquiring these bases—the French and British, the Dutch, and Danish possessions along our coast—where we can base our naval forces and our air forces.

A SEPARATE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR SERVICE

On February 28, 1919, I introduced a bill for the establishment of a separate department of the Air Service. I have emphasized the Air Service. I went along with General Mitchell on that, and we have stated to our fellow citizens that it was the key to our defense system. But unless we have the bases, we are unable to make full use of that arm of defense.

MAKING A DOOR MAT OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

We have professed to keep this Western Hemisphere free from further encroachments from Europe. At the same time we permit favored nations to make a door mat of the Monroe Doctrine, and even aid them, directly and indirectly, in occupying islands of the Western Hemisphere.

What kind of blindness leads us to this type of American defense? Our leaders are not acting in the best interests of America by aiding further acquisition of American lands by foreign countries. Real defense of America involves keeping Europe out of America.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I merely wanted to take this opportunity to make the observation that I happen to know personally that the able Senator from Minnesota, who now holds the floor, discussed with me the acquisition of islands in the Caribbean a number of years ago—as a matter of fact, about

4 or 5 years ago. The Senator talked with me at great length in regard to matters pertaining to our gaining possession of those outposts, and at that time he was reviewing some of his experiences during the World War. He stated that, in his judgment, unquestionably we should unhesitatingly endeavor to secure ourselves by acquiring those possessions.

I wish to say at this time that, relying very largely upon the Senator's fine vision, as it was evidenced years ago, several months ago I introduced in this body two joint resolutions, which were similar. Both authorized the Chief Executive of the United States to enter into negotiations with both Great Britain and France with a view to acquiring those island possessions strung along the coast of the Atlantic from Port of Spain, just across from Venezuela, northward to St. Pierre and Miquelon, the latter belonging to the French Government. For the past several days, if I may be permitted to say so, I have been giving more consideration to those joint resolutions than ever before, for the reason that it does appear to my mind at the present time that in view of the chaotic conditions existing throughout the world, and particularly in view of what has taken place across the broad waters of the Atlantic, the hour may unhappily arrive when we will be forced to take charge of those possessions concerning which we have been talking for years.

By that I mean that we shall have occasion, by and with force of arms, to go into the Leeward Islands, the Windward Islands, and proceeding north take the Bahama Islands, as well as Bermuda, just off the coast of North Carolina, and then northward to Newfoundland, and stepping across to St. Pierre and Miquelon, in order that we may protect ourselves against aggression from European soil, if such aggression should occur.

Mr. President, that being the case, would it not have been much better if the Foreign Relations Committee had given immediate consideration to my resolutions, which were referred by it to the State Department? According to information I have received the State Department has not reported back to the Committee on Foreign Relations as to what its opinion is concerning negotiating with Great Britain and France for the acquisition of those islands.

In other words, I contend that it would be much better even at this late date to acquire even by purchase the islands in the Caribbean, as well as those in the north that I have mentioned, which belong to France—it would be much better at this late hour for us to acquire peacefully all those outposts in the South Atlantic and in the North Atlantic and to permit the price agreed upon them to be credited to the indebtedness of our sister republics across the seas rather than endanger ourselves by taking a step forward into those Caribbean waters with guns upon our shoulders, thus endangering us by involving us in war.

So I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the able Senator from Minnesota for having years ago made mention of the matter concerning which I have spoken. I congratulate the Senator as the representative of his people for having had the foresight to have visioned that the hour would come when certainly we would need outposts in that part of the world as a part and portion of that national defense which we are all interested in building. And I am happy indeed to observe in the columns of the press, as a moment ago mentioned by the Senator, statements to the effect that those who laughed at the Senator, those who criticized him, those who jibed at him because of his suggestions, are now saying "He was right. What he then advocated ought to be done." I hope that it is not now too late, and I sincerely hope that the Senator will continue to vote for the acquisition of those islands.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from North Carolina for his fine statement, which I much appreciate, and I will say with respect to the resolutions offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, that I have given them every support and I hope they will be passed. I never introduced any resolution concerning the British and the French West Indies. I have introduced resolutions dealing with the Danish and Dutch possessions. I introduced resolutions covering the islands belonging to

Latin American nations; I have proposed that we should negotiate for and fortify islands within 1,500 or 1,800 miles of the Panama Canal Zone, or the Nicaragua Canal Zone. But I had not introduced a resolution with regard to the British and French West Indies. I was very happy when the Senator from North Carolina introduced his resolution in respect to those islands. I thought perhaps my vote against American entry into the World War would prejudice such a resolution if I were to introduce it. So I was very glad to see the able patriot, the Senator from North Carolina, introduce his resolution, and I give my hearty support to his ably drawn resolutions, and hope that some day the negotiations therein provided for will be completed, and that those islands will be placed under the American flag.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. LEE. While the Senate was debating whether or not the United States should sell arms to the Allies, the United States actually started doing it. I read from the late edition of the Evening Star of Washington:

UNITED STATES LIFTS ARMS AID, SELLING SURPLUS WAR STOCKS TO BRITISH—450 75-MM. GUNS AND 500,000 LEE-ENFIELD RIFLES ARE RELEASED

The War Department has informed Arthur Purvis, head of the Allied Purchasing Commission in the United States, that the prohibition on sale of surplus war materials to belligerent nations has been removed.

Mr. President, I heartily applaud that action on the part of the Government. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding.

ADMINISTRATION HELPS BRITAIN INTO AMERICAN ISLANDS

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, here is an article by Arthur Sears Henning, appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of May 17, 1940, dealing with the matter under discussion:

Consequences of the German invasion of the Netherlands and Belgium have served to disclose the effectiveness with which the Roosevelt administration is supporting measures adopted by Great Britain and France for the prosecution of the war.

In both the Atlantic and Pacific sectors the President is pursuing the policies that the British Government deems most helpful at the moment to further the cause of the destruction of Hitlerism, which no one has more closely at heart than Mr. Roosevelt.

IMPATIENT WITH UNITED STATES

Impatience is being manifested by a portion of the British public with American public sentiment opposing participation of the United States in the war again "to make the world safe for democracy." The same type of British mind that coined the term "Uncle Shylock" in exasperation at the suggestion that Britain pay her war debt to America is now wisecracking that "the next war will be between the yellow countries, Japan and the United States."

The President is well aware, however, that this is not the attitude of responsible Britishers. The British Government, kept informed by Lord Lothian, the keenest mind that has operated at the British Embassy in many a day, is well aware of the state of public opinion in the United States and doesn't expect us to go into the war as the situation now shapes itself.

It realizes America will not go in unless public opinion undergoes a great change as the result of future developments in the war or of such influences as are being quietly exerted by Mr. Roosevelt and Lord Lothian.

EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT

The latest demonstration of the support the President is giving to British and French policy affecting America was afforded by the incident of British occupation of the Dutch Islands in the West Indies. British and French warships on Saturday landed armed forces at the Dutch islands of Curacao and Aruba ostensibly to prevent German submarines or other warships or German nationals ashore from destroying the oil refineries.

THE BRITISH OBTAIN A LARGE PERCENTAGE OF THEIR OIL FROM THESE ISLANDS

Occupation of the islands by the Allies followed a consultation with the Roosevelt administration which readily gave its approval of the move. The British and French sought our consent because these islands are within America's immediate sphere of influence and command the approach to the Panama Canal, and because there was involved a question of possible violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Under the Monroe Doctrine, the United States would not tolerate the acquisition or occupation of any additional territory on the American continents by a non-American nation. A change of ownership of any American territory from one non-American nation to another would be a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine. To forestall the occupation of the Danish West Indies by Germany

during the World War, the Wilson administration bought the islands from Denmark for \$25,000,000.

PROTECTION REQUESTED

The British and French Governments assured the Roosevelt administration that their occupation of Curacao and Aruba involves no transfer of sovereignty to Britain and France. The Dutch flag will continue to fly over the islands, they stated, and British and French soldiers and marines would assist the Dutch Governor in coping with any depredations attempted by the enemy.

British and French representations to Washington also included the statement that the Dutch Government had requested the Allies to assume protection of these islands.

The Roosevelt administration gave its consent to the action, the State Department declaring no infringement of the Monroe Doctrine was involved because there was no change of sovereignty and because Holland had requested the step.

The status of the islands will become an issue of interest to the United States at the end of the war. If Germany were to gain the islands, or they were to pass to any other non-American power a violation of the Monroe Doctrine would be involved.

ADMINISTRATION VIOLATES ARTICLE VI OF 1907 HAGUE CONVENTION

Mr. President, I wish to read article VI of the Hague Convention of 1907. That convention was signed by both Germany and the United States. It concerns the rights and duties of neutral powers in naval warfare. I read the provision of article VI of the 1907 Hague Convention:

The supply in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever is forbidden.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask, what did the Senator just read?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Article VI of the Hague Convention of 1907, subscribed to by Germany and America, concerning the rights and duties of neutral powers in war. I will read the provision again. It is very short.

The supply in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever is forbidden.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I think a volume of material that would be as large as a family Bible has come from the State Department and Government officials since I have been in the Senate calling down the blessings of God upon international law as it is understood and defined by the State Department, calling upon the Congress of the United States to abandon this fanciful neutrality reflected by the laws we have passed, and urging us to go back to international law, because that was a moral basis for the official conduct of the United States. I think it is clear that international law forbids the sale of arms, ammunition, cannons, ships, and implements of war by the United States to belligerents. Every work I have gotten hold of dealing with international law so pronounced the law, and the treaties to which we are a signatory so declare.

I wonder now, in view of that, whether our State Department now puts the stamp of blessing and approval upon this transaction, whether the apostolic benediction of the State Department now rests upon the sale of cannon, artillery, and munitions of war by the Federal Government itself to a belligerent, in view of the signature of this Government attached to treaties which declare that, not to be a law, but, on the contrary, a violation of law.

Obviously we cannot in one breath say that we are going to be bound by international law, and that it is the proper and the moral thing for us to follow that law, that that is the right course for us to pursue, and on the other hand deliberately to set it aside. I am not going to pass at the moment on the morals of the transaction, but I think every Senator in the sound of my voice will agree that the State Department has continually preached to us the sanctity of international law, and I doubt if any student of international law or any writer on the subject of international law will be heard to say that that is not a violation of the standards of international law to which this Government itself has adhered.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, a treaty between nations is greater than an act passed by a lawmaking body of any one nation. Remember that. It is a mighty serious thing to set

aside such a treaty and flaunt our disregard to the whole world.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I do not subscribe to the view that Congress may not set aside a treaty by statute. I think it is clear that we may abrogate a treaty by statute. To be sure, the other party might not agree to an arrangement of that sort, but I think Congress may abrogate a treaty.

I am not attempting to pass upon the merits of the sale of cannon and munitions of war. I am simply pointing out that it has been the studied policy of the State Department to tell Congress, as far back as I can remember in my service in this body, that our duty is not to pass special legislation, but to rely exclusively upon international law. If I am in error in that statement, I hope I may be corrected. I remember that statement as coming from the highest officials in the Government. I wanted to see neutrality legislation passed, and I was told, as were many other Senators, that that was bad business, that we should junk all efforts of that kind and rely exclusively and wholly upon the canons of international law in our relationship both with belligerents and with nations at peace. So, regardless of the merits of this controversy, concerning which I do not care to express an opinion at this time, because I do not think it is of great moment, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that according to every text writer on international law with whose work I am familiar this proposal is a violation of international law, the very thing which the State Department urges us to follow.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator that our country has sought to respect international law, and has been meticulous in its observance. But when there is a Hitler dominating a great nation like Germany and flouting international law, destroying democratic nations, and declaring his purpose not only to destroy those in Europe, but to invade nations in the Western Hemisphere, then when he disregards international law so far as he is concerned in his government, I am not so sure that there is an obligation on the part of other governments to respect him when he asserts that we should maintain international law.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The very point discussed by the able Senator from Utah is the thing which makes me ask these questions: Where are we going? Are we to adhere to international law one moment, and junk it the next? Where do we stand in the field of international law? It is urged, as a justification, that we abandon it because Germany has done violent things, under conditions which we all agree are vicious, and very bad. I never saw a greater exhibition of sadism in my life. But the point is, What are we going to anchor to—international law, or the absence of it? That is the question before us.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. KING. So far as the United States is now concerned, in the light of the attitude of Mr. Hitler, it is our duty, of course, to maintain the integrity of the United States and to pursue the course which will defend its territorial integrity and its international rights. Under the Monroe Doctrine there is some obligation to protect the Latin American republics from attack. We know not only that Hitler aims at the destruction of democratic nations in Europe but that his influence is already exerted in South America, Central America, and Mexico.

In a sense it might be claimed that he is violating international law, and we are not violating international law when we adopt measures to enable us to repel his assaults upon territory which we may be under obligation to protect.

Mr. LUNDEEN. If Hitler is declaring war on us, or making war on us, as I believe the phrase was, then is the Senator from Utah in favor of declaring war on Germany now?

Mr. KING. We do not need to declare war. We can declare a defensive war. That is to say, we are going to defend our rights.

Mr. LUNDEEN. We are going into war by the back door.

Mr. KING. No; we are not going into war at all. We are going to defend our rights. If Hitler lands his troops here, or continues his efforts, subtle or otherwise, to undermine our influence, our territorial interests in Latin America, we are going to repel them on this continent. I do not say we will go across the ocean. I do not say we will declare war. We can defend our rights without declaring war. If the able Senator from Minnesota should strike me, I do not need to declare openly that I am going to strike back. I can resist his assaults without saying anything.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whatever we may call it, it is a fight just the same.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, something like 2 weeks ago, I think, I made the statement on the floor that I thought the Congress of the United States ought to stay in session so as to meet any emergency which might arise. I understand that the Republicans, in their meeting this morning, urged that the Congress stay in session. Since I have listened to some of the speeches on the floor of the Senate today, advocating measures that would lead us into war, much as I dislike Mr. Hitler and everything he stands for, I think it might be well for the Congress to adjourn and go home, and find out what the sentiment of the people is with reference to our entering into the war.

I am sure that if Members of Congress were to get away from the hysteria in Washington and the hysteria which is emanating from New York City and the great newspapers in that metropolis, and were to get out among the people themselves, they would find that the mothers of America, the youth of America, and the laboring people of America are just as determined now as they were 6 months ago that we shall not become involved in war.

Outside of New York City and the city of Washington, there is no sentiment for our getting in, either by the back door or the front door; and in my judgment it is ridiculous for any Senator to stand on the floor of the Senate and say that any country is at the present time attacking the United States, either directly or indirectly. Of course, if Hitler is attacking the United States, then we ought to have a declaration of war.

I appreciate the fact that there is hysteria in the city of Washington; and it seems to me that step by step we are following exactly the same course which we followed during the period from 1914 to 1916, before the last war.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I shall not be a party to leading this country down the road to war; and if any Senator thinks that the masses of the people of this country want war, he is sadly mistaken.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, if I can be assured that these two able gladiators will fight it out on this line, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KING. We know, from the news which we read in the newspapers, and from authentic information and from the attitude of our State Department, that in various States in South America the influence of Mr. Hitler is pervasive, and that he is undermining or trying to undermine the integrity of South American republics. I stated that under the Monroe Doctrine it is our duty to defend the Latin-American republics; and if Mr. Hitler or any other individual, or any country, attacks the Western Hemisphere or the territories which come within the periphery of the Monroe Doctrine, the obligation rests upon us—we voluntarily assumed it—to defend them. That does not mean that we shall declare war against Germany or any other country. I am very much opposed to that course, and I do not believe our country will become involved in war. I am just as much opposed to our country becoming involved in war as is the able Senator from Montana.

LXXXVI—483

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a minute?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the able Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I entirely agree with what the Senator has last said—that of course if Mr. Hitler attacks some South American country, under the Monroe Doctrine we should protect those countries against Mr. Hitler or anybody else.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. KING. I do not agree with the interpretation placed by the Senator upon my remarks; and I now say that the Senator and I are in agreement. We are going to defend the Monroe Doctrine. I say we will defend the Monroe Doctrine but without being called upon to declare war against Germany or any other country.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LUNDEEN. In just a moment. I will say that so far as I am concerned, when the time comes for the defense of the Monroe Doctrine I can join both distinguished Senators. I believe in defending the Monroe Doctrine.

I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, as a matter of fact we would not now be hysterical and frightened if the administration had followed the advice of the able Senator from Minnesota in respect to providing for itself outposts in the South and the Middle and the North Atlantic. He suggested those and I have suggested them, because if we are ever attacked we do not want any American blood spilled upon American soil, but if it must be spilled we want it spilled in the briny waters of the Atlantic.

I want to get back to the question of war which has been so ably discussed by Senators. Every time I come into the Chamber of late, some Senator is talking about war. The question is whether it is our war or whose war it is. There is but one question here that we are all thinking about, and that is this: Is this our war? If it is our war, then let us get into it. Let us not beat around the bush.

Let us not try to deceive ourselves. Let us not attempt to deceive the American people. Let us go to it if we believe it is our war.

A couple of days ago I was reading the Washington Daily News, and I read there a very interesting article by the pen of Mrs. Walter Ferguson, who writes daily for that newspaper. She has a great deal of good common sense which is expressed in almost all her articles, particularly in this one, which attracted my attention at the time. She was speaking of war. I will read a couple of paragraphs, if I may take a moment or two more of the time of the Senator from Minnesota:

As the fortunes of war seem to favor Hitler, a good many Americans, famous and obscure, say we should lend money to the Allies. They believe we ought to furnish them with war materials on credit.

No man need be ashamed of the sentiment, and certainly we cannot quarrel with any man's right to express it. Only we wish these people would voice their opinions in the proper words.

With the Allies owing us several billions for the last war, isn't it rather visionary to talk about lending them more to fight this one? Let us be honest with ourselves and, if that's the way we feel, give them outright the money and goods they need in order to carry on the struggle.

No boy's life is ever paid back. Thousands of fine American lads went to Europe in 1917. We gave generously of their blood, expecting nothing half so precious in return. We did not demand a life for a life, and were not too disappointed when we failed to receive a dollar for every dollar we contributed to the cause of human freedom.

All that generous outpouring was a noble gesture, nothing more. Beautiful, but futile. Nevertheless we are convinced no true American regrets that it was made. It was done because the people then living honestly felt that good would come.

Yet only evil has resulted. Many of our boys and dollars never came back. Some of us managed to work up poetic sentiments about the fact, or could, until the same martial piping began to sound upon the wind. Now the time has come to speak candidly.

I particularly direct the attention of those who are here this afternoon to the closing paragraph of Mrs. Ferguson's article:

Altruists who wish to lend to the Allies are building a camouflage of words to hide the truth. For lending, in this instance, can only mean giving. And if we are so sure the Allied cause is ours, and believe its loss means our downfall, then how shabby it is to talk about lending them money. Let's give them cash and war materials, asking no security in return. Certainly we owe that much to those who are fighting our war—if it is our war.

That is the question.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I will yield for a brief statement; yes.

Mr. BONE. Reference has been made here to telegrams received by Members of Congress; and the astounding thing is that the senders of these telegrams seem to be laboring under the impression that the United States is not making airplanes available to the Allies. As a matter of fact, there is not a barrier anywhere that I know of to manufacturing plants in the United States selling the Allies all the planes they can get, provided they do not interfere with the priority of Government orders.

There is a great deal of misapprehension, and a lot of it has been whipped up. I think it is time that we begin to clarify this whole picture for the people of the United States, and put an end to some of the hysteria that is seizing the people. Otherwise, we are going to be charged with deliberately doing those things which inflame public sentiment to the point that this country is pushed day by day, hour by hour, closer to the vortex of war.

Mr. President, I do not want my party to be justly charged with having led this country into another World War. I think it would ruin the Democratic Party, and blast its last hope in the year 1940, for the American people ever to become possessed of the idea that the Democratic Party is a war party. You may think what you please, but you need only contemplate the effect upon the millions of American mothers and fathers whose boys will surely die and rot on foreign soil if we go into another war. You need only contemplate the unbearable pressure of added debt of billions which would destroy this Republic. You need only contemplate the great new army of veterans who would be here justly asking pensions—pensions added to the already great army of veterans getting them, and needing them—to know what the impact of that debt would do to this Republic.

Such a vast addition to our national debt would, in itself, destroy our republican form of government. I think the Republic would wash up in a vortex of financial chaos. That is what this thing implies; and day after day we sit here and allow a war fever to be fanned into flame.

I think the time has come now to tell the American people some plain, blunt truths about the cost of war in blood and treasure and put an end to this business of allowing people to think we are unmindful of its dreadful significance. If nothing else, the mothers of America ought to rise and protest against the potential butchering of their boys.

Where do you think we will land in another war, with \$75,000,000,000 of debt added to the one we have now, and, on top of that, illimitable pension claims that would stretch to infinity? Today we are still paying pensions arising out of the War of 1812. If there is a Member of the Senate of the United States who thinks this Government could stand the torsional, financial strain of another war, I should like to have him rise and explain how that miracle could be achieved. I have yet to find a man who entertains sound views on financial problems who believes that the Republic could survive the financial impact of another costly World War.

We may soon have to decide whether we shall go to war. We are repeatedly assured by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] that Hitler has declared war on the United States; and every implication, every inference, every shading, every nuance of his repeated speeches is that we ought to fight back.

If that be true, what does he want us to do? Declare war ourselves and plunge into this hell of war? He suggests that we can shoot off a musket halfway. Well, you load one and try it and see if you can fire half the charge. We cannot go halfway into war without soon going completely in. We are either going to war or we are not. We ought to have the moral courage to tell the American people whether or not we intend to plunge this country into the war on the basis of the facts now exploited by the Senator from Florida. We know well that we could not send an army to Europe. Our "half war" presents deadly possibilities.

Why take the hearts and souls of millions and millions of American mothers and fathers in our hands and blast out of their hearts the last hope they have for their boys and their girls? We listen day after day to the flaming oratory of the Senator from Florida, whose every effort seems to be to thrust this country as close as possible to the hell of war without actually taking the fatal leap into the inferno.

My own family suffered enough from war to satisfy me with war for the rest of my life. That is one of the reasons why I support a popular referendum on war overseas. I want the mothers and fathers of America and the potential cannon fodder to be their own executioners, if they deliberately vote to send men to Europe or Asia. I would take out of the hands of Congress the right to be the executioner of two or three million boys in an overseas war; and I would let the victims vote on whether or not they elected to make this terrible sacrifice abroad.

I think the time is upon us to make some decisions. The crossroads of destiny loom before us. If we are going to war, let us prepare for the slaughter and not by slow degrees edge the American people carefully toward the precipice where some day they will wake up and find themselves slipping down the hill into the abyss.

Is there a Senator in this body, is there a man sitting here listening to me, who will rise and tell me now that he believes the Republic could survive another war which would cost forty or fifty or seventy-five billion dollars?

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

Mr. BONE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MINTON. Does not the Senator think the situation is more threatening now than it has ever been before? The Senator from Washington has never voted for a Navy appropriation bill until the other day. Is not that correct?

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I was in the Senate Naval Affairs Committee several years ago when we reported out the Vinson-Trammell bill, which I supported. I have supported every Army and Navy appropriation and every one of these authorizations since I have been a Member of the Senate. I even went further and tried to enlarge our navy yards years ago so that we would have facilities to lay down in them every fighting ship we now need. No living man can charge me with ever pulling back in the traces in the matter of national defense. I believe in making our armament so formidable that no nation on earth would dare approach us, let alone attack us. I have always believed that.

I voted for every one of these measures referred to by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON]. The record shows it. What I am pointing out is that the cost of war in itself is a prohibition. In Caesar's time it cost 75 cents to kill a man in war. The best present estimate is that it costs \$21,000 to kill him in current wars. What lies ahead for future generations in that ghastly financial picture?

If I am in error in this, I want somebody in this presence to rise and tell me I am wrong. We might as well settle some of these questions now. If I am in error, I want some of my brethren here, for all of whom I entertain the highest respect, to rise and tell me so. I have learned to have great respect and admiration for the men in this body. I have heard man after man in this Chamber assert without any challenge that adding more debt to our presently inflated debt structure would be fatal to America. That is correct, is it not? Is there any dissent from that?

A number of gentlemen who are at the present moment candidates for nomination on the Republican ticket are saying to the people of this country from platform after platform, that if we add any more to the present national debt, damnation lies at our door. Many of my own brethren on this side of the aisle, in the Democratic Party, have assured us, time after time, that if we continue to add to our debt we are going to hell financially. What do they mean by that? Is it true? The Senator from Florida talks of doing these things that might lead us into a war which might cost a minimum certainly of \$50,000,000,000, and in its aftermath give us a new army of millions of veterans entitled to pensions.

When you draft a boy, you do not draft part of him; you draft 100 percent of him. When you deal with a question of this kind you are dealing with the lives and property of the people of this country, not merely with the views of some Senator. A war would ultimately require a virtual confiscation of all our property as well as the lives of our boys.

Now, when one is careless in handling that sort of thing, he is juggling with the life of the Republic itself. If we love it, we must not lightly consider the serious implications of this thing. That is why I think the time has come to calm the fears of the people of the United States, calm them by saying we are not going to war unless we are attacked here in this western world of ours.

We have already guaranteed the integrity of much of the earth. The Senator from Utah has just pointed out that we have guaranteed the integrity of one-half of the earth, the entire Western Hemisphere. Is not that enough for the United States to take on, with 10,000,000 of our fellow countrymen unemployed? We meet contests in this body over the amount of money we are going to appropriate at this session to feed these our own people, who have to break bread with beggars and sleep in the brush. There is no hope in their hearts. Yet we hear careless talk of going outside of the Western Hemisphere and fixing up the rest of the world by sheer force at a time when our own problems multiply and terrify us.

God knows Europe's troubles are terrifying. But that does not constitute any justification for destroying the Republic, and that is what war means to us.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Washington for his statement, and I assure him that millions of Americans love him for his fighting spirit, for his Americanism.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I merely wanted to make the statement that I think the thanks of the mothers of America are due the able Senator from Washington for the observations he has made in the Senate this afternoon. It is actually appalling to my mind to find many American people writing me and telegraphing me that they think the war in Europe is our war, and that we should go to war now. It is quite true that people are hysterical, but I cannot help regretting that attitude when we have not by any means liquidated the obligations imposed on us as a result of our brief participation in the last war.

It might be well for me to add at this juncture that even now, 25 years after the end of the last World War, we have not sufficient hospital accommodations for our World War veterans who are entitled to hospitalization. Our participation to date has cost us \$67,000,000,000. Before we get through we will have paid out \$100,000,000,000. It is really pathetic to find the American people so thoroughly disturbed. Many of them actually believe that Hitler will be over here in 2 or 3 months to attack us.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have not the floor, but I trust the Senator from Minnesota will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina made a remark about there not being a sufficient number of hospitals to take care of the veterans of the World War. I hope the Senator does not place upon the Government any condemnation for the treatment which the veterans of the World War in this country have received. I think the country has been quite generous, in view of the tremendous number of hospitals which have been constructed throughout the United States.

There is no comparison between the treatment which the veterans of our country receive and the treatment received by the veterans of other nations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly not; and, Mr. President, I intended to make no reflection of that kind at all upon our country. I do not understand how the Senator can for a moment gather that I reflected upon the Veterans' Administration of the present administration or the Hoover administration. As a matter of fact, the United States has done more for its veterans than any other government on the face of the earth has done for its veterans. I simply remarked, Mr. President, that now it is 25 years after the World War, and yet we do not have hospital facilities sufficient to accommodate the veterans of the last war, and I know that, because I venture to say unhesitatingly and without personal reflection that my office handles as many veterans' cases as are handled by any other Member of Congress, and time and time again my secretary and I have experienced extreme difficulty in finding accommodations for veterans in whom my office was interested. I agree with the able Senator and I repeat that the United States has treated its veterans better than any other country on the face of the earth has treated its veterans.

I regret, however, to note that the people of the United States are so thoroughly hysterical with respect to Hitler coming here, and this and that.

The other day I was having lunch in the dining room of the United States Senate and one of the colored boys ran up to me with a newspaper in his hand and said, "Senator, do you know that Hitler has took 'Cadilas'?"

"You mean Calais," I said.

"Yes, Calais. And do you know, Senator, that Mr. Hitler is on the way to Paris?"

"Certainly."

The boy then asked, "When will Hitler be over here?"

I said, "Have not you heard the news yet?"

"No," he replied.

I said, "He is going to address the United States Senate next month." [Laughter in the galleries.]

Many people believe Hitler will be here in a couple of weeks. I received a telegram from a very close friend of mine living in western North Carolina, a man who has had a very large earning capacity, who was so excited that he telegraphed me, "If necessary vote \$100,000,000,000 for defense." Another telegraphed me, "If necessary, vote \$50,000,000,000 for defense." Another telegraphed, "If necessary vote \$10,000,000,000 for defense."

Mr. LEE. The Senator seems to be very sure that Hitler will not come over here if he breaks the Allied line. But does the Senator from North Carolina remember making a statement on the floor of the Senate respecting the neutrality of Norway, which had not heretofore been violated, and yet within a week Norway's neutrality was violated?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. I made the statement on the floor of the Senate that the Scandinavian countries, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, had maintained their neutrality throughout the entire World War, and yet they were only within a stone's throw of war itself. And I said, "They are going to maintain their neutrality now," and they did. They never violated their neutrality. But who violated it? Hitler himself violated it.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the Senator for a short statement.

Mr. LUCAS. It will be very short and very much to the point. I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina—

Mr. REYNOLDS. O Mr. President—North Carolina, if the Senator please. I do not mean by the emphasis I placed on my remark to reflect, and I trust the Senator from Illinois will not think that I thereby reflect upon South Carolina. I have a very deep affection for the people of South Carolina, because as a matter of fact the patriots of South Carolina during the War of the Revolution aided the patriots of North Carolina in winning the Revolutionary War. I may add, since I see the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] in the chair, that the patriots of North Carolina during the revolutionary days appreciated immensely the frontiersmen who came from his State to help North Carolina win the Revolutionary War for the American people. If it had not been for North Carolina, today the British flag might be floating over this Capitol instead of the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I regret very much that I made that slight error, and said South Carolina, when I should have said North Carolina. I immediately looked around the Senate Chamber and observed that both Senators from South Carolina were absent, and I was very happy that they were not present in view of that slip of my tongue.

I will state the question I wanted to ask the Senator. In telling his story about the colored boy downstairs, I think the Senator said he told him facetiously that Hitler was going to be here, I think he said, the following month. I wonder whether or not the Senator means that he would be here in the United States Senate if Hitler were to come to the Senate to make an address.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not get the inference. I will be very grateful to the Senator if he will be good enough to be a little more explicit.

Mr. LUCAS. I wonder where, in the United States, Senators would be if Mr. Hitler should come to make an address in the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, there would be no United States Senate if Hitler were to come here and were successful in conquering our country. I wish to state that, in my opinion, I do not think our immediate danger is from without. I think our immediate danger will result from those constituting the "fifth column" who are here in the United States today, the "fifth columnists" and the Trojan horses; in other words, alien enemies. I think our danger is from within. I do not think we are in danger of being assaulted from without for many years to come, because I believe that after the war in Europe is over, all factions who are fighting at the present time will be so thoroughly exhausted that they will not be so foolish as to attempt to cross the Atlantic to make attacks upon this, the greatest Nation upon the face of the earth.

We are preparing now more than ever before, by way of constructing and preparing to construct a perfect national defense. I voted for the defense bills within reason, and I expect to vote for them, because, like the Senator from Illinois, I am desirous of protecting my country from any assault that might come from the south or the north or from the Pacific or across the Atlantic.

I think the sooner we begin to dig down into the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States and withdraw therefrom the cash that is necessary for our national defense, the better, and the sooner that is done the sooner a great deal of this hysteria in America will disappear.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me so I may ask the Senator from North Carolina one more question?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. There has been much discussion in the Senate and elsewhere about the hysteria which is prevalent in the United States. I have never heard a single Senator say he was in favor of sending American boys to European soil. Even the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]

stated he was not in favor of sending American boys to European soil.

I have never yet heard in the cloakroom, in the corridor, or on the floor of the United States Senate, a single Senator say that he would vote to send American boys to fight in Europe. In my opinion that is what the American people are interested in at the present time. They will go the limit to support the American Congress in the defense of this hemisphere or the defense of the Monroe Doctrine, but I have never heard any Senator, either on or off the floor of the Senate, say that he would be in favor of voting for a declaration of war to the point of sending American boys to Europe to fight the battles of some other country. So I do not know where all the war hysteria comes from that we hear so much talk about on the floor of the Senate.

I have never heard it on the floor of the Senate. I have never heard it in the cloakroom; and until some Senator makes an official statement of some kind in the Senate to the effect that he is in favor of a declaration of war, it seems to me that perhaps the talk about hysteria is more talk than anything else. Perhaps it is coming from the floor of the Senate, without any real substance behind it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator that I have never heard one Senator say that he would even consider voting for a declaration of war. But the Senator will surely agree that there is war hysteria. I dare say there is hardly a Member of this body who would not agree that there is war hysteria.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, everyone is concerned about the war, in view of what has transpired across the sea. We see nations which have been neutral for 147 years, as Holland was, and which were spared the wrath of the last war, overrun by German domination. Of course, we are interested in what is going on throughout the world. We are a part of the world. We must be interested. We must discuss war. We must talk about it. We must prepare. But I still think that the people of the United States and the Members of the Senate and House have their feet on the ground so far as this war is concerned, notwithstanding statements to the contrary.

So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I must be convinced of many things before I will ever vote for a declaration of war of any kind. I have made the statement many times—and I now repeat it—"Billions for defense, but nothing for aggression, so far as sending soldiers to Europe is concerned." I am willing to do practically everything within my very limited power as a United States Senator to aid the Allies in their fight short of sending manpower; but I am not willing to support any legislation now before the Senate, or which may come before us in the future, which is tantamount to a declaration of war.

That is the position of the Senator from Illinois: I want my people in the Corn Belt district of Illinois where I come from to know that I am giving every piece of legislation which comes before the committees of which I am a member, and every piece of legislation which comes before the United States Senate, my best and most conscientious judgment, with only one thought in mind, and that is the interest of my country first. Politics is taboo so far as this particular situation is concerned. I honestly believe that America will not participate in the present European war. I am willing to give to this country everything that is within our power to give her so that no hostile foot shall ever tread upon American soil.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think we are in accord as to that. Billions for defense, but not a drop of blood upon foreign soil.

I thank the able Senator from Minnesota.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. As a matter of information for the Senate, I read an article in the Washington Post this morning which caused me to direct an inquiry to the War Department, and I received the information which I requested. The article had to do with the sale of munitions to the Allies. The information which I requested from the War Department was as to the number of rifles we have on hand at the present time—not on order, but on hand. I find that

there are on hand 40,000 Garand rifles, 895,000 Springfield rifles, and 2,045,000 Enfield rifles.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article which caused my concern.

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

TECHNICALITIES ROUTED—DEAL REPORTED TO SEND ALLIES UNITED STATES
WORLD WAR GUNS
(By Frank L. Kluckhohn)

The United States will make available at once to the Allies vast stocks of World War rifles, field guns, and ammunition, it was learned yesterday. The way for immediate sale of part of the stocks held by the Army was cleared by a ruling just made by Robert H. Jackson, the Attorney General, who held that the arms could be transferred without violation of international law.

The Army has on hand more than 2,000,000 World War Enfield and Springfield rifles with considerable ammunition for them, and about 5,000 field guns of 75-millimeter caliber with plenty of ammunition. While it is understood that only part of these "obsolete" stores will be made available to Great Britain and France it is reported that at least 600,000 rifles and 2,500 field guns, with ammunition, are included in the program.

While this equipment is regarded as unsatisfactory for the use of this country's Army which is rapidly being modernized, it would permit the British to compensate in part for the losses of equipment the B. E. F. suffered in Flanders. Although old, the rifles and guns are usable. Most of the supplies, it is said in official quarters here, will go to the British.

The Justice and the War Departments refused to comment upon the Attorney General's ruling. It is known to set forth, however, that under a law of July 1919, authorizing the Army to dispose of surplus armaments held at that time, old equipment can be turned over to private American manufacturers in payment for new equipment to be produced. Under American and international law, private manufacturers can sell equipment to belligerent governments.

Under this ruling the question of direct sale of war equipment by a neutral government to a belligerent government will not arise, and competitive bidding in sales to private domestic concerns or individuals will not be required.

In diplomatic circles it was said yesterday that arrangements for the transfer of World War equipment had been completed "in principle." It was not revealed, however, whether details regarding sale and shipment had been fully settled. There was general expectation, however, that shipments would begin shortly.

The Attorney General's ruling applied only to equipment held by the Army in 1919, but it was reported in official circles that moves are under way to make possible the transfer to the Allies of a certain number of planes now in Army service and, perhaps, of naval destroyers.

By a vote of 19 to 2, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday rejected a proposal by Senator PEPPER, of Florida to authorize sale by the Government of modern military planes, ships, and other equipment to the Allies. This particular proposal never obtained administration support, however, and it was said in some informed circles that the same result might be achieved administratively or through another type of legislation.

In diplomatic circles it was reported that the administration is giving considerable attention to the matter, and several anti-administration Senators were said to be favorable to more general legislation which would permit the Army to dispose of some of its older-line planes and equipment for new equipment now nearing completion if administrative action to attain this result cannot be developed.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. LEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to say a word of explanation of the amendment which has been before the Senate all the afternoon, of which I am the author, and which strikes out the present limitation of 280,000 on the size of our Army, contained in existing law, and substitutes therefor a top limit of 750,000.

For pressing reasons I shall not be able to be present on Monday, the day on which I understand the amendment will come to a vote. The able Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] has assured me that he will keep his eye on the amendment, but I should like to have the RECORD contain a very brief statement of my reasons for offering it.

As I said several days ago, I believe we should have an army of 750,000, which would include 176,000 for the Air Corps alone. It would include the number necessary to have mechanized and tank forces of 2,400 vehicles. It is not at all an extravagant figure. It is the Army which I think we

should have if we are to go from the small, experimental type of army which we have had to a standing army which is capable of making a major effort immediately.

The theory of our national defense has been that after a declaration of war we would wait weeks and months to get our Army ready. I submit that we must have a force which is available at once, and I have taken the figure 750,000 because it is the figure of the protective-mobilization plan which has been developed by the War Department. It is the figure which the Congress had in mind when it made appropriations during the past 2 weeks for equipment and matériel.

The bills which appropriated money for tanks, machine guns, and all varieties of artillery and ordnance, were to provide the equipment for an army of 750,000 men. I submit it is inconsistent for us to appropriate money for the equipment for such an army and allow a limitation such as exists today to continue on the statute books.

The Chief of Staff, Gen. George Marshall, appearing before a House committee yesterday, said that an enlargement of the Regular Army up to 400,000 men would probably make a mobilization of the National Guard unnecessary in case trouble should arise in the Western Hemisphere. I bring up that point because I know that many Senators are troubled by the proposals regarding the National Guard, and I think it is noteworthy to have the statement of the Chief of Staff that if we build up the Regular Army to a certain extent, then any question of mobilizing the National Guard will be rendered much less likely.

Personally, I strongly believe that we should set the ceiling at 750,000. By voting for my amendment, we merely remove a limitation. We take no practical steps toward such an Army until we appropriate the funds. However, if Senators think that is too much of a jump—and personally I think it is a very modest step—

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, instead of increasing the Army at the present time, would it not be much better to give some training to the National Guard during the summer months? There are a number of places where such training can be given, particularly in Massachusetts, where fine equipment is available. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the Government giving training to the National Guard; but I am not in favor of giving anybody the power to send the National Guard out of the country at this particular time. However, I think it would be an excellent thing to call them for duty in the United States and give them some training.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is a good thing to train the National Guard. I agree with the Senator about that.

It has been represented to me that if we were to have the guard under arms for 5 or 6 months it would be a pretty hard thing on a young officer in the National Guard, let us say, who may be married and have a couple of small children. He will be mustered out, and the chances are that he might lose his employment or suffer some other hardship, whereas if we increase the Regular Army we do not have any such difficulties. Moreover, if we increase the Regular Army we do not raise the question which is troubling so many people—of giving the President the discretion in time of peace to call out the National Guard, a function which, if I am correctly informed, has always been a prerogative of the Governors of the States.

I wish to conclude by saying that while I believe that a figure of 750,000 as the strength of the Army is a proper figure, if Senators feel that it would be better to substitute 400,000, of course I should regard that as a step in the right direction.

I am obliged to the Senator from Minnesota for giving me the chance to make this explanatory statement. I hope Senators will read it, and that my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I have yielded rather freely to others, and there has been an interesting debate

and discussion. While I find myself unable to resist the requests of my persuasive colleagues, I ask that after I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma I may have a few minutes for my own remarks.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I must say that the Senator from Minnesota has been most generous with his time, and I thank him.

With regard to the statement of the lovable junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], whose patriotism no one can question, I wish to say that, in my opinion, it is a mistake to belittle a danger which threatens our country. The Senator has made light of the possibility of the Nazis striking at the United States. I believe that is a mistake. He has assured us that there is no danger from Hitler for at least a long time, many years, that he would be too exhausted.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator—

Mr. LEE. Let me finish the point, and then I shall be glad to have the Senator reply. I merely want to see whether we can rely upon the prophetic ability of the Senator in his assurances of our safety. I read from page 4137 on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 8, 1940, where the Senator is reported to have said:

We recall that Norway, Sweden, and Denmark did not get into the last World War. They were within a stone's throw of the war for more than 4 years, but they did not get into it. We were 3,000 miles away, but we got into it. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark are today within a stone's throw of a repetition of the same thing, and they are not going to get into it.

So as a prophet my good friend is still a good friend and a fine man, and his patriotism cannot be questioned; but I doubt the wisdom of making light of the danger which threatens this country. It tends to put the people to sleep. I admire the Senator, but I doubt his prophetic ability.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, a few moments ago I was questioned on that very point, and at that time I made an answer which was entirely to my satisfaction. [Laughter.]

OVER A MILLION TRAINED MEN TODAY

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I should like to say, concerning the strength of the Army, referred to by the very able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], that there is a misapprehension of the strength of the Army of the United States. Some time ago I wrote a letter to Secretary of War Woodring, and he replied, and I placed his reply in the RECORD. He gave the armed strength of the United States at 624,200, as of January 31, 1940. If we add to that the number in the R. O. T. C. and the C. M. T. C., and the naval strength of the country, we find we have a million fifteen thousand nine hundred and seventy men who can be called to the colors by pressing a button tonight. The figures I have placed in the RECORD are not very generally known. I am in entire sympathy with those who wish to keep the Army in the best of condition. I have served in the Army of the United States and the National Guard for more than 10 years and I believe that we should have a reasonable, sane and sensible defense; but I do not believe in hysterical chatter and all that sort of thing.

AMERICA'S LINE OF DEFENSE—ISLANDS

I think the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts is a reasonable one considering the times, but there are others who wish to place us in the condition of a nation which is right across the line from some European dictator. The Almighty has placed 4,000 miles of ocean between the dictators and the United States, and if we acquire bases on the Atlantic coast, beginning with Iceland and Greenland, coming down to Miquelon and St. Pierre, down to Bermuda, and down through the British and French West Indies, and past the islands in the Caribbean Sea to the Gulf of Mexico, down to the coast of South America, where we should have defenses in the Guianas—and the military and naval authorities have so requested—if we have that kind of a defense, we will have steeled ourselves against any attack from Europe.

Our naval and air bases will be there, and we will be ready for any attack. We will have the finest aircraft in the world there on land and sea bases. A navy from across the ocean cannot attack land-based planes and the territory they command. These foreign forces must carry their own colliers and refueling vessels with them; they must bring a force three times the naval strength of the United States to attack us over here, as the naval and military authorities have repeatedly said. I cannot conceive of any such strength unless some dictator in Europe should be able to consolidate all the navies. By that time, no doubt, a good part of those navies would be down in Davy Jones' locker. Someone wisecracked the other day about the possibility of the King of England having to review his fleet in a diving suit; and that is perhaps not entirely pleasantry. [Laughter in the galleries.]

NAVIES THREATENED FROM THE AIR

The situation in Europe, as we have watched it, is this—and this is borne out by military and naval authorities—that when a navy approaches within 50 miles or thereabouts, perhaps a hundred miles, of an aircraft base they are in mortal danger. They have to get out of there just as fast as they can—find a way out somehow. They must keep moving. The minute they are stationary they are in great danger from dive bombers and submarines.

I get back now to the question of acquiring these bases. When we have acquired the bases, there is nothing but the great Atlantic Ocean between those bases and Europe.

Now I am straying, perhaps, from the manuscript I had briefly and hurriedly prepared; but I wish to say that every soldier who falls on the western front in France today—and I regret as much as any man in this world the loss of life on both sides, I regret the loss of all these fine young men over there—every soldier who falls weakens the power of his nation just that much. When the war is over, the nations of Europe will be bled white. They will be exhausted and weak beyond their condition at any time in the war up to the signing of peace. They will be in a less favorable position to attack us than at any other time. World history teaches us that it takes 15, 20, or 25 years for the warring nations, both victor and vanquished, to recover so that they can begin an attack upon a country that is right across their borders.

NO CAUSE FOR HYSTERIA

Well, we are not right across the line. We have the great ice cap on the north. We have the great ice cap on the south.

We have 7,000 miles of Pacific Ocean on the west and 4,000 miles of distance on the east. We have been placed in the most favorable position in which Providence could place any nation on this great earth; and there is no sense in our becoming hysterical, with 130,000,000 people in this country, with a World War army that can furnish several hundred thousand officers. I will not say that that entire army can be put into service now. That would not be fair, although we Spanish-American War men think we could still fight a bit; but perhaps we could only count on several hundred thousand. With an army of over a million that we can call tonight, and with several hundred thousand World War men who can officer an Army, and with the training and the great appropriations we are now making here, I fail to see how any nation or any group of nations can successfully attack this country in this generation.

I have studied the map diligently. Any man who has been an officer in the Army—and there are a number of Senators here who have served in our military forces—knows how we love to study maps. I can find no weak spot, no "Achilles heel" on our map so far as Europe is concerned, except the steps that I have already outlined, from Scotland to the Orkneys to the Shetland Islands to the Danish Faroes, now occupied by the British military forces, and from there to Iceland, now occupied by the British forces, from there to Greenland, and from there to Canada.

ICELAND IS AMERICAN

Those are the only ocean steps from Europe to America. Iceland is a part of the North American Continent, of the

Western Hemisphere—of the American Hemisphere, as I like to call it. I give as my authority for that statement Dr. Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the great Arctic explorer, who wrote the book *Iceland the First American Republic*. You may go to the geographers in the Congressional Library and they will show you the maps, and they will tell you that Iceland is a part of the Western Hemisphere, and naturally belongs to us; and yet we permit the British military forces there. I am not talking particularly about the British. We should not permit any naval or military establishment there of any country other than our own. Iceland is an American island, and Greenland certainly is an American island.

Let us picture the situation there. Here are Iceland and Greenland. They are only 180 miles apart. You can stand on the mountains of Iceland and see Greenland. You can stand on the deck of a vessel in midchannel between Greenland and Iceland and see them both. That is how close together they are. Iceland is a territory of 39,709 square miles. It has perfect naval and submarine bases. It has a plentitude of land suitable for air bases, and it can absolutely cut off those steps to North America from Europe.

From there you go on to Greenland, an island which is fairly continental in size. It is so wide at its widest point that the distance is the same as from New York to St. Louis. I hope Senators will check my figures. Sometimes we get them wrong. I know I have them right. The length is as great as from the border of Minnesota—my own Minnesota, the North Star State, the 10,000-lakes State—to the Rio Grande. I wish to call the attention of my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] to that, and invite North Carolinians to come up to our 10,000-lakes State, and also the residents of other States.

From the north border of Minnesota, where it adjoins Canada, down to the Rio Grande, is the same distance as the length of Greenland. Lindbergh surveyed Greenland. Peary, the great explorer, crossed this great island several times. He sailed around the northern portion of it, and discovered that it was an island. By right of discovery and by right of exploration it is an American island; it belongs to us; and we never should have ceded to Denmark our rights in it when we acquired the Virgin Islands.

It is not too late now, I hope, to negotiate for Greenland.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS SURVEY GREENLAND

I consider the great Pan American Airways one of the finest airway corporations in all the world. Not so long ago it was my pleasure and privilege to participate in the first clipper flight from New York to Ireland and Portsmouth and London, and we flew not far from Iceland and Greenland. I wish to say that the Pan Americans were up in Greenland, and surveyed the situation. They kept men up there watching the meteorological conditions, the weather conditions. They found the great central plateau of Greenland perfectly level, just as level as a table. For more than a thousand miles in width and for nearly 1,500 miles in length all the air fleets of the world could land there and be lost in that vast expanse. There are no crevasses in the ice until near the shore line; and the fjords of Greenland are deeper and greater than the fjords of Norway. There can be located submarine bases. There are some fjords great enough to hide a fleet; yet we are asleep. Somebody wrote a book about America being asleep. That is where we have been asleep. We should have been wide awake on that subject. We should have acquired this great base.

I will grant that before aviation came, it perhaps was not reasonable, perhaps was hardly sensible, to think of Greenland in connection with development. With advance of aviation, with this great new method of travel, and the all-surrounding air being one mighty ocean around the earth, one traveling from San Francisco to Berlin would cross Iceland and Greenland. Berlin is now approaching 5,000,000 in population, and there will be travel, I hope, in the future, some day, when there is peace.

ACT IN THE LIVING PRESENT

In going to all North Europe, there lies the shortest line of travel, and I highly value the views of the Pan American

Airways, of Admiral Peary, and of Colonel Lindbergh. They know—they have the facts. It is time for us to act in the living present.

GERMANY EXPLORES ICELAND AND GREENLAND

Let me say in this connection, that I am not here to try to frighten anyone. However, so long as it is supposed to be in the fashion to frighten people, I suppose I might throw in the remark that the Germans are supposed to be behind every tree, and are going to take us tomorrow morning and fry us for breakfast.

The Germans have surveyed Greenland and Iceland. I have material concerning both Greenland and Iceland which I will place in the RECORD. I was going to read it, but I shall not trespass upon the time of Senators who have been good enough to remain and listen to me, though not much of the time was taken by me in making my statement. We should have American naval bases and American air bases on both islands. The authorities I have cited are unanimous on that subject.

VITAL FACTS ON ICELAND

I wish to say that a few years ago very little had been written about these far distant countries, although Iceland is rather an ancient country. The Irish went to Iceland in 600 or 700, and remained as the only people there for about 200 or 250 years. The Norwegians discovered Iceland through conquest of North Ireland, and the Irish there told them about the island they had up north. Then the Vikings and the Norse went to Iceland. The people are by blood 90 percent Irish-Norwegians. The percentage is 30 percent Irish, 60 percent Norwegian, 2 percent Scotch, 2 percent Swedish, 2 percent English. I have this information from Dr. Stefansson. I do not make this statement based simply on some casual reading. I have had the honor to meet this famous explorer, and he gave me much other valuable information. He has traveled through these regions. The great explorer told me, and those who have studied weather conditions will confirm his statement, that the weather conditions at the southern tip of Greenland are no worse than those of Newfoundland, particularly with respect to fogs. Pan American Airways make flights across the southern tip of Greenland, New Brunswick, and Newfoundland. I presume they have cut off travel there at the present time, but they made many flights there after the flight which a Senate delegation took with members of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and others. These airways that have been laid out by experts are right along these steps to Europe. Certainly some of these steps are within the western hemisphere, within the North American Continent, and should be under our flag. We should negotiate for them. We should purchase them and take possession before it is too late. If all the threats we are hearing are to be made good some day, then there is all the more reason why we should have our naval bases and our air bases there. That is all the more reason why we should get there first, why we should have them fortified, and have our aircraft there, so that no possible threat to us could be made.

I have stated that it is only 180 miles from Iceland to Greenland, and from Greenland it is only 20 miles to Ellesmereland. Dr. Stefansson told me that he stood in Greenland and through glasses watched an expedition cross over the ice from Greenland and enter Canada. That shows how short the distance is between Greenland and Canada at that one point.

ISLAND BASES FOR DEFENSE

Mr. President, the day and the hour has now arrived when we must survey our coast. We must look to our island bases. I speak not only of the bases to the north, but the island bases around the Panama Canal belonging to Latin-American nations, and within some 1,500 or 1,800 miles of our coasts. These small friendly nations are unable to fortify those islands. They should be surveyed by our naval and aviation authorities, and wherever bases should be planted, they should be established and equipped. We should obtain them by negotiations and purchase, or by some such method, in order that they may be a bastion and a defense for all the American nations.

AMERICAN CONTINENT—POLE TO POLE

Mr. President, I say in all sincerity that I hope the day will soon come when there will be no flags in the American hemisphere, the Western Hemisphere, but American flags. I believe when European flags are out of North and South America, when Europe is once more over in Europe, and all on this hemisphere are Americans, we will have less intrigue, and fewer war plots, and less talk of bringing the capital of England over to Canada, as is suggested in the article written by Pearson and Allen, which I placed in the RECORD of yesterday.

Hysteria has now become so prevalent that we are told that the highest officials in this country are advising the French that they should move their capital to Africa. It is proposed to establish the capital of the French Empire in Africa, and it is suggested that the British may come to Canada and establish their capital there. Very well, if the situation is so serious as all that, we had better look to our Atlantic island bases. We had better look to the Latin-American islands off the west coast of Panama and to the west of Nicaragua.

EUROPE IN THE AMERICAS

Mr. President, in trying to estimate the extent of the territories belonging to European nations we discover that there is some difficulty in finding out how much they own in North and South America. Some surveys do not include the Falkland Islands, which is a key group of islands.

But below the Falkland Islands are the South Shetland Islands, and the South Orkneys, and the South Georgia, and South Sandwich. It may seem that we are traveling a little far south, but we are still in the Western Hemisphere when we consider Antarctica, where Admiral Byrd and other explorers have gone. I believe in insisting on American rights, and seeing that we obtain the territory in Antarctica which belongs to us.

The time is past for America to play Santa Claus to the earth, giving away everything. The time has come to protest the United States and the American people.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted a little while ago I was about to refer to an article by Arthur Sears Henning, which appeared in the Times-Herald of May 17. I intended to read the article, but since I received permission to place it in the RECORD I shall not do so. I will refer to it only briefly. Senators would be particularly interested if they were to read Mr. Henning's statement with reference to the "wisecracking" Britishers who once called us "Uncle Shylock" because we asked payment of their old World War debts. This same type of British mind says the next war will be between the yellow countries—Japan and the United States.

SENDING OUR BOYS TO DIE FOR THEM

That is the thanks we get for lending them billions of dollars and sending our boys to die for them.

Mr. President, my only purpose in calling the attention of the Senate to this matter is to illustrate the words of George Washington, when he warned his country not to show excessive partiality toward some foreign countries and excessive dislike toward others.

Today when our leaders point to the inadequacy of our defense, I remind the Senate that island bases off our shores are necessary for adequate defense. These island bases are of greater defense value than all the billions of dollars we are now so rapidly appropriating. I repeat that these bases which are vital to the defenses of America, are worth all the billions we are now appropriating.

I am proud to support the resolutions offered by the able Senator from North Carolina. I am glad he introduced them, because he is a member of the majority party in the Senate, and a distinguished Senator. I have membership in a minority party. The Senator is more likely to succeed in having his resolution adopted. I wish to see these efforts succeed. I have no pride of authorship in this matter.

To the support of those resolution I give everything I have. In the interest of our country, I hope the resolution may be adopted.

I do not believe that results from the defense appropriations will materialize as we think they will. So far as the appropriations we are now making are concerned, I think that 1940 is out of the picture. I am not alone in that statement. I have authority for it. We shall, indeed, be fortunate if we approach the proposed program in 1941, 1942, 1943, or even later.

PLANLESS DEFENSE

It is now claimed that we have no real defense, after the administration has expended \$7,000,000,000 during the past 7 years. In our present hurried, planless defense debacle—and that is what it seems to me to be—no sensible American can take a real pride. It is a planless program. There are no blueprints. Where are we heading, where are we going to wind up, when we cannot even find any real results from the last \$7,000,000,000 we appropriated?

We are now talking about lowering the income-tax exemption for a man with a family to \$1,800, and for a single individual to \$800. We propose to levy an income tax on nearly two and a quarter million people who have never been taxed before. When we do so, let us have something to show for it.

FRONTIERS ON THE RHINE

We could negotiate for these bases and pay for them with a few millions of these enormous appropriations, and really get somewhere. We are slavishly retreating from old-fashioned Americanism, and are patterning after the hysterical statements we have been hearing. The protection and defense of America does not call for foolhardy frontiers on the Rhine, as we have been led to believe. Our frontier of defense calls for island bases off our coasts—the British, Dutch, and French West Indies, and Bermuda. Do not forget, Bermuda is a key to the Atlantic coast. Let me ask the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] how far it is from his State.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is 534 miles from Kitty Hawk.

BERMUDA, KEY TO UNITED STATES COAST DEFENSE

Mr. LUNDEEN. The distance from North Carolina to Bermuda is 534 miles. The distances from Bermuda run like the spokes of a wheel—toward New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and down through the Southern States. Bermuda is a veritable key, and must be under the American flag, with naval bases and air bases.

THE RAMPARTS WE WATCH

These truly American islands must become American possessions and must be established as our first line of defense. They are the ramparts we watch. Some of us are contemplating the day when they will be under our jurisdiction.

Europe must be removed from them by negotiation or seizure. I have before me an article by Raymond Clapper, the columnist, who says we may have to go out with troops and seize these islands. Yet I was ridiculed a short time ago because I quoted Andrew Jackson. The words were not mine. I was quoting Andrew Jackson when he threatened to seize the French West Indies because the French Empire would not pay its debts. Now American columnists in our greatest newspapers are saying that we may have to use troops to go in and take possession of the islands. I am not in favor of doing so unless it becomes necessary. Let us first negotiate peacefully. Let us pay, and give credit, where credit is due, on their World War debt.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let me remind the Senator of a situation which might arise, and which might prove not only extremely embarrassing, but perhaps dangerous. If Hitler should win this war he would claim all the properties in the Western Hemisphere which belong to Great Britain. They include not only the Leeward and Windward Islands, Trinidad, Bimini, Nassau, and Bermuda, but also include British Honduras and British Guiana.

A moment ago the Senator mentioned the Falkland Islands. I understand that there is some misunderstanding between the Republic of Argentina and Great Britain as to the real ownership of those islands. Many persons expect

Hitler to win this war. It is even stated that he has already won, and that it will last only a short time. I will not believe that he has won it until he has actually won it. But, if unfortunately he should win the war, he will claim the islands in the Caribbean, in Central America, and in South America, including Nassau, Bimini, and Bermuda, which the Senator mentioned a moment ago. If we should then attempt to take possession of those islands, of course we should have a war on our hands.

The Senator will recall that after the Spanish-American War in 1898 we seized the Philippine Islands. I believe as a result of that war we also became possessors of Guam, Puerto Rico, and Cuba. We claimed them after the war, because we had won the war. If Hitler should win this war, he will claim the islands about which the Senator is talking, and in addition he will claim British Honduras and British Guiana. He will also claim the Falkland Islands.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Do not forget Dutch Guiana.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is where the difficulty will arise. Hitler has already conquered the Netherlands, and he will lay claim to Curacao, which, I believe, is the name of the main island, which is being used for refining oil which comes from Venezuela. So, according to the Senator's suggestion, why not carry out negotiations with Great Britain and France, as I suggested to the administration through the introduction of resolutions authorizing such negotiations? The Senator kindly stated that he would support the resolutions.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, let me recall that long before this war I submitted resolutions to negotiate with the Netherlands for the purchase of Curacao and Aruba, where there are oil refineries doing an annual business of \$125,000,000. A long time ago I suggested that all the Dutch possessions in the Western Hemisphere be acquired by negotiation and purchase. I do not recall receiving very much support for that suggestion until recently. We seem to be regretful of the fact that we did not act some years ago.

MONROE DOCTRINE STRANGELY INTERPRETED

A strange interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine may cause the illegal transfer to foreign lands of Greenland and Iceland. Already Great Britain has occupied Iceland, which is an American island, according to the noted Arctic explorer, Dr. Vilhjalmur Stefansson, who is our greatest expert on these northern territories. The British Ambassador, Lord Lothian, admits through the press that the Monroe Doctrine covers Greenland. So does our President, and so do the geographical experts; but Lord Lothian states that Britain can occupy the island whenever Germany threatens invasion. If we are to judge from the past history of English strategy, Canada, under British direction and as a part of the British Empire, may take over Greenland and perhaps other Western Hemisphere possessions, despite the Monroe Doctrine, which we have established for the protection of this truly American Hemisphere. That is the claim of Lord Lothian. All this will be done under the claim that the Germans threaten invasion.

But suppose the Germans win the war. Where will that leave the islands? Would it not then have been the better part of wisdom to have negotiated for these islands and acquired them at the time I first brought this matter to the attention of the Senate?

This American island would be occupied by a foreign power. It is an American island because it is part of the Western Hemisphere and lies in close proximity to North America.

At this time I wish to quote from the Washington Star of April 16, 1940, relative to Lord Lothian's interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine.

The article in part is as follows:

LORD LOTHIAN SAYS MONROE DOCTRINE COVERS GREENLAND—BRITISH WILL NOT OCCUPY TERRITORY UNLESS NAZIS THREATEN INVASION

Lord Lothian, British Ambassador here, said today he did not expect any British or Canadian occupation of Greenland unless there was a more definite threat of German invasion of the Danish Arctic possession.

The Ambassador said he considered Greenland came well within the Monroe Doctrine, so that possible Canadian occupation of the island would be supporting principles of the doctrine against extension of control in this hemisphere by foreign nations.

He added that there apparently was no immediate danger of Germany attempting to take over Greenland, however, and that he would not expect Canada or Great Britain to act except to protect the island from possible invasion.

SITE FOR AIR BASE

He pointed out that if Germany should gain control of Greenland it might be made an effective base for airplane or submarine warfare in the North Atlantic, which the Allies would be prepared to prevent.

HULL INDICATES AGREEMENT

Secretary of State Hull indicated at his press conference later that this Government agrees that Greenland comes within the scope of the Monroe Doctrine. In response to questions, Mr. Hull said he believed the President indicated the slant of opinion last week when Mr. Roosevelt remarked that from the point of view of ancient history and other considerations, Greenland belongs much more closely to the American than to the European Continent.

The President emphasized at that time, however, that he was viewing the situation more from the humanitarian than the political point of view.

Secretary Hull said he had heard of no plans for extension of United States protection to Greenland, or of any plans for landing forces there by any other powers.

Lord Lothian was asked about reports concerning Greenland when he called at the State Department to confer with Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles and Assistant Secretary of State Henry F. Grady, who is in charge of the reciprocal trade-agreement program.

DISCUSSIONS NEAR COMPLETION

The Ambassador said discussions looking toward settlement of numerous pending disputes between this country and the Allies, growing out of the Allied blockade of Germany, mail censorship, and restrictions on certain imports from this country to conserve foreign exchange, were nearing completion.

He said the British and French economic experts who have been conferring with Government officials here on details of the problems, expected to return to Europe next week and that a joint statement on results of their mission here probably would be issued before they left.

AMERICA MUST BE FREE FROM EUROPE

Mr. President, the Monroe Doctrine seeks American independence from Europe. The Monroe Doctrine is an effort on the part of Americans to resist the web of European politics and the insidious hand which attempts to draw us back into the British Empire orbit, from which we declared our independence in 1776. There are those in that nation who have attempted to align us once again with the so-called mother empire. There are those who predict that we will dutifully go back to the "English wing."

Our ancestors gave their blood, their lives, to create a new country, free from Europe. They established in 1823 a Monroe Doctrine which eventually would enable them to live in the Americas free from European governments and European wars. Now is the time to remember the Monroe Doctrine and apply it in the spirit in which it was conceived.

HENRY CABOT LODGE AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Henry Cabot Lodge, a Senator of long experience in foreign relations, and a well-known American historian, stated his conception of the American doctrine, as follows:

It is not a doctrine of international law, and the attempt to discuss it or to oppose it on that ground is a waste of words. Like the independence of this country, it is a question of fact and not of law. The independence of this country is unquestioned, because, having declared it, we compelled the world to recognize it. In the same way we have always acted on the declaration of Mr. Monroe as the guiding principle of our foreign policy. We shall now, I hope, declare it again with the formal sanction of Congress, representing the people of the United States. It is idle to argue either for or against it as a matter of international law, for it requires no such support. We stand by the Monroe Doctrine for the same reason that England upholds Afghanistan and takes the Shan States from China, because it is essential to our safety and our defense. The Monroe Doctrine rests primarily on the great law of self-preservation.

We declare the Monroe Doctrine to be a principle which we believe essential to the honor, the safety, the interests of the United States.

We declare it as a statement of fact, and we must have it recognized as our independence and national existence are recognized by all the world. It must be recognized, because we sustain and support it, and we can no more permit it to be a matter of discussions with other nations than we can afford to discuss with them our national welfare or our forms of government. It embodies for us the same principle as the balance of power so jealously

maintained by the nations of Europe. They will not allow that to be disturbed, and we hold to our balance of power with equal tenacity.

The Monroe Doctrine interferes in no wise with the rights which the principles of international law give to all nations. It does not touch the question of reparation for injuries inflicted upon the subjects of any European power by any of the Central or South American states. We cherish that right jealously ourselves; we do not deny it to others. * * *

The Monroe Doctrine * * * is merely the declaration that no foreign power must establish a new government, acquire new territory by purchase or force or by any method whatever, or seek to control existing governments in the Americas. That is the principle which Mr. Monroe declared. If there is any dispute as to the meaning of his language, it is not needful to dwell upon it. That is what the American people believed he meant. That is the way American statesmen have interpreted it, and that there may be no future misunderstanding, that is what we should declare it to be and have always been by this resolution.

Senator Lodge introduced, and the Senate passed, in 1912, a resolution known as the Lodge corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, which states that no new foreign naval or military stations can be established in America. I quote:

Resolved, That when any harbor or other place in the American continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another government, not American, as to give that government practical power of control for naval or military purposes.

I have before me a complete history of the Monroe Doctrine and its application, as compiled by the Library of Congress. Their conclusion is that Greenland, as a part of the Western Hemisphere, must be included in our application of the Monroe Doctrine.

Let me call special attention to the evidence we have found which clearly establishes the fact that England wants Greenland, and would seize it at the first opportunity.

GREAT BRITAIN WANTS GREENLAND

In 1917, when we purchased the Danish Virgin Islands, we turned over to Denmark all claims to Greenland which we had established by right of discovery and exploration.

In 1920, before Great Britain recognized the Danish sovereignty over Greenland, Great Britain asked that she have pre-emptive rights in receiving Greenland when and if Denmark wished to dispose of it.

Evidence of Britain's asking for these prior rights to Greenland, which would enable Britain to spread again her control in the Western Hemisphere, are contained in a letter from the Ambassador in Great Britain (Davis) to the Secretary of State. The letter, dated May 20, 1920, states:

Lord Curzon has informed Danish minister that the geographical position of Greenland makes the question of ownership a matter of great importance to the British Empire as a whole and to Canada in particular, and that His Majesty's Government therefore feel obliged to attach to their recognition of Danish sovereignty over it the condition that in the event of Denmark wishing to dispose of the territory she will grant the British Empire the right of pre-emption. Subject to this condition His Majesty's Government are prepared at once to recognize officially the sovereignty of Denmark over Greenland.

AMERICAN STATESMEN OBJECT TO FOREIGN ENCROACHMENTS

To this letter the American Secretary of State (Colby) replied in no uncertain terms. The letter, June 5, 1920, reads:

You may inform the foreign office that at the time the treaty cession of Danish West Indies was signed, August 4, 1916, the Government of United States declared that it would "not object to Danish Government extending their political and economic interests to the whole of Greenland."

The Government, however, is not disposed to recognize the existence in a third government of a right of preemption to acquire this territory if the Danish Government should desire to dispose of it, and accordingly reserves for future consideration what position it may take in the event of a specific proposal for such a transfer.

Charles Evans Hughes, now Chief Justice of the United States, declared that the United States would not recognize or tolerate a third foreign government in Greenland. I quote his letter to the Danish Minister—Brun—dated August 3, 1931:

In this connection, however, I desire to state that owing to the importance of its geographical position, this Government would not be disposed to recognize the existence in a third government of the right of preemption to acquire the interests of the Danish Government in this territory should the latter desire to transfer them.

Of recent date, Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS said before the House of Representatives, April 25, 1940:

To so declare our interest prevents any other government from taking possession of Greenland, an act which automatically forces us into difficulties with that government because of our responsibilities under the Monroe Doctrine.

I insert in the RECORD at this point, under the permission heretofore granted me, further matter prepared for me by the Library of Congress on the subject of Greenland.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE APPLICATION OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE TO GREENLAND

The Monroe Doctrine states:

"The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by European powers. * * * We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States * * *."—Bingham, Hiram. *The Monroe Doctrine*, an Obsolete Shibboleth, p. 3, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1915, (JX1425.B66).

GREENLAND AND ICELAND IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

By these express terms an attempt by a foreign power to extend its system of government to any portion of this hemisphere would be a contravention of the policy of the doctrine.

However, looking at this language, consideration must be given to what constitutes "this hemisphere." Although there are some inferences that Greenland is not in the Western Hemisphere as far as the application of this doctrine is concerned, the weight of authority would indicate otherwise. Col. Lawrence Martin, Chief of the Maps Division of the Library of Congress, states that—

"The international date line, as the western limit of the Western Hemisphere, solves the problem concerning Siberia, New Zealand, etc., and that the four departures from the meridian of 20° west longitude take care of the situation with respect to the Cape Verde Islands, the Azores, and northeastern Greenland, as well as the view of Stefansson with respect to Iceland * * *." (Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2188.)

This view places not only Greenland but also Iceland within the Western Hemisphere.

MONROE DOCTRINE NOT A DEAD LETTER

Another argument upon which it might be said that the Doctrine would not apply is the contention that the Monroe Doctrine is a dead letter, no longer effective. Senator Hiram Bingham in substantiation of this theory stated in 1913:

"The very words 'Monroe Doctrine' are fraught with a disagreeable significance from our neighbors' point of view. There is no one single thing, nor any group of things, that we could do to increase the chances of peace and harmony in the Western Hemisphere comparable with the definite statement that we have outgrown the Monroe Doctrine, that we realize that our neighbors in the New World are well able to take care of themselves, and that we shall not interfere in their politics or send arms into their territory, unless cordially invited to do so, and then only in connection with, and by the cooperation of, other members of the family." (Bingham, op. cit., p. 112.)

However, in a later paper Senator Bingham changed his position concerning the doctrine, saying:

"Since we are the only world power in the Western Hemisphere, our duty to ourselves, our desire to preserve our own institutions, and our own independence, as well as our duty to protect the other powers in this hemisphere against possible aggression on the part of European or Asiatic powers, and to prevent such powers from securing bases from which we or any other American republics might be successfully attacked, becomes evident. If Argentina, Brazil, and Chile were world powers, the problem would be different. But they are not yet world powers, nor are they likely to become such until they have followed a rough and rugged road and given proof of their faithful adherence to the cause of liberty as well as of their ability to take their place in world movements. Until such time we must not be accused of selfishness if we deem it our duty to maintain the Monroe Doctrine alone against all comers. (Hiram Bingham, *The Future of the Monroe Doctrine*, the Journal of International Relations, vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 397-398, April 1920.)

Citing the Monroe Doctrine, by T. B. Edgington, we find instances in which the United States has not interfered where colonization has been made in this hemisphere:

"There are a number of occasions in which the Monroe Doctrine has been asserted, and some occasions in which any assertion of it was omitted or neglected altogether.

"Geographers, in dividing the globe into hemispheres, have placed the dividing line 20° west of Greenwich. This throws all Europe and Africa and the greater part of Asia into the Eastern Hemisphere.

"The Western Hemisphere contains the continents of North and South America, Greenland, a part of Iceland, a part of Siberia, including a portion of Kamchatka and one-half of each of the polar regions. It also contains a large number of islands, some of which, like the West Indies, are near to us, while others are widely scattered.

"Among the distant islands of the Western Hemisphere may be mentioned the Cape Verde, the South Shetland, the Samoan group, the Hawaiian group, the Fiji group, and the New Zealand Islands. Some of the questions which present themselves to the American citizen and statesman are as to what the duties of the Government of the United States would be in respect to the Monroe Doctrine in its application to the colonization and government of these remote islands and sections. There are ice-bound regions so worthless in an economic point of view and so dreary in their isolation that our Government could feel no interest in them. There are islands of the Western Hemisphere so inconsequential and so remote from the lines of ocean traffic that our ships would never visit them. The question is, in case European governments should colonize these regions, some of which are inhabited by cannibals and naked savages, and should they, by their control and management, dedicate them to Christianity and to progress, would it be the duty of the United States to assert the Monroe Doctrine, and, if necessary, go to war with all Europe in its vindication? There can be but one answer to this question, and that a negative one.

"We will refer here briefly to some of the practices of this Government on this question, and in order to avoid partisan bias or prejudice take our illustrations from the practices of both the Democratic and Republican Parties.

"In the year 1840, during the administration of Martin Van Buren, the islands of New Zealand, and in 1871, during the administration of General Grant, the Fiji Islands, passed under the control of Great Britain. They were peopled by cannibals. Great Britain has colonized them and they are now the homes of industry, culture, and refinement.

"Here are two striking examples of the construction of the Monroe Doctrine in the same manner by the Government when respectively administered by each of the great political parties of the country. These two acts of colonization by Great Britain seem to have passed unnoticed by our Government. Not even so much as a protest was offered. The Fiji Island group passed under the dominion of Great Britain only 4 years after the expulsion of the French from Mexico." (T. B. Edgington, *The Monroe Doctrine*, pp. 302-303, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1904.)

The difference seems to be in the position of the territory under consideration. This may be seen from the resolution of Senator Lodge, which was supplemented to the policy of the United States Government.

LODGE COROLLARY TO MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. Lodge introduced into the Senate, July 31, 1912, Resolution 371 (which subsequently was passed), which read:

"When any harbor or other place in the American Continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another government, not American, as to give that government practical power of control for national purposes." (J. Reuben Clark, *Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine*, p. 176, December 17, 1928.)

If this outlook governs the applicability of the Doctrine to near or distant territories, Greenland would still be a subject of the Doctrine because of its nearness to the United States and its strategic position.

The question as to whether or not the Doctrine would apply to a transfer of Greenland from Denmark to Great Britain by mutual agreement has been considered. At the inception, the Doctrine presented to Congress by President Monroe in 1823 is silent as to the transfer of a colony from one European nation to another. It states only—

"* * * With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere." (See J. Reuben Clark, *Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine*, p. 180 (S. Doc. No. 114, 71st Cong., 2d sess.), and Albert Bushnell Hart, *The Monroe Doctrine: An Interpretation*, p. 74.)

However, the principle that such transfers should not be made had been suggested in 1803 and 1810. Prof. Dexter Perkins, the authority on the Monroe Doctrine, says in his study, *The Monroe Doctrine, 1826-67*, pages 33-94, that the "so-called no-transfer principle" of 1803-10 did not become engrafted to the doctrine until President Polk tied it up with the original doctrine in his message to Congress in 1845, when he stated:

"That it should be distinctly announced to the world as our settled policy that no future European colony or dominion shall with our consent be planted or established on any part of the North American Continent."

Apparently from this interpretation there is no waiver of the policy even for a transfer by mutual consent of the countries that are parties thereto.

It might be of significance to note that Greenland has in the past been within the scope of the interest of the United States. This may be seen from the declaration of Secretary of State Robert Lansing at the time the Virgin Islands were ceded to the United States by Denmark:

"DECLARATION

"In proceeding this day to the signature of the convention respecting the cession of the Danish West Indian Islands to the United States of America, the undersigned Secretary of State of the United States of America, duly authorized by his Government, has the honor to declare that the Government of the United States of America will not object to the Danish Government extending their political and economic interests to the whole of Greenland.

"ROBERT LANSING.

"New York, August 4, 1916."

GREAT BRITAIN WANTS GREENLAND

In 1920, before Great Britain recognized the Danish sovereignty over Greenland, the request was made asking that she have preemptive rights in receiving Greenland if Denmark wished to dispose of it. I quote:

"The Ambassador in Great Britain (Davis) to the Secretary of State
"LONDON, May 20, 1920.

"Lord Curzon has informed Danish Minister:

"That the geographical position of Greenland makes the question of ownership a matter of great importance to the British Empire as a whole, and to Canada in particular, and that His Majesty's Government therefore feel obliged to attach to their recognition of Danish sovereignty over it the condition that in the event of Denmark wishing to dispose of the territory she will grant the British Empire the right of preemption. Subject to this condition His Majesty's Government are prepared at once to recognize officially the sovereignty of Denmark over Greenland." Source: Papers relating to the foreign relations of the United States, 1922, page 1 [vol. II] Department of State Publications, No. 1156. Government Printing Office, 1933.

To this the American Secretary of State replied in certain terms:

"The Secretary of State to the Ambassador in Great Britain (Davis)

"WASHINGTON, June 5, 1920.

"You may inform the Foreign Office that at the time the treaty cession of Danish West Indies was signed, August 4, 1916, Government of United States declared that it would 'not object to Danish Government extending their political and economic interests to the whole of Greenland.'

"This Government, however, is not disposed to recognize the existence in a third government of a right of preemption to acquire this territory if the Danish Government should desire to dispose of it; and accordingly reserves for future consideration what position it may take in the event of a specific proposal for such a transfer.

"COLBY."

[Foreign Relations, op. cit., p. 2.]

In the same vein, Charles E. Hughes later made statements relative to the possibility of considering the transfer of Greenland to Great Britain:

"The Secretary of State to the Danish Minister (Brun)

"WASHINGTON, August 3, 1921,

"In this connection, however, I desire to state that owing to the importance of its geographical position, this Government would not be disposed to recognize the existence in a third government of the right of preemption to acquire the interests of the Danish Government in this territory should the latter desire to transfer them.

"CHARLES E. HUGHES."

Foreign Relations (op. cit., p. 3).

Contemporary interpretations of the applicability of the Monroe Doctrine accord largely with the view that a transfer or taking of Greenland by a foreign power would be a contravention of the policy. In a statement by Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS before Congress, she said:

"To so declare our interest prevents any other government from taking possession of Greenland, an act which automatically forces us into difficulties with that government because of our responsibilities under the Monroe Doctrine" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 25, 1940, p. 5054).

The present official statements regarding this problem are indicative of this same interpretation.

The President's press conference of April 12, 1940, is reported in the *New York Times*, page 3, column 1:

"The President told his press conference that all questions bearing on application of the Monroe Doctrine to Greenland were hypothetical and premature.

"Referring to the conversation, the President said he was entirely satisfied from a scientific standpoint that Greenland belonged more to the American Continent than to the European. He told of studying the encyclopedia and other works on Greenland, of having

talked with geologists and geographers. From earliest history and from the character of its flora and fauna, it appeared that the island belonged to the American Continent, Mr. Roosevelt said."

From the Department of State, we find:

"Secretary of State Cordell Hull also put aside all questions, such as regarding the possible future position of Greenland under the Monroe Doctrine and policies that this Government would follow toward Norway and Denmark, as premature." (New York Times, April 12, 1940, p. 3.)

There will undoubtedly be in the near future a further interpretation of the applicability of the Monroe Doctrine to Greenland. From the historical standpoint, the consensus of opinion would indicate that Greenland is one of the countries of the Western Hemisphere that comes within the policy of the doctrine. (M. M. Bennett, May 24, 1940.)

GREENLAND AND ICELAND

Mr. President, in the light of the Monroe Doctrine, and realizing the fact that it was conceived and established for the protection of the Americas from further encroachments of foreign powers into the Western Hemisphere, I wish to dwell at some length on Greenland and Iceland.

I have already placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15, 1939, fairly complete data on Greenland; and I want to say that at that time I was taken to task by eminent and distinguished Senators because I dared mention the subject of Greenland; yet now we are in a panic about Greenland. I think I am justified in calling our attention to the matter.

Before I proceed any further, let me call your attention to a map drawn by the National Geographic Society, an institution which has gained reputation as an authority on matters of geography. This map, available at the Library of Congress, places Greenland and Iceland within the Western Hemisphere.

GREENLAND—FACTS AND FIGURES

Greenland is American: Greenland belongs to the New World rather than to the Old for several reasons, among them that it is nearer to the continent of North America (Hebron, Labrador to Frederikshaab, W. Greenland, 510 statute miles) than to the continent of Europe (Scoresby Sound to Norway, 1,000 miles), that it is nearer to considerable American islands, such as Baffin (210 miles) and Ellesmere (20 miles) than to any considerable European islands, such as Scotland (950 miles) or Ireland (1,150 miles). When discovered by Europeans it was inhabited by people who had come from the mainland of America, Eskimo Indians.

CHARACTER OF GREENLAND

Interior Greenland is a mass of ice because there are coastal ranges on the east and the west which have captured the snow that makes up the Greenlandic Inland Ice, the only true ice cap now remaining in the northern hemisphere from the ice ages of the past. This ice mass rises somewhat abruptly, from the sea or from coastal lands which are snow-free in summer, to a height of 5,000 to 6,000 feet; and then almost imperceptibly inland to a height of 9,000 and 10,000 feet.

Having the ice there is no doubt in the main a drawback, but it has one important compensatory advantage—through it, interior Greenland is the largest and most nearly perfect airplane landing field in the northern hemisphere (to find anything larger and equally good you have to go to the snow fields of the Antarctic). The margins of the inland ice are crevassed, but there remains an interior plateau "as level as a billiard table" averaging a north-south length of 1,200 or 1,300 miles and an east-west width of 500 or 600 miles. The total length of Greenland from north to south is about 1,600 miles.

Although Greenland is 84 percent ice-covered, by recent estimates, the remaining 16 percent—which changes from winter snow to summer green, like the prairies of Dakota—amounts to about 118,000 square miles, which is more than the total area of the British Isles. The land is prairie in the sense that the prevailing vegetation is grasses and sedges, among them bluegrass and timothy; but it is not a true prairie except in a few places, for most parts are rugged.

There is far more snow-free land each summer near the low north tip of Greenland than near the high south tip; for Greenland snow does not last from one year to the next

except in the mountains, or where it has gathered upon a nearby mountain and slid out upon the lowland as a glacier.

Glaciers feed into many of the fjords of Greenland, producing icebergs that drift seaward and are a menace to navigation. There are in Greenland, however, a number of fjords which are not reached by glaciers. Which they are can be seen readily from any of the good new maps; for instance, from the 1937 map published by the Geodaetisk Institut of Copenhagen. These fjords are generally suitable for naval bases, including submarine bases.

CLIMATE

Much of the coastal climate of Greenland is comparable to that of Nome, Alaska—there are parts of the coast which are less barred with ice during winter, others that are more barred, and the north coast inaccessible to ship the whole year. The lowest temperatures taken on the Greenland coast are about like the lowest recorded in New York State and Minnesota. No records yet taken on the Greenland coast are as low as the lowest for Havre, Mont., and Riverside, Wyo.

Aviation: Most authorities seem to agree that flying conditions average good for the year in the northern two-thirds of Greenland, deteriorating southward and being worst at the south tip. However, flight conditions are probably not so bad on the average the year around even in southern Greenland as they are around most coasts of Newfoundland. The very best Greenland flying is probably in Peary Land. Scoresby Sound is recognized as good, and that is about 1,000 miles from Norway; the southwest coast is good between Godthaab and Holsteinsborg. It is some 500 miles from Godthaab to Labrador and a little more from Holsteinsborg to Labrador. Flight conditions are not so good right out on the seacoast where the towns are located, but much better 25 and 50 miles up different fjords. This statement is the average opinion of those who have studied Greenland and would perhaps amount to saying that in winter a strip of coastal land 30 to 50 miles wide would be comparable in average flying conditions to a similar strip along the coast of Maine—except, of course, that Maine is forested inland while Greenland is prairie. In some places the snow-free land on the Greenland west coast is as much as 125 miles wide.

Generally speaking, the coast of Greenland is not well suited to flying boats because there float around in the water ice fragments which, although not a danger to ships, would be a danger to flying boats. Airplanes operating out of Greenland would therefore be chiefly land planes. It is considered, however, that pontoon planes can descend upon the inland ice and take off again with ease and safety. Whether a flying boat could take off similarly from a level snow surface is debated.

NAVIGATION

The ship commerce of the Danes customarily begins during March, reaching then only the southwest coast, and continues on that coast until during October. The season appears to be shorter the farther up you go on the west coast, when once you get north of Disko.

It has been considered that the only feasible ship cultivation of the east coast is around midsummer; but this statement is for small ships not particularly designed for ice work. If there were in use around Greenland craft of the style and size used by the Soviet Union for its northern work, the southern half of the west coast of Greenland could probably be supplied, whether for peace or war, every week during the year. It seems likely also that ships of that type could reach the east coast of Greenland even in winter, though perhaps not at all times.

However, it is not meant that battleships, cruisers, and such ships could work in and out of Greenland harbors in winter—merely that ships could bring in during winter supplies for carrying on airplane or submarine work. For submarines it may even prove that the harbor ice is in winter an advantage, for battleships could not approach near enough to submarine bases to shell them, while the submarines themselves could work freely through submerging in an inner basin artificially kept free from ice, not

taking the surface again until well at sea. (These are not the average views of naval authorities; but they are views strongly held by some good submarine men, both in Europe and America.)

THE HUMAN SITUATION

The current population of Greenland is about 20,000, all but a few hundred, Eskimos. However, many of these Eskimos would remind you, to look at them, more of Will Rogers or Vice President Curtis than of that Chinese type which is typically Eskimo. Natives are self-supporting, so far as food and native-style fuel is concerned, although it is no doubt safer to have a small backlog of staples, cereals, with a few extras to fall back upon in case of local hard luck in hunting on a given fjord.

If a humanely managed limited-profit trading company were to operate in the future somewhat as the Royal Danish Trading Co. has done in the past, Greenland, as it now stands, would just about pay its way.

RESOURCES

No doubt the chief resource of Greenland is the exceptional rich ocean which surrounds it. Through suitable cultivation, seals, walrus, and other mammals will produce not merely local food but a great deal for export of that fat which, through such methods as those of Denmark, makes margarine so fine that it takes an expert to distinguish it from butter. Then there are in the sea the ordinary North Atlantic fishes. Experimental fishing by the Faroese on the southwest coast of Greenland has demonstrated in recent years the commercial feasibility of developing the industry along lines similar to those of the Newfoundland Banks.

Although there has been export of cryolite, marble, and a few other things, the chief known resource of the land is grazing. Sheep did well in the Middle Ages, when the Norsemen were there, and they are doing well again now—it appears to be a mistake to think that Greenland climate is more severe than it used to be in pre-Columbian times. Then a reindeer industry could be developed similar to that of Lapland. Caribou are, of course, the same animal as reindeer, only with a different name—we call them reindeer if they are domestic and caribou if they are wild; and caribou were found in large numbers both on the east and west coasts formerly. They have been exterminated in some parts by the Eskimos, a few survive in others.

HISTORY

Greenland, visible from Iceland, was sighted by colonists bound for Iceland around 900. It was first extensively explored by Icelanders during the years 908–985, and colonized by some 400 of them who came to the southwest coast in 14 ships during the summer 986. A republic was established about 990. The National Parliament of Greenland adopted Christianity in the year 1000, and the Roman Church was in contact with Greenland thereafter, so that bishops of Greenland were still holding office when Columbus sailed, the last bishop dying in Europe during 1537. The last published official reference to the Greenland Church was by Pope Alexander VI who wrote about it in the winter of 1492, about when Columbus was starting back from the West Indies.

EARLY COLONIZATION

The colonies along the southern half of the west coast of Greenland had eventually a maximum population of about 10,000, according to Professor Finnur Jonsson, of the University of Copenhagen, a foremost authority on the history of Greenland. They had 16 churches, a monastery, a nunnery, and 290 farms. They cultivated sheep specially, but archaeologists have examined stable ruins which show stalls for 100 cows.

Sailings between Europe and Greenland may or may not have ceased completely around 1500 or 1520—on this, see the Stefansson and McCaskill 130-page introduction to *The Three Voyages of Martin Frobisher*, London, 1938, which summarizes most of the known evidence.

There are two theories of what eventually happened to the Europeans of Greenland. The view is held by many Danes that they became extinct through a combination of causes, while many Norwegians, among them Fridtjof Nan-

sen, consider that the people did not die out, but only their culture—that they intermarried with the Eskimos and became Eskimo in ways of life. Some scholars of other lands follow the Danes and so do a few Norwegians; foreign scholars frequently, and Danes occasionally, side with the Norwegian (Nansen) school.

Danish control of Greenland is usually dated from the arrival there of the Norwegian-born missionary, Hans Egede, in 1722.

Denmark has one of the most creditable records, perhaps the most creditable, in modern history for the relation of a white people with a native race. They have administered Greenland wholly from the point of view of the Eskimos—the interests of individual Danes, or of Denmark as a whole, always being subordinated to what was considered to be the welfare of the natives. Incidentally, what change in policy toward Indians, including the Alaska Eskimos, which there has been during the administration of Mr. Ickes, has been largely in the direction of profiting by the Danish Greenland example.

Admiral Peary, the great explorer of the north region, and through whose explorations we established claims to Greenland, foresaw trouble if an enemy occupied Greenland. I had intended to read extracts from an article written by him in 1916. They are incorporated in an article written by his daughter, Marie Peary Stafford, of Washington, D. C. It is a very able article, and I regret that the hour is so late. Therefore, I will not inflict upon the Senate the reading of the article but will place it in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 21, 1940]

PEARY, IN 1916, FORESAW TROUBLE IF ENEMY OCCUPIED GREENLAND—EXPLORER POINTED OUT VALUE OF DEEP FJORDS IN NAVAL OPERATIONS AND ISLAND AS AIR BASE

(By Marie Peary Stafford)

In view of Germany's complete absorption of Denmark, various questions arise regarding the Danish colony of Greenland.

First of all, what effect on the United States and the rest of the world would a possible Nazi occupation of Greenland have? Second, did the United States overlook an opportunity when, in 1916, we traded to Denmark our rights in Greenland, plus \$25,000,000 for the Danish West Indies? And, lastly, what effect would German rule and the breaking of relations with a benevolent Danish Government have on the sturdy race of Eskimos which has so long and so peaceably inhabited this vast island?

The first two of these questions are partly answered by an article written by Rear Admiral Robert E. Peary in 1916, before the negotiations had been completed. Although the claims of the United States to the northern part of Greenland were based on the explorations and discoveries of a series of American explorers, among them Kane, Hall, Hayes, and Greeley, Peary's work was by far the most extensive. He twice transected the northern part of Greenland and by his journeys along the northern shore determined its insularity. Therefore, it may be supposed that he wrote with knowledge and authority.

The following is a quotation from his article:

"Greenland is the largest island in the world. Its total length from Cape Farewell, its southern extremity, in latitude 60° N., to Cape Morris Jesup, its northern extremity, in latitude 83° N., is in round numbers 1,500 miles, almost exactly the same length as the United States on the ninety-seventh meridian, from the mouth of the Rio Grande to where our northern boundary crosses the Red River of the North.

"LARGE AS EASTERN UNITED STATES

"The greatest width of Greenland is about the same distance as from New York to St. Louis. In regard to its area, the figures of various authorities vary widely. It may be sufficient to say that as regards area it can be grouped in size with the United States east of the Mississippi, Alaska, Mexico, Colombia, Persia, or Portuguese West Africa. Its interior is covered with a great sheet of ice rising to elevations of probably 10,000 feet in places and several thousand feet in thickness. The available ice-free land is a strip of varying width along the coast, intersected by numerous deep fjords.

"When one turns the pages of American Arctic exploration, Greenland is found more or less intimately associated during over 60 years with all American expeditions except the Jeannette expedition. Americans have lifted nearly all its northern and northwestern coasts out of the Arctic night and fog and have twice crossed its northern part. American names stud its coasts and the name of an American marks its northern extremity, the most northern known land in the world.

"Geographically Greenland belongs to North America and the Western Hemisphere, over which we have formally declared a sphere of influence by our Monroe Doctrine. Its possession by us will be in line with the Monroe Doctrine and will eliminate one

more possible source of future complications for us from European possession of territory in the Western Hemisphere. Will turning Greenland over to Denmark now mean our repurchase of it later, or will obtaining it now mean closing the incident and placing Greenland where it must ultimately belong?

"TRADE WITH PHILADELPHIA

"Greenland is comparatively near to us. For years American ships have conveyed cryolite from the Ivigtut mines to Philadelphia. There is coal and cryolite, probably graphite and mica, possibly gold, in its rocks. With our unlimited means it may, like Alaska, prove a sound and most valuable business investment. The abundance of native coal and the numerous glacial streams which come tumbling into the southern fjords from the great interior ice sheet represent enormous potential energy which might be translated into nitrate and electrical energy, to make Greenland a powerhouse for the United States. Greenland represents ice, coal, and power in inexhaustible quantities.

"And stranger things have happened than that Greenland, in our hands, might furnish an important North Atlantic naval and aeronautical base. A North Pacific naval base for the United States in the Aleutian Archipelago is a recognized possibility. Why not a similar base in the North Atlantic? Cape Farewell in Greenland is but little north of Sitka. It is in the same latitude as St. Petersburg, Christiania, Great Britain's naval base in the Orkneys, and the northern entrance to the North Sea, which Great Britain has patrolled with her warships, incessantly now, summer and winter, for 2 years.

"There are fjords in southern Greenland which would hold the entire Navy, with deep, narrow, impregnable entrances. Thirty hours' steaming due south from Cape Farwell by 35-knot war craft would put them in the trans-Atlantic lanes midway between New York and the British channel. With the rapid shrinkage of distance in this age of speed and invention, Greenland may be of crucial importance to us in the future.

"The present war has shown most strikingly how far-flung may be the regions having a bearing on the struggle. Great Britain's coaling station in the Falklands spelled destruction for Germany's squadron of commerce destroyers. Russia's port of Archangel has been an invaluable gateway for her. Greenland in our hands may be a valuable piece of our defensive armor. In the hands of a hostile interest it could be a serious menace."

Today, 25 years after the above article was written, the points made in it seem so farsighted as to be almost prophetic. By a wise and kindly system of government Denmark has developed a fur and ivory trade with Greenland, which has been immensely valuable. Her chief source of income from this colony, however, has been in the working of the cryolite mines. Although cryolite occurs, to a limited extent in the Ilmen Mountains, at Pikes Peak, and in the Yellowstone, it is in such small quantities that it might almost be said to be found exclusively at Ivigtut. It is of great economic importance and among its many uses is that of a flux for aluminum.

But it is not the potential wealth which we inadvertently let slip through our fingers which concerns us most at the present time. Lindbergh, when he landed in Greenland, commented on the fact that the inland ice made an ideal landing field for planes. With a German air base established in Greenland, what of Canada, and, as far as that goes, what of the United States, since neutrals apparently are not respected except when convenient? It is being demonstrated every day that the fjords of Norway make ideal hiding places for destroyers and battleships. The fjords of Greenland are very similar to those of Norway. With a German submarine base in Greenland, what of shipping and the seacoast towns of Canada and the United States?

PROBLEM OF WHITE INHABITANTS

Looking at a possible Nazi occupation of Greenland from a slightly less personal and selfish point of view, what is to happen to the people of Greenland? Are the Eskimos, who have survived privations, hunger, and rigors of the climate to go down before a ruthless invasion of civilization?

There is still another point to consider. Suppose the Germans are prevented from making any strategic use of Greenland. How much better off will her people be? It would probably be only a short time before the Eskimos themselves would learn to do without the luxuries and delicacies to which they have become accustomed through years of contact with the white man. Tea, sugar, ship's biscuit, even tobacco can be foregone if necessary, and the Eskimos would revert to the simple, healthy, carefree lives which they led before they knew of a world beyond their own snow-covered domain. But there are white people living in Greenland, not just explorers—although there is at least one Danish expedition in the field at present—but Danes who make their homes there as teachers, missionaries, doctors, governors, and nurses. They are more or less dependent on supplies and medicines from the outside world.

If Germany allows no ships to leave Denmark, who is to take care of these people? Outside of the Danes themselves and the Dundee whalers, long extinct in Arctic waters, and a rapidly diminishing handful of navigators, few people know the waters and ice conditions surrounding Greenland well enough to take a ship there.

Perhaps airplanes will be the answer, and perhaps the answer will be that history can and does repeat itself. In the fourteenth century, what had been a fairly prosperous Scandinavian colony

in Greenland disappeared completely, and the manner of its disappearance is still one of the mysteries of the Arctic upon which learned men ponder and write articles. Some say it was due to a break-down of commerce with Europe and the consequent impossibility of obtaining what, for Europeans, would have been the essentials of life. Others maintain that the colonists, no longer having behind them the moral support of contact with the outside world, were murdered by the Eskimos. There are several other theories, but no one knows what actually happened, except that the colony, men, women, and children, disappeared completely and forever. Is it possible that this could happen again?

After giving these various matters careful consideration, it may be borne in upon us that Peary spoke truly when, in the same article already quoted, he said:

"Would it not be better if the treaty provisions as to Greenland were reversed and the bargain should take the form of Denmark transferring to us her rights in Greenland and giving us the Danish West Indies and Greenland for \$25,000,000?"

Mr. President, under the permission heretofore given me, I place in the RECORD at this point two articles concerning the value of Greenland to America from the point of aviation and economics.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune of May 8, 1940]

GREENLAND IN AVIATION PICTURE

Army, Navy, and diplomatic officials are hurriedly imbibing all the scanty information available on Greenland, Iceland, and the American far north. Belatedly they have come to a realization that the polar region may be of vital strategic significance to aviation.

Thomas Burke, the energetic chief of the State Department's Division of International Communications, has been a couple of jumps ahead of his colleagues on this score. His office deals with the foreign aspects of American flying. Some time prior to the German conquest of Denmark and the subsequent general interest in Greenland, he enlisted the services of Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the noted polar authority, to get a "fill-in" on flying conditions in the Arctic area. They are rather different from popular assumptions.

Greenland is more than 80 percent covered by ice. But this ice, so far from being a handicap, is a help to aviation. It provides a vast and almost perfect emergency landing field. Moreover, its climate is one of the best in the world for flying. Save at the margins of the inland ice, fogs and blizzards are extremely rare. Danger from the icing of plane wings is held to be virtually negligible. According to Stefansson, there is less danger in blind or other descents on this enormous landing field than anywhere else in the northern hemisphere. He, along with other experts who have studied it, looks upon Greenland as a safety zone, instead of a barrier, for great circle flights over the polar regions as, for example, from Chicago to Moscow or from San Francisco to Berlin.

In view of what has been learned, aside from the significance of the area in wartimes, it may well be that the intercontinental airways of the future will be over the roof of the world, rather than by the more southerly route over the open Atlantic.

To military men, however, Greenland begins to look like an indispensable bastion for the defense of North America.

GOLD AND SILVER IN GREENLAND ENOUGH TO PAY DENMARK'S NATIONAL DEBT

At a meeting recently held in Viby in Denmark, arranged by the society Open Greenland, a man who has been occupied with Greenland matters for 30 years, Valdmars Madsen, advanced the startling information that fantastically rich gold and silver outcroppings are to be found in Greenland. Mr. Madsen, among other things, made the statement:

"I permit myself to advance the fact that gold and silver sufficiently rich to quickly pay the entire Danish national debt is located at a certain place in Greenland."

It is possible that the field may be yet larger than perhaps even the world's richest field. I can prove my contention and I believe that the prime minister, who never misses a chance to heap contempt upon us, now ought to give me permission to go to Greenland this summer so that I may be able to document the correctness of my arguments with gold in my hands. I therefore hope that the Greenland Administration will favorably receive my application for permission to enter, which I already have sent in.

A Copenhagen newspaper has submitted the matter to the almighty Greenland Administration, which, with short shrift, has turned thumbs down on the project of Mr. Madsen who, incidentally, is a master baker by profession. He will not be granted the opportunity to place his feet on Greenland's soil unless a scientific expedition of 20 members jointly with the Greenland Administration may find him worthy for the undertaking. And there is little possibility that this will ever happen in the "democratic" Denmark of today.

As previously mentioned in this paper, Greenland is to be subjected to a systematic exploration this and the ensuing summers.

Source: Norrona, Winnipeg, Canada, May 25, 1939. Translated by A. W. Nelson.

GREENLAND TEMPERATURES

Mr. President, I shall place in the RECORD a brief table drawn up by the Navy Department giving the comparative temperatures of cities in the United States and various harbors of Greenland and Iceland. It is interesting to note that the January temperature of Duluth, Minn., is 10 degrees below the lowest temperatures for any of the listed cities of Greenland and Iceland. Duluth is in my home State, and is situated at the head of Lake Superior. The annual temperature of Duluth is only 11 degrees above the lowest annual temperature of any Greenland or Iceland harbor listed; whereas we have been led to believe, because we hear the words "Iceland" and "Greenland" associated with a great ice cap, that, of course, no human being can live there, and no life can exist there.

The table is as follows:

Temperatures and precipitation in Greenland and Iceland

Place	Average temperature, degrees Fahrenheit			Precipitation (inches per year)
	January	July	Annual	
Boston, Mass.....	28	72	50	43
New York, N. Y.....	31	74	52	43
Seattle, Wash.....	40	64	51	31
San Francisco, Calif.....	50	59	56	22
Duluth, Minn.....	9	65	39	28
St. Paul, Minn.....	12	72	44	27
South Iceland, Reykjavik.....	32	52	40	154
North Iceland, Grimsey.....	28	45	35	11
Greenland:				
Angmagsalik.....	17	44	29	36
Ivigut.....	19	50	33	45
Godthaab.....	14	44	28	24

¹ At Vestmano.

Due to the fact that all the stations in Iceland and Greenland are coastal stations they have a maritime climate. The temperature range from winter to summer is not great and changes at a fairly regular rate; compare for example with Duluth. Precipitation is comparable to maritime stations in the United States, except in northern Iceland where it is markedly reduced.

SHOULD WE BUY GREENLAND?

Mr. President, permit me to call the attention of the Senate to an article in Harper's magazine of May 1940, entitled "Should We Buy Greenland?" written by Earl P. Hanson, also a noted authority on the Arctic regions.

Of particular importance is the following statement by him:

One significant difference between the epidemic of flights over the Greenland-Iceland route and the similar one over the open and much stormier Atlantic, was that while dozens drowned in the Atlantic, nobody was even hurt along the more northerly route. Cramer and Pacquette, its only casualties, were drowned in the North Sea in 1931 after successfully flying the route and reaching the Shetlands.

Of Iceland he says:

In Washington Army men scaled off their maps and discovered that Iceland comes within the thousand-mile limit, that Greenland is closer yet, that Greenland is visible from Iceland, Canada from Greenland, that the latter's ice cap is the world's largest and finest natural landing field for airplanes.

I urge all Senators to read this article by Earl P. Hanson, which I place in the RECORD under the permission already granted me.

The article is as follows:

SHOULD WE BUY GREENLAND?

(By Earl P. Hanson)

Rumors have recently appeared in the papers that the United States is thinking of buying Greenland from Denmark. For the time being they will probably come to nothing; this is an election year, and the storm that was once raised over the purchase of "Seward's folly" on the other side of the continent showed that there is political dynamite in the purchase of a supposed mere "useless" clump of arctic ice and snow. Nevertheless, to those who have for years labored tooth and nail for the awakening of public consciousness to the real value of the polar regions in general and the Arctic in particular, our eventual acquisition of Greenland seems almost inevitable.

Seemingly farfetched as an isolated venture, the possible purchase of Greenland begins to take on a measure of sense when considered together with: (1) Our present national efforts in relation to turbulent world affairs; (2) the past 15 years of stirring history in the polar regions; and (3) a glance at a terrestrial globe instead of one of those confounded Mercator projection maps that lose themselves in infinite space when they reach the far north and south.

The recent war in Finland's Arctic is only one of many indications that the world's thinking and pushing have lately marched into the polar regions with seven-league boots. Our own Government expedition to Antarctica is an indication that Washington is not unaware of that movement. In two previous Harper articles—*Geography Goes Fluid*, and *Stefansson: 20 Years After*—I have tried to make clear that the polar regions are no longer the ends of the earth; they have become parts of the "inhabited" world, to be included in the inhabited world's political, economic, strategic thinking. How much closer that brings us to Greenland is immediately apparent from a consideration of our major efforts elsewhere.

DEFENSE OF THE WEST

Predominant in our national consciousness today is the thought that we must not only stay out of the modern Thirty Years' War, but must take the lead in doing everything possible to keep the whole Western Hemisphere out of it. The world has shrunk; we are directly concerned with everything that concerns our half of it, and our defense is in a large measure the defense of the West. Military men have proclaimed the principle that modern advances in aviation demand that we prevent the establishment of an air base by any possibly hostile foreign power within a thousand miles, not of the United States proper, but of the North American continent as a whole.

In the north we are showing a fast-growing awareness of Alaska. In 1935 the War Department quietly commissioned Stefansson—by far the world's greatest authority on all things pertaining to the Arctic—to prepare a guide to the Far North and a manual on how our soldiers might get about there and take care of themselves; the war in Finland was an indication of their foresight.

Then, last year, came the Interior Department's famous Slattery report, demanding that something be done about the development of our northern territory. At about the same time the Army and the Navy announced their desire to make Alaska "the most highly fortified region on earth." All that is not done merely to protect the reindeer industry, the salmon fisheries, and Charley Brower's collection of picturesque Eskimos at Point Barrow. It is done in the realization that Alaska is one of the gateways to the American continent, and that its development and defense would safeguard us against aggression from a whole 14 points of the compass, ranging from the north, through the west, to the southwest.

GREENLAND IN THE PICTURE

So Greenland comes into the picture. Balanced against Alaska, on the other side of the continent, it controls the approaches from the north, northeast, and east.

A few years ago such reasoning would have been laughed out of court. The supposedly terrible Arctic was a natural barrier, fit only for the sporting antics of Robert W. Service's heroes and the press agents' intrepid explorer clients, doing dangerous things for science, the movies, and the newspapers. In previous articles I have told something of the course of events and observations through which that illusion was gradually dispelled. Here we need only remember that in 1927 Wilkins made three safe airplane landings on the supposedly forbidding ice of the Arctic Sea; that Wilkins, Amundsen, Byrd, and Nobile all agreed that this sea is remarkably free from storms and not nearly so bitter cold as most people had thought; that there has been an epidemic of land and air expeditions to Greenland to study conditions there, Pan American Airways being especially interested and seeking concessions in 1932; that in 1937 the Russians landed four heavy freight planes not only at the North Pole but all over the floating ice as well, between there and Siberia, and sent two planes on successful nonstop flights to our west coast; and that later Wilkins conducted a 33,000-mile search for Levanovsky, in fall and in the dead of winter, over the very heart of the Polar Sea, and as a matter of everyday unheralded routine.

So the Greenland icecap and the floating ice of the Arctic Sea, although indisputable barriers to surface transport, and therefore natural protections against naval attack, have been revealed as positive boons to aircraft loaded with the materials of peace and war. One significant difference between the epidemic of flights over the Greenland-Iceland route and the similar one over the open and much stormier Atlantic, was that while dozens drowned in the Atlantic, nobody was even hurt along the more northerly route. Cramer and Pacquette, its only casualties, were drowned in the North Sea in 1931, after successfully flying the route and reaching the Shetlands.

Greenland, which faces the Arctic Sea in one direction, and toward Europe in another, is rapidly being changed from a barrier into a gateway to our continent. Those Americans who want to buy it want only to be sure that we can close it, when and if necessary, against undesirable aliens bearing bombs.

VIKING ROUTE

Two reports came over the wires recently that make the potential acquisition of Greenland a matter of more urgent interest. One came from Iceland in March 1939; the other, more recently, came from Canada.

The report from Iceland, since it concerns the Germans, requires a little preliminary explanation. In 1928 an old-time barnstorming flier named Bert ("Fish") Hassell got the idea that he would like to fly from Rockford, Ill., to his ancestral home of Sweden by way of the old Viking route. He came to New York to talk to Stefansson about it. I was privileged to get into things, having just returned from a trip to Iceland to investigate the route's possibilities there. We urged him to look for good weather by keeping well north, near the Arctic Circle, and to remember that the Greenland ice cap,

inside its serrated edges, is as flat as a billiard table and about as hard.

Hassell and Cramer started out, aiming for the Greenland fjord where Hobbs, of the University of Michigan, had prepared a landing field for them. Something went wrong with their navigation, and they hit Greenland too far south. For safety's sake they headed for the interior, ran out of gas, made a safe landing on the ice cap, and spent some 10 days walking out into Hobbs' arms—the first men ever to walk out from a forced landing in the middle of a trans-Atlantic flight. That failure to fly to Sweden gave them opportunity to study Greenland conditions in detail and convinced them of the feasibility of the route.

Over here we saw only the failure; in Germany they recognized the success. Hassell and Cramer were taken to Copenhagen on a Danish ship, together with the University of Michigan expedition. They no sooner got there than an invitation came from Berlin to go down and talk things over. Cramer and Hobbs accepted and went to Berlin to talk about Greenland in glowing terms while officials of the Lufthansa were all ears. It would be foolish to imply that the Americans were the first to make the Germans aware of Greenland's possibilities; but the fact that they called Hobbs and Cramer to Berlin for a conference does indicate the intensity of their alert interest. After that conference the Germans got busy.

The next year, in 1929, the Lufthansa went to Iceland and told its people that it was too bad that they didn't have internal aviation across their own country. (The Germans, who would have loved an air and submarine base near Reykjavik in the last war and the present one, have long had a touching concern for the physical and spiritual progress of the Icelanders.) One thing led to another, and so the Flugfjelag Islands, the Icelandic Aviation Co., was founded, with the Germans owning the major part of the stock. It didn't make money and was dissolved in a few years. But that was a minor matter. The Icelanders, Cramer, and some of the rest of us, were pretty certain that all the Germans wanted was control of the Greenland-Iceland route through control of its focal point. Sure enough, when they went to Iceland last year to make some rather terrifying demands, they invoked an obscure most-favored-nation clause that they had slipped into their contract of 10 years before. Fortunately the Icelanders found a loophole in the contract, by means of which they could legally refuse Hitler.

GERMAN FLIGHTS OVER GREENLAND AND ICELAND

The German flier, Von Gronau, made two flights between Europe and America over Greenland and Iceland. Publicly, he said over here that the route was no good, but it is well known that his official report to Berlin said just the opposite. The eminent German scientist, Alfred Wegener, made two important expeditions to Greenland, making a thorough study of conditions along the edges and on top of the ice-cap. He died up there—of heart failure (he was an elderly man)—but the results of his work are of extreme significance nevertheless.

Hitler has long been interested in Iceland, strategically located only about 600 miles from Britain's northern exposure. For years he has managed a cultural infiltration there that included teaching the Icelanders the grand sport of gliding. If the modern descendants of the Vikings took to the sport with uproarious enthusiasm they were not unaware that Hitler's altruism in bringing it to them also enabled him to take back home a thorough knowledge of Iceland's entire terrain, including the location of every possible landing field. Then, about a year ago, their suspicions were justified.

With a gunboat in nearby waters "to inspect German fisheries," a German commission suddenly appeared in Reykjavik to demand that Iceland give Germany an air base, together with exclusive aviation privileges. The resounding "no" with which the little nation of a hundred and thirty thousand unarmed and unprotected citizens told the bogeyman of Europe to go to hell deserves to be recorded as one of the most courageous acts in modern history, but it didn't prevent a flurry of apprehension here in America.

In Canada the Dominion Government suddenly realized that the establishment of air power in Iceland would put Germany within striking distance of Quebec, Montreal, and Ottawa—with Greenland, so far from intervening as a barrier, serving as a stepping-stone. In Washington, Army men scaled off their maps and discovered that Iceland comes within the 1,000-mile limit, that Greenland is closer yet, that Greenland is visible from Iceland, Canada from Greenland, that the latter's ice-cap is the world's largest and finest natural landing field for airplanes, and that things were getting a little too close for comfort. There perhaps was born the present-day thought that it might be well for us to purchase Greenland.

AIR ATTACK FROM THE NORTH

Then, recently, the report was published in the Saturday Evening Post that the Canadian Government is considering the establishment of aerial arctic patrols stretching from Labrador to Alaska, because the Russian trans-Polar flights proved this continent to be vulnerable to air attack from the north. The fact that such attack must come via the Arctic Sea may also have something to do with the possible purchase of Greenland. The northernmost part of that island, beautiful, low-lying Peary Land, discovered and explored by Americans, covered with grass, flowers, grass-hoppers, and bumblebees in summer, dominates the Polar Sea because it is closer to the Pole than any other land.

Today's rapidly changing ideas about those matters are well illustrated by a couple of conversations that I had in recent years with the famous Canadian, Air Commodore Herbert Hollick-Kenyon.

CANADIAN ARCTIC PRAIRIES

A sane and able technician, one of Canada's oldest and foremost fliers, Hollick-Kenyon has for some 15 years played a leading part in the Dominion's northward expansion by air. Thousands of miles of routine flying to the Arctic coast had convinced him that there is nothing to stop commercial and military aviation in any part of Canada's North at any time of year, summer or winter, except that there are some special short-term difficulties during spring break-up and fall freeze-up. But, like many Canadian fliers, he was nevertheless sure that only fliers near the lunatic fringe would venture out over the Arctic Sea or the Greenland ice cap.

I met him shortly after his return from Antarctica, where he had flown Lincoln Ellsworth part of the way from Graham Land to Little America, and walked with him the rest of the way. He dismissed that expedition with the pertinent remark that he had had much tougher jobs on the Canadian Arctic prairies. Then he added: "Sort of makes you think, though. Now I know that I've been all wrong about Greenland. Antarctica is just like the Greenland ice cap, only larger. Since the job was so easy down there, the Greenland-Iceland flying route may well be by far the best between Europe and America except for the southern one by way of the Azores, and it's much shorter than that."

BETTER FLYING CONDITIONS

That was one significant change of mind, but still Hollick-Kenyon thought that all this talk about flying over the Polar Sea was pure nonsense insofar as any commercial or military implications were concerned. Then Wilkins hired him, in the fall and winter of 1937, to help search for Levanovsky over the very "pole of inaccessibility." On that remarkable job, that covered a distance in the farthest north equivalent to one and a third times around the world at its thickest part, Hollick-Kenyon discovered that flying conditions are not only better in the polar winter, by moonlight, than in summer, but that they are apt to be better at any time of year than at the same time over the northern Canadian mainland, which he had long come to regard as the flyer's natural habitat.

When he returned he said to me: "If the Russians are crazy for talking about an air line from Moscow to San Francisco by way of the Pole, then we Canadians should have been put in padded cells long ago for flying millions of miles and carrying 10 times as many millions of pounds of freight and passengers all over our north in the last 10 years or so. One of these days that story is going to break, and somebody is going to do something about it."

According to recent reports, the story seems just about to break, and the United States seems on the verge of doing something very realistic about it.

SEWARD—ALASKA AND GREENLAND

This is not the first time by any means that Washington has given thought to the acquisition of Greenland, though it may well come close to being the last insofar as this time the thought may be translated into positive action. In 1867, having won the Civil War to the chagrin of England which had sided with the South, Seward spent \$7,200,000 of the taxpayers' money on the purchase of Alaska from Russia. He burned his fingers on it too, as on dry ice, because the public couldn't see any value in that "useless" expanse of Arctic wastes. Nothing daunted, he turned to Denmark and made arrangements for the purchase of the Virgin Islands, which for some reason came to nothing for 50 years. Then he turned his attention to the acquisition of Greenland and Iceland—which in those days were both Danish colonies.

The State Department's "A report on the resources of Iceland and Greenland," compiled by Benjamin Mills Peirce, is rare today but can still be found. It was prepared at Seward's request as the first step toward purchase and is an excellent summary of everything then known about those lands. It mentions Greenland's low-lying fringe of grassy meadows, beech and willow, where the ancient Norsemen had once maintained a sheep- and cattle-raising culture for some four centuries, and which today is known to have an aggregate snow-free [in summer] area bigger than England. It goes into what little was then known about Greenland's enormous resources, coal, cryolite, with "indications [since proven] of great mineral wealth." It deals at length with the island's vast store of marine and land animal wealth.

BRITAIN VS. GREENLAND

Most revealing, however, from the historical point of view, is the main reason given for urging the purchase of Greenland. In his letter of transmittal to Seward, Benjamin Walker says: "The proof has heretofore been submitted by me, that the government, recently established in British America, called the Dominion of Canada, was gotten up by England in a spirit of bitter hostility to the United States. * * * By this purchase (of Alaska) we have flanked British America on the Arctic and the Pacific. * * * Now, the acquisition of Greenland will flank British America for thousands of miles on the north and east, and greatly increase her inducements, peacefully and cheerfully to become part of the American Union."

Today there is no need to induce Canada to join us, but there is need to make common cause with her for the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

The political entity that Seward wanted to buy in Greenland was the southern half. The northern half was terra incognita, far less well known than any part of Antarctica is now. Petermann, the world's leading geographer, thought that it reached across the Pole and down the other side, ending in what is now known to be Wrangel Island. Hence, if Seward accepted that geographical reasoning, he thought of buying Wrangel Island just as much as Greenland, and, through purchase, of acquiring the commanding position on the Arctic Sea that Russia now holds through years of intensive development, exploration, and experience.

WRANGLE ISLAND

In 1926 we tacitly gave up the strong rights to Wrangel Island that we once held by virtue of exploration and colonization. A tabloid history runs as follows: The island was first sighted by the British under Kellett in 1849; Captain Long, American, was the first to land on it in 1867; the American, DeLong, proved its insularity in 1879. In 1881 an American naval officer, Lieutenant Berry, spent 3 weeks on it preparing the only map available for 33 years. In 1914 members of Stefansson's Canadian expedition spent several months on it and claimed it for Great Britain. Because of the island's strategic position in relation to future Arctic air lines, this was followed up in 1920 by a British "colonizing" expedition, planned by Stefansson and commanded by Crawford. But Britain didn't want the island, and her interests were therefore taken over by Americans headed by Carl Lomen. We didn't back up Lomen either, and made no objections when, in 1926, Russia sent a gunboat to remove his colony and replace it with one of her own. We saw no "value" in the island.

Today Russia has a colony of some 60 people there, greenhouses, a radio station, a weather station that is of great value to our aviation in Alaska through improving Alaskan weather forecasting, and an excellent airport, which may constitute one of many reasons why our Army and Navy are now intensely interested in the fortification of Alaska.

Just before and after the publication of Seward's report a long string of heroic American explorers firmly established our rights to northern Greenland—rights that were far stronger than those we now have to our part of Antarctica by virtue of discovery and exploration. Kane, Hayes, Hall, and Greeley were names to be conjured with in the long and stirring cycle of Greenland explorations in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Peary crossed northern Greenland in 1892, and again in 1895. The most important of all his life work as an explorer, not even barring his attainment of the Pole, was done in 1900 when he sailed around northernmost Greenland, established its insularity, and thus settled once and for all a baffling geographical problem.

In 1916 the Panama Canal had been completed for some years and we were again interested in the acquisition of the Virgin Islands. As part of the bargain Denmark asked that we grant official recognition to her sovereignty over Greenland.

To her the term, insofar as it indicated a political entity, still meant the southern part where she had for some centuries exercised governmental, police, and economic jurisdiction. She didn't press the point about northern Greenland, but Admiral Peary did. He bombarded members of our Government with letters, explaining our rights there, and begging Washington's statesmen not to give away with a flourish of the pen what we had won in the preceding 50 years through the expenditure of heroic American effort, of thousands of American dollars, and a number of American lives.

But only now is the United States beginning to lose its past reputation for failing to give official recognition to the work of its great explorers with anything but medals and parades. Few nations have been as lax as we in following up the work of those citizens who risked their lives and their fortunes in carrying our flag to the far north and south. To the men in Washington, Greenland was still a mere forbidding clump of polar ice. In the treaty of New York, signed August 4, 1916, we acquired an important strategic base in the Caribbean Sea, and grandly gave away another in the north that may soon prove as important and a thousand times as wealthy.

ICELAND FIRST AMERICAN REPUBLIC

In 1939 Stefansson published a book called *Iceland, the First American Republic*. There he made the claim that Iceland is in the Western Hemisphere and geographically a part of America. In fact, he gave credit for the discovery of America to the Irish, who reached the American island of Iceland before 795 A. D. as Columbus reached the American island of San Salvador in 1492. The implication of that reasoning is that Iceland, and especially Greenland, comes within the territory covered by the Monroe Doctrine.

As had happened before, his reasoning was widely dismissed as fantastic; later it was found to be not at all new. At the time of his writing, Stefansson was not aware that our own State Department had published similar reasoning some 70 years earlier. In the Seward report referred to occurs the statement that Iceland, which today figures so often in European shipping and naval news, and which is now, because of the war, sending her steamers to New York instead of to Europe, "is 130 miles east of Greenland and 850 miles west from Norway. By location, then, it belongs to the Western Hemisphere, and is an insular dependency of the North American continent."

In his history of the United States Woodrow Wilson advances as the reason for the purchase of Alaska our desire to extend the

Monroe Doctrine to still another part of the Western Hemisphere. Apparently he wasn't far off. Today the Monroe Doctrine is being tightened for the progressive isolation of the west from the fighting of Europe and Asia, and the potential purchase of Greenland looms as an important step toward extending it still farther in the north and the east.

The one country that has not been heard from in all this is the present owner of Greenland. Nobody seems to know as yet if Denmark wants to sell, but few people believe that she could hold out if approached or that we can afford to let things go too far along their present course. In every day's newspaper we read that the war is encroaching more and more on the Scandinavian countries; every letter I get from my friends and relatives in Denmark carries the firm conviction that it won't be long before Hitler gobbles up their country. What will happen to Greenland if he does is anybody's guess. Certainly neither Britain nor the United States will let Hitler run it, even through the Danish Greenland office, and certainly we should hate to see Britain carry the war to our very shores by taking it away from him in case he takes Denmark.

In authoritative but unquotable circles in Washington there exists the conviction that we should have to step in and take charge of Greenland if Germany stepped in and took charge of Copenhagen. At the same time there exists the conviction that such action would come regrettably close to being a hostile act in the midst of our present efforts to stay out of the war. Similarly, the story appeared in our newspapers only a few months ago that Secretary Lansing, while negotiating for the purchase of the Virgin Islands, gave the Danes a strong hint that their refusal to sell might compel us to take the islands by force in the event of a German victory in the World War.

The alternative seems to be to take no chances on what the future may bring and to buy while the buying is good. How the Greenland Eskimos would like it is another question. Under Denmark they have had the finest treatment that any aboriginal people has ever had at the hands of a modern nation—with the possible exception of Soviet Russia in her dealings with the Siberian primitives. Under us, unless the frightfulness of our past Indian and Eskimo policies has taught us some lessons, they may well, by being allowed to stay out of the war, become major casualties of the war. That, however, calls for enlightenment of policy rather than for blindness to pressing world issues.

ICELAND IS AMERICAN

Mr. President, I next insert in the RECORD excerpts from a book by Vilhjalmur Stefansson entitled "The First American Republic."

The matter referred to is as follows:

There is much in common, though perhaps more in contrast, between the first American democracy and the greatest American democracy.

The Republic of Iceland is dated from 930, the year in which sectional governments were replaced by a national parliament. We date the United States either from 1776 or 1789—from the Declaration or from the Constitution—so Iceland became a republic either 846 or 859 years ahead of the United States.

It has been contended that Iceland is part neither of Europe nor of America but a midway house between them—or, to use a figure with truer and more picturesque historical meaning, that Iceland is a stepping stone between the Old and New Worlds.

By the convention of Eastern and Western Hemispheres Iceland comes near being a halfway mark; for the line between them is usually drawn through Iceland. That line, however, cuts east of the middle of the island, and there are textbooks which show part of Iceland on the map of the Eastern Hemisphere but all of it on the map of the Western.

To reach Iceland from Europe you must cross a wide sea, long out of sight of land—the distance is more than 500 miles from southeastern Iceland to the nearest large European island, Scotland. But from northwestern Iceland children at play see Greenland when they scramble up the mountains that are only 180 miles from the still higher mountains of the Blosseville coast. In northwestern Greenland you do not have to climb a hill to see the next island west, which is Ellesmere—you do not even have to sail to it, but can walk across, as many Europeans and Americans have done the last hundred years, and as the Eskimos have been doing for one or more thousands of years.

RESOURCES IN ICELAND

Here and there throughout the country are extensive bogs yielding a fair quality peat that is used for fuel, especially in the rural districts. During the present century, up to the Great War, more than 20,000 tons were dug each year. During the war the quantity dug reached a maximum of 48,000 tons, due to the high price of coal and the risk about getting it to the country. Peat output declined to 14,000 in 1935 and has continued dropping since.

That the use of peat declined instead of growing with the increase in population has several reasons. People have more money now than before the war and are better able to purchase coal from abroad. Roads have improved and have been extended so that trucks are used instead of pack horses for bringing coal from the harbor to a farm. Hot water piped to buildings has decreased the need for fuel. Cities have developed municipal electric plants with current so cheap that it is used for cooking as well as for light, and even for heating, particularly on chilly days that come in a generally warm part of the year. Many farmers have developed their

own small electric plants, usually through water power. Between large developments and small individual (farmer) production, Iceland now has probably a higher percentage of electric cooking than any other country in the world.

The forests (brushland most of them would be called in America) are used not only for sheep runs but for fuel. During the first decade of the present century it is considered that 700 tons of firewood were cut, on an average, every year. In 1918 this reached a maximum of 2,600 tons, but has decreased until it has now been at about 1,300 tons for the past few years.

The first hothouse was built in 1913. Now such buildings cover an area of 55,000 to 65,000 square feet. They are chiefly used for growing flowers, tomatoes, and cucumbers. They are kept at optimal temperatures by piped hot water from the thermal springs. In some places the hot water is conducted through the soil to warm it for plants which are in other respects grown in the usual way out of doors.

However, no more than a beginning has been made in the use of subterranean heat for agriculture. There are great possibilities.

The livestock consists mainly of sheep, cattle, and horses, mostly descended from animals brought by settlers from Norway, Ireland, and Scotland.

In proportion to the number of inhabitants, Iceland has more sheep than any country north of the Equator—six to each person—whereas in Bulgaria (which comes next) the average is only one and five-tenths per capita. Iceland is, of course, surpassed in this respect by Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. President, I next call the attention of the Senate to a very able discourse on Iceland written by the noted explorer, Stefansson, already referred to, entitled "Iceland Has a Way!" I have permission to place that article in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

ICELAND HAS A WAY
(By Vilhjalmur Stefansson)

"Iceland has accomplished more per capita than any other country in the world." Those are words of Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Mayor of New York City, on June 17, 1939. But he said them while sharing in the dedication of the Iceland Pavilion on Iceland Day at the world's fair. One is sometimes extravagant upon such occasions.

Still there are many who have concluded that, within limited spheres, Iceland, with its 117,000 population, is, if not the greatest, at least a remarkable country. One of these is James Bryce, who wrote what many Americans still consider about the most discriminating book on their form of government, *The American Commonwealth*. He showed in his later book *Studies in History and Jurisprudence* that many institutions, such as trial by jury, that are commonly supposed to have originated in Britain were borrowed from Iceland by the English. Through his and other studies one sees that it is Iceland and not England which should be called the Mother of Parliaments, for Iceland had a parliamentary government from A. D. 930—one, incidentally, which is still functioning, now in its 1,011th year.

ICELANDIC LITERATURE

It was Bryce, also, who said that there were three great pre-Renaissance literatures in Europe, developed in Greece, in Rome, and in Iceland; and that Icelandic literature, although in his opinion not equal to that of Greece, was superior to the literature of Rome.

As a historical record, this early Icelandic literature is priceless. Small indeed would be our knowledge of the pre-Christian religion that was general over northern Europe were it not for the poetic Edda and the prose Edda. The poetic Edda was composed in part abroad, the rest in Iceland; it was preserved only in Iceland. The prose Edda was both composed in Iceland and preserved only there. Without these two books we would know little of Odin and Thor, Baldur and Freyja, of the ethics, morals, and philosophy of the "Teutonic" religion, its doctrines of fate and of the destiny of men and gods.

EARLY RECORDED HISTORY

Not only do the historians and critics of the ancient religion find their main source in the books of Iceland, but that is true also of those who need the information for lighter purposes; as, for instance, Wagner when he had to turn to Iceland for the literary material behind his Nibelung operas. The history of Norway up to the tenth century is taught in Norwegian schools less from the Norwegian than from Icelandic sources.

In fact, many countries of Europe would have gaps in their histories but for the sagas that were composed, written down, and preserved in Iceland. Russia owes a considerable debt to the sagas. Their value holds even as far southeast as Istanbul (formerly Constantinople), where Icelanders were court poets or bodyguards under the Empire of the East and returned in their middle or old age to have the information which they brought back recorded in what became material for one or another of the Icelandic sagas.

North America, too, is indebted. Icelanders discovered the island of Greenland off the coast of North America, colonized it after 982, established there a republic (functioning through a parliament) about 990, adopted Christianity in 1000, and maintained continuous relations between America and Europe at least to 1347. This relation was partly through trade with northwest-

ern Europe. The Vatican retained its contact until some years after Columbus' time.

DISCOVERIES OF EIRIK THE LUCKY

As said, this relation goes farther south and west than Greenland. For in the year 1000 a man who had been born in Iceland, but who was now a citizen of the Greenland Republic, discovered the North American mainland, in southern Labrador. This discoverer has been well named "Leif the Lucky." Part of the luck of Leif the Lucky was to be the son of a really great man, Eirik the Red, the first polar explorer whose achievements and character are known to us.

All previous explorers, of whatever zone, whose doings found their way into records that have been preserved, journeyed to lands known in considerable detail through hearsay. They were even accompanied by interpreters. The voyage to Greenland was nothing like that. The mountain tops of the island had been seen, true enough, at least as early as 900 by ships voyaging along the west coast of Iceland, and doubtless had been seen also from the mountains of northwestern Iceland. But nothing was known about the country except that it lay to the west.

This makes Eirik the first man whose name we know who sailed to investigate what was, properly speaking, an unknown land. His was also the first known voyage that ever encountered pack ice and made systematic attempts to penetrate it. All previous voyagers had retreated from this form of menace which, so far as we know, had been unknown to all sailors of the British Isles and Scandinavia until after Iceland's discovery.

Like the sailors of later times, Eirik found he could not penetrate the belt of pack ice that tumbles in the polar current flowing southward along the Atlantic coast of Greenland. So, like hundreds of ships in later centuries, he had to follow around Cape Farewell to where the ice scattered and he could get ashore.

Eirik's crew were his family and the families of some of his friends; their equipment was their tools of husbandry; provisions were the farm animals on hoof and wing—cattle and sheep for certain, and fowl; goats and swine in all likelihood. Overland transport was to be horses—Iceland ponies.

After being for three summers and winters the first explorer of land farther west than Iceland, Eirik the Red decided to attempt securing colonists for the new land, and, as a first step in his campaign, chose a good selling title. The record has it that "he conceived people would all the more readily colonize the land if it had an attractive name, and so he called it Green Land."

This article is the story of Iceland, not of the vicissitudes of Greenland or of the discovery of North America. But it is part of Iceland's history that for centuries it maintained Europe's contact with the North American mainland and Greenland.

Leif, as said, was a Greenlander when he reached Labrador in 1000. Neither he nor any other Greenlander is known to have been a leader in attempting the colonization of the mainland; but Icelanders, 160 in number, led by Thorfinn Karlsefni, tried to colonize the southward extension of Labrador, called Vinland, from 1004 to 1007. They had spent the winter of 1003-4 in Greenland and reached the mainland by Leif's directions—up the west Greenland shore to Disko (Bear Island), then southwest and south to Baffin Island, Labrador, and the coast southward. With them were a few Greenlanders.

The Indians whom they met, perhaps Algonquins, were almost as well armed as the Norsemen—they were at least equal with the bow and arrow, inferior only as to sword and armor. They had better judgment, too, than their more southerly cousins of later centuries, who first welcomed the Puritans and other Europeans, and began to resist them only when it was too late. The wiser North Americans of the eleventh century started attacking the Europeans during their second year and drove them away at the end of the third season, in 1007.

COMMERCE THROUGH ICELAND

But that did not end the relation between the North American mainland and Europe, for commerce through Iceland remained. The chief item of that commerce no doubt was that ships left Greenland empty, took on cargoes of timber in southern Labrador (perhaps sometimes Newfoundland), and returned with these to Iceland, where they were sold for Irish cloth, Norwegian weapons, and wares from other European countries. Then the ships returned to Greenland.

We do not know how late these triangular voyages continued, for they were so commonplace as not to be mentioned in the annals just as voyages. That they were still going in 1347 we know, because a ship engaged in this trade is recorded as having been wrecked on the coast of Iceland.

Except that the island continued to be literary, preserving through books the religion, history, novels, and poetry of the viking period, Iceland fell into the general backwash of the Dark Ages. With much of the rest of northwestern Europe it shifted from Roman Catholicism to Lutheranism during the sixteenth century. Through two or three centuries thereafter it was, as far as we can tell, a more impoverished land than any in Europe materially, although it always maintained a lead over Europe in percentage of literacy. This literacy was unique in the wide use of pen and ink for the native tongue.

ICELAND ABOLISHING POVERTY

If we accept the common premise that prosperity depends on natural resources, then the economic situation of modern Iceland is a near miracle. For the land has fewer natural resources than any of the democracies, but nevertheless has come nearer than any other democracy to abolishing poverty.

Iceland, a high land in a warm sea, has mountains which capture snow enough to create larger glaciers than any of Europe or of the mainland of Asia. Large parts of the country have a surface of lava too recent for vegetation, while in other parts the grass has been buried in volcanic ash. The coldest seaport town of Iceland is not so cold in January as Portland, Me., and Reykjavik, the capital, is as warm as Philadelphia; but it is nevertheless true that the summers are too cool for agriculture, and the meager soil of Iceland therefore supports no economic vegetation except grass for pasture and hay for winter feed.

In spite of this, the land produces enough meat and milk for its own use, with some products of both for sale to Europe. Wool is a considerable export, and so were horses until recently. Still and all, when we realize that Iceland cannot grow cereals and has none of the important economic minerals, we think of it as a land practically devoid of resources.

ICELAND FISHERIES

But if Iceland's soil is poor, the waters which surround it are rich. To excel them one might have to go to the icy seas that border the Antarctic Continent. This wealth of Iceland's sea not only draws large fishing fleets from many European nations each year but also (and crucially for Iceland) has caused a development through which Icelanders have won per capita leadership in the capture and export of fish and their products.

Before the outbreak of war in Europe, according to an international bureau of fish statistics, the Germans caught 15 pounds of fish for each individual of their population, the French 24 pounds, the English 44, the Scots 70, the Norwegians 815. Icelanders caught 5,104 pounds per inhabitant.

Naturally, the fishing industry is well represented in the memberships of the three Rotary Clubs of Iceland; so also are such allied businesses as ocean shipping, shipbuilding, marine salvage, and marine biology. It was the writer's pleasure to be guest at a meeting of Iceland's first Rotary Club, the Rotary Club of Reykjavik, 4 years ago. The club, then 3 years old, had 29 members; latest reports give it 32. Two more Rotary Clubs have since been established in Iceland—one at Isafjordur, the other at Siglufjordur. It is a safe assumption that the fishing industry is proportionately even better represented in these new Rotary Clubs, for they are located in cities even more dependent upon the sea and its harvests than is the capital city.

SOCIALISTIC ICELAND

It is from almost the sole resources of grazing and fishing that Iceland has abolished poverty. Its percentage of unemployment for several years has been lower than that of France, England, or the United States. Unemployment insurance, old-age insurance, and similar measures are in force. Iceland is advanced also in the effectiveness of its public-health measures. This country which in 1810 had less than one hospital bed for each 10,000 persons now has a free bed for every 110. It is, perhaps, significant that an Icelander, Niels R. Finsen, was the third to win the Nobel Prize in medicine and won it 9 years before a similar honor came to the United States.

The term "the middle way," popularized for the Scandinavian countries by Marquis W. Childs in his book *Sweden—The Middle Way*, applies to all Scandinavian countries. It is an Americanism for what Scandinavians themselves call socialism. By their own way of looking at it, they have been socialistic for a decade, some of them longer.

In Iceland no single left party has ever had a majority. There were governments of a coalition between a party which featured the development of cooperatives and a party which, though not hostile to cooperatives, favored a gradual development of outright State ownership. At present, however, there is a national government composed of mild capitalists who work with the somewhat larger combined number of the cooperative party and the State-ownership party.

An upper house and a lower house compose the Althing, or parliament. Executive power theoretically rests with the King of Iceland, but he exercises it only through his ministers. Denmark acknowledged Iceland as a sovereign state 22 years ago—in 1918. By that arrangement, Iceland was united with Denmark only in that the King of Denmark was also the King of Iceland. That tie was severed on April 10 when, the Germans having invaded Denmark, the Iceland Parliament declared that the King of Denmark, being a prisoner of a foreign power, was unable to function as King of Iceland and that they would no longer employ the Danish diplomatic service.

Taxes in Iceland are high, much higher than in the United States. Various other methods are employed, however, to distribute and equalize wealth and to keep money in circulation. If one may judge from Government and other figures, a third or a quarter of the people of the United States, potentially the wealthiest nation in the world, live at a lower level (measured in food, clothing, housing, education, medical attendance, etc.) than that of perhaps even a single family in Iceland.

The average well-being of the other Scandinavian countries is about as high as that of Iceland—perhaps higher in one or two cases. But that is not surprising, for some of those countries are rich both in soil and in economic minerals. It is the abolishing of poverty by a land poor in resources which is Iceland's glory.

Perhaps that was what Mayor LaGuardia meant when he said, "Iceland has accomplished more per capita than any other country in the world."

Mr. President, I insert in the RECORD at this point part of an article from the Washington Times-Herald of June 3, and an article from the Washington Evening Star of June 2.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 3, 1940]

EUROPE BARRED FROM AMERICAS IN BLOOM BILL—ROOSEVELT PLANNING ECONOMIES IN NONDEFENSE ITEMS

Refusal of the United States to "recognize" or "acquiesce" in the transfer of any portion of the Western Hemisphere from one non-American power to another is provided in a bill introduced late today by Chairman BLOOM of the House Foreign Affairs Committee—with the approval of the State Department, he said. * * *

PROVISIONS OF BILL

The Bloom bill, to be accompanied by a companion measure in the Senate by Chairman PITTMAN of the Foreign Relations Committee, would provide:

"1. That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer any geographic region of the Western Hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power; and

"2. That if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States shall, in addition to other measures, immediately consult with the other American republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interests."

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 2, 1940]

GERMANS HAVE EYES ON ICELAND AS AIR BASE, SAYS STEFANSSON—ISLAND IS IMPORTANT STEPPING STONE TO UNITED STATES, EXPLORER DECLARES

(By Ira Wolfert)

NEW YORK, June 1.—With a British garrison now settled on it, Iceland's character as a powder barrel in an exploding world becomes more discernible.

It is a powder barrel with fuse attached and Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the explorer, historian, and geographer whose most recent book is called "Iceland: The First American Republic," explained in an interview today about the fuse.

Dr. Stefansson made it clear that the Germans have their eyes on Iceland and that the island's major value is as a stepping stone between North America and Europe for airplanes.

President Roosevelt, in his first defense message to Congress, mentioned that Greenland is only 6 hours by air from New England. Iceland, an island about as large as Ohio and with a population of 120,000—90 percent of whom are Norwegian or Irish descent—is less than 1 hour from Greenland.

ALL-YEAR AIR BASE

"It is, also, because of its temperate climate, an excellent all-year-around air base," said Dr. Stefansson. Its average temperature for the coldest month is about that of Philadelphia. In addition, the latest maps of the Danish Geodetic Survey, which would be the most accurate, show that Greenland extends 50 miles farther east than the most easterly point of Iceland."

That would be what makes it a powder barrel. The fuse is an ancient but now more than ever aggravated difference in concept between the United States and Germany as to the place Iceland occupies in world affairs.

"Not many seem to be aware of this," said Dr. Stefansson, "but Secretary of State Seward, at the time of the purchase of Alaska, advocated the simultaneous purchase of both Iceland and Greenland—Alaska to dominate the North Pacific, Greenland and Iceland to dominate the North Atlantic. He was acting on a report compiled at his request by Benjamin Mills Pierce, then head of our Coast Survey. Professor Pierce offered evidence to prove that by location, it (Iceland) belongs to the Western Hemisphere, and is an insular dependency of the North American Continent * * *"

"CALLED NAZI HOLY LAND

"On the other hand, high Nazi officials, in the course of their attempt to oust Christianity from Germany, have described Iceland as their holy land, and in a speech last summer, one of them—Joseph Goebbels, the Minister of Propaganda, I believe—said that Germans of the type who had once made pilgrimages to Jerusalem should make pilgrimages to Iceland to see the shrine of the Teutonic religion."

The Nazis have not let it go with that. In Iceland they have practiced what is now a familiar technique of penetration. Here it can be described as an attempt to make sure that if the god they worship cannot be on the side of the heaviest battalions, the heaviest battalions can be put on his side.

"Under Hitler," said Dr. Stefansson, "Germany began to send teachers—paid by Germany—to lecture at the university and the technical colleges. After that they sent over many athletic instructors who formed classes and vereins and initiated friendly international competitions. Iceland football teams toured Germany, and German football teams toured Iceland.

"Suddenly the Nazis took to encouraging the sport of gliding—flying with motorless airplanes. They sent over instructors and tools and materials. Two years ago they sent over two airplanes, which proceeded carefully to survey and map all of Iceland and its innumerable harbors. Their announced purpose was to aid the sport of gliding. The newspapers became alarmed and pointed out at that time that Iceland had confidence in the British Navy.

"GOOD RAIDING BASE"

"Iceland is the best raiding point, next to Ireland, against shipping between the United States or Canada and northern Europe. Its harbors offer wonderful protection for seaplanes and submarines and destroyers, and that very likely is why Great Britain garrisoned it during the Norwegian campaign."

Dr. Stefansson, who is consultant on northern operations for Pan-American Airways, pointed out that it was only the outbreak of war which has interfered with the adoption of Iceland as the way station en route across the Atlantic. He said pan American has maintained a meteorological station there for a year now and that the country's "indefinite number of ice-free harbors" offer better opportunities for on-schedule operations all year round than the Azores.

"The fact that the Germans are alert to this is indicated by the interesting history of a certain lost letter," he said. "Long before Hitler, Lufthansa, the German aviation company, was engaged with Icelanders in the operation of a commercial air service in Iceland. The company went bankrupt in 1932, I believe, and the Prime Minister of Iceland, out of gratitude for Lufthansa's efforts, sent a letter promising Germany most-favored-nation treatment in the establishment of commercial air bases.

FEW LAND AIR FIELDS

"In March 1939 a report came to the attention of the German Government that another country was preparing to set up a base in Iceland. The Germans promptly sent a note reminding Iceland of the promise contained in the letter from its former prime minister. They sent the note in the cruiser *Emden*, and two other warships were reported to have come along, perhaps to help carry it.

"The filing system in Iceland, no doubt, is not the best. The prime minister was no longer in office. In fact, he was dead. The Icelandic Government could not find the letter at all. It reported that and added politely that the information of the German Government about the establishment of an air base by another nation was erroneous. The Germans withdrew."

Dr. Stefansson said that while the great number of harbors were perfect for fast flying boats, of the type used as long-range bombers now, there were few land airports in Iceland.

"The Icelanders were deterred from building any by the natural feeling that land airports would merely make their country all the more desirable to a foreign nation."

Mr. President, while I cannot join Dr. Stefansson in his expressed and implied hostility to a friendly power with which we have full diplomatic relations, nevertheless, the article is worth reading, especially the part devoted to scientific data. When the good doctor departs into the diplomatic and international field, he is not quite so successful.

While we are busy berating and lecturing Germany, let us never forget that Great Britain by force of arms occupied Iceland. It is time for America to serve notice on that Empire to get out of Iceland and stay out.

HEMISPHERE DEFENSE

"Hemisphere Defense Is Speeded by the United States." This is an article from the Washington Daily News; and that is really the point I have been driving at in all the months and years that I have made a careful study of the acquisition of these islands. We should take care of hemisphere defense, and another word should be added, so as to make it "American Hemisphere defense." It is the Western Hemisphere, of course; but in time it must become the American Hemisphere. The greatest and most powerful nation in the Western Hemisphere must carry the burden of the defense of these air bases and naval bases.

I place in the RECORD at this point the article to which I have just referred.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 4, 1940]

HEMISPHERE DEFENSE IS SPEEDED BY UNITED STATES

The United States today prepared military, economic, and political moves to make the declaration of solidarity of the 21 American nations something more than a scrap of paper.

The major attempt to preserve the status quo in the Western Hemisphere comes at a meeting of the House Foreign Affairs Committee today. It considers a resolution by Chairman SOL BLOOM which would have the effect of writing Monroe Doctrine into law by laying down a policy of nonrecognition by the United States of transfers of Western Hemisphere territory between non-hemisphere nations.

DANGER SPOTS STUDIED

Moves on other fronts included:

1. A survey, in conjunction with Latin American governments concerned, of potential danger spots where "fifth columnists" might seek to undermine a country's stability.

2. A speeding up of machinery to find new markets for Latin-American products to replace those lost as a result of the war.

3. Extension of assistance to Latin American countries to establish new industries.

Representative BLOOM's resolution has State Department approval. Representative HAMILTON FISH (Republican, New York), ranking Republican member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, approved and said he believed Congress should take steps toward acquisition of all Western Hemisphere islands owned by European governments, "from Greenland to Trinidad."

The British blockade has cut off Argentina's and Uruguay's former markets in central Europe and Scandinavia for wheat, meat, and wool; German submarine activity and the scarcity of ships has seriously curtailed the markets in Great Britain for the same products.

COFFEE MARKETS LAST

The same causes have virtually eliminated the European markets for coffee from Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela, and Costa Rica. Lack of shipping facilities has seriously affected Chile's exports of minerals and nitrates; of Peru's exports of sugar and cotton.

The Inter-American Development Committee is actively studying ways of creating new industries. Brazil is negotiating with United States steel interests for the establishment of a steel plant to work her vast iron-ore deposits and produce steel for industrial development.

NEGOTIATING FOR BASES

The Inter-American Financial and Economic Committee plans to hasten establishment and operation of an inter-American bank which would help to finance development of new industries in Latin America.

Meanwhile, the Army and Navy Journal revealed in its current issue that negotiations are being conducted by the State Department, assisted by Army and Navy missions, to establish naval and air bases in South America, and perhaps in the Portuguese-owned Cape Verde Islands, and to eliminate Germans from the operation of air lines which they control.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the Chair and the Senate for their indulgence at this late hour. I speak in all seriousness to my colleagues. I hope those who are not present may do me the honor at least to examine the information, statistics, and data, which I have placed in the RECORD.

ISLAND BASES FOR DEFENSE

The day may come at some future time when the very life of America will hang in the balance, and the decision may rest on these bases. I may be mistaken; I am only one individual, and of course, my judgment may be at fault. We make many mistakes. I have fortified my files with the statements of admirals and generals and able authorities in aviation and naval affairs that no nation or group of nations can successfully attack us if we have these bases. On the other hand, if we permit foreign countries to take over, for instance, the Orkneys, which might happen if the British Empire were defeated, and the Shetland Islands, then the Faroes, each step only 150 or 200 miles from the next, then another 200 miles from the Faroes to Iceland, then across from Iceland 180 miles to Greenland, and from there only 20 miles to Canada to Ellesmere Land, step by step the European powers would be carried into North America.

Mr. President, that can be prevented. It is not too late, and I am pleading with the State Department and the Chief Executive that we may not be too late in this matter.

In Proverbs we are told that "Where there is no vision the people perish," and I think it is time for a little vision on our part. There were those of us in 1917 who visualized the poverty and destitution and hunger, the malnutrition, the huge burden of debt that would press down upon the shoulders of our children and our grandchildren. We foresaw the pensions; we foresaw that if the United States entered the World War in 1917 we would be drawn perhaps into a succession of wars, and I so stated on April 6, 1917, on the floor of the House of Representatives. Today, no one disputes my words of that hour. Though we passed through the fires of persecution, we were correct, because we stated the truth.

EUROPE OUT OF AMERICA

We must have an American policy, and that American policy must be the policy of Washington and Jefferson, and Madison and Monroe, it must be the policy which every great statesman in this country has pursued like a golden thread down through the decades of American history. We have laid down the policy, "Europe, keep out of South and North America, and we will keep out of Europe." That has

been our policy, and the minute we depart from that policy we are in difficulty, and endanger the Republic.

Whenever I go down Pennsylvania Avenue and pass the old National Hotel, the old structure where the National Guard of the District of Columbia is now housed, I think of Henry Clay when he used to live there. History tells us that once there came to him the great Hungarian patriot, Louis Kossuth, who pleaded with Henry Clay to use his powers of eloquence and his great talents of persuasion to convince the American people that they should help the Hungarian patriots on to liberty and independence. The great orator from Kentucky listened, and when the Hungarian patriot had concluded his remarks, I cannot recall the exact words, but in effect Henry Clay said:

We, the American people, sympathize with the Hungarian patriots. We wish them well in their endeavor to achieve liberty and independence. But, if we entered the European scene with our armed forces, if we threw our might and strength into the balance over in Europe, what if we should sink with the European powers with which we allied ourselves? Who then would hold aloft the light of liberty to the world?

"WORLD POLICING"

Of course, we have come upon other days, and we are now in an era of world saving. We are going to save the world; we are going to police the world, and we are building battleships costing approximately \$100,000,000 apiece. We should remember that every time we build a battleship costing \$100,000,000 we have to multiply that dollar for dollar, because of the necessity of having submarines, aircraft, and fast surface vessels, to protect the dreadnaught from being sunk. That is the statement of the naval authorities.

Perhaps Henry Clay was right, that we should not endanger the liberty and strength and power of this great American Republic, which was handed down to us by our forefathers great and strong and powerful, and practically without debt at one time. During Andrew Jackson's administration there was no national debt. I recently visited the Hermitage, in the State of the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], who now presides, and I have great reverence and great respect for the glorious history of Jackson. I should like to have Senators and the Nation follow his ideas in regard to foreign affairs. They were the ideas of Jefferson and Madison and of Monroe. But perhaps the world saviors, the world police, will not listen to that.

If we pursue any other policy, our boys will be dying upon the battlefields of every nation around this great globe. What I am trying to do now is to bring back American thought to our own hemisphere, to our own island bases, to our own shores. If I had my way about it, I would bring every one of our warships home from Europe, Asia, and Africa, and I would station our fleet on our own shores. I would have our great strength around this beloved American continent and this great American Republic, instead of sending our ships roving over the earth, where they may get into the line of fire. We are an emotional people, and are easily stirred, and we may be drawn into war because of incidents. So far as I am able, with whatever strength I may have, I will urge that we return to our own country and to the interests of our own people at home.

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand from some of the newspapermen that the Navy has just announced that 50 airplanes have been turned back to one of the airplane companies so that they may be sold to the British Government. These were planes which were being built for the Government of the United States.

I stated a while ago that we were following in our footsteps of the period between 1914 and 1916. I am afraid that I was not correct in that, because I know of no occasion when the administration in charge of the Government of the United States between 1914 and 1917 either sold munitions directly to one of the belligerents, or sold to some pri-

vate individual so that he in turn could sell to one of the belligerents.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I thank the able Senator from Montana for his statement and for directing the attention of the American public to this subject. I especially appreciate what he has said because of his eminence in American affairs.

Let me say in all seriousness that there may be some truth in the statement of Henry L. Mencken, published in the Baltimore Sun not long ago, when the headlines read, "Do not tie up to England. You may be tying up to a corpse."

THE HISTORY OF EMPIRES

Mr. President, we do not hope for that to occur. We want to see England live. We in America, where there are so many good people of British blood, hope that will not occur; we wish no ill to any nation. But why should we imperil this great Nation by tying up with an empire which may be dying?

All empires rise and then go down. That has been true throughout all the history of the world. Are we to load their troubles and burdens upon this great Republic and carry them down through the ages? As much as we respect the glorious part that Britain has played in history, it certainly is not the duty of the American Republic to assume such burdens. And certainly we are not going to give any blood or money to any of these contestants if I can prevent it by my vote.

So, when we come to the question of protecting America, let me say that the most important act, the most important negotiation, that can be had in this hour is to acquire island bases on the east coast and the west coast and put our ablest aviation experts at work to develop such bases—air bases and naval bases—so as to make this great Nation of ours invincible from any and all foreign attack.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on April 10, 1940, the Senate, during a call of the calendar, passed Senate bill 3195 for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, which was transmitted to the House, and on April 12 was referred to the Committee on Claims in that body. On May 29, 1940, the House of Representatives passed an identical House bill, H. R. 8096, instead of taking up and passing the Senate bill, which had been sent over to that body 6 weeks previously.

In order that the same bill may pass both Houses, and be presented to the President, I ask unanimous consent that the House bill may be taken up for consideration and passed. The two bills are identical.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will that require action on the Senate bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; I do not think so. What I ask is merely the passage of the identical House bill. We passed the Senate bill, according to the information I have received from the clerk. We sent it to the House, and as they sometimes do, they passed an identical bill, and sent it to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate bill is in the House. Of course, the House bill is here, and it can be acted upon if it is desired to act upon it.

Mr. LODGE. And the bill which the Senator desires passed is identical with the one which was previously passed by the Senate?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; identical.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 8096) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, which was read twice by its title.

The bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McKellar, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. HERRING, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported favorably the nomination of Edward C. Eicher, of Iowa, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1945 (reappointment).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state in order the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold L. Williamson, Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roy L. Perkins, Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HATCH. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc. That concludes the calendar.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. HATCH. As in legislative session, and in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 10, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 6 (legislative day of May 28), 1940

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Charles E. Jackson, of South Carolina, to be Deputy Commissioner in the Bureau of Fisheries. Reappointment.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Lt. Col. John M. Arthur to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of August 1939.

Lt. Col. James T. Moore to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1939.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of August 1939:

William P. Kelly	Robert J. Straub
Pierson E. Conradt	Robert O. Bare
John W. Lakso	Raymond A. Anderson
William R. Hughes	Walter J. Stuart
Thomas B. White	James H. N. Hudnall
Maxwell H. Mizell	Alexander W. Kreiser, Jr.

Capt. Thomas C. Perrin to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of August 1939.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1939:

Lenard B. Cresswell
Thomas J. McQuade
Kenneth B. Chappell

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1939:

Arthur W. Ellis
Edwin C. Ferguson
Homer L. Litzenberg, Jr.

Capt. Wilburt S. Brown to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January 1940.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of April 1940:

Floyd A. Stephenson
Samuel S. Ballentine
David K. Claude

First Lt. Clyde R. Nelson to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1939.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of August 1939:

John P. Condon	Lawrence B. Clark
Joseph P. Fuchs	Lehman H. Kleppinger
Bennett G. Powers	John E. Weber

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 3d day of June 1940:

John G. Walsh, Jr.	Robert F. Ruge
Arthur W. Fisher, Jr.	John R. Lirette
Joseph A. Gerath, Jr.	Owen A. Chambers

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 6 (legislative day of May 28), 1940

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Harold L. Williamson, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Troy L. Perkins, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

TO BE CAPTAIN

Robert S. Haggart

TO BE COMMANDERS

Adrian O. Rule, Jr.	Francis P. Old
John L. Reynolds	William H. Wallace
Dorrance K. Day	Forrest M. O'Leary
Paul L. Mather	Benjamin P. Ward
Clarence H. Pike	John F. Rees
Henry S. Nielson	James B. Carter
Alf O. R. Bergesen	John B. Mallard
Lyman S. Perry	James L. Wyatt
Paul R. Heineman	Hugh W. Turney
Maurice E. Curtis	Russell C. Bartman
Allen Hobbs	Robert Holmes Smith
William H. Buracker	Oscar A. Weller
Harold F. Fick	Robert E. Melling
Paul W. Steinhagen	

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Ernest St. C. von Klebeck, Jr.	William G. Becher, Jr.
Donald C. Beard	Hamilton L. Stone

Thomas G. Reamy
Knowlton Williams
William C. Schultz
Charles A. Bond
Harry F. Miller
John O. Lambrecht
Thomas Burrowes
Donald C. Varian
Harry H. Henderson

Charles S. Weeks
Kenneth C. Hurd
Hunter Wood, Jr.
Joseph H. Wellings
William R. Headden
Barton E. Bacon, Jr.
Paul C. Crosley
James M. Hicks

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Joel C. Ford, Jr.
John H. Kaufman
William R. Franklin
William L. Richards
Francis D. Foley
Paul H. Harrington
William M. Ryon

Richard V. Gregory
Alfred L. Cope
Richard C. Williams, Jr.
Harold L. Sargent
George W. Kehl
Wallace H. Weston

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Carl H. Amme, Jr.
Charles E. Gibson
Henry A. Rowe
Terrell H. W. Connor
Carl R. Hirschberger
Warren W. Ford
Harvey P. Lanham
Oliver M. Ramsey
Patrick H. Hart
Joseph A. Dodson, Jr.
Morton H. Lytle
David E. Dressendorfer
Vincent F. McCormack
Raymond A. Moore
Donald D. Patterson
Charles E. Lake
Theophilus H. Moore
Robert F. Farrington

Stockton B. Strong
Thomas E. Edwards, Jr.
Warren C. Hall, Jr.
Harold D. Shrider
Lloyd F. Jakeman
Robert L. Savage, Jr.
Frank A. Patriarca
Leonce A. Lajaunie, Jr.
John M. De Vane, Jr.
John C. Kelly
Robert M. Ware
Francis W. Ingling
Paul J. Riley
William A. H. Howland
Geoffrey P. Norman
Thomas J. Nixon 3d
James N. Mayes
Charles R. Dodds

TO BE PAY INSPECTOR

Louis A. Puckett

TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTER

John W. Neel

TO BE NAVAL CONSTRUCTOR

Frederick G. Crisp

TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS

Robert W. Carter
Ira F. Haddock

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Alene W. Moxley, Cobbtown.
Alma Bustle, Coolidge.
John L. Callaway, Covington.
Robert A. Fowler, Fort Gaines.
Helen U. Kent, Glenwood.
Ursuline Belcher Ingersoll, Industrial College.
Arthur G. Williams, Jesup.
Pearl E. Hughs, Stillmore.
Claude M. Proctor, Summit.
William H. Freeman, Toombsboro.

INDIANA

Clyde B. Oberlin, Butler.
C. Dudley Watson, La Crosse.
Jeannette Manifold, Mooreland.
Albert E. Sewell, Pleasant Lake.
Guy R. Sears, Red Key.
Fonzo Martin, Shelburn.
Elijah A. Gebhart, Warren.
Dorothy B. Schirr, Westville.
James D. Arnold, Winslow.

LOUISIANA

Albert B. Coroy, Gonzales.

MARYLAND

M. Elizabeth Acree, Capitol Heights.
Morgan H. Baldwin, Crownsville.

Benjamin F. Johnson, Denton.
Clayton F. Porter, Greensboro.
Herbert A. Wrenn, Lanham.
Alfred F. Gough, Leonardtown.
Charles E. Nikirk, Middletown.
Ethel W. Gallagher, Preston.
Madeleine L. Boshier, Riverdale.
Elizabeth E. Wood, Sandy Spring.
Basil Frank Dorsey, Woodbine.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Arthur A. Croteau, Marlboro.
Edward A. Davis, North Conway.
Edward W. Clement, North Woodstock.
Louis T. Pike, Pike.
Charles L. McGinness, Troy.

NEW YORK

Barthold C. Hadel, Amagansett.
Agnes G. Polley, Andes.
Curtis Van Valkenburgh, Arkville.
Chester T. Burnett, Burdett.
Timothy B. Ryan, Chateaugay.
Purdy A. Kinkaid, Cohocton.
Melvin C. Bundy, Cooperstown.
John H. S. Griffin, Delhi.
Frank P. Morstatt, Garnerville.
Anna C. Allen, Groveland.
Ethel M. Martin, Hamlin.
Rita McGoe, Hartsdale.
Antoinette Ducharme, Lyon Mountain.
Albert A. Morse, Moravia.
Lewis N. S. Rockwell, Otisville.
Bernard H. Powers, Oyster Bay.
Eugene B. Gormley, Phoenicia.
Frank P. Bakutis, Quogue.
Cecile G. Taylor, Sloatsburg.
James J. Collins, Water Mill.
Oliver Townsend, West Coxsackie.
George M. Allen, Worcester.

NORTH DAKOTA

John Urbon Pavlik, Buffalo.
Joseph M. Moen, Galesburg.
Ethel E. Hall, Hettinger.
Bernhard C. Hjelle, Mercer.
Mary J. Dunbar, Souris.
Alice G. Russell, Thompson.
Anna F. Jones, Verona.
Mae Scollard, Watford City.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles Gubin, Northumberland.

VERMONT

Dora W. Brown, Lunenburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou, our everlasting portion, at Thy footstool we offer our tributes of praise and gratitude. Thou who canst hear the falling of a tear and the whisper of a sigh, read our hearts, purify our purposes, and cleanse us from all hidden motives which are contrary to Thy righteous will. As the work of life is too long and too arduous to be borne alone, we beseech Thee, dear Lord, to direct us with Thy counsel and make plain for us the definite outlines of duty. Go with us through all the scenes of life and be with us when we reach the end. In the name of our holy Redeemer. Amen.

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